Greater Harney Basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan

Developed by the:

Greater Harney Basin Local Advisory Committee

Oregon Department of Agriculture

With support from the:

Harney Soil and Water Conservation District

Date: April 6, 2016

ODA and SWCD Contact Information

Oregon Department of Agriculture
Water Quality Program
635 Capitol St. NE
Salem, OR 97301
Phone: (503) 986-4700

Harney SWCD
530 Highway 20 South
Hines, OR 97738
Phone: (541) 573-6446

www.oregon.gov/ODA/programs/NaturalResources/Pages/AgWaterQuality.

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Terms Used in this Document i

Foreword 1

Disclaimer 1

Water Rights 1

Required Elements of Area Plans 1

Plan Content 2

Chapter 1: Agricultural Water Quality Management Program Purpose and Background 3

1.1 Purpose of Agricultural Water Quality Management Program and Applicability of Area Plans 3

1.2 History of the Ag Water Quality Program 3

1.3 Roles and Responsibilities 4

1.3.1 Oregon Department of Agriculture 4

1.3.2 Local Management Agency 7

1.3.3 Local Advisory Committee 7

1.3.4 Agriculture's Role 7

1.3.5 Public Participation 8

1.4 Agricultural Water Quality 8

1.4.1 Point and Nonpoint Sources of Water Pollution 8

1.4.2 Beneficial Uses and Parameters of Concern 8

1.4.3 Impaired Water Bodies and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) 9

1.4.4 Oregon Water Pollution Control Law – ORS 468B.025 and ORS 468B.050 9

1.4.5 Streamside Vegetation and Agricultural Water Quality 10

1.5 Other Water Quality Programs 11

1.5.1 Confined Animal Feeding Operation Program 11

1.5.2 Groundwater Management Areas 12

1.5.3 The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds 12

1.5.4 Pesticide Management and Stewardship 12

1.5.5 Drinking Water Source Protection 13

1.6 Partner Agencies and Organizations 13

1.6.1 Oregon Department of Environmental Quality 13

1.6.2 Other Partners 14

1.7 Measuring Progress 14

1.7.1 Measurable Objectives 14

1.7.2 Land Conditions and Water Quality 15

1.7.3 Focused Implementation in Small Geographic Areas 15

1.8 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management 16

1.8.1 Statewide Aerial Photo Monitoring of Streamside Vegetation 16

1.8.2 Agricultural Ambient Water Quality Monitoring 16

1.8.3 Biennial Reviews and Adaptive Management 16

Chapter 2: Local Background 19

2.1 Local Roles and Responsibilities 19

2.1.1 Local Advisory Committee 19
2.1.2 Local Management Agency 20
2.2 Area Plan and Regulations: Development and History 20
2.3 Geographical and Physical Setting 20
2.3.1 Geographic and Programmatic Scope 20
2.3.2 Map of the Management Area 21
2.3.3 Location, Climate, Soils and Geology, Vegetation, Hydrology, Land Use 23
2.4 Agricultural Water Quality in the Management Area 30
2.4.1 Local Issues of Concern 30
2.4.2 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies 30
2.4.3 Basin TMDLs and Agricultural Load Allocations 32
2.4.4 Beneficial Uses and Parameters of Concern 33
2.5 Prevention and Control Measures 36
2.5.1 Waste Management 37
2.5.2 Desired Streamside Riparian Condition 37
2.5.4 Soil Erosion Prevention and Control 39
2.5.5 Management Intent and Optional Practices 39

Chapter 3: Measurable Objectives and Strategic Initiatives 44
3.1 Measurable Objectives 44
3.1.1 Management Area Measurable Objectives 44
3.1.2 Demonstration Area Measurable Objectives 44
3.2 Strategic Initiatives 44
3.2.1 Silvies River Demonstration Area/Focus Area(s) 44
3.2.2 Strategic Implementation Area 45
3.2.3 Pesticide Stewardship Partnership 46
3.2.4 Harney County Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurance (CCAA) for Greater Sage Grouse 46
3.3 Strategies and Activities 46
3.3.1 Community Awareness 47
3.3.2 Conservation Planning and Conservation Activities 47
3.3.3 Funding 47
3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation 48

Chapter 4: Implementation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management 51
4.1 Progress Toward Management Area Measurable Objectives 51
4.2 Progress on Demonstration Area/Focus Area 51
4.3 Activities and Accomplishments 54
4.4 Water Quality Monitoring—Status and Trends 55
4.5 Biennial Reviews and Adaptive Management 56

References 57

Acronyms and Terms Used in this Document

Ag Water Quality Program – Agricultural Water Quality Management Program
Area Plan – Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan
Area Rules – Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Rules
CAFO – Confined Animal Feeding Operation
CNPCP – Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program
CWA – Clean Water Act
CZARA – Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments
DEQ – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
DMA – Designated Management Agency
GWMA – Groundwater Management Area
HABs – Harmful Algal Blooms
LAC – Local Advisory Committee
LMA – Local Management Agency
Management Area – Agricultural Water Quality Management Area
MOA – Memorandum of Agreement
NPDES – National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
OAR – Oregon Administrative Rules
ODA – Oregon Department of Agriculture
ODF – Oregon Department of Forestry
OHA – Oregon Health Authority
ORS – Oregon Revised Statute
OWEB – Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
PMP – Pesticides Management Plan
PSP – Pesticides Stewardship Partnership
SIA – Strategic Implementation Area
SWCD – Soil and Water Conservation District
TMDL – Total Maximum Daily Load
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture
US EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency
WQPMT – Water Quality Pesticides Management Team

Foreword

This Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan (Area Plan) provides guidance for addressing water quality due to agricultural activities in the Agricultural Water Quality Management Area (Management Area). The purpose of the Area Plan is to identify strategies to prevent and control water pollution from agricultural lands through a combination of outreach programs, suggested land treatments, management activities, compliance, and monitoring.

The Area Plan is neither regulatory nor enforceable (Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 568.912(1)). It references associated Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Rules (Area Rules), which are Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) that are enforced by the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA).

Disclaimer

It is not the intent of the Greater Harney Basin Local Advisory Committee (LAC) to create a document that will restrict future land uses.

This Area Plan is not intended to stand as a permanent document but is rather to be used as a framework for addressing agricultural water quality issues and for developing a set of enforceable rules to be adopted by the ODA for the current 'snapshot in time.' From time-to-time, legal and enforceable standards and parameters may change, thus potentially changing recommendations for rules made in association with this Area Plan. This Area Plan is revisited biennially and portions may be revised to accommodate any changes required by modifications in enforceable standards or parameters. The physical and historical descriptions within this plan may not require revision.

Following recommendations of this Area Plan will not necessarily prevent an operator from violating established laws or requirements of other regulatory bodies nor hold him harmless from penalty for those violations.

Water Rights

This Area Plan should not be construed as an infringement upon water rights.

The Federal Clean Water Act, Title 33, Chapter 26, Subchapter 1, Section 1251 states: "It is the further policy of Congress that nothing in this chapter shall be construed to supercede or abrogate rights to quantities of water which have been established by any state." (Emphasis added.) Furthermore, Oregon Senate Bill 502, codified in ORS 561.19(4) states: "Nothing in this section is intended to change or reduce the authority of the Water Resources Commission or the Water Resources Department under ORS chapters 536 to 543." (Emphasis added.)

Required Elements of Area Plans

Area Plans must describe a program to achieve the water quality goals and standards necessary to protect designated beneficial uses related to water quality as required by state and federal law (OAR 603-090-0030(1)). At a minimum, an Area Plan must:

- Describe the geographical area and physical setting of the Management Area.
- List water quality issues of concern.
- List impaired beneficial uses.

- State that the goal of the Area Plan is to prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion and to achieve applicable water quality standards.
- Include water quality objectives.
- Describe pollution prevention and control measures deemed necessary by ODA to achieve the goal.
- Include an implementation schedule for measures needed to meet applicable dates established by law.
- Include guidelines for public participation.
- Describe a strategy for ensuring that the necessary measures are implemented.

Plan Content

Chapter 1: Agricultural Water Quality Management Program Purpose and Background. The purpose is to have consistent and accurate information about the Ag Water Quality Program.

Chapter 2: Local Background. Provides the local geographic, water quality, and agricultural context for the Management Area. Describes the water quality issues, Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Rules (Area Rules), and available or effective practices to address water quality issues.

Chapter 3: Local Goals, Objectives, and Implementation Strategies. Presents goal(s), measurable objectives, and timelines, along with strategies to achieve these goal(s) and objectives.

Chapter 4: Local Implementation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management. Summarizes land condition and water quality status and trends to assess progress toward the goals and objectives in Chapter 3.

