

## **LOW IMPACT HYDROPOWER INSTITUTE**

### **APPENDIX B – QUESTIONNAIRE** (April 2014 REVISION)



## **Summary Status of Woronoco Hydro Project May 2015**

Woronoco Hydro LLC's, Woronoco Station is located at river mile 18.5 on the Westfield River in, Russell, Massachusetts. The Woronoco Project is licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as Project Number 2631. The Westfield River's headwaters originate in North-Western Massachusetts and flow 78.1 miles to its confluence with the Connecticut River in West Springfield.

Since receiving LIHI certification in 2009 Woronoco Hydro has successfully satisfied the conditions that came with LIHI certification. These conditions related to the implementation of downstream Fish Passage Effectiveness Testing for Atlantic salmon and American Eel. Woronoco has submitted the required documentation to LIHI related to these conditions. The Woronoco Project filed with resource agencies and FERC a Comprehensive Fish Passage Plan with provisions for evaluating the effectiveness of the existing downstream fish passage facilities for passing Atlantic salmon smolts. Multiple effectiveness studies and modifications to the passage facility were performed, as summarized in FERC's Order Approving 2011 Downstream Smolt Passage Effectiveness Study Report Under License Article 404.

In July 2012, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) announced that it would end its involvement in efforts to restore Atlantic salmon to the Connecticut River and its tributaries. At the time, the Massachusetts Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) stated that it may continue restoration and stocking efforts. Since then, the MDFW also decided to end its participation in the Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Restoration Program. As a result, Atlantic salmon fry stocking into Connecticut River tributaries, including the Westfield River, was concluded in the spring of 2013.

In light of the changes to the restoration program, Woronoco Hydro requested that the resource agencies agreed with discontinuing the planned testing of the passage facility. The MDFW stated that expensive studies of smolt passage effectiveness make little sense and therefore also agreed to waive the smolt passage effectiveness testing. The MDFW further stated that downstream fish passage will be required at the projects through the 2015 fish passage season to allow fry in the 2013 stocking year to be passed as 2015 smolt. Woronoco has complied with this requirement and has opened its downstream fish passage facility for the 2015 season.

Woronoco has functional upstream passage for Juvenile American eels. Effectiveness testing was completed in 2011 and approved by FERC November 15 2012.

On June 17<sup>th</sup> 2014, Woronoco Hydro's largest turbine suffered an accident when its shaft broke in three places which completely totaled the 1900 kW turbine. Woronoco is currently replacing its number 3 Turbine with a new Norcan camelback Francis turbine. Installation is scheduled to be completed by fall of 2015.

Woronoco Hydro is in full compliance with the terms and conditions of its LIHI certification and has no outstanding compliance issues with any of the resource agencies or the FERC.

<b>Background Information</b>	
1) Name of the Facility as used in the FERC license/exemption.	Woronoco Hydro LLC (P-2621)
2) Applicant's complete contact information (please use Appendix D, Project Contact Form)	<p>Name of Owner and LIHI Applicant:</p> <p>Woronoco Hydro LLC  Attn: Peter Clark, Manager  P.O. Box 149 A  Hamilton, Massachusetts 01936  (Phone)- (978) 468-3999  (Fax) - (978) 468-1210  <a href="mailto:pclark@swiftrivercompany.com">pclark@swiftrivercompany.com</a></p> <p>Name of Woronoco Station Operator:</p> <p>Swift River Hydro Operations Company Inc.  Attn: Davis Hobbs, General Manager  Wayne Roberts, Operations Manager and Station Operator  21 Wilbraham St C6.  Palmer, 01069  (Phone)- (413) 289-0040  (Fax)- (413) 289-0041  <a href="mailto:wdhobbs@swiftriverhydro.com">wdhobbs@swiftriverhydro.com</a></p> <p>Woronoco Hydro LLC is the owner of the Woronoco Hydroelectric Project and the applicant for the Woronoco Hydroelectric LIHI application. Swift River Hydro Operations Company is the O&amp;M Contract Operations Company that manages and operates the Woronoco Station.</p>
3) Location of Facility including (a) the state in which Facility is located; (b) the river on which Facility is located; (c) the river-mile location of the Facility dam; (d) the river's drainage area in square miles at the Facility intake; (e) the location of other dams on the same river upstream and downstream of the Facility; and (f) the exact latitude and longitude of the Facility dam.	The Facility is located in Russell, Massachusetts on the Westfield River. The power station is located on the Westfield River approximately 18.5 miles upstream for the confluence of the Westfield River with the Connecticut River. The dam immediately upstream of Woronoco is the Indian River Power Supply dam and the next downstream project is the West Springfield Hydroelectric Facility.

