

# Low Impact Hydropower Institute

34 Providence Street Portland, ME 04103 Tel.  
(207) 773-8190 • Fax (206) 984-3086  
[www.lowimpacthydro.org](http://www.lowimpacthydro.org)

## LOW IMPACT HYDROPOWER QUESTIONNAIRE

Prospect No. 3 Hydroelectric Project FERC No. 2337

### E. LOW IMPACT HYDROPOWER QUESTIONNAIRE

<b>Background Information</b>	
1) Name of the <i>Facility</i> .	Prospect No. 3
2) Applicant's name, contact information and relationship to the Facility. If the Applicant is not the Facility owner/operator, also provide the name and contact information for the Facility owner and operator.	Randy Landolt, Director, Hydro Resources PacifiCorp Energy 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 1500 Portland, OR 97232 Tel: 503.813.6650 FAX: 503.813.6659 Email: <a href="mailto:randy.landolt@pacificorp.com">randy.landolt@pacificorp.com</a>
3) Location of Facility by river and state.	South Fork Rogue River, Oregon.
4) Installed capacity.	7,200 kW

5) Average annual generation.	Based on the past 30 years (including 2008), the average annual generation of the project is 37.3 GWh.
6) Regulatory status.	The project was relicensed for a 30-year term by FERC Order dated January 30, 1989.
7) Reservoir volume and surface area measured at the high water mark in an average water year.	Volume (total storage capacity)= 10 acre-feet Surface area= 1 acre
8) Area occupied by non-reservoir facilities (e.g., dam, penstocks, powerhouse).	Approximately 8.9 acres are occupied by non-reservoir facilities consisting of: 0.26 acres (powerhouse, substation, diversion dam, fish ladder & screen) and 8.7 acres (canal, conduit, penstock).
9) Number of acres inundated by the Facility.	0.8 acres (including original river channel)
10) Number of acres contained in a 200-foot zone extending around entire impoundment.	Approximately 8.68 ac are contained within a 200-ft zone extending around the diversion impoundment.
11) Please attach a list of contacts in the relevant Resource Agencies and in non-governmental organizations that have been involved in Recommending conditions for your Facility.	Please see Attachment 1.
12) Please attach a description of the Facility, its mode of operation (i.e., peaking/run of river) and a map of the Facility.	Please see Attachment 2.
<b>Questions For “New” Facilities Only:</b> If the Facility you are applying for is “new” i.e., an existing dam that added or increased power generation capacity after August of 1998 please answer the following questions to determine eligibility for the program	N/A- A turbine unit was renovated in 2002 and its capacity was increased. However, the power generation capacity of the facility is limited by the output of the generator unit. FERC issued an Order dated December 12, 2002 confirming that the installed capacity of the facility was unchanged.
13) When was the dam associated with the Facility completed?	N/A

<p>14) When did the added or increased generation first generate electricity? If the added or increased generation is not yet operational, please answer question 18 as well.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>15) Did the added or increased power generation capacity require or include any new dam or other diversion structure?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>16) Did the added or increased capacity include or require a change in water flow through the facility that worsened conditions for fish, wildlife, or water quality, (for example, did operations change from run-of-river to peaking)?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>17 (a) Was the existing dam recommended for removal or decommissioning by resource agencies, or recommended for removal or decommissioning by a broad representation of interested persons and organizations in the local and/or regional community prior to the added or increased capacity?</p> <p>(b) If you answered “yes” to question 17(a), the Facility is not eligible for certification, unless you can show that the added or increased capacity resulted in specific measures to improve fish, wildlife, or water quality protection at the existing dam. If such measures were a result, please explain.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>18 (a) If the increased or added generation is not yet operational, has the increased or added generation received regulatory authorization (e.g.,</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>approval by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)? If not, the facility is not eligible for consideration; and</p> <p>(b) Are there any pending appeals or litigation regarding that authorization? If so, the facility is not eligible for consideration.</p>	
---	--