Chapter 1: Agricultural Water Quality Management Program Purpose and Background

1.1 Purpose of Agricultural Water Quality Management Program and Applicability of Area Plans

As part of Oregon's Agricultural Water Quality Management Program (Ag Water Quality Program), the Area Plan guides landowners and partners such as Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) in in addressing water quality issues due to agricultural activities. The purpose of the Area Plan is to identify strategies to prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion (ORS 568.909(2)) on agricultural and rural lands for the area within the boundaries of this Management Area (OAR 603-090-0000(3)) and to achieve and maintain water quality standards (ORS 561.191(2)). The Area Plan has been developed and revised by ODA and the Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Local Advisory Committee (LAC), with support and input from the SWCD and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The public was invited to participate in the original development and approval of the Area Plans and is invited to participate in the biennial review process. The Area Plan is implemented using a combination of outreach, conservation and management activities, compliance with Area Rules developed to implement the Area Plan, monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management.

The provisions of the Area Plan do not establish legal requirements or prohibitions (ORS 568.912(1)). Each Area Plan is accompanied by Area Rules that describe local agricultural water quality regulatory requirements. ODA will exercise its regulatory authority for the prevention and control of water pollution from agricultural activities under the Ag Water Quality Program's general regulations (OAR 603-090-0000 to 603-090-0120) and under the Area Rules for this Management Area (OAR 603-095-3340). The Ag Water Quality Program's general rules guide the Ag Water Quality Program, and the Area Rules for the Management Area are the regulations that landowners are required to follow.

The Area Plan and its associated regulations apply to all agricultural activities on non-federal and non-Tribal Trust land within this Management Area, including:

- Farms and ranches.
- Rural properties grazing a few animals or raising crops.
- Agricultural lands that lay idle or on which management has been deferred.
- Agricultural activities in urban areas.
- Agricultural activities on land subject to the Forest Practices Act (ORS 527.610).

1.2 History of the Ag Water Quality Program

In 1993, the Oregon Legislature passed the Agricultural Water Quality Management Act (formerly known as "Senate Bill 1010") directing ODA to develop plans to prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities, soil erosion, and to achieve water quality standards (ORS 568.900 through ORS 568.933). Senate Bill 502 was passed in 1995 to clarify that ODA regulates agriculture with respect to water quality (ORS 561.191). The Area Plan and its associated Area Rules were developed and subsequently revised pursuant to these statutes.

Between 1997 and 2004, ODA worked with LACs and SWCDs to develop Area Plans and associated Area Rules in 38 watershed-based Management Areas across Oregon (Figure 1). Since 2004, ODA, LACs, SWCDs, and other partners have focused on implementation including:

- Providing education, outreach, and technical assistance to landowners.
- Implementing projects to improve agricultural water quality.
- Investigating complaints of potential violations of Area Rules.
- Conducting biennial reviews of Area Plans and associated Area Rules.
- Monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management.
- Developing partnerships with SWCDs, state and federal agencies, tribes, watershed councils, and others.

Figure 1: Map of 38 Agricultural Water Quality Management Areas



1.3 Roles and Responsibilities

1.3.1 Oregon Department of Agriculture

The Oregon Department of Agriculture is the agency responsible for implementing the Ag Water Quality Program (ORS 568.900 to 568.933, ORS 561.191, OAR 603-090, and OAR 603-095). The Ag Water Quality Program was established to develop and carry out a water quality management plan for the prevention and control of water pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion. State and federal laws that are drivers for establishing an Ag Water Quality Management Plan include:

- State water quality standards.

- Load allocations for agricultural nonpoint source pollution assigned under Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) issued pursuant to the Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 303(d).
- Approved management measures for Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA).
- Agricultural activities detailed in a Groundwater Management Area (GWMA) Action Plan (if a GWMA has been established and an Action Plan developed).

The Oregon Department of Agriculture has the legal authority to develop and implement Area Plans and associated Area Rules for the prevention and control of water pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion, where such plans are required by state or federal law (ORS 568.909 and ORS 568.912). ODA bases Area Plans and Area Rules on scientific information (ORS 568.909). ODA works in partnership with SWCDs, LACs, DEQ, and other partners to implement, evaluate, and update the Area Plans and Area Rules. ODA has responsibility for any actions related to enforcement or determination of noncompliance with rules (OAR 603-090-0080 through OAR 603-090-0120). ORS 568.912(1) and ORS 568.912(2) give ODA the authority to adopt rules that require landowners to perform actions necessary to prevent and control pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion.

The emphasis of the Area Plan is on voluntary action by landowners or operators to control the factors affecting water quality in the Management Area. The Area Rules are outlined as a set of minimum standards that landowners and operators must be meet on all agricultural or rural lands.

ODA will use enforcement where appropriate and necessary to gain compliance with agricultural water quality rules. Figure 2 outlines ODA's compliance process. Any enforcement action will be pursued only when reasonable attempts at voluntary solutions have failed (OAR 603-090-0000(5)(e)). If a violation is documented, ODA may issue a pre-enforcement notification or an Order such as a Notice of Noncompliance. If a Notice of Noncompliance is issued, ODA will direct the landowner or operator to remedy the condition through required corrective actions (RCAs) under the provisions of the enforcement procedures outlined in OAR 603-090-060 through OAR 603-090-120. If a landowner does not implement the RCAs, civil penalties may be assessed for continued violation of the rules. See the Compliance Flow Chart for a diagram of the compliance process. If and when other governmental policies, programs, or rules conflict with the Area Plan or associated Area Rules, ODA will consult with the appropriate agency to resolve the conflict in a reasonable manner.

Figure 2: Compliance Flow Chart



1.3.2 Local Management Agency

A Local Management Agency (LMA) is an organization that ODA designated to implement an Area Plan (OAR 603-090-0010). The Oregon legislature's intent is for SWCDs to be LMAs, to the fullest extent practical, consistent with the timely and effective implementation of Area Plans (ORS 568.906). SWCDs have a long history of effectively assisting landowners to voluntarily address natural resource concerns. Currently, all LMAs in Oregon are SWCDs.

The day-to-day implementation of the Area Plan is accomplished through an intergovernmental agreement between ODA and each SWCD. Each SWCD implements the Area Plan by providing outreach and technical assistance to landowners. SWCDs also work with ODA and the LAC to establish implementation priorities, evaluate progress toward meeting Area Plan goals and objectives, and revise the Area Plan and associated regulations as needed.

1.3.3 Local Advisory Committee

For each Management Area, the director of ODA appoints an LAC (OAR 603-090-0020) with as many as 12 members to assist with the development and subsequent biennial reviews of the local Area Plan and associated Area Rules. The LAC serves in an advisory role to the director of ODA and to the Board of Agriculture. LACs are composed primarily of agricultural landowners in the Management Area and must reflect a balance of affected persons.

The LAC may meet as frequently as necessary to carry out their responsibilities, which include but are not limited to:

- Participate in the development and ongoing revisions of the Area Plan.
- Participate in the development and revisions of the Area Rules.
- Recommend strategies necessary to achieve the goals and objectives in the Area Plan.
- Participate in biennial reviews of the progress of implementation of the Area Plan and Area Rules.
- Submit written biennial reports to the Board of Agriculture and the ODA director.

1.3.4 Agriculture's Role

Each individual landowner or operator in the Management Area is required to comply with the Area Rules, which set minimum standards. However, the rules alone may not be enough in every Management Area. Each landowner and operator in the Management Area is required to comply with the Area Rules. Landowners also are encouraged to engage in restoration activities to achieve the goals and objectives of the Area Plan. Each landowner and operator's actions will contribute toward achievement of the water quality standards.

Technical and financial assistance is available to landowners who want to work with SWCDs (or other local partners) to achieve land conditions that contribute to good water quality. Landowners also may choose to improve their land conditions without assistance.

Under the Area Plan and associated Area Rules, agricultural landowners and operators are not responsible for mitigating or addressing factors that do not result from agricultural activities, such as:

- Conditions resulting from unusual weather events.
- Hot springs, glacial melt water, extreme or unforeseen weather events, and climate change.
- Septic systems and other sources of human waste.
- Public roadways, culverts, roadside ditches and shoulders.

- Dams, dam removal, hydroelectric plants, and non-agricultural impoundments.
- Housing and other development in agricultural areas.
- Other circumstances not within the reasonable control of the landowner or operator.

However, agricultural landowners or operators may be responsible for some of these impacts under other legal authorities.

1.3.5 Public Participation

The public was encouraged to participate when ODA, LACs, and SWCDs initially developed the Area Plans and Area Rules. In each Management Area, ODA and the LAC held public information meetings, a formal public comment period, and a formal public hearing. ODA and the LACs modified the Area Plans and Area Rules, as needed, to address comments received. The director of ODA adopted the Area Plans and Area Rules in consultation with the Board of Agriculture.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture, LACs, and SWCDs conduct biennial reviews of the Area Plans and Area Rules. Partners, stakeholders, and the general public are invited to participate in the process. Any future revisions to the Area Rules will include a formal public comment period and a formal public hearing.

