

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON D.C. 20426
March 15, 2007

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

Project No. 2144-035-Washington
Boundary Hydroelectric Project
City of Seattle, Washington

Barbara Greene, Relicensing Program Lead
Seattle City Light Department
P.O. Box 34023
Seattle, WA, 98124-4023

Reference: Study Plan Determination for Boundary Hydroelectric Project

Dear Mrs. Greene:

This letter contains, pursuant to 18 CFR §5.13(c), my study plan determination for the City of Seattle's Boundary Hydroelectric Project (Boundary Project), operated by Seattle City Light or SCL. My determination is based on the staff's review of the revised study plan, comments on the proposed and revised study plans, and the verbal record, including comments made at the study plan meeting and teleconferences.

Most study issues have been resolved. I accept the staff's findings on the issues still in dispute, which are discussed in Appendix A. A list of approved studies is attached as Appendix B.

Background

On October 16, 2006, SCL filed their proposed study plan that included studies on fish, water quality, cultural, recreation, land use, aesthetics, and terrestrial resources.

On November 15, 2006, SCL held a study plan meeting to discuss the study plans, and on January 12, 2007, SCL conducted a teleconference to discuss the toxic assessment study. SCL filed a revised study plan on February 14, 2007. Comments on the revised study plan were filed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), jointly by the U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Selkirk Conservation Alliance, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (Tribes). On March 9, 2007, SCL filed responses to the FWS's, Forest Service and BLM's, Selkirk Conservation Alliance's, and the Tribe's comments on the revised study plan.

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 2
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

Study Plan Determination

The study plan filed on February 14, 2007, is approved, with the following modifications:

Waterfowl/Waterbird and Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Wildlife Studies

In order to ensure an adequate assessment of the potential effects of continued project operation on sensitive wildlife species, the Waterfowl/Waterbird and Rare, Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Studies is revised to include the black tern.

Toxics Assessment: Evaluation of Contaminant Pathways, Potential Project Nexus

To ensure that the effects of project operations on the distribution of toxics in project waters and sediments are adequately addressed, the toxic assessment study plan is modified as follows:

- Phase 1 of the study plan is revised to include an objective of developing a detailed toxics sampling plan (Phase 2) that tests for toxics in project areas subject to erosion from reservoir fluctuations.
- Phase 1 of the study plan is revised to include a provision for determining exactly where, when, and how to best sample sediments, pore water, and the water column within the active storage zone of the project reservoir (*i.e.*, between elevation 1,990 feet and 1,950 feet) where project operations likely result in suspension of sediments in the area of the Pend Oreille, Grandview, Josephine, Oriole, and Blue Bucket Mine sites and the cement kiln residue along the mouth of Sullivan Creek for the following heavy metals: arsenic, cadmium, lead, mercury, and zinc; based on this Phase 1 analysis, the Phase 2 sampling plan shall include, at a minimum, provisions for sampling reservoir sediments, pore water, and the water column for the aforementioned heavy metals in the reservoir in the vicinity of the mine sites and confluence with Sullivan Creek.
- The Phase 2 study plan filed with the Commission for approval shall address the study criteria stipulated in 18 CFR§5.9(b).
- The Phase 1 study report and Phase 2 study plan shall be filed for Commission approval no later than July 31, 2007, as defined in table 2.9-1 of the study plan. In accordance with 18 CFR §5.15(c)(4), (5), and (6), any

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 3
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

participant may file disagreements concerning the Phase 2 study plan within 30 days (August 30, 2007), setting forth the basis of the disagreement and any proposed modifications to the Phase 2 study plan; responses to filed comments must be filed within 30 days (October 1, 2007); and the Office of Energy Projects Director's determination on the Phase 2 study plan will be issued within 30 days of the due date for responses (October 31, 2007).