A. Flows	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
<p>1) Is the Facility in <i>Compliance with Resource Agency Recommendations</i> issued after December 31, 1986 regarding flow conditions for fish and wildlife protection, mitigation and enhancement (including in-stream flows, ramping and peaking rate conditions, and seasonal and episodic instream flow variations) for both the reach below the tailrace and all bypassed reaches?</p>	<p>YES = Pass, Go to B N/A = Go to A2</p>	<p>No = Fail</p>	<p><b>Yes-</b> PacifiCorp’s Prospect No. 3 project is in compliance with resource agency recommendations issued after December 31, 1986 regarding flow conditions for fish and wildlife protection. When the project was relicensed in 1989, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) was consulted regarding the establishment of appropriate minimum in-stream flows. The ODFW agreed with the results of a PacifiCorp study indicating that a minimum release of 10 cfs would protect and maintain habitat for resident rainbow trout (see Attachments 3 and 4). This recommended minimum flow was adopted in Article 402 of the project license, which is included as Attachment 5 to this application. In a letter dated January 5, 1988, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) deferred to ODFW on operational recommendations for fish and wildlife protection.</p> <p>A United States Geological Survey (USGS) gage located 0.25 mile downstream of the Prospect No. 3 diversion dam monitors the flow released to the bypass reach. The most recent year for which data have been published is the period from October 2007 through September 2008. With few exceptions, minimum flow requirements were met during this period. Excursions in late 2007 are attributed to use of an inaccurate rating curve following a USGS adjustment that was not reported to the facility operator. The facility operator has subsequently improved coordination with USGS in order to ensure that flow releases are based on up to date ratings.</p>

<p>2) If there is no flow condition recommended by any Resource Agency for the Facility, or if the recommendation was issued prior to January 1, 1987, is the Facility in Compliance with a flow release schedule, both below the tailrace and in all bypassed reaches, that at a minimum meets Aquatic Base Flow standards or “good” habitat flow standards calculated using the Montana-Tennant method?</p>	<p>YES =          Pass,          Go to B          NO =          Go to          A3</p>		<p>Answer not required</p>
<p>3) If the Facility is unable to meet the flow standards in A.2., has the Applicant demonstrated, and obtained a letter from the relevant Resource Agency confirming that demonstration, that the flow conditions at the Facility are appropriately protective of fish, wildlife, and water quality?</p>	<p>YES =          Pass,          go to B</p>	<p>NO =          Fail</p>	<p>Answer not required</p>

B. Water Quality	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
<p>1) Is the Facility either:                      a) In Compliance with all conditions issued pursuant to a Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification issued for the Facility after December 31, 1986? Or                      b) In Compliance with the quantitative water quality standards established by the state that support designated uses pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act in the Facility area and in the downstream reach?</p>	<p>YES = Go to B2</p>	<p>No = Fail</p>	<p><b>Yes (b)-</b> The facility is believed to be in compliance with the quantitative water quality standards established by the state.</p> <p>The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) waived issuing a Section 401 Water Quality Certification for the Prospect No. 3 project in a letter dated June 7, 1985 because the project was operated under a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System general permit.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment for the project states that “Water quality of the South Fork in the project vicinity is generally excellent... Water quality in the project area meets or exceeds the standards established for all uses in the Rogue River Basin by the state of Oregon.” Moreover, the ODEQ 2004/2006 Integrated Report on Water Quality Status also provided information that confirms the continued health of the river (see Assessment database at <a href="http://www.deq.state.or.us/WQ/assessment/rpt0406.htm">http://www.deq.state.or.us/WQ/assessment/rpt0406.htm</a>, accessed 8/24/09). ODEQ designated the South Fork Rogue River as a “Category 2” waterway. This classification indicates that state water quality standards are being met, although data are lacking to document compliance with all standards. PacifiCorp requested a letter from the ODEQ on September 21, 2009 regarding the facility’s compliance with water quality standards but, the agency declined to provide such a letter, citing a lack of resources to commit to the review of water quality data. ODEQ has not indicated that there are any water quality concerns for the project.</p>
<p>2) Is the Facility area or the downstream reach currently identified by the state as not meeting water quality standards (including narrative</p>	<p>YES = Go to B3 NO = Pass</p>		<p><b>No-</b> The South Fork Rogue River, and the Rogue River within the Upper Rogue watershed are not on the 303(d) list. Attachment 6 presents the ODEQ’s list of the water quality limited water bodies in the Upper Rogue watershed.</p>

and numeric criteria and designated uses) pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act?			
3) If the answer to question B.2 is yes, has there been a determination that the Facility is not a cause of that violation?	YES = Pass	NO = Fail	Answer not required

