

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

<b>Study Plan</b>	<b>Commenter (initials/ agency)</b>	<b>Section #/Title</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>All</b>	GW/USFWS	N/A	The USFWS has no further comments on the revised draft study plans.	N/A
	CR/USFS	N/A	No comments on the revised draft study plans	N/A
	RB/BOR	N/A	I have reviewed the revised documents and have no additional comments or changes that need to be made at this time.	N/A
	KL/DWQ	N/A	The Division of Water Quality has reviewed the study plans and accepts them as edited.	N/A
	CV/AW	N/A	AW has no comments on the subject study plans and the Recreation Plan previously sent by separate transmittal email. We are very interested in the group response to the additional hydrology information that has been added in this revision.	N/A
<b>Cultural</b> (no change since Nov 2015 Draft version)	CH/SHPO	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FERC's comments on the Preliminary Study Plan for Cultural Resources (dated October 2, 2015) included a request that PacifiCorp seek concurrence from SHPO on the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project.</li> <li>• Per FERC direction, PacifiCorp provided a letter to the Utah State Historic Preservation Office seeking concurrence with and approval of the proposed APE. The letter included a description of the Project Area and a map depicting the APE. A copy of the Preliminary Draft Study Plan for Cultural Resources was also provided.</li> <li>• SHPO provided concurrence with the APE (Letter from Chris Hansen, State Historic Preservation Office, Nov. 4, 2015)</li> </ul>	N/A
	BJ/UDWR	N/A	UDWR has no further comments on the Cultural Resources Study Plan and accepts the plan as it is.	N/A
<b>Fisheries</b>	BJ/UDWR	N/A	UDWR has no further comments on the Fisheries Study Plan and accepts the plan as it is.	N/A
	CM/FERC	N/A	No additional comments on the most recent Fisheries Plan.	N/A
	KL/UDEQ	Section 3.1.5	Utah Division of Water Quality has reviewed the study plans and accepts them as edited. One typo noted in section 3.1.5 - it reads " <b>steam</b> dwelling trout" instead of " <b>stream</b> dwelling trout."	Typo corrected.
	PB/TU	N/A	Trout Unlimited staff accepts the fisheries study plan as written.	N/A

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
Recreation	BJ/UDWR	N/A	No editorial changes are needed, because we are in accord and are setting out to study the necessary points: we would like to see an eventual improvement in the angler trail under the freeway, and we understand that this is going to be evaluated; we are also cooperating with PacifiCorp to adjust signage to better manage angler access and usage at particular points in the vicinity of the hydropower facility	No change needed to study plan; will track as potential mitigation measure.
	KO&AB/FERC	Section 3.4.2 Recreation Use and Demand Analysis, Para. 3 & 5	<p>Para. 3 - Don't like the word potentially here. Either they will or they won't. Same issue with 'Could' here</p> <p>Paragraph 5 - Another example of the "could" language. A beam counter would be a good way to measure use of the informal trail. Are you not sure if you will deploy the counter?</p>	<p>Text revised to eliminate "potentially." Since surveys have now been finalized, text that follows was revised to reflect content of surveys.</p> <p>Text revised to "will" and to reflect change in proposed instrumentation from beam counter to trail camera.</p>
	KO&AB/FERC	Appendix A, General Recreation Visitor Use Survey	<p>Question 11 - This portion of the question should perhaps be a scale. I am not sure a yes/no question gives us our information needs. Besides, is "sufficient" what we want them managing for?</p> <p>Question 15</p>	<p>We added a trail item to the point scale in question 15. We believe "sufficient" is appropriate in this context.</p> <p>To clarify that we were asking about the "primitive" trail in this facilities rating table, and to get a scale response, we deleted "Trail" in the first column and replaced it with "Primitive trail passing under the freeway from the recreation site." In order to include the other trail candidate, we added another row in the table for "Paved walkway running downriver from recreation site."</p>