Lands and Roads Study

To ensure that staff can assess the effects of continued operation of project-related roads on environmental resources and to determine consistency with the Colville National Forest Land Management Plan, the lands and roads study shall be modified as follows:

- A roadway condition analysis and an easement and permit analysis shall be conducted for the following roads during the 2007 study season and the results made available by the initial study report (March 2008): the road needed to reach the project power house, project operations buildings and yards, the tailrace recreation area, and forebay recreation area; the road needed to access the project transmission line; the roads, or portion thereof, used solely to access SCL's Vista House; and the roads, or portions thereof, used solely to access the active groundwater monitoring wells.

If you have any questions, please contact David Turner at (202) 502-6091 or david.turner@ferc.gov.

Sincerely,

J. Mark Robinson, Director
Office of Energy Projects

Enclosure A: Appendix A, Response to Comments on Revised Study Plan
Enclosure B: Appendix B, Study Plan Summary

cc: Mailing List, Public Files

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 4
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

APPENDIX A – STUDY REQUEST ISSUES

Staff's Findings/Response to Comments on Revised Study Plan

The following discusses comments and recommendations by stakeholders on the revised study plan, filed February 14, 2007, including the basis for requiring or not requiring modifications to the revised study plan.

Waterfowl/Waterbird Study and Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Wildlife Study

As part of its Waterfowl/Waterbird Study, SCL proposes to estimate the number of piscivorous waterbirds using the project area and to locate their nest sites, if possible, with an emphasis on double crested cormorants and great blue heron. As part of its Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Wildlife Study, SCL would document historical and recent observations and the location and condition of potential habitat, and identify potential threats to rare wildlife in the project area. The studies did not specifically list the black tern. The Selkirk Conservation Alliance recommends that the study also specifically include the black tern because of its declining numbers throughout its range. In its March 9, 2007, filing, SCL agreed to add the black tern to these studies. The study plans are so modified to ensure an adequate assessment of the potential effects on sensitive wildlife species.

Toxics Assessment: Evaluation of Contaminant Pathways, Potential Project Nexus

SCL proposes to implement its toxics study plan in two phases. In Phase 1, which would commence in March 2007 and end with the filing of a Final Phase 1 Study Report in June 2007, SCL would: (1) use existing information to characterize the current state of toxics contamination and bioaccumulation within Boundary reservoir; (2) identify any data gaps for information necessary to understand the nexus between project operations and toxics contamination and bioaccumulation; (3) determine potential pathways of contamination and mechanisms affecting bioavailability of toxics of concern in Boundary reservoir; (4) determine where sediments occur in Boundary reservoir that have grain size characteristics similar to mine waste or tailings deposited by entities in the past; (5) identify the relationship between Boundary reservoir operations and pathways of contamination or mechanisms of bioavailability for toxics of concern; (6) develop a conceptual model of potential contaminant pathways in the project area; (7) develop a one-dimensional, steady-state hydraulic model for initial evaluation of sediment transport (sediment with grain-size characteristics of waste rock or tailing) in the mainstem Pend Oreille River in the project area; and (8) develop hypotheses regarding the potential effects of project operations on the conveyance and bioavailability of toxics of concern. In Phase 2, SCL would conduct field sampling and analysis for toxics of concern that

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 5
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

have been identified in the Phase 1 analysis as being potentially affected by project operations. Phase 2 would commence after Commission staff's approval of a proposed Phase 2 field sampling plan that SCL would file with the Commission by July 31, 2007, as part of Phase 1.

In reference to SCL's desire in Phase 1 to better understand the nexus between project operations and toxics contamination and bioaccumulation, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (Tribes), U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) all comment that a nexus between project operations and adverse effects associated with toxics of concern has already been established by the information in the project record. The Tribes also imply that Phase 1 is designed to result in a finding of no nexus between project operations and toxics contamination in the project area.