1.4 Agricultural Water Quality

1.4.1 Point and Nonpoint Sources of Water Pollution

There are two types of water pollution. Point source water pollution emanates from clearly identifiable discharge points or pipes. Significant point sources are required to obtain permits that specify their pollutant limits. Agricultural operations regulated as point sources include permitted CAFOs, and many are regulated under ODA's CAFO Program. Pesticide applications in, over, or within three feet of water also are regulated as point sources. Irrigation water discharges from agricultural fields may be at a defined discharge point but they do not currently require a permit.

Nonpoint water pollution originates from the general landscape and is difficult to trace to a single source. Nonpoint water pollution sources include runoff from agricultural and forest lands, urban and suburban areas, roads, and natural sources. In addition, groundwater can be impacted from nonpoint sources including agricultural amendments (fertilizers and manure).

1.4.2 Beneficial Uses and Parameters of Concern

Beneficial uses related to water quality are defined by DEQ in OARs for each basin. They may include: public and private domestic water supply, industrial water supply, irrigation, livestock watering, fish and aquatic life, wildlife and hunting, fishing, boating, water contact recreation, aesthetic quality, hydropower, and commercial navigation and transportation. The most sensitive beneficial uses usually are fish and aquatic life, water contact recreation, and public and private domestic water supply. These uses generally are the first to be impaired because they are affected at lower levels of pollution. While there may not be severe impacts on water quality from a single source or sector, the combined effects from all sources can contribute to the impairment of beneficial uses in the Management Area. Beneficial uses that have the potential to be impacted in this Management Area are summarized in Chapter 2.

Many water bodies throughout Oregon do not meet state water quality standards. Many of these water bodies have established water quality management plans that document needed pollutant reductions. The most common water quality concerns related to agricultural activities are temperature, bacteria, biological criteria, sediment and turbidity, phosphorous, algae, pH, dissolved oxygen, harmful algal blooms, nitrates, pesticides, and mercury. These parameters vary by Management Area and are summarized in Chapter 2.

1.4.3 Impaired Water Bodies and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

Every two years, DEQ is required by the federal CWA to assess water quality in Oregon. Clean Water Act Section 303(d) requires DEQ to identify a list of waters that do not meet water quality standards. The resulting list is commonly referred to as the 303(d) list. In accordance with the CWA, DEQ is required to establish TMDLs for pollutants specific to the pollutants that led to the placement of a waterbody on the on the 303(d) list.

A TMDL includes an assessment of water quality data and current conditions and describes a plan to achieve conditions so that water bodies will meet water quality standards. TMDLs specify the daily amount of pollution a water body can receive and still meet water quality standards. In the TMDL, point sources are allocated pollution limits as "waste load allocations" that are then incorporated in NPDES waste discharge permits, while a "load allocation" is attributed to nonpoint sources (agriculture, forestry, and urban). The agricultural sector is responsible for helping achieve the pollution limit by meeting the load allocation assigned to agriculture specifically, or to nonpoint sources in general, depending on how the TMDL was written.

Total Maximum Daily Loads generally apply to an entire basin or subbasin, and not just to an individual water body on the 303(d) list. Water bodies will be listed as achieving water quality standards when data show the standards have been attained.

As part of the TMDL process, DEQ identifies the Designated Management Agency (DMA) or parties responsible for submitting TMDL implementation plans. TMDLs designate the local Area Plan as the implementation plan for the agricultural component of this Management Area. Biennial reviews and revisions to the Area Plan and associated regulations must address agricultural or nonpoint source load allocations from relevant TMDLs.

The list of impaired water bodies (303(d) list), the TMDLs, and the agricultural load allocations for the TMDLs that apply to this Management Area are summarized in Chapter 2.

1.4.4 Oregon Water Pollution Control Law – ORS 468B.025 and ORS 468B.050

In 1995, the Oregon Legislature passed ORS 561.191. This statute states that any program or rules adopted by ODA "shall be designed to assure achievement and maintenance of water quality standards adopted by the Environmental Quality Commission."

To implement the intent of ORS 561.191, ODA incorporated ORS 468B into all of the Area Rules.

ORS 468B.025 states that:

> "(1) ...no person shall:
>
> > (a) Cause pollution of any waters of the state or place or cause to be placed any wastes in a location where such wastes are likely to escape or be carried into the waters of the state by any means.

(b) Discharge any wastes into the waters of the state if the discharge reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards established by rule for such waters by the Environmental Quality Commission.

(2) No person shall violate the conditions of any waste discharge permit issued under ORS 468B.050."

The aspects of ORS 468B.050 that apply to the Ag Water Quality Program, state that:

"(1) Except as provided in ORS 468B.053 or 468B.215, without holding a permit from the Director of the Department of Environmental Quality or the State Department of Agriculture, which permit shall specify applicable effluent limitations, a person may not:

(a) Discharge any wastes into the waters of the state from any industrial or commercial establishment or activity or any disposal system."

Definitions used in ORS 468B.025 and 468B.050:

"Wastes" means sewage, industrial wastes, and all other liquid, gaseous, solid, radioactive or other substances, which will or may cause pollution or tend to cause pollution of any waters of the state. Additionally, OAR 603-095-0010(53) includes but is not limited to commercial fertilizers, soil amendments, composts, animal wastes, vegetative materials, or any other wastes.

"Pollution or water pollution" means such alteration of the physical, chemical, or biological properties of any waters of the state, including change in temperature, taste, color, turbidity, silt or odor of the waters, or such discharge of any liquid, gaseous, solid, radioactive, or other substance into any waters of the state, which will or tends to, either by itself or in connection with any other substance, create a public nuisance or which will or tends to render such waters harmful, detrimental or injurious to public health, safety or welfare, or to domestic, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, or other legitimate beneficial uses or to livestock, wildlife, fish or other aquatic life or the habitat thereof.

"Water" or "the waters of the state" include lakes, bays, ponds, impounding reservoirs, springs, wells, rivers, streams, creeks, estuaries, marshes, inlets, canals, the Pacific Ocean within the territorial limits of the State of Oregon and all other bodies of surface or underground waters, natural or artificial, inland or coastal, fresh or salt, public or private (except those private waters which do not combine or affect a junction with natural surface or underground waters), which are wholly or partially within or bordering the state or within its jurisdiction.

1.4.5 Streamside Vegetation and Agricultural Water Quality

Across Oregon, the Ag Water Quality Program emphasizes streamside vegetation protection and enhancement to prevent and control water pollution from agriculture activities and to prevent and control soil erosion. Streamside vegetation can provide three primary water quality functions: shade for cooler stream temperatures, streambank stability, and filtration of pollutants. Other water quality functions from streamside vegetation include: water storage for cooler and later season flows, sediment trapping that can build streambanks and floodplains, narrowing and deepening of channels, and biological uptake of sediment, organic material, nutrients, and pesticides.

Additional reasons for the Ag Water Quality Program's emphasis on streamside vegetation include:

- Streamside vegetation improves water quality related to multiple pollutants, including: temperature (heat), sediment, bacteria, nutrients, toxics, and pesticides.
- Streamside vegetation provides fish and wildlife habitat.

- Landowners can improve streamside vegetation in ways that are compatible with their operation. Streamside conditions may be improved without the removal of the agricultural activity, such as with managed grazing.
- Streamside vegetation condition is measureable and can be used to track progress in achieving desired site conditions.

Site-Capable Vegetation

The Ag Water Quality Program uses the concept of "site-capable vegetation" to describe the vegetation that agricultural streams can provide to protect water quality. Site-capable vegetation is the vegetation that can be expected to grow at a particular site, given natural site factors (e.g., elevation, soils, climate, hydrology, wildlife, fire, floods), and historical and current human influences that are outside the program's regulatory purview (e.g., channelization, roads, modified flows, previous land management). Site-capable vegetation can be determined for a specific site based on: current streamside vegetation at the site, streamside vegetation at nearby reference sites with similar natural characteristics, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil surveys and ecological site descriptions, and local or regional scientific research.

The goal for Oregon's agricultural landowners is to provide the water quality functions (e.g., shade, streambank stability, and filtration of pollutants) produced by site-capable vegetation along all streams flowing through agricultural lands. The area rules for each Management Area require that agricultural activities provide the water quality functions equivalent to what site-capable vegetation would provide.

In some cases, for narrow streams, mature site-capable vegetation such as tall trees may not be needed. For example, shrubs and grass may provide shade, protect streambanks, and filter pollutants. However, on larger streams, mature site-capable vegetation is needed to provide the water quality functions.

In many cases, invasive, non-native plants such as introduced varieties of reed canary grass and types of blackberry grow along streamside areas. This type of vegetation has established throughout much of Oregon due to historic and human influences, and may provide a degree of site capability functions. ODA's statutory authority does not require the removal of these plants. ODA recognizes removal as good conservation activity and encourages producers to remove them. Voluntary programs through Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Watershed Councils provide technical assistance and financial incentives to implement control and restoration projects. In addition, the Oregon State Weed Board identifies invasive plants that can negatively impact watersheds. Public and private landowners are responsible for eliminating or intensively controlling noxious weeds as may be provided by state and local law enacted for that purpose. For further information, visit www.oregon.gov/ODA/programs/weeds.