<b>C. Fish Passage and Protection</b>	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
1) Is the Facility in Compliance with <i>Mandatory Fish Passage Prescriptions</i> for upstream and downstream passage of anadromous and catadromous fish issued by Resource Agencies after December 31, 1986?	YES = Go to C5 N/A = Go to C2	NO = Fail	N/A- There were no mandatory fish passage prescriptions issued by resource agencies for anadromous or catadromous fish passage at the Prospect No. 3 project.
2) Are there historic records of anadromous and/or catadromous fish movement through the Facility area, but anadromous and/or catadromous fish do not presently move through the Facility area (e.g., because passage is blocked at a	YES = Go to C2a NO = Go to C3		<b>Yes-</b> The 2006 Environmental Assessment conducted for the neighboring project, Prospect Nos. 1, 2, and 4, reported that Spring Chinook salmon ( <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> ) and winter steelhead ( <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> ) may have historically migrated to the area. In all but the wettest years, however, a series of waterfalls on the South Fork Rogue River downstream of the diversion blocked passage. The William L. Jess Dam (formerly known as Lost Creek Dam) was constructed in 1977 without fish passage facilities, and it presents a complete fish passage barrier to upstream migration on the Rogue River. The William L. Jess Dam is operated by the Army Corps of Engineers and is located

<p>downstream dam or the fish run is extinct)?</p>			<p>approximately 21 river miles downstream of the South Fork (Prospect No. 3) diversion dam.</p>
<p>a) If the fish are extinct or extirpated from the Facility area or downstream reach, has the Applicant demonstrated that the extinction or extirpation was not due in whole or part to the Facility?</p>	<p>YES = Go to C2b N/A = Go to C2b</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p><b>Yes-</b> The Environmental Assessment conducted in 1988 in conjunction with relicensing the Prospect No. 3 facility, as well as the Environmental Assessment conducted in 2006 for relicensing the nearby Prospect Nos. 1, 2, and 4 facilities, found that anadromous fish were extirpated from the area due to downstream migration barriers that were unrelated to the Prospect facilities.</p>
<p>b) If a Resource Agency Recommended adoption of upstream and/or downstream fish passage measures at a specific future date, or when a triggering event occurs (such as completion of passage through a downstream obstruction or the completion of a specified process), has the Facility owner/operator made a legally enforceable commitment to provide such passage?</p>	<p>YES = Go to C5 N/A = Go to C3</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p><b>Yes-</b> Several fish passage measures were adopted in the project license at the recommendation of the ODFW. Articles 403 and 404 of the license require modifying the existing upstream passage facility as well as the fish screening and downstream bypass facility. Article 405 requires PacifiCorp to develop a plan to evaluate the efficiency of the new upstream and downstream facilities (see Attachment 5).</p> <p>Both the ODFW and the USFWS were consulted during the development of the fish passage designs and monitoring plans. In a letter dated September 7, 1994, ODFW stated that PacifiCorp could proceed with implementing Articles 403, 404, and 405 because the Interim Fish Screen Policy had been finalized by the agency (see Attachment 7).</p> <p>In December 1995, PacifiCorp submitted the Fish Facilities Monitoring Plan to FERC, ODFW, and the USFWS. A letter from ODFW dated December 12, 1995 notes that “ODFW is satisfied with the proposed plan to evaluate upstream passage conditions to ensure that the ladder is functioning properly and meeting</p>



			<p>criteria for passing resident trout.” In a letter dated March 27, 1996 (Attachment 8), the USFWS formally stated their approval of the monitoring plan and the facility designs, noting that the fish passage designs and monitoring plans “accurately address the Service’s concerns.”</p> <p>PacifiCorp completed the planned modifications to the bypass facilities in the fall of 1996. In consultation with ODFW and USFWS, PacifiCorp tested and adjusted the upstream and downstream facilities to meet ODFW criterion for fish passage approach velocity. In accordance with Article 405 of the project license, PacifiCorp filed a monitoring report on the effectiveness of fish passage in September 2000. In a letter dated August 20, 2002 (Attachment 9), FERC accepted the findings, noting that no resource agencies had commented on the report and that the results “indicate that the facilities are functioning as designed.”</p>
<p>3) If, since December 31, 1986:</p> <p>a) Resource Agencies have had the opportunity to issue, and considered issuing, a Mandatory Fish Passage Prescription for upstream and/or downstream passage of anadromous or catadromous fish (including delayed installation as described in C2a above), and</p> <p>b) The Resource Agencies declined to issue a Mandatory Fish Passage</p>	<p>NO = Go to C5 N/A = Go to C4</p>	<p>YES = Fail</p>	<p>Answer not required</p>