Section 4.3 of the Pre-Application Document (PAD) and section 2.4 of SCL's proposed Erosion Study notes that numerous areas exist throughout Boundary reservoir where active undercutting and sloughing of banks and slopes is taking place, including shorelines and banks in the vicinity of the Josephine, Yellowhead, and Pend Orielle mines. Section 2.1 of the Erosion Study also notes that project operations may be responsible in part for these erosive processes, many of which likely result in the suspension and transport of sediments located within the active storage zone of the reservoir. Information provided in the PAD (section 4.4.5.3.3) shows that toxics of concern at the Pend Oreille, Grandview, Josephine, Oriole, and Blue Bucket Mine sites likely have migrated, and continue to, migrate downslope toward the project reservoir. In addition, tailings from one or more of these mines likely exist at and along the project reservoir. Based on this existing information, we find that available information does show that a nexus between project operations and toxics contamination exists in that erosion and suspension of sediments due to project operations may result in the suspension and transport of toxics that may be bound to the sediments. We, therefore, disagree with the Tribes that the Phase 1 results would likely lead to a finding of no project nexus, because one has already been established and, is in part, the basis for our approval of Phase 1 of the study plan. We find that the information generated in Phase 1 of the study plan would serve to identify any additional relationships that may exist between project operations and toxics in the project area.

The Tribes expressed concern that the study plan is designed such that the Phase 2 field sampling may not be conducted if the results of Phase 1 would show that there would be no nexus between project operations and adverse effects associated with toxics contamination. The Selkirk Conservation Alliance expressed a somewhat similar concern by noting that it is unclear to them what findings in Phase 1 would trigger Phase 2 field sampling. The Forest Service, BLM, and Selkirk Conservation Alliance comment that SCL's study plan does not provide for sampling the water column or sediments of Boundary reservoir for toxics of concern. SCL responded by letter filed on March 9,

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 6
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

2007, that they are committed to field sampling and that “the purpose of Phase 1 is to provide information to design a sampling program (Phase 2) that more effectively targets the toxic pathways present and the potential problems they may cause.”

We are modifying the study plan to include the development of a field sampling plan as an objective of Phase 1. We are also modifying the study plan to ensure that Phase 1 determines how, when, and specifically where to best sample sediments, pore water, and the reservoir water column in the reservoir’s active storage zone near the Pend Oreille, Grandview, Josephine, Oriole, and Blue Bucket Mine sites and the cement kiln residue along the mouth of Sullivan Creek. We are also modifying the study plan to ensure that Phase 2 field sampling for toxics includes locations in the vicinity of the mines and the cement kiln residue.

The Forest Service and BLM recommend that the proposed study plan include provisions to locate or sample water at openings where reservoir water floods and drains underground mine workings associated with the Josephine, Yellowhead, and Lookout mines during project operations. In its March 9, 2007, filing, SCL comments that there is no evidence to support a conclusion that the mines are hydraulically connected to the reservoir.

This appears to be the first time in the proceeding that anyone raised the particular issue of the relationship between project operations and underground mine workings. We note that the recommendations by the Forest Service and BLM do not include the requisite information stipulated in 18 CFR §5.9(b) to justify their requests and to assist in our analysis of the recommendation. For example, although the Forest Service and BLM generally explain how underground mine workings that are hydraulically connected to a reservoir may serve as a pathway for toxics contamination, the Forest Service and BLM recommendations do not provide existing information showing that such openings exist or even have the potential to exist at the Boundary Project as required by 18 CFR §5.9(b)(4). As another example, the Forest Service and BLM recommendations do not include the methodology for locating such openings or determining whether there is a hydraulic connection between the mines and the project as required by 18 CFR §5.9(b)(6). Because of this lack of detail, it’s not clear to us exactly what the Forest Service and BLM would have us require SCL to do to determine whether a hydraulic connection (and therefore a nexus to the project) exists. We, therefore, make no modifications to the study plan to incorporate the recommendations by the Forest Service and BLM to include an assessment of underground mine workings in the project area.