1.5 Other Water Quality Programs

The following programs complement the Ag Water Quality Management Program and are described here to recognize their link to agricultral lands.

1.5.1 Confined Animal Feeding Operation Program

Oregon Department of Agriculture is the lead state agency for the CAFO Program. The CAFO Program was developed to ensure that operators do not contaminate ground or surface water with animal manure. Since the early 1980s, CAFOs in Oregon have been registered to a general Water Pollution Control Facility permit designed to protect water quality, while allowing the operators and producers to remain economically viable. A properly maintained CAFO does not pollute ground or surface water. To assure continued protection of ground and surface water, the 2001 Oregon State Legislature directed ODA to

convert the CAFO Program from a Water Pollution Control Facility permit program to a federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. Oregon Department of Agriculture and DEQ jointly issue the NPDES CAFO Permit, which complies with all CWA requirements for CAFOs. This permit does allow discharge in certain circumstances as long as the discharge does not violate water quality standards.

Oregon NPDES CAFO permits require the registrant to operate according to a site-specific, ODA-approved, Animal Waste Management Plan that is incorporated into the NPDES CAFO permit by reference.

1.5.2 Groundwater Management Areas

Groundwater Management Areas are designated by DEQ where groundwater has elevated contaminant concentrations resulting, at least in part, from nonpoint sources. After the GWMA is declared, a local groundwater management committee comprised of affected and interested parties is formed. The committee works with and advises the state agencies that are required to develop an action plan that will reduce groundwater contamination in the area.

Oregon has designated three GWMAs because of elevated nitrate concentrations in groundwater: the Lower Umatilla Basin GWMA, the Northern Malheur County GWMA, and the Southern Willamette Valley GWMA. Each GWMA has a voluntary action plan to reduce nitrate concentrations in groundwater. After a scheduled evaluation period, if DEQ determines that the voluntary approach is not effective, then mandatory requirements may become necessary.

1.5.3 The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds

In 1997, Oregonians began implementing the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, referred to as the Oregon Plan (www.oregon-plan.org). The Oregon Plan seeks to restore native fish populations, improve watershed health, and support communities throughout Oregon. The Oregon Plan has a strong focus on salmonids because of their great cultural, economic, and recreational importance to Oregonians and because they are important indicators of watershed health. ODA's commitment to the Oregon Plan is to develop and implement Area Plans and associated Area Rules throughout Oregon.

1.5.4 Pesticide Management and Stewardship

The ODA Pesticides Program holds the primary responsibility for registering pesticides and regulating their use in Oregon under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide Rodenticide Act. ODA's Pesticide Program administers regulations relating to pesticide sales, use, and distribution, including pesticide operator and applicator licensing as well as proper application of pesticides, pesticide labeling, and registration.

In 2007, the interagency Water Quality Pesticide Management Team (WQPMT) was formed to expand efforts to improve water quality in Oregon related to pesticide use. The WQPMT includes representation from ODA, Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF), DEQ, and Oregon Health Authority (OHA). The WQPMT facilitates and coordinates activities such as monitoring, analysis and interpretation of data, effective response measures, and management solutions. The WQPMT relies on monitoring data from the Pesticides Stewardship Partnership (PSP) program and other monitoring programs to assess the possible impact of pesticides on Oregon's water quality. Pesticide detections in Oregon's streams can be addressed through multiple programs and partners, including the PSP program.

Through the PSP, state agencies and local partners work together to monitor pesticides in streams and to improve water quality (www.deq.state.or.us/wq/pesticide/pesticide.htm). ODA, Department of

Environmental Quality, and Oregon State University Extension Service work with landowners, SWCDs, watershed councils, and other local partners to voluntarily reduce pesticide levels while improving water quality and crop management. Since 2000, the PSPs have made noteworthy progress in reducing pesticide concentrations and detections.

Oregon Department of Agriculture led the development and implementation of a Pesticides Management Plan (PMP) for the state of Oregon (www.oregon.gov/ODA/programs/Pesticides/water/pages/AboutWaterPesticides.aspx). The PMP, completed in 2011, strives to protect drinking water supplies and the environment from pesticide contamination, while recognizing the important role that pesticides have in maintaining a strong state economy, managing natural resources, and preventing human disease. By managing the pesticides that are approved for use by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) and Oregon in agricultural and non-agricultural settings, the PMP sets forth a process for preventing and responding to pesticide detections in Oregon's ground and surface water resources.

1.5.5 Drinking Water Source Protection

Oregon implements its drinking water protection program through a partnership between DEQ and OHA. The program provides individuals and communities with information on how to protect the quality of Oregon's drinking water. Department of Environmental Quality and OHA encourage preventive management strategies to ensure that all public drinking water resources are kept safe from current and future contamination. For more information, see: www.deq.state.or.us/wq/dwp/dwp.htm.

1.6 Partner Agencies and Organizations

1.6.1 Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

The US EPA delegated authority to Oregon to implement the federal CWA in our state. DEQ is the lead state agency with overall authority to implement the CWA in Oregon. DEQ coordinates with other state agencies, including ODA and ODF, to meet the requirements of the CWA. The Department of Environmental Quality set water quality standards and develops TMDLs for impaired waterbodies, which ultimately are approved or disapproved by the EPA. In addition, DEQ develops and coordinates programs to address water quality including NPDES permits for point sources, the CWA Section 319 grant program, Source Water Protection, the CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and GWMAs. DEQ also coordinates with ODA to help ensure successful implementation of Area Plans.

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between DEQ and ODA recognizes that ODA is the state agency responsible for implementing the Ag Water Quality Program. ODA and DEQ updated the MOA in 2012.

The MOA includes the following commitments:

- ODA will develop and implement a monitoring strategy, as resources allow, in consultation with DEQ.
- ODA will evaluate the effectiveness of Area Plans and associated Area Rules in collaboration with DEQ.
    - ODA will determine the percentage of lands achieving compliance with Management Area Rules.
    - ODA will determine whether the target percentages of lands meeting the desired land conditions, as outlined in the goals and objectives of the Area Plans, are being achieved.
- ODA and DEQ will review and evaluate existing information to determine:

- Whether additional data are needed to conduct an adequate evaluation.
- Whether existing strategies have been effective in achieving the goals and objectives of the Area Plans.
- Whether the rate of progress is adequate to achieve the goals of the Area Plans.

The Environmental Quality Commission, which serves as DEQ's policy and rulemaking board, may petition ODA for a review of part or all of any Area Plan or its associated Area Rules. The petition must allege, with reasonable specificity, that the Area Plan or Area Rules are not adequate to achieve applicable state and federal water quality standards (ORS 568.930(3)(a)).

1.6.2 Other Partners

Oregon Department of Agriculture and SWCDs work in close partnership with local, state, and federal agencies and organizations, including: DEQ (as indicated above), the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) NRCS and Farm Service Agency, watershed councils, Oregon State University Agricultural Experiment Stations and Extension Service, tribes, livestock, and commodity organizations, conservation organizations, and local businesses. As resources allow, SWCDs and local partners provide technical, financial, and educational assistance to individual landowners for the design, installation, and maintenance of effective management strategies to prevent and control agricultural water pollution.

1.7 Measuring Progress

Agricultural landowners and operators have been implementing effective conservation projects and management activities throughout Oregon to improve water quality for many years. However, it has been challenging for ODA, SWCDs, and LACs to measure progress. ODA is working with SWCDs, LACs, and other partners to develop and implement strategies that will produce measurable outcomes. ODA also is working with partners to develop monitoring methods to document progress.

1.7.1 Measurable Objectives

A measurable objective is a numeric long-term desired outcome to achieve by a specified date. Milestones are the interim steps needed to make progress toward the measurable objective and consist of numeric short-term targets to reach by specific dates. Together, the milestones define the timeline needed to achieve the measurable objective.

After ODA, the LAC, and the LMA establish measurable objectives and associated milestones, they will evaluate progress toward the milestones at each biennial review of the Area Plan. Using adaptive management, the biennial review will evaluate progress toward the most recent milestone(s) and why they were or were not achieved. ODA, the LAC, and LMA will evaluate whether changes are needed to keep on track for achieving the longer-term measurable objective(s), and will revise strategies to address obstacles and challenges.

Measurable objectives allow the Ag Water Quality Program to better evaluate progress toward meeting water quality standards. Many of these measurable objectives relate to land conditions and primarily are implemented through focused work in small geographic areas (section 1.7.3), with a long-term goal of developing measurable objectives and monitoring methods at the Management Area scale. The measurable objectives and associated milestones for the Area Plan are in Chapter 3 and progress toward achieving the measurable objectives and milestones is summarized in Chapter 4.