4) Installed capacity.	<p><b>Existing Facility</b></p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"><b>Turbine Type</b></th> <th><b>Peak Output (kW) per</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3"><b>manufacturers specifications:</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>T1:</td> <td>Horizontal Francis</td> <td>490 kW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T2:</td> <td>Horizontal Francis</td> <td>490 kW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T3:</td> <td>Horizontal Francis</td> <td>1700 kW</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Station Total:</td> <td>2680 kW</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Turbine Type</b>		<b>Peak Output (kW) per</b>	<b>manufacturers specifications:</b>			T1:	Horizontal Francis	490 kW	T2:	Horizontal Francis	490 kW	T3:	Horizontal Francis	1700 kW	Station Total:		2680 kW
<b>Turbine Type</b>		<b>Peak Output (kW) per</b>																	
<b>manufacturers specifications:</b>																			
T1:	Horizontal Francis	490 kW																	
T2:	Horizontal Francis	490 kW																	
T3:	Horizontal Francis	1700 kW																	
Station Total:		2680 kW																	
5) Average annual generation.	Current: 11,359 kWh																		
6) Regulatory status.	The project is currently regulated by the FERC as H.P. # 2631. The project was relicensed in 2002 and has a FERC license that expires in 2042 All Permits are in good standing.																		
7) Reservoir volume and surface area measured at the normal maximum operating level.	The project impoundment has a surface area of approximately 43 acres. The reservoir has a maximum depth of approximately eight feet and an average depth of approximately four feet. Therefore the reservoir has a volume of approximately 172 acre-feet.																		
8) Area occupied by non-reservoir facilities (e.g., dam, penstocks, powerhouse).	The non-reservoir facilities for the project include 2 dams, intake works, 11 ft. diameter 550' long penstock, powerhouse, a transformer/switchyard building and a tailrace. These facilities occupy approximately 20,576 square feet.																		
9) Number of acres inundated by the Facility.	Approximately 43 acres of land area are located under the project impoundment. The 5 acres tailrace pond is a natural river pool rimmed by ledge outcropping with 1-2 foot deep island at outlet formed when dam broke during the 1955 Hurricane																		
10) Number of acres contained in a 200-foot zone extending around entire reservoir.	A buffer area extending 200 feet outwards from the project impoundment would have an area of 88.7 acres																		
11) Contacts for Resource Agencies and non-governmental organizations	A list of key Resource Agencies and NGOs involved in the 2009 relicensing proceedings and consultation regarding compliance with the conditions of the FERC license and local environment conservation and recreational uses of the project area is in Appendix A.																		
12) Description of the Facility, its mode of operation (i.e., peaking/run of river) and photographs, maps and diagrams.																			
<p><b>Questions for “New” Facilities Only:</b> If the Facility you are applying for is “new” (i.e., an existing dam that added or</p>																			