The Tribes claim that SCL’s proposed toxics study does not meet the intent of 18 CFR §5.9(b)(6) in that the proposed study does not include an explanation of how the Phase 2 field sampling methodology would be consistent with generally accepted scientific practice. We disagree. One of the purposes of Phase 1 is to determine how best to conduct field sampling in Phase 2. In other words, the Phase 2 field sampling

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 7
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

plan has not yet been developed by SCL in consultation with the stakeholders; therefore, the Phase 2 field sampling plan can not be weighed against the study criteria at this time. We do note, however, that the Tribes raise a valid concern with regard to the content of the Phase 2 field sampling plan with respect to the study criteria stipulated in 18 CFR §5.9(b); therefore, we are modifying the study plan to require that SCL's Phase 2 field sampling plan address the study criteria.

FWS expresses concern that the implementation schedule of the toxics study plan does not allow stakeholders to adequately participate in the development of the Phase 2 field sampling plan. We note that table 2.9-1 of the study plan shows that the stakeholders will be given opportunities to provide input to the Phase 2 field sampling plan on the week of June 11, 2007, and the week of July 9, 2007. In addition, we are modifying the schedule to allow any participant to file disagreements concerning the Phase 2 study plan within 30 days of the filing of the plan by SCL for Commission approval (August 30, 2007); responses to any filed comments are due 30 days later (October 1, 2007);¹ the Office of Energy Projects Director's determination will be issued no later than 30 days thereafter, in accordance with consultation procedures of 18 CFR § 5.15(c)(4), (5) and (6). We, therefore, find that the stakeholders will have sufficient opportunities to provide input to and comment on the Phase 2 study plan both prior to and immediately after it has been filed with the Commission for approval.

The Forest Service and BLM comment that SCL should use the "Lowest Apparent Effects Threshold (LAET)" to determine the need to conduct further biotic sampling based on the results of the Phase 2 study. FWS comments that the study plan does not clearly explain the procedures for establishing thresholds for evaluating toxic effects on aquatic organisms.

Staff is recommending the development of a Phase 2 field sampling plan, the purpose of which is to acquire toxics data that will assist staff in assessing the effects of project operations on aquatic resources. Until the actual field data have been acquired as part of the Phase 2 field sampling, we are unwilling to in essence pre-determine the need for additional field data by establishing effects thresholds. Modifications to the Phase 2 field study or the need for additional studies to acquire additional toxics data will be determined in accordance with procedures defined in 18 CFR §5.15(c)(2)-(7).

Recreation Resources Study

As part of its recreation resources study, SCL proposes to evaluate dispersed recreation use and access to the project reservoir. SCL would identify and document/map existing and potential dispersed recreation use areas and sites; identify and

¹ Because day 30 (September 29, 2007) falls on a Saturday, we set the due date as Monday, October 1, 2007.

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 8
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

document/map existing road, foot trail, and watercraft access routes used to access the shoreline and project facilities; document site-related ecological impacts; and identify opportunities and constraints to maintaining or enhancing dispersed recreation use areas and public road/trail access. The Selkirk Conservation Alliance recommends that this study evaluate the feasibility of, and the effects of, closing unnecessary or lightly used trails and roads to protect environmental resources.

This appears to be the first time that this recommendation has been raised. We note that the recommendations by the Selkirk Conservation Alliance do not include the requisite information stipulated in 18 CFR §5.9(b) to justify their requests and to assist in our analysis of the recommendation. For example, the Selkirk Conservation Alliance's recommendations do not include existing information to suggest that there are project-related roads that are not necessary for project purposes [18 CFR §5.9(b)(4)] or, include methods for conducting the feasibility assessment [18 CFR §5.9(b)(6)]. Because of this lack of detail, it's not clear to us exactly what the Alliance would have us require SCL to do to determine which roads should be closed. While such measures may ultimately be considered, the information gathered during the dispersed recreation analysis and the lands and roads study is needed first to determine which roads and trails are or are not needed for project purposes. Therefore, further modifications to this study are not recommended at this time.