1.7.2 Land Conditions and Water Quality

Land conditions can serve as useful surrogates (indicators) for water quality parameters. For example, streamside vegetation generally is used as a surrogate for water temperature, because shade blocks solar radiation from warming the stream. In addition, sediment can be used as a surrogate for pesticides and nutrients, because many pesticides and nutrients adhere to sediment particles.
The Ag Water Quality Program focuses on land conditions, in addition to water quality data, for several reasons:

- Landowners can see land conditions and have direct control over them.
- It can be difficult to separate agriculture's influence on water quality from other land uses.
- Extensive monitoring of water quality is needed to evaluate progress, which is expensive and may fail to demonstrate improvements in the short term.
- Improved land conditions can be documented immediately, but there may be significant lag time before water quality improves or water quality impacts may be due to other sources.
- Reductions in water quality from agricultural activities are primarily through changes in land conditions and management activities.

Water quality monitoring data may help ODA and partners to measure progress or identify problem areas in implementing Area Plans. However, as described above, water quality monitoring may be less likely to document the short-term effects of changing land conditions on water quality parameters such as temperature, bacteria, nutrients, sediment, and pesticides.

1.7.3 Focused Implementation in Small Geographic Areas

Focus Areas
A Focus Area is a small watershed with water quality or concerns associated with agriculture. Through the Focus Area process, the SWCD delivers systematic, concentrated outreach and technical assistance in small geographic area. A key component of this approach is measuring land conditions before and after implementation, to document the progress made with available resources. The Focus Area approach is consistent with other agencies' and organizations' efforts to work proactively in small geographic areas, and is supported by a large body of scientific research (e.g., Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, 2012).

Systematic implementation in Focus Areas provides the following advantages:

- Measuring progress is easier in a small watershed than across an entire Management Area.
- Water quality improvement may be faster since small watersheds generally respond more rapidly.
- A proactive approach can address the most significant water quality concerns.
- Partners can coordinate and align technical and financial resources.
- Partners can coordinate and identify appropriate conservation practices and demonstrate their effectiveness.
- A higher density of projects allows neighbors to learn from neighbors.
- A higher density of projects leads to opportunities for increasing the connectivity of projects.
- Limited resources can be used more effectively and efficiently.
- Work in one Focus Area, followed by other Focus Areas, will eventually cover the entire Management Area.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts select a Focus Area in cooperation with ODA and other partners. In some cases, a Focus Area is selected because of efforts already underway or landowner relationships already established. The scale of the Focus Area matches the SWCD's capacity to deliver concentrated

outreach and technical assistance, and to complete (or initiate) projects over a biennium. The current Focus Area for this Management Area is described in Chapter 3.

Working within a Focus Area is not intended to prevent implementation within the remainder of the Management Area. The SWCD will also continue to provide outreach and technical assistance to the entire Management Area.

Strategic Implementation Areas

Strategic Implementation Areas (SIAs) are small watersheds selected by ODA, in cooperation with partners based on a statewide review of water quality data and other available information. ODA conducts an evaluation of likely compliance with agricultural water quality regulations, and contacts landowners with the results and next steps. Landowners have the option of working with the SWCD or other partners to voluntarily address water quality concerns. ODA follows up, as needed, to enforce agricultural water quality regulations. Finally, ODA completes a post-assessment to document progress made in the watershed. Chapter 3 describes any SIAs that are underway in this Management Area.

1.8 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management

ODA, the LAC and the LMA will assess the effectiveness of the Area Plan and associated Area Rules by evaluating the status and trends in agricultural land conditions and water quality data. This assessment will include an evaluation of progress toward measurable objectives on agricultural lands across the entire Management Area and within the Focus Area. ODA will utilize other agencies' and organizations' local monitoring data when available. The Area Plan summarizes the results and findings in Chapter 4 for each biennial review. ODA, DEQ, SWCDs, and LACs will examine these results during the biennial review and will revise the goal(s), measurable objectives, and strategies in Chapter 3, as needed.

1.8.1 Statewide Aerial Photo Monitoring of Streamside Vegetation

Starting in 2003, ODA began evaluating streamside vegetation conditions using aerial photos. Stream segments representing 10 to 15 percent of the agricultural lands in each Management Area were randomly selected for long-term aerial photo monitoring. Stream segments are generally 3-5 miles long. ODA evaluates streamside vegetation at specific points within 30-, 60-, and 90-foot bands along both sides of stream segments from the aerial photos and assigns each segment a score based on streamside vegetation. The score can range from 70 (all trees) to 0 (all bare ground). The same stream segments are re-photographed and re-scored every five years to evaluate changes in streamside vegetation conditions over time. Because site capable vegetation varies across the state, there is no single "correct" streamside vegetation index score. The purpose of this monitoring is to measure positive or negative change. The results for this Management Area are summarized in Chapter 4.

1.8.2 Agricultural Ambient Water Quality Monitoring

The Oregon Department of Agriculture evaluates water quality data from DEQ's long-term monitoring sites to determine trends in water quality at agricultural sites statewide. Results from monitoring sites in this Management Area, along with local water quality monitoring data, are described in Chapter 4.

1.8.3 Biennial Reviews and Adaptive Management

This and all Area Plans and associated Area Plans around the state undergo biennial reviews by ODA and the LAC. As part of each biennial review, ODA, DEQ, SWCDs, and the LAC discuss and evaluate the progress on implementation of the Area Plan and Area Rules. This evaluation includes discussion of enforcement actions, land condition and water quality monitoring, and outreach efforts over the past

biennium. ODA and partners evaluate progress toward achieving measurable objectives, and revise implementation strategies as needed. The LAC submits a report to the Board of Agriculture and the Director of ODA describing progress and impediments to implementation, and recommendations for modifications to the Area Plan or associated Area Plans necessary to achieve the goal of the Area Plan. ODA and partners will use the results of this evaluation to update the measurable objectives and implementation strategies in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2: Local Background

2.1 Local Roles and Responsibilities

2.1.1 Local Advisory Committee

The Area Plan was developed with the assistance of the LAC. The LAC was formed in 2003 to assist with the development of the Area Plan and associated regulations, and with subsequent biennial reviews. Members of the Greater Harney Basin LAC represent the interests of local landowners, producer groups, watershed councils, biologists, Harney County Court, and the Burns Paiute Tribe. Current LAC members are:

Name	Location	Description
Jack Southworth (Chair)	Bear Valley	Rancher
Karen Moon (Vice-Chair)	Crane	Landowner, Harney County Watershed Council
Gary Defenbaugh	Trout Creek	Rancher
Cecil Dick	Burns	Burns Paiute Tribal Council
Susan Hammond	Diamond	Rancher
David Banks	Burns	ODFW Fish Biologist
Gary Marshall	Silver Creek	Rancher
Dan Nichols	Diamond/Princeton	Landowner, Harney County Court
Steve Rickman	Burns	Rancher
Tim Smith	Burns	Rancher, Geologist
Ronald Whiting	Burns	Rancher
Berry Anderson	Princeton	Rancher
Jason Kesling	Burns	Burns Paiute Tribe

Primary technical advisors are:

Name	Description
Chad Boyd	Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station
Lindsey Davies	Bureau of Land Management
Chad Karges	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Dustin Johnson	Oregon State University Extension Service
Theresa Debardelaben	Oregon Department of Agriculture
Zola Ryan	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Marty Suter-Goold	Harney Soil and Water Conservation District

The LAC receives additional technical support from other entities including local, state, and federal agencies, the Burns Paiute Tribe, and others.

As resources allow, SWCD, NRCS, Oregon State University Cooperative Extension, Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station, and Northern Great Basin Agricultural Experiment Station staff can assist landowners in evaluating effective practices for meeting water quality objectives. Personnel in these offices and with other agencies can also design and assist with implementation of practices, and assist in identifying any sources of cost-sharing funds for the construction and/or use of some of these practices.

2.1.2 Local Management Agency

The implementation of the Area Plan is accomplished through an Intergovernmental Agreement between ODA and the Harney SWCD. This Intergovernmental Agreement defines the SWCD(s) as the LMA(s) for implementation of the Area Plan. The SWCD(s) was/were also involved in development of the Area Plan and associated regulations.

The SWCDs, with sufficient funding from the state or federal government:

- Participate in developing and evaluating outreach and education programs designed to provide public awareness and understanding of water quality issues.
- Review reports, projects, demonstrations, and tours used to showcase successful management practices and systems.
- Evaluate the adequacy of technical and financial assistance sources available to the agricultural community to implement recommended best management practices, monitoring, and education.

ODA and the SWCDs will provide presentations to interested groups on an ongoing basis. They also will meet individually with landowners to explain the Area Plan and Rules and to provide site-specific educational reviews of land conditions relative to water quality.

2.2 Area Plan and Regulations: Development and History

The director of ODA approved the Area Plan and associated regulations in 2003.

Since approval, the LAC met in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 to review the Area Plan and associated regulations. The biennial review process includes an assessment of progress toward achieving the goals and objectives in the Area Plan.