<p>increased power generation capacity after August of 1998) please answer the following questions to determine eligibility for the program.</p>	
<p>13) When was the dam associated with the Facility completed?</p>	<p>The Woronoco project dam is composed of two sections, the 351' long South Dam replaced a timber crib dam built in 1872 with a concrete dam in 1950. A 307' North Dam was constructed after the 1938 hurricane flood swept away the area that now forms the bypass reach below the North Dam. Both dams have concrete ogee shaped spillways built on ledge outcroppings. Both have deep discharge gates that are used to drain the impoundment and discharge the minimum habitat maintenance flow from the dams (22 cfs at the North dam, 15 cfs at the South dam and 20 cfs at the Forebay fish passage facility).</p>
<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>The rehabilitation the two existing generation units was completed when T-2 began generation in July 2005 and T-1 began generation in April 2008. Each generator passed capacity tests above 490 kW and has been rated at the capacity for generation of CT Class I RECs and to generate RI New RECs.</p>
<p>15) Did the added or increased power generation capacity require or include any new dam or other diversion structure?</p>	<p>No, neither increase in project capacity required or included a new dam or diversion structure. The original capacity increase was from the rehabilitation of existing units on site. Another proposed capacity increase is lowering the tail pool and repairing draft tubes; modification to the trash racks with a new rake at the intake will reduce debris accumulation and relocation of the fish passage at the intake works will improve fish passage and reduce head losses.</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>No: the plant operates in pond level control as a run-of-river plant. However, the restored capacity from the two rehabilitated units did restore the design flow to the licensed 710 cfs peak flow of the facility but it did not change any environmental characteristics of the project. The capacity change was approved by the appropriate Resource Agencies during the FERC re-licensing process. The current modifications to restore the project capacity to 2780 kW have no influence on the amount of water flows that the project's licensed water rights because the capacity increases are due to efficiency increases. The output increase will fund the fish passage facility improvements</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>No, Woronoco Dam has never before been recommended for removal. A detailed search of Woronoco's FERC docket has revealed no recommendation for dam removal. The reissued FERC license reduced the gross head by 2.5 ft because the former owner, IPC, did not include the 30" of flashboards in its</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>license renewal application because it shut down its paper mill and planned to sell the hydro plant.</p>	
<p>18 (a) If the added or increased generation is not yet operational, has the increased or added generation received regulatory authorization (e.g., approval by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)? If not, the facility is not eligible for consideration; and (b) Are there any pending appeals or litigation regarding that authorization? If so, the facility is not eligible for consideration.</p>	<p>(a) No, the increase in generation from the 2700 kW of the FERC license would require an amended license, which is not proposed at this time. (b) There are no litigation/pending appeals on any license issue</p>	
<p><b>A. Flows</b></p>	<p><b>PASS</b></p>	<p><b>FAIL</b></p>
<p>1) Is the Facility in Compliance with Resource Agency Recommendations 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 Yes, Woronoco is in compliance with the Resource Agency recommendations made during the FERC relicensing process. Woronoco has a Resource Agency and FERC approved Minimum Flow Discharge and Management Plan (see <b>Appendix C from 2009 application</b>) and operates in compliance with that the Discharge Monitoring Plan</p>	<p>NO = Fail</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>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</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to B</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>

are appropriately protective of fish, wildlife, and water quality?		
<b>B. Water Quality</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>FAIL</b>
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?	YES = Go to B2 Yes- the facility is in compliance with the Woronoco Water Quality Certificate issued after December 31, 1986. Please see the attached Water Quality Certificate in Appendix D of the original 2009 application and annual compliance statements from Woronoco LLC to the FERC FERC e-library	NO = Fail
2) Is the Facility area or the downstream reach currently identified by the state as not meeting water quality standards (including narrative and numeric criteria and designated uses) pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act?	No, the area downstream of the project is classified by the State of Massachusetts as a Class B water body which means it meets the appropriate water quality standards. The Strathmore Paper Mill was shutdown in 1997 and its water treatment plant (not part of the Woronoco Hydro project) is no longer discharging into the Westfield River. Please see the attached Water Quality Assessment of the Westfield River Basin in <b>Appendix E of the original 2009 application.</b>	
3) If the answer to question B.2 is yes, has there been a determination that the Facility does not cause, or contribute to, the violation?	YES = Pass	NO = Fail
<b>C. Fish Passage and Protection</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>FAIL</b>
1) Are anadromous and/or catadromous fish present in the Facility area or	YES = Go to C2	

<p>are they know to have been present historically?</p>	<p>YES NO = Go to C6</p>	
<p>2) Is the Facility in Compliance with Mandatory Fish Passage Prescriptions for upstream and downstream passage of anadromous and catadromous fish issued by Resource Agencies after December 31, 1986?</p>	<p>YES = Go to C6 YES N/A = Go to C2</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>
<p>3) 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 downstream dam or the fish no longer have a migratory run)?</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>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 C2a NO = Go to C3</p> <p>YES = Go to C2b N/A = Go to C2b</p> <p>YES = Go to C5 N/A = Go to C3</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p> <p>NO = Fail</p>
<p>4) 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 C.3.a above), and</p> <p>b) The Resource Agencies declined to issue a Mandatory Fish Passage 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</p>	<p>NO = Go to C6 N/A = Go to C4</p>	<p>YES = Fail</p>