Lands and Roads Study

SCL proposes to conduct a Lands and Road Study that would document current information on project-related land ownership, rights, and encumbrances, and project-related roadway ownership, rights-of-way, road use, and access needs within and adjacent to the project boundary. The lands analysis would identify land ownership, in tabular and mapped (GIS) format, for all lands and waters within the project boundary, parcels immediately adjoining the project boundary, and other lands needed to operate and maintain the project. The data gathered would include parcel name, tax parcel number (if applicable), legal description, and approximate acreage if available. For lands within the project boundary, SCL would provide the location of surveyed lines (e.g., east line of NE1/4) and monuments (corners), date of survey, and record of survey filing information (if applicable). However, SCL suspects that some changes to the project boundary are likely to be required as result of various studies; thus, SCL would not conduct related land survey work until the Commission approves any proposed changes to the project boundary, which SCL would make in its license application. SCL intends to adhere to Commission guidance regarding the preparation of project exhibits (FERC 2006), including appropriate geo-referenced survey monument data in developing the exhibit G drawings.

In their comments on the revised study plan, the Forest Service believes that the lands analysis may not capture the information necessary to describe adequately the

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 9
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

ownership and project boundary situation. However, the Forest Service does not explain why the information would not be adequate [18 CFR§5.9(b)(7)] , specifically what additional information would need to be gathered and how [18 CFR§5.9(b)(6)], and at what level of effort or cost [18 CFR§5.9(b)(7)].

A review of the consultation record indicates that the Forest Service apparently does not want SCL to conduct detailed surveys, but rather to retrace the original survey lines to see if the boundary monuments are still there and assess their condition (January 17, 2007, telephone conversation between Forest Service's Glenn Koehn and SCL's Michele Lynn). The Forest Service believes that understanding the on-the-ground extent of SCL, Forest Service, and other private lands is important to ensure that any on-the-ground improvements that they may propose or require occurs on federal land.

SCL states that it would be a monumental task to retrace the survey lines and would take well over a year to complete. Plus, the information would provide little useful information and may have to be redone if the project boundary changed. SCL believes that it makes more sense to see where holes in the existing information exist, which is what SCL is proposing in the Lands and Roads Study.

We agree with SCL. Moreover, the information sought by the Forest Service is not needed to prepare exhibit drawings, to evaluate the effects of the project on land uses, or to define proposed environmental measures. SCL is required to file exhibit G drawings that conform to the Commission's regulations (18 CFR 4.41), which for federal lands within the project boundary must be identified on the map by: (i) legal subdivisions of a public land survey of the affected area (a protraction of identified township and section lines is sufficient for this purpose); and (ii) the Federal agency, identified by symbol or legend, that maintains or manages each identified subdivision of the public land survey within the project boundary; or (iii) in the absence of a public land survey, the location of the Federal lands according to the distances and directions from fixed monuments or physical features. SCL proposes to follow these requirements in preparing its application and its proposed study would gather the data necessary to compile this information; therefore, the study does not need to be modified to require SCL to relocate and determine the condition of the survey monuments and boundaries.

For the roads analysis, SCL proposes to first, determine what roads across Forest Service and BLM lands are needed for known project operations and maintenance and if currently available routes meet access needs for safe and efficient operation and maintenance of the project. Then, SCL would determine the condition of the existing road system needed for project operation and maintenance, with respect to user vehicle types, soil and water resource impacts (i.e., erosion or mass wasting from the road prism), and administrative use by the national forest and others. It would also determine if appropriate road use easements or permits exist for routes needed for project operation and maintenance. SCL would defer analysis of other Forest Service roads that might be

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 10
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

used to informally access the project reservoir for recreation until the dispersed recreation use assessment is completed. If additional roadway access to the project is needed for recreational use based on the results of the recreation study and integrated analysis, then SCL would complete a road condition analysis and an assessment of road use easement and permit needs.