2.3 Geographical and Physical Setting

2.3.1 Geographic and Programmatic Scope

603-095-3320(1) The Greater Harney Basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area consists of the Malheur Lake Basin, as defined by the State of Oregon, with the exclusion of the Thousand Virgin Subbasin. The physical boundaries of the Management Area are indicated on the map included as Attachment 1 of these rules.
(2) Operational boundaries for the land base under the purview of these rules include all lands within the Greater Harney Basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area in agricultural use, agricultural and rural lands that are lying idle or on which management has been deferred, and forested lands with agricultural activities, with the exception of public lands managed by federal agencies and lands that are held in Tribal Trust.
(3) The provisions and requirements outlined in these rules may be adopted by reference by Designated Management Agencies with appropriate authority and responsibilities in other geographic areas of the Greater Harney Basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area.

(4) For lands in agricultural use within other Designated Management Agencies' or state agency jurisdictions, the department and the appropriate Local Management Agency will work with these Designated Management Agencies to assure that provisions of these rules apply, and to assure that duplication of any services provided or fees assessed does not occur.
Statutory Authority: ORS 561.190 - 561.191, ORS 568.912 Statutes Implemented: ORS 568.900 - 568.933

2.3.2 Map of the Management Area




Greater Harney Basin
Agricultural Water Quality
Management Area
South Half
Map Explanation
Towns
Streams
Major Highways
Boundary
Cities
Major Lakes
This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for, or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. Users of this product should review or consulte the primary data and information sources to ascertain the usability of the information.
0 1 2 4 6 8 Miles
Oregon Department of Agriculture
635 Capitol Street NE
Salem OR 97301-2532
Natural Resources Division
December 1, 2005 Request 846
Princeton
Diamond
Frenchglen
Fields
Wagontire
Malheur Lake
Harney Lake
Alvord Lake
Twelvemile Cr
Antelope Cr
Whitehorse Cr
Willow Cr
Big Trout Cr
Pueblo Slough
Denio Cr
Trout Cr
Wildhorse Cr
Willow Cr
Big Indian Cr
Skull Cr
Home Cr
Paul Cr
Riddle Cr
Riddle Cr
Kiger Cr
KIGER CREEK
McCoy Cr
Krumbo Cr
Donner Und Blitzen River
Jackass Cr
Buzzard Cr
Wilson Cr
Rock Cr
Deer Cr
Guano Cr
Jack Cr
Sage Hen Creek
78
205
140

2.3.3 Location, Climate, Soils and Geology, Vegetation, Hydrology, Land Use

Location

The Management Area is in southeastern Oregon and consists of most of the Malheur Lake Basin, as defined by the Oregon Water Resources Department. It includes the Silver, Silvies, Harney-Malheur Lakes, Guano, Donner und Blitzen, and Alvord Lake subbasins; it does not include the Thousand Virgin subbasin as DEQ currently does not intend to develop a TMDL for that area. The Management Area encompasses 9,745 square miles (6,236,500 acres) and includes the towns and communities of Wagontire, Riley, Suntex, Burns, Hines, Seneca, Crane, Princeton, Diamond, Frenchglen, and Fields (see map). The Management Area includes 80 percent of Harney County, 10 percent of Lake and Grant Counties, and 5 percent of Malheur County.

More detailed information on the various subbasins in the Management Area can be found in assessments prepared by the Harney County Watershed Council for the Silvies River, Silver Creek, Harney-Malheur Lakes Subbasins, and subsequent assessments.

Climate[1,2,3]

Elevation above sea level ranges from 4,025 feet at Harney Lake to 9,730 feet at the top of Steens Mountain, and averages approximately 5,200 feet. The climate is semiarid with long, rather severe winters and short, warm summers, which have a high proportion of clear, sunny days. The average monthly temperatures range from 22˚F to 59˚F in Seneca (January and July, respectively), 23˚F to 66˚F in Burns, 31˚F and 66˚F at the P-Ranch near Frenchglen, and 30˚F to 69˚F at the Whitehorse Ranch in Malheur County. Recorded extremes range from –50˚F to 107˚F. The average annual precipitation ranges from 8-12 inches in lower elevations to over 40 inches in higher elevations. The low precipitation months are July, August, and September. During the average year, less than 4 inches of precipitation falls during the irrigation season (April through September). During the summer months, much of the Management Area is subject to cloudbursts and thunderstorms that can cause severe erosion and flood damage.

Much of the precipitation falls as snow, which accumulates between November and March. Annual snowfall varies from a few inches in the valleys to more than 70 inches in the mountains. The mountain snowpack is the principal source of streamflows. The natural thawing of rivers in the spring can cause considerable ice damage to streambanks and streamside vegetation.[4]

The short growing season ranges from 90-120 days in the open lower valleys to 60-90 days in the upper valleys.

Prevailing winds are from the west. Strong winds are common throughout the year, especially from March to June. Easterly summer winds generally result in high temperatures and low humidity. In 1972 and 1973, it was estimated that 80-96 percent of the inflow to Malheur Lake was lost to evapotranspiration.[5] During the winter, cold continental air from the northeast brings subzero weather over the Management Area. Freezing weather has been recorded in every month of the year.

Soils and Geology[2,3]

The Management Area is largely a young high lava plain comprised of three geomorphic subdivisions: Central Mountains, Harney high lava plain, and Basin and Range.

The northern portion is mountainous. This area generally slopes to the south with the lowest elevation about 4,500' and summits of 5,100 to 8,000'. The Silvies River, Silver Creek, and other small drainages are entrenched in this upland to form steep-walled canyons except where constrictions have left large alluvial valleys.

The Harney High Lava Plain in the central portion of the Management Area consists of approximately 600 square miles of moderate relief. It is dotted with cinder cones and lava buttes and includes closed basins containing playa lakes that have water at certain times of the year. The northern 400 square miles is called Harney Valley and is one of the largest compact bodies of nearly level lakebed alluvium in Eastern Oregon. Malheur and Harney Lakes, near its center, receive the drainage of the Silvies River, Silver Creek, and Donner und Blitzen River.

During times of great rainfall that coincided with the Pleistocene glacial stages, water from a large lake in Harney Basin drained eastward into Malheur River. At first its course was through Malheur Gap at Princeton and later, when Pleistocene lavas blocked this channel, through the Crane Creek Gap at Crane until it was also blocked. Lakes have formed at low points, some perennial and alive, others intermittent, saline, and alkaline. Harney Lake, a large saline-alkaline lake is the ultimate drainage of the northern Management Area. Malheur Lake, a live lake, is the largest body of water in the Management Area. Other live lakes, numerous playas, and dry lakes occur throughout the area.

Basin and Range covers the southern two-fifths of the Management Area. It offers an exceptional display of crustal breakup by block faulting characterized by north-trending fault-block mountains and internal drainages into which sediments from the hills and mountains are deposited. Hart Mountain and Poker Jim Ridge form the western border; they slope gently eastward into the wide Catlow Valley, a down-dropped block, which was a large Pleistocene lake and is now a dry alluvial basin. Steens Mountain to the east shows many signs of glaciation. The larger lakes become dry at infrequent intervals while most of the lakes are dry except for a short period following spring runoff.

Geothermal sources are located throughout the Management Area, primarily near Soldier Creek, Burns, Crane, and Harney Lake in the north, and in the Alvord Desert and other localities in the south.[6]

Ten groups of soils are delineated in the Management Area. The lowland soils were developed in alluvium of different forms and vary from deep, well drained, fertile soils to shallow, very strongly alkaline soils with hardpans in the subsoil. Croplands and the areas susceptible to development are composed of these soils. The upland soils developed mostly from volcanic materials. Most of the upland soils that support timber are deep and well drained, while the soils supporting range are shallow over silica-lime hardpans.

Local elevated concentrations of metals and salts occur within water bodies in the Management Area[7]. The accumulation of metals and salts in regions of internal drainage such as the Greater Harney Basin is common and a result of natural processes.

Two major factors create elevated levels of potentially toxic elements such as arsenic, mercury, and boron[7]. The first is that the Greater Harney Basin is surrounded by volcanic units that are formed both by direct accumulation of volcanic rocks (flows, cinder cones and shallow intrusives) and secondary accumulations of volcanic material spread by both airborne and water laid processes and deposited as sediments. Worldwide, volcanically derived units are typically elevated in-group IIB, IIIA, IVA, and VA periodic table elements (e.g. boron, arsenic, tin, and mercury). In the Hines area, a study done for DEQ (Report on Baseline Arsenic-in-Soil Study for the Snow Mountain Pine Industrial Park Area, Resnick-Glerup Property, TKS Consulting Ltd., August 1999), showed natural arsenic levels elevated to about five parts per million (ppm), two and one-half to five times the worldwide average (D.A. Berkman, Field Geologists Manual, 1976). Elevated levels of these elements in soil accumulations are a product of retention of relatively non-soluble compounds in soil horizons as the rocks weather. Residual buildups in contained waterbodies result from the accumulation of more soluble compounds in areas of cyclic water accumulation and evaporation.

The second factor is that thermal ground water and thermal spring activity in young volcanic terrain, such as the Great Basin of Oregon, Idaho, and Northern Nevada is inherently high in many of those same potentially toxic elements. The surface and groundwater component of these thermal water systems contribute soluble forms of these elements and increases their natural concentrations in the region's water bodies.