<p>Prescription,</p> <p>c) Was a reason for the Resource Agencies' declining to issue a Mandatory Fish Passage Prescription one of the following: (1) the technological infeasibility of passage, (2) the absence of habitat upstream of the Facility due at least in part to inundation by the Facility impoundment, or (3) the anadromous or catadromous fish are no longer present in the Facility area and/or downstream reach due in whole or part to the presence of the Facility?</p>			
<p>4) If C3 was not applicable:                  a) Are upstream and downstream fish passage survival rates for anadromous and catadromous fish at the dam each documented at greater than 95% over 80% of the run using a generally accepted monitoring methodology?</p>	<p>YES = Go to C5</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p>Answer not required</p>

<p>Or</p> <p>b) If the Facility is unable to meet the fish passage standards in 4.a., has the Applicant demonstrated, and obtained a letter from the US Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service confirming that demonstration, that the upstream and downstream fish passage measures (if any) at the Facility are appropriately protective of the fishery resource?</p>			
<p>5) Is the Facility in Compliance with Mandatory Fish Passage Prescriptions for upstream and/or downstream passage of <i>Riverine</i> fish?</p>	<p>YES = Go to C6 N/A = Go to C6</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p>N/A- There were no mandatory fish passage prescriptions issued by resource agencies for the Prospect No. 3 facility. However, as described above in response to C2b, resource agency recommendations regarding both upstream and downstream fish passage have been implemented. These facilities primarily benefit resident brook (<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i>) and rainbow trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>).</p>

6) Is the Facility in Compliance with Resource Agency Recommendations for Riverine, anadromous and catadromous fish entrainment protection, such as tailrace barriers?	YES = Pass, go to D N/A = Pass, go to D	No = Fail	<b>Yes-</b> ODFW and USFWS recommendations to reduce entrainment into the power canal were implemented per Article 403 of the project license (see response to C2b). The agencies' recommendations were prompted by excessive water approach velocities to the screen face and an inadequately positioned bypass orifice in the project's old fish screening and bypass facility. PacifiCorp designed and constructed a new fish screening and bypass facility according to ODFW criteria in 1996. As previously noted, FERC acknowledged the successful completion of these facilities in a letter dated August 20, 2002 (see Attachment 9).
--	--	-----------	---

<b>D. Watershed Protection</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>FAIL</b>	<b>Applicant Answer</b>
1 ) Is there a buffer zone dedicated for conservation purposes (to protect fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, aesthetics and/or low-impact recreation) extending 200 feet from the high water mark in an average water year around 50 - 100% of the impoundment, and for all of the undeveloped shoreline	YES = Pass, go to E and receive 3 extra years of certification	NO = go to D2	<b>No</b> – There is no designated buffer. However, it should be noted that the small impoundment is entirely located on undeveloped National Forest land and it is managed in accordance with USFS regulations.
2 ) Has the facility owner/operator established an approved watershed enhancement fund that: 1) could achieve within the project's watershed the ecological and recreational equivalent of land protection	YES = Pass, go to E and receive 3 extra years of certifi-	NO = go to D3	<b>No</b>

<p>in D.1.,and 2) has the agreement of appropriate stakeholders and state and federal resource agencies?</p>	<p>ation</p>		
<p>3 ) Has the facility owner/operator established through a settlement agreement with appropriate stakeholders and that has state and federal resource agencies agreement an appropriate shoreland buffer or equivalent watershed land protection plan for conservation purposes (to protect fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, aesthetics and/or low impact recreation)</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to E</p>	<p>NO = go to D4</p>	<p><b>No</b> – There is not a settlement agreement.</p>
<p>4 ) Is the facility in compliance with both state and federal resource agencies recommendations in a license approved shoreland management plan regarding protection, mitigation or enhancement of shorelands surrounding the project.</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to E</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p>The project is in compliance with state and federal recommendations in the FERC license regarding protection, mitigation or enhancement of shorelines surrounding the project, although not as part of a shoreline management plan. The diversion impoundment is small and entirely surrounded by undeveloped national forest land and there were no recommendations to develop a shoreline management plan during relicensing of the project. However, PacifiCorp is implementing multiple plans and programs that serve the purpose of a shoreline management plan for protecting the watershed and natural resources. These plans and programs were developed at the direction of state and federal resource agencies for conservation purposes.</p> <p>Prospect No. 3 project plans and programs designed to preserve fish and</p>