In its comments on the revised study plan, the Forest Service expressed concern that there would not be sufficient time between the completion of the recreation study and integration analysis (February 2009) and submission of the preliminary licensing proposal (April 2009) to allow for incorporating data or results in the preliminary licensing proposal. The Forest Service requests that SCL gather the road data/information for specific roads defined in Attachment A to its February 28, 2007, comments now so that the information is available for use in other studies (big game and erosion studies) and post-study reporting and integration. The roads identified by the Forest Service originate from either State Route 31 and County Road 3669 on the east side of the reservoir or County Road 2975 on the west side and proceed toward the project reservoir or parallel the reservoir.

SCL did not define how it would determine whether a road is needed for project operation and maintenance. Information in the PAD and the proposed study shows that the following roads are clearly needed for project operation and maintenance and other purposes: the road needed to reach the project power house, project operations buildings and yards, the tailrace recreation area, and forebay recreation area; the road needed to access the project transmission line; the roads, or portions thereof used solely to access SCL's Vista House; and the roads, or portions thereof, used solely to access the active groundwater monitoring wells established to monitor the influence of reservoir on water levels in area mines. It appears that SCL would analyze road conditions for these roads during the 2007 study season. The study plan should be modified to clearly indicate that the roadway condition analysis and the easement and permit analysis for the above roads will be conducted during the 2007 study season and that the results would be made available by the initial study report (March 2008). This information is necessary to evaluate the project's consistency with the Colville National Forest Land Management Plan.

However, the remaining roads identified by the Forest Service in its Attachment A may not be needed for project purposes or only used incidentally for project purposes (i.e. recreational access). Available information suggests that few dispersed recreation sites along the project reservoir are accessed via a road system, which is understandable given the steep terrain in this portion of the project. Moreover, most of the Forest Service roads are multi-purpose roads located high above the reservoir, potentially limiting their use to access the project and their need for project purposes. Because these roads are not solely

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 11
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

used for project purposes,² we are not clear how the information requested by the Forest Service would be used to inform license requirements [18 CFR § 5.9(b)(6)]. Therefore, we will not require SCL at this time to assess road conditions and conduct a permit analysis on any roads except those described above as being needed for project purposes. There should be sufficient time to review the results of the dispersed recreation survey efforts during the initial and updated study reports to determine when and whether any additional road conditional and permit analysis should be conducted and to incorporate those results in the review of the preliminary licensing proposal.

As part of the lands and roads study, the Selkirk Conservation Alliance recommends that SCL investigate the feasibility of closing vehicle access to roads that are not necessary to the project or the federal landowners to benefit environmental resources. This appears to be the first time that this recommendation has been raised. Our reasons for not modifying the study as requested are the same as discussed above regarding Recreation Resources Study.

Socioeconomic Impact of the Boundary Project on Selkirk School District

Citing a decrease in population numbers and school enrollment, and an apparent shift in support for the local referendums on school improvements, the Selkirk Consolidated School District (School District) believes that construction and operation of the Boundary Project has changed local demographics, environmental conditions, and other factors (i.e. from a population with a direct connection to the local school district to a recreation-based and retirement community with no ties to the school district) in such a manner that it has adversely impacted its ability to garner support for much needed school improvements. The School District requests that SCL study pre-project economic, demographic, and property value conditions relative to existing conditions within the school district boundary to determine if there is a connection between the construction and operation of the Boundary Project and the School District's inability to pass long-term bonds for school construction. The School District recommends that SCL (a) conduct demographic surveys to determine the number of households with school-aged children versus retirement or vacation homes, voting patterns, and impact of property values on voting patterns; (b) conduct focus group discussions to understand reasons behind voting patterns; (c) compare lost benefits to school district in terms of property tax dollars due to the fact that the city is exempt from local property tax requirements; and (d) conduct a hedonic model that statistically contrasts the value of homes in the school district with house values in nearby community without a reservoir. If such a connection exists, the School District would recommend that a new license include requirements for

² While the extent to which roads may be found necessary for project access may vary from case to case, as a general matter the concept of roads being "necessary" for a project must be restricted to roads used solely by a project [*Portland General Electric Company*, 117 FERC ¶ 61,112 at P 16 (2006)].