Vegetation[2,6]

Vegetation varies from forested mountains in the north to sagebrush-covered mountains and flatlands in the south.

Approximately 80 percent of the Management Area is classified as rangeland. Rangeland vegetation varies by location: open areas of grass in the northern forests; juniper/brush areas in the central portion; sagebrush/grass sites in the semi-arid south; and tracts such as the Alvord Desert that are devoid of vegetation.

Forested land occupies 12 percent of the Management Area in the northern section at elevations above 5,600'. The forests are almost exclusively conifers, predominantly ponderosa pine, with stringers of hardwoods in the valleys. Minor conifer species include Douglas fir, white fir, lodge pole pine, alpine fir, and Engelman spruce. Usually a belt of western juniper separates the conifer forest from the shrub/grasslands within the forests. Areas of grassland, occasionally exceeding 1,000 acres, are intermingled within the forests. These areas occur in all elevation zones and furnish much of the summer feed for livestock and big game. Domestic livestock and wildlife graze almost all of the forestland sometime during the year.

A significant portion of the Management Area has wetland characteristics that result largely from spring runoff, irrigation, and fluctuating lake levels. Marshes in the central portion of the Management Area include seasonally flooded grass sedge meadowland.

Recognition of the benefits of reducing monocultures of juniper and sagebrush has resulted in prescribed fires and other juniper reduction projects conducted by private landowners, Harney County Watershed Council, Harney SWCD, Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station, Bureau of Land Management, US Forest Service, and others.

Hydrology[2,3,5,6,8,9,10]

The Management Area exhibits hydrological cycles that are characteristic of both a closed basin as well as the more classic runoff situation wherein the streams flow into the ocean.

The Management Area is composed of several closed basins. The Silver, Silvies, and Donner und Blitzen Rivers empty into Malheur and Harney Lakes. Willow Creek and Whitehorse Creek basins flow into Coyote Lake. The Trout Creek basin streams naturally sink and only connect to the dry Alvord Lake. Water in the Guano and Alvord Subbasins generally drains into dry lakebeds. The 'Harney Basin' consists of the flat valley surrounding Malheur and Harney Lakes and includes the Silvies River floodplain.

The vast majority of the Management Area streams are intermittent. All of the larger perennial streams start either in the Ochoco and Malheur National Forests in the north or Steens Mountain in the south. Except for the Catlow-Alvord area, larger streams ultimately drain into Harney/Malheur Lake. Many streams have zero flows in some parts of their channels during the low-flow period of some years.

Land management directly influences the yield and quality of water and, in turn, all segments of the economy of the basin. The water yield, which varies from year to year, is approximately 8 inches of runoff in the higher areas and less than one inch in the desert-like areas. The total average annual yield was about 572,500 acre-feet for the 1935-64 period. Groundwater recharge was estimated at 260,000 acre-feet with the citation of Robison, 1968. Discharge to streams is estimated at 89,200 acre-feet available to recharge groundwater. Natural streamflow is characterized by high runoff in the spring and low runoff the remainder of the year. In most years, 60-80 percent of the annual discharge occurs in March, April, and May, except for the Donner und Blitzen River and Trout Creek, which peak approximately one month later. During this period of natural high runoff, farmers and ranchers maximize the use of these high flows through flood irrigation, which can benefit the environment through groundwater re-charge, cooling of return flows through subsurface flows, forage production, and the creation of wildlife habitat.

Subbasins

The *Silvies River* originates in the Blue Mountains and flows approximately 180 river miles southward into Malheur Lake. It drains approximately 1,350 square miles. Bear Creek is a major tributary and enters the Silvies just above Seneca. Emigrant Creek enters above the steep Silvies Canyon and contributes one-quarter of the flow of the Silvies River. The gradient begins to flatten out below Silvies Canyon and the river becomes very silty. The Silvies enters the Harney Valley approximately five miles northwest of Burns. The Harney Valley contains many sloughs and other wetlands, which can be attributed to irrigation practices, spring runoff, and fluctuating lake levels within the closed Subbasin. Waters may eventually flow into Malheur Lake.

Silver Creek comprises all drainage into Harney Lake west of The Narrows. It drains approximately 1,700 square miles and lower elevation tributaries are intermittent. Silver Creek flows south from the Ochoco National Forest into Moon Reservoir, then on through Warm Springs Valley. In flood stage, water in Silver Creek divides at the upper end of Warm Springs Valley, so that part continues along the eastern side of the Valley and enters Harney Lake. The bed of Silver Lake typically is dry except for some small pools supplied by springs at its northern and eastern edges. When filled to overflowing, Silver Lake covers an area of about 4,000 acres with a maximum depth of four to six feet.

Malheur Lake is one of the largest freshwater marshes in the United States and receives water from four principal sources. In a typical year, approximately 62 percent of the inflow comes from the Donner und Blitzen River, 25 percent from the Silvies River, 12 percent from direct precipitation, and 1 percent from groundwater. *Harney Lake* receives water from Silver and Warm Springs Creeks and acts as a sump for the entire Harney Basin, thus being very alkaline. Malheur and Harney Lake levels fluctuate annually depending on the total runoff available from the Silvies and Donner und Blitzen Rivers. Whenever the Malheur Lake level rises above an elevation of 4,091.5', it overflows into Mud Lake at The Narrows, which in turn overflows into Harney Lake when the surface exceeds an elevation of 4,093.5'. Harney Lake normally has a water surface elevation about eight feet lower than Malheur Lake. During extremely dry years, such as 1889, 1924, and 1934, both Malheur and Harney Lakes were dry. The area of Malheur Lake varies from an average minimum of about 25,000 acres to an average maximum of 45,000 acres. The maximum depth of Malheur Lake at normal stage does not exceed seven feet; Harney Lake is deeper. Its water surface area averages 30,000 acres. However, due to wet winters in 1980-1985, the three lakes combined with a surface water elevation of 4,102' above sea level and covered 173,000 acres. In 2001, Malheur Lake was estimated at a surface water elevation of 4,096' and 59,400 acres of water[11].

The *Donner und Blitzen River* receives its flow from the western and northern sides of Steens Mountain and flows north into Malheur Lake. It drains somewhere between 750 and 1,000 square miles and is approximately 70 miles long. The Donner und Blitzen and its tributaries have fairly steep gradients on Steens Mountain and very low gradients in Blitzen Valley. Steens Mountain is barren of timber with the

exception of large patches of juniper, quaking aspen, and one grove of fir trees. The snow forms immense drifts in the canyons, and for this reason often produces a season-long runoff. The main flow occurs irregularly from as early as February but usually in May and June as a result of snowmelt, a month to six weeks later than flows from the upper Silvies watershed.

Portions of the Donner und Blitzen River are designated as "wild" under the Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act due to their wild trout, scenery, and geologic features.

The Trout Creek and Oregon Canyon mountains rise from 3,937 feet (above mean sea level) at the desert floor to 8,202 feet AMSL. Streams flow through deep, rugged canyons of steep rimrock. The lowest elevations contain irrigated hay fields where the streams empty onto flat valleys. The *Willow Creek and Whitehorse Creek basins* are located between the Oregon Canyon Mountains to the east and the Trout Creek Mountains to the west. Both drainages flow northward into the pluvial Coyote Lake and are currently isolated from each other. The Whitehorse Creek watershed is 129 mi^2 , and the Willow Creek watershed is 50 mi^2. Behnke (1992) suggested that these two drainages may have had intermittent connectivity through pluvial Coyote Lake several thousand years ago, but Coyote Lake has been dry in recent history. The Willow Creek basin includes small, intermittent tributaries, whereas the Whitehorse basin includes perennial Whitehorse, Little Whitehorse, Fifteenmile, Doolittle, and Cottonwood creeks. The primary vegetation consists of sagebrush Atemesia spp., rabbit brush Chrysothamnus spp., and native bunchgrasses (e.g., Agropyron spicatum, Festuca idahoensis, Stipa thurberiana, Sitanion hystri, and Poa sandbergii) in the uplands and willow Salix spp., wild rose Rosa gymnocarpa, sedges Carex spp., and sagebrush along streams. Mountain mahoganies Cerocarpus ledifolius cover some of the high-elevation areas, scattered quaking aspens Populus tremuloides occur on hillsides and riparian areas and some cottonwoods Populus angustifolia remain in the basin.[23]

The *Trout Creek Basin* is bordered by the Steens and Pueblo Mountains on the west, the Oregon-Nevada state line to the south, and Big and Little Trout Creek and their tributaries in the Trout Creek Mountains to the east. This area is known as the Alvord Basin and is defined by fault-block mountains trending in a north-south direction and forming an interior basin. Elevations range from 4,025 to 9,670 feet above sea level and contain mountain peaks, rolling hills, buttes and desert playas. The climate in the Alvord Basin is semi-arid with low precipitation generally, but some areas of higher precipitation. Average precipitation varies from 7" at Andrews, Oregon to more than 18" in the Steens Mountains. The dominant form of precipitation is snow. Summer temperatures can exceed 100 ˚F while winter temperatures may drop below 0 ˚F. Evapotransporation rates range from 3.1" in December to 11.4" in July. Major vegetation types in this basin are: bunch grasses (e.g. *F. idahoensis, S. Thurberiana, P. sandbergii*) and sagebrush (*Artemesia spp.*); Desert shrub communities (*Atriplex spp.*) in saline soils and old lake beds; Mountain mahogany stands occur at higher elevations and riparian areas contain willows (*Salix spp.*), sedges (*Carex spp.*), wild rye (*Elymus spp.*) and aspens (*P. Tremuloides*). All streams in this basin have peak flows during spring receding to low flows during the late summer. All streams naturally sink and only connect to the dry Alvord Lake during extremely wet years. Major streams in this area include: Big and Little Trout Creeks, Cottonwood Creek (Trout Creeks), Denio Creek, Van Horn Creek, Wildhorse Creek, Pike Creek, Little Alvord Creek, Big Alvord Creek, Cottonwood Creek (Steens), Willow Creek, McCoy Creek and Mann Creek.