		<p>wildlife habitat, water quality, aesthetics, and opportunities for low impact recreation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Fish Passage Plans</i>- As discussed above in section C, PacifiCorp implemented upstream and downstream fish passage plans, as well as an associated evaluation plan, that were developed in consultation with the ODFW and USFWS (project license articles 403, 404, 405).</li> <li>• <i>Soil and Erosion Control Plan</i>- PacifiCorp is implementing a soil and erosion control plan to minimize the quantity of sediment and other potential water pollutants resulting from project operation and maintenance. The Plan was accepted by ODFW and USFWS in letters dated June 28 and July 13, 1989, respectively, and approved and modified by FERC Orders dated March 2, 1990 (project license article 401).</li> <li>• <i>Wildlife Crossing and Canal Fencing Maintenance Program</i>- Wildlife crossings on project lands allow a variety of animals to access habitat in the watershed, while canal fencing prevents accidental drowning. Every year, PacifiCorp inspects and reports to FERC regarding its maintenance priorities for the project’s wildlife crossings and canal fencing. As noted in the FERC Orders approving the program on September 7, 1989, this annual maintenance program was established with the support of the Forest Service, the USFWS, and the ODFW (project license article 406).</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the plans and programs outlined above, PacifiCorp consults with the US Forest Service annually regarding its protection and development of natural resources in the project area in accordance with license article 102. Furthermore, per article 103 of the project license, PacifiCorp is committed to developing fish and wildlife habitat mitigation plans that meet the approval of the US Forest Service whenever land disturbing activities must be conducted.</p>
--	--	---

<b>E. Threatened and Endangered Species Protection</b>	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
1) Are threatened or endangered species listed under state or federal Endangered Species Acts present in the Facility area and/or downstream reach?	YES = Go to E2 NO = Pass, go to F		<p><b>Yes-</b> The Environmental Assessment that was conducted in 1988 for relicensing the project cited no threatened or endangered species in the project area. A more recent 2006 Environmental Assessment for the neighboring downstream projects, Prospect No. 1, 2, and 4, noted that the following federally listed species may potentially occur in the project area: northern spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis caurina</i>), gray wolf (<i>Canis lupus</i>), and Canada lynx (<i>Lynx canadensis</i>).</p> <p>There has been no documented occurrence of gray wolves in western Oregon and no documented occurrence of Canada lynx in Oregon since 1974. The 2006 Environmental Assessment for Prospect Nos. 1, 2, and 4 reported that a northern spotted owl had been sighted 0.5 mile east of the Middle Fork diversion (approximately 2 miles north of the Prospect No. 3 South Fork diversion). It also noted that a bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) nest was located near Lost Creek Lake, approximately 20 miles downriver from the project. Although the bald eagle has been removed from the federal Endangered Species list, the state of Oregon continues to list the bald eagle as a threatened species.</p>
2) If a recovery plan has been adopted for the threatened or endangered species pursuant to Section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act or similar state provision, is the Facility in Compliance with all recommendations in the plan relevant to the Facility?	YES = Go to E3 N/A = Go to E3	NO = Fail	<p><b>Yes-</b> The Prospect No. 3 project is in compliance with the relevant recommendations in the sole adopted recovery plan for threatened and endangered species that may be present in the project area: the <i>Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl</i>, adopted by the USFWS in May 2008 (<a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/NSO%20Final%20Rec%20Plan%20051408.pdf">http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/NSO%20Final%20Rec%20Plan%20051408.pdf</a>). A Recovery Outline for the Contiguous United States Distinct Population Segment of Canada Lynx (<i>Lynx canadensis</i>) has also been prepared by the USFWS, but it has not been finalized and adopted.</p>

<p>3) If the Facility has received authority to incidentally <i>Take</i> a listed species through: (i) Having a relevant agency complete consultation pursuant to ESA Section 7 resulting in a biological opinion, a habitat recovery plan, and/or (if needed) an incidental Take statement; (ii) Obtaining an incidental Take permit pursuant to ESA Section 10; or (iii) For species listed by a state and not by the federal government, obtaining authority pursuant to similar state procedures; is the Facility in Compliance with conditions pursuant to that authority?</p>	<p>YES =                  Go to                  E4                  N/A =                  Go to                  E5</p>	<p>NO =                  Fail</p>	<p><b>N/A-</b> At the time of license issuance, no federally-listed species were known to occur in the Prospect No. 3 Project area requiring issuance of an incidental take statement.</p>
---	---	---------------------------------------	--