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
			<p>Question 16 - It would be good to add mention of the trail here as well, to augment Q15. i.e. "improved river access via the informal trail under the highway"</p> <p>Question 19 - If done in person it is usually best to simply have the interviewer record the gender, rather than asking. It is almost always obvious, and I'm not sure if many rural Utahans would like being asked if they are male or female. It could lead to a loss of rapport, especially since this question is in the beginning. For a mail-back or online survey this is not an issue.</p> <p>Question 20</p>	<p>We added an item for "Improved trail passing under the freeway from the recreation site" and modified the next item to read "Other improved fishing access to river."</p> <p>Agreed. Our intention was for the person administering the survey to respond to that question without asking if possible, and we added an "Other" option and a "Prefer not to respond" option.</p> <p>We added an "Other" option and a "Prefer not to respond" option.</p>
<b>Terrestrial TES</b>	BJ/UDWR	N/A	UDWR has no further comments on the TES Study Plan and accepts the plan as it is.	N/A
	QE/FERC	N/A	The updated study plan looks good, I have no comments to provide.	N/A
<b>Water Resources</b>	CP/Weber & Ogden River Water Commissioner	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update Table 2 and Figure 3 to correspond with the attached table.</li> <li>• Change the title of the table to: Established fish and wildlife operating criteria for major facilities in the Weber watershed</li> <li>• Remove the footnote for Table 2</li> <li>• Update Table 2 and Figure 3 to correspond with the attached table.</li> <li>• In the last paragraph of section 3.1 state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All of the operating criteria for fish and wildlife was established when WBWCD was created other than PacifiCorp's.</li> <li>○ Many facilities are either bypassing flow for senior water right holders or are not diverting so instream flows vary throughout the year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Requested edits incorporated except as noted below:</p> <p>Table 2 - Gateway tunnel – changed from "N/A" to "no criteria" for consistency</p>

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
	JB/Provo River Water Users Association	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise the last paragraph of Section 3.1 to state: Table 2 and Figure 3, below, indicate the various <b>established</b> minimum instream flow <b>operating criteria</b> at other diversions within the wider Weber watershed, and which reaches of the Weber River are affected by these flows. <b>With the exception of PacifiCorp, the operating criteria for fish and wildlife were established when the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District was created. Many facilities included in Table 2 are either bypassing flow for senior water right holders or are not diverting, so instream flows vary throughout the year.</b></li> <li>• Replace Table 2 with the new table provided by Cole, which does not include footnote 2. The Association would suggest using “none” rather than “no criteria” in Cole’s new table.</li> <li>• Change the title of Table 2 to “Established fish and wildlife operating criteria for major facilities in the Weber watershed.</li> <li>• Change the title of Figure 3 to “Established fish and wildlife operating criteria for reaches in the Weber watershed,” make the corresponding change to the legend, and make the necessary changes to the image.</li> <li>• Update the list of tables and list of figures to reflect these changes.</li> <li>• The Association prefers that the last paragraph of Section 3.1, Table 2, and Figure 3 be removed from the study plan altogether. However if PacifiCorp is unwilling to remove those portions, the Association would be willing to approve the Draft Study Plan as long as the above changes are made.</li> </ul>	<p>Table 2 and Figure 3 have been revised as noted above (per Cole Panter). Retained “no criteria” per Cole Panter. Revised Figure 3 title and legend as requested.</p> <p>Lists updated in table of contents.</p> <p>The Association’s comments have been addressed as noted above. Information regarding hydrology in the wider Weber Basin is required by FERC and the associated NEPA analysis process to be included in relicensing studies and analysis.</p>
	RS/WRWUA & DWCCC	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3.2, Table 2 page 8 of the latest revision mentioned above, under the <b>“Weber Provo Canal, 25* (cfs)”</b> should be removed, including the asterisk statement: <b>“*denotes flows the Weber River Commissioner believes may be required but which may not be being implemented currently”</b>. At the very least, should this statement remain, there needs to be the disclaimer that at no time can water volume quantities be guaranteed. It must be based upon the <b>AVAILABILITY OF WATER</b> at</li> </ul>	Table 2 has been revised as noted above, per Cole Panter.

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
		Section 4.1, Hydrology Assessment	<p>any given point in time and according to priority right requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page 9 same section, Figure 3 “Minimum flows for reaches in the Weber watershed, if left in should add the words: “based upon availability of water according to priority rights in real time”, or this section should be deleted.</li> <li>Section 4.1 <u>Hydrology Assessment</u> assumes that there could always be an availability of water in the river of “between 34-50 cfs, annually”..... I quote: “Specifically, the assessment looked at flow volumes and percentages in the bypassed reach of the Weber River, including the existing minimum flow, which varies between 34-50 cfs, annually, based on the annual flow forecast for the Weber River.” Forecasting is no guarantee for water to be available. If you quote statistics and studies they, in and of themselves do not create a guarantee and assurance at any given time, that the water will be available for proper distribution and usage. We do not see the validity of this study and analysis based upon our description of how the Weber River System really works. This section should be removed or at least emphasized verbally that the study information relates only to Pacific Corp and/or Rocky Mountain Power’s analysis for their potential water sources, according to water right prioritization and availability of water at any given time in the Weber River System and, which may not always be available or happen.</li> </ul>	<p>Added “or inflow if less” directly after 34-50 cfs</p> <p>Please see note above (p.6) regarding removal of description of hydrology in the wider Weber Basin from the study plans and associated analysis documents; FERC process requires this information be included.</p>
	DH/WBWCD	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	Changes are needed to Table 2 - Stoddard Diversion Dam has a range of 15-30 cfs. We can reduce to 15 cfs when we are operating the power plant operating. Also Causey Dam is 25 cfs as shown in the plan OR natural inflow into Causey whichever is less.	Table 2 has been revised as noted above, per Cole Panter and subsequent additional clarifications, as noted by this comment.