(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>5) If C4 was not applicable:</p> <p>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? Or</p> <p>b) If the Facility is unable to meet the fish passage standards in 5.a, has the Applicant either i) demonstrated, and obtained a letter from the U.S. 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, or ii) committed to the provision of fish passage measures in the future and obtained a letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service indicating that passage measures are not currently warranted?</p>	YES = Go to C6	NO = Fail
6) Is the Facility in Compliance with Mandatory Fish Passage Prescriptions for upstream and/or downstream passage of Riverine fish?	YES = Go to C7 N/A = Go to C7 YES	NO = Fail
7) Is the Facility in Compliance with Resource Agency Recommendations for Riverine, anadromous and catadromous fish entrainment protection, such as tailrace barriers?	Yes ¾ inch racks seasonally prevent entrainment. YES = Pass, go to D N/A = Pass, go to D	NO = Fail
<b>D. Watershed Protection</b>	PASS	FAIL
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 average annual high water line for at least 50% of the shoreline, including all of the undeveloped shoreline?	YES = Eligible for 3 extra years of certification; Go to D4	NO = Go to D2 No, there is no buffer zone around the impoundment. However, there are no residences within 200' of the impoundment, but there is a public road, bridge and RR track in active use within 200' of the river, as well as a

		<p>FERC approved public Recreation Plan (Appendix J from original 2009 application) and the Town of Russell has a park and recreation area that uses the impoundment for fishing, boating and swimming. All of the activities around the shore of the impoundment are low impact and managed by the town or by the project. See <b>FERC inspection reports in Appendix N original application ) Inspection reports since 2009 are included in this submittal</b></p>
<p>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 in D.1, and 2) has the agreement of appropriate stakeholders and state and federal resource agencies?</p>	<p>YES = Eligible for 3 extra years of certification; Go to D4</p>	<p>NO = Go to D3  No, the owner has not established an approved watershed enhancement fund. It is a member of the Westfield River Watershed Association and participates in its meetings as a contributing resource. Woronoco has some river bank land that could be transferred to an appropriate non-profit organization, but an option has not presented itself to date.</p>
<p>3) Has the Facility owner/operator established through a settlement agreement with appropriate stakeholders, with 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 = Go to D4</p>	<p>NO = Go to D4  No</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  N/A = Pass, go to E  <b>YES</b>  Yes- We are in compliance</p>	<p>No = Fail</p>

	<p>with the issued FERC License regarding a Public Recreation Plan (<b>Appendix J of original 2009 application</b>). No plan was ever recommended by the Resource Agencies during the relicensing process. Please see <b>Appendix G of original 2009 application</b> for a copy of the FERC Environmental Assessment and <b>Appendix H of original 2009 application</b> for the FERC License with its compliance orders</p>	
<p><b>E. Threatened and Endangered Species Protection</b></p>	<p>PASS</p>	<p>FAIL</p>
<p>1) Are threatened or endangered species listed under state or federal Endangered Species Acts present in the Facility area and/or downstream reach?</p>	<p>YES = Go to E2  NO = Pass, go to F  Yes, there is a Massachusetts State Listed Species present at the project. Both the USFWS and MNHESP were consulted during the FERC relicensing and Kleinschmidt made a study. USFWS found no evidence of federally listed species, however the MNHESP found evidence of the Squawfoot freshwater mussel, a state listed species. Please see Appendix G for the MNHESP and USFWS correspondence.</p>	
<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?</p>	<p>YES = Go to E3  N/A = Go to E3  Yes, we are in compliance with all provisions of the “Standard Operating Procedures for Relocation of Freshwater Mussels in the Project Impoundment,” a plan approved by FERC and the Resource Agencies. The impoundment cannot be drained unless the “Mussel Relocation Plan” is</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>