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 12
Project No. 2144-035-Washington

SCL to place in a construction fund the amount equal to the school's indebtedness to use for school construction or modernization.

SCL does not propose to conduct the study because there is nothing to suggest that the School District's inability to date to issue such bonds is a direct, indirect, or cumulative effect of project operations. (See 18 CFR § 5.9(b)(5)). Moreover, the School District provides no information about what construction or modernization of facilities it wishes to perform, and any potential linkage between those particular improvements and the project. SCL avers that it is likely the passage of time since construction of the schools, rather than project operations, is the reason School District facilities now require modernization. They also assert that the study result would be unlikely to inform the requirements of the new project license because payment of impact fees to the School District is and should continue to be handled outside the FERC licensing process pursuant to state law, which imposes requirements independent of FERC's licensing process on municipal owners of hydropower facilities to compensate local governments for project impacts on those local governments (RCW 35.21.425). Finally, SCL states that the School District's proposed methodology would be inappropriate because a comparison of pre-project to existing conditions would shed no light on project impacts. A "then and now" comparison would reflect how the present differs from the past, but would not reveal whether the differences are due to the passage of time, regional factors, or other factors outside SCL's control.

The School District did not participate in the study plan meetings or file comments in response to the revised study plan.

For the reasons noted by SCL above, we do not recommend conducting the study. Moreover, the Commission has long held that it is not a matter for the Commission to be involved where state law provides procedures for establishing tax payments for such purposes.³

³ City of Tacoma, 84 FERC ¶ 61,037 (1998), reh'g denied, 85 FERC ¶ 61,020 (1998) (not a matter for the Commission where state law provided procedures for establishing payments in lieu of taxes.); Holyoke Water Power Company, 88 FERC ¶ 61,186 (1999) (FPA has no "no net loss" standard for affected resources and values, including tax revenues); Ohio Power Co., 71 FERC ¶ 61,092 at p. 61,314 & n. 43 (1995); PUD No. 1 of Chelan County, WA, et al., 107 FERC ¶ 61,280 at P 127-130 (2004) (Mid-Columbia HCPs), order on reh'g, 109 FERC ¶ 61,208 (2004) (potential tax impacts too speculative).

Boundary Hydroelectric Project 13
 Project No. 2144-035-Washington

APPENDIX B
APPROVED STUDIES

#	Study Name
1	Erosion Study
2	Analysis of Peak Flood Flow Conditions Above Metaline Falls
3	Evaluation of TDG and Potential Abatement Measures
4	Toxics Assessment: Evaluation of Contaminant Pathways, Potential Project Nexus
5	Water Quality Constituent and Productivity Monitoring
6	Evaluation of the Relationship of pH and DO to Macrophytes in Boundary Reservoir
7	Mainstem Aquatic Habitat Modeling Study
8	Sediment Transport and Boundary Reservoir Tributary Delta Habitats Study
9	Fish Distribution, Timing, and Abundance Study
10	Large Woody Debris Management Study
11	Productivity Assessment
12	Fish Entrainment and Habitat Connectivity Study
13	Recreational Fishery Study
14	Assessment of Factors Affecting Aquatic Productivity in Tributary Habitats
15	Waterfowl/Waterbird Study
16	Inventory of Riparian Trees and Shrubs
17	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) Plant Species Inventory
18	RTE Wildlife Species Study
19	Big Game Study
20	Bat Surveys and Habitat Inventory
21	Recreation Resource Study
22	Land and Roads Study
23	Aesthetic/Visual Study
24	Cultural Resource Study