<p>4) If a biological opinion applicable to the Facility for the threatened or endangered species has been issued, can the Applicant demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) The biological opinion was accompanied by a FERC license or exemption or a habitat conservation plan? Or</p> <p>b) The biological opinion was issued pursuant to or consistent with a recovery plan for the endangered or threatened species? Or</p> <p>c) There is no recovery plan for the threatened or endangered species under active development by the relevant Resource Agency? Or</p> <p>d) The recovery plan under active development will have no material effect on the Facility's operations?</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to F</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p>Answer not required</p>
<p>5) If E.2. and E.3. are not applicable, has the Applicant demonstrated that the Facility</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to F</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>	<p><b>Yes-</b> A Finding of No Significant Impact was issued for Prospect No. 3. The Environmental Assessment stated that “the project would not affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species....Moreover, relicensing the</p>

and Facility operations do not negatively affect listed species?			project would permit the implementation of the applicant’s proposed fish and wildlife mitigation, which would benefit the environmental resources of the project area.” To assure continued protection for listed species, Prospect No. 3 license articles 101, 102, and 103 require a special use permit, fish and wildlife habitat mitigation plans, and continued consultation with the USFS and FERC regarding new land disturbing activities on National Forest land.
--	--	--	--

<b>F. Cultural Resource Protection</b>	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
1) If FERC-regulated, is the Facility in Compliance with all requirements regarding Cultural Resource protection, mitigation or enhancement included in the FERC license or exemption?	YES = Pass, go to G N/A go to F2	NO = Fail	<b>Yes-</b> The project is in compliance with all requirements of the Prospect No. 3 FERC license regarding cultural resources. Article 407 of the project license requires PacifiCorp to consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and develop a cultural resources management plan prior to conducting any land-clearing or land-disturbing activities that were not specifically authorized in the license. SHPO staff has informally consulted with PacifiCorp regarding efforts such as canal fencing, but a cultural resources management plan has not been warranted for project actions to date.
2) If not FERC-regulated, does the Facility owner/operator have in place (and is in Compliance with) a plan for the protection, mitigation or enhancement of impacts to Cultural Resources approved by the relevant state or federal agency or <i>Native American Tribe</i> , or a letter from a senior officer of the relevant agency or Tribe that no plan is needed because	YES = Pass, go to G	NO = Fail	<b>Answer not required</b>

Cultural Resources are not negatively affected by the Facility			
--	--	--	--

<b>G. Recreation</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>FAIL</b>	
1) If FERC-regulated, is the Facility in Compliance with the recreational access, accommodation (including recreational flow releases) and facilities conditions in its FERC license or exemption?	YES = Go to G3	No = Fail	<b>Yes-</b> The project is in compliance with recreational measures in the Prospect No. 3 FERC license. Article 408 of the project license required PacifiCorp to submit a recreation monitoring report summarizing recreational use and demand at the project every six years. PacifiCorp submitted monitoring reports that were approved by FERC in Orders dated March 6, 1995 and April 3, 2001, respectively. In the latter Order, FERC also stated that further recreational monitoring was unnecessary. This is due to the consistently low amount of recreational use in the project area.
2) If not FERC-regulated, does the Facility provide recreational access, accommodation (including recreational flow releases) and facilities, as Recommended by Resource Agencies or other agencies responsible for recreation?	Yes = Go to G3	No = Fail	Answer not required
3) Does the Facility allow access to the reservoir and downstream reaches without fees or charges?	YES = Pass, go to H	No = Fail	<b>Yes-</b> PacifiCorp provides free access to all Project lands that are not specifically excluded for operational security. The upstream portion of the Project which includes the diversion impoundment, is on USFS land and therefore access is also available without charge. Although accessible to the public, the 1-acre impoundment is not considered to be a recreational facility.

<b>H. Facilities Recommended for Removal</b>	PASS	FAIL	Applicant Answer
1) Is there a Resource Agency Recommendation for removal of the dam associated with the Facility?	NO = Pass, Facility is Low Impact	YES = Fail	<b>No-</b> Resource agencies have not recommended removal of the Prospect No. 3 South Fork diversion dam.