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
	JR/BOR	Section 3.1, Hydrology, Existing Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclamation agrees with the comments provided by Cole Panter, Ivan Ray, and Jeff Budge which include... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Replacing Table 2 with the updated version prepared by Cole Panter.</li> <li>○ Changing the title of Table 2 and Figure 3 to reflect the fact that the by-pass flows are an operational criteria of certain Reclamation facilities and not a protected instream flow.</li> <li>○ Removing the existing footnote to Table 2 about instream flow requirements on the Weber River outside of the Weber Canyon.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reclamation believes it is important to distinguish the differences between an operational criteria and a protected instream flow. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Several Weber Basin Project features are required to have a minimum bypass flow.</li> <li>○ This bypass flow can be water be composed of stored water releases for downstream delivery or water necessary to satisfy for downstream senior water rights.</li> <li>○ The Weber Basin project has a limited obligation to preserve the bypassed water in the Weber River after it has bypassed the facility and this water can often be diverted by downstream water users.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See comments by CP/ Weber &amp; Ogden River Water Commissioner, above.</p> <p>Bullet points were added to Section 3.1 to address this concern.</p>
	BJ/Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	<p>Page 6 - Change sentence in the middle of the page from "Both species are doing well in the Project Area river reach, between the Weber diversion dam and powerhouse (Paul Thompson – pers. comm. 2015; Paul Burnett – pers. comm. 2015)" to something like: "Both species are present in the Project Area river reach, between the Weber diversion dam and powerhouse. PacifiCorp's minimum flow regime appears to be protective of the fishery in the project area as compared to some other reaches of the mainstem Weber River (Paul Thompson – pers. comm. 2015; Paul Burnett – pers. comm. 2015)."</p> <p>The wording change for the Water Resources Study Plan is accurate and needed, but our motivation for making it is focused largely on what it helps to demonstrate and make possible in other discussions, with other parties, working on other sections of the river.</p>	<p>Change incorporated with TU's comment (below).</p>

**Weber Hydroelectric Project**  
**FERC No. 1744**  
**Comments on Revised Draft Study Plans**  
**Compiled March 25, 2016**

Study Plan	Commenter (initials/ agency)	Section #/Title	Comment	Resolution
	JH/FERC	Section 4.1.1, Methods and Analysis & Appendix A	Adding the water resources analysis to the water quality report was a good idea. Using the shortened hydrological record based on climate change concerns is reasonable. Ten years of record provides a reasonable average. Rather than (or in addition to) presenting the flow duration curve (Figure 10) on an annual basis, we encourage you to present monthly flow exceedance curves (12 graphs, one for each month). The regulations regarding license application content, Section 4.41 (f), state that for Exhibit E “(2) <i>Report on water use and quality</i> . The report must discuss water quality and flows and contain baseline data sufficient to determine the normal and <u>seasonal variability</u> ” (Emphasis mine) Presentation of the data in this fashion would facilitate the comparison of project effects on flow with life history requirements for species of concern in the bypassed reach.	Monthly flow exceedance curves added to study plan as Appendix A.
	PB/TU	Section 3.1, Hydrology Existing Data	I agree with Paul Thompson that the quote referenced on Page 6 needs to be changed:  “Both species are doing well in the Project Area river reach, between the Weber diversion dam and powerhouse (Paul Thompson – pers. comm. 2015; Paul Burnett – pers. comm. 2015).”  I am not sure the fisheries data exists to make this claim. I believe a more appropriate comment on these populations is that they exist throughout the project area. Bluehead sucker and a unique population of Fluvial BCT use the project area and habitat within the bypass reach.	Change incorporated with UDWR comment (above).
	PB/TU	Section 4.1.1, Methods and Analysis and Appendix A	The gauge assessment that was added to the study plan was very helpful but I think we should also include a hydrography analysis looking at the flow coming into the project area and show daily values over the period of a year in addition to the flow duration curves. This might be more helpful to the general public, who may not know how to interpret the flow duration analysis.  In short, I appreciate the analysis completed so far as it has been really informative regarding the magnitude of the bypass flow. I think presenting graphs that show daily flow values contextualizes the bypass flow and shows how important it is, and also shows that the challenges the native fish resourced face are greater than this single hydropower project, including increasing water demand, climate change and habitat fragmentation.	Graphs provided have been incorporated into Appendix A, Figure A-2.