	<p>implemented. Please see a copy of the attached plan in Appendix I. Woronoco is in compliance and has not drawn down the impoundment since installing a stop log gate to mitigate the need for annual draw downs of the head pond as IPC did to make equipment repairs. Woronoco installed an automatic roller gate at the entrance to the penstock so the draining the impoundment for turbine maintenance is not required.</p>	
<p>3) If the Facility has received authorization to incidentally Take 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 authorization pursuant to similar state procedures; is the Facility in Compliance with conditions pursuant to that authorization?</p>	<p>YES = Go to E4  N/A = Go to E5  Yes, Woronoco consulted with the appropriate Resource Agencies, MNHESP and MDFW during the licensing process and since when it built the stop-log gate. They stated that no habitat destruction would occur by operating the station in its current configuration and the only way that the fresh water mussels would be harmed is from impoundment “drawdowns” for repairs and maintenance. Woronoco is concerned about the environment, therefore it first constructed a “stoplog” gate structure that allows work in the intake area without the need to draw down the head pond. Only repair of one of the deep discharge gates or a below water area on the upstream side of the dam would require lowering the impoundment. At such time Woronoco would obtain the necessary permits and</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>

	<p>implement its Mussel Relocation Plan to avoid harm to any mussels found in the impoundment. Please see the Resource Agencies correspondence in Appendix G original application and the Mussel Relocation Plan in Appendix I in original application</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>YES, the Resource Agencies approved Woronoco's Freshwater Mussel Relocation Plan to protect the endangered species when there is a need to drain the impoundment. There is no active "recovery plan" for the "threatened or the endangered species at the Woronoco Project, other than the freshwater mussels relocation plan in the Woronoco impoundment or bypass reach because the operation of the project does not threaten this state listed specie</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>
<p>5) If E.2 and E.3 are not applicable, has the Applicant demonstrated that the Facility and Facility operations do not negatively affect listed species?</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to F</p> <p>Yes, generation at the Woronoco Facility does not directly affect the listed Mussels. The Mussel Recovery Plan was developed, tested, and implemented to eliminate any hazard for freshwater mussels. Please see the Resource Agencies correspondence in Appendix G in original application and the Mussel Recover Plan in Appendix I of original</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>

	application	
<b>F. Cultural Resource Protection</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>FAIL</b>
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 Yes, the facility is in compliance with all requirements regarding Cultural Resource protection, mitigation and enhancement included in the FERC license. No significant cultural resources were identified by the Massachusetts Department of Historic Preservation in correspondence during project relicensing. Please see Appendices G and H of original applicaiton	NO = Fail
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 Native American Tribe, or a letter from a senior officer of the relevant agency or Tribe that no plan is needed because Cultural Resources are not negatively affected by the Facility?	YES = Pass, go to G N/A Site is FERC regulated.	NO = Fail
<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 N/A = Go to G2 Yes, the facility encourages public access to its recreational facilities in the project impoundment, bypass reach and tailrace. Please see the FERC approved Recreational Plan in Appendix J of the original application and the FERC inspection of the project recreational resources on June 2009 found in Appendix N in	NO = Fail

	<p>the original application with letters confirming repair of signs following the FERC site visit</p> <p>Recreation Statistics via FERC Form 80 from March 2015 are in are filed with this submission</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>YES = Go to G3</p> <p>N/A site is FERC regulated</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>
<p>3) Does the Facility allow access to the reservoir and downstream reaches without fees or charges?</p>	<p>YES = Pass, go to H</p> <p>Yes, Woronoco Hydro LLC permits free public access to the shoreline of the Woronoco Project across Woronoco's lands where project facilities, hazardous areas and easements do not preclude access.</p>	<p>NO = Fail</p>
<p><b>H. Facilities Recommended for Removal</b></p>	<p>PASS</p>	<p>FAIL</p>
<p>1) Is there a Resource Agency Recommendation for removal of the dam associated with the Facility?</p>	<p>NO = Pass, Facility is Low Impact</p> <p>No Resource Agency has ever recommended that Woronoco Dam be considered for removal.</p>	<p>YES = Fail</p>