The closed *Guano Basin* receives drainage from surrounding hills and mountains including Steens Mountain, Hart Mountain, the Pueblo Mountains, and Poker Jim Ridge. The closed *Alvord Basin* receives drainage from the Steens, Trout Creek, Pueblo, and Sheepshead Mountains.

Groundwater

Due to geological processes, the rocks bordering the central alluvial plain dip inward from all sides to form a closed basin; therefore, all drainage is toward Malheur and Harney Lakes. The valley fill alluvium

washed into Harney Valley by the various streams has created a groundwater reservoir that supplies a considerable amount of perennial groundwater. However, the water yielding capacity varies due to the discontinuous and irregular distribution of the water-bearing beds.

Portions of the Guano and Alvord subbasins contain substantial quantities of groundwater.[3] Geothermal sources are located throughout the Management Area and may contribute to higher stream temperatures.[4] Wells southeast of Burns near Lawen measure 130-160˚F.[12] Three clusters of thermal springs occur in the Alvord Basin[13]; those near Borax Lake have been measured at 95-104˚F.[14] Exploratory drilling near Borax Lake discovered thermal water at 325˚F 2,000 feet below the surface.[15]

Land Use

Malheur National Wildlife Refuge[17]

The Malheur National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1908 as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory water birds. It originally consisted of 81,786 acres. Sixty-five thousand acres (primarily the Blitzen Valley) were added in 1935 and the last large segment, the 14,751-acre Double-O Unit, was purchased in 1941. More recent purchases have increased the refuge area to over 186,000 acres. Malheur Lake and the Donner und Blitzen River constitute the major portions of the refuge.

Economics and Agriculture[2,4,6,11,18,19,20]

Approximately 8,000 people inhabit the Management Area. Harney County's population in 2014 was estimated at 7,265, with most people living in Burns and Hines. A few hundred more live in adjoining counties, particularly in the Seneca area. Harney, Malheur, Grant, and Lake Counties are all defined as economically distressed by the state. Harney County's 2010 per capita income was $26,358.

The top commodities for Harney County in 2013 were: cattle ($68,436,000), alfalfa hay ($32,780,000), other hay ($8,675,000), and horses and mules ($800,000). Approximately 172,000 head of cattle were sold and 109,850 acres of grains, hay, and forage were harvested in 2013. Harney County has a large agricultural sector that depends heavily on water for irrigation. Very little non-irrigated cropland exists due to the low annual precipitation and the short growing season.

Farming operations are generally limited by the short growing season and the limited annual precipitation. However, with close attention to irrigation practices and cropping patterns, agriculture has established itself as one of the basic economic elements of the Management Area.

Diversion of floodwaters in early spring is the most common method of irrigation water management. Flooded fields provide prime waterfowl habitat and draw over 40,000 tourists annually to view the waterfowl migration and breeding; these tourists contribute over $3 million annually to the local economy. Groundwater is also used to irrigate crops and provide water for stock and wildlife. Stock water from wells has been used as a management tool to improve the distribution of both wildlife and livestock.

Water Rights[21]

Water rights (surface and groundwater) have been issued for approximately 290,000 acres within the Management Area. Some areas in Harney County still have unadjudicated water rights; these include, but are not limited to, streams on the east side of Steens Mountain and Riddle Creek on the west side. Fourteen instream water rights are in place, most with a 1989 date. The instream rights are for portions or tributaries of Trout Creek, Wildhorse Creek, Silver Creek above Riley, and Silvies River at Silvies Valley. There are no instream leases.

Water rights on the Silvies River essentially provide year-round irrigation. Although the decree defines the irrigation season as being March 20 to September 1, water users are awarded a right to use waters of

the Silvies and its tributaries at other times when such use will be beneficial to the land and the crops grown thereon when the ground is not frozen and the same can be used without needless waste.

The Silver Creek decree defines the irrigation season as March 1 to August 1. The Donner und Blitzen order defines the irrigation season as March 1 to October 1.

For the Silvies River, Silver Creek, and Donner und Blitzen River, the beginning of the irrigation season was established to coincide as nearly as possible with the beginning of spring runoff. This also was established on Trout, Little Cottonwood, and Willow creeks in the Alvord Subbasin. On certain other streams such as Wildhorse, Rattlesnake, Mill, and Coffeepot creeks, no irrigation season was set since streamflow varied from year to year according to time and quantity of snowmelt and thus had to be used when available.

The Silvies River, Silver Creek, and Donner und Blitzen River are all over-appropriated (as is most of the state). The Management Area is essentially closed to new surface water appropriations or groundwater applications that have the potential to *substantially* interfere with surface water flows.

Certain uses don't require a water right; exempt uses are listed in ORS 537.141 and ORS 537.545.

Benefits of Flood Irrigation to Migratory Birds[22]

One of the most important migration and production areas in the Pacific Flyway consists of the Refuge and private lands in the Silvies River floodplain, Malheur Slough area, Diamond Valley, Silver Creek drainage, Donner und Blitzen Valley, Krumbo Valley, "00" Valley, Catlow Valley, Alvord Subbasin, Barton/Dry Lake, and the Silvies River near Seneca. These lands supply waterfowl with habitat through both natural marshlands and flood irrigation. Flood irrigation is a historical, common, and acceptable ranching activity. Flood irrigation of meadows during the spring and summer directly benefits many species of migratory birds (e.g. sandhill cranes; northern pintails; ibis; and snow, Ross', and greater white-fronted geese) by providing high quality feeding and resting habitat during migration. Flooding of hay meadows in spring actually mimics natural hydrologic processes that occurred annually for thousands of years within the region prior to permanent European settlement.

The timing of spring migration and the arrival of many species of migratory birds in the Management Area coincide with annual runoff, irrigation, and flooding events. In addition to the flooding of meadows, the annual flooding creates many shallow seasonal wetlands and sloughs that support a rich diversity of aquatic invertebrates and plants that are essential to sustain the birds during their northward migration. Many of the migratory birds that stop in the Management Area to feed and rest eventually make their way to breeding grounds in eastern Siberia and Wrangel Island Russia, Alaska, Arctic Canada, northern boreal forests, and the prairie pothole regions of Canada and the United States.

The flood-irrigated meadows and seasonal wetlands in the Management Area also support numerous *breeding* species of migratory birds such as Canada geese, cinnamon teal, greater sandhill cranes, long-billed curlews, snipe, willet, Wilson's phalarope, and yellow-headed and red-winged blackbirds.

Some examples of the species and number of birds that depend on flood irrigation in the Management Area are (numbers are from surveys conducted in the last 10 years by Refuge personnel):

- Snow and Ross' goose (spring migration): 400,000+
- Northern pintail (spring migration): 250,000
- American widgeon (spring migration): 147,000+
- Green-winged teal (spring migration): 65,000+
- Lesser sandhill crane (spring migration): 10,000+

- Greater sandhill crane (breeding): 300+ pairs
- White-faced ibis (breeding): 2,500+ pairs
- Long-billed curlew (breeding): 1,500+

2.4 Agricultural Water Quality in the Management Area

2.4.1 Local Issues of Concern

Temperature concerns in the Management Area were included by Oregon's DEQ on its 2010 303(d) list, which identifies 'water-quality limited' streams as required by the Federal Clean Water Act. Dissolved oxygen concerns and heavy metals were also identified in a few streams.

2.4.2 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies

The 303(d) list contains streams that are determined to be water quality limited by DEQ. If a stream is water-quality limited, the landowner is not in violation as long as his or her activities do not contribute to the water quality problem. When a stream is first placed on the 303(d) list as impaired, it is generally designated as Category 5 (TMDL needed). The Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process helps determine the cause of the water quality concern and sets targets for what needs to happen in order for the stream to meet the standard. A TMDL for the Alvord Lake Subbasin was completed and approved in 2004. Once TMDLs are completed for a basin, the streams with TMDLs (such as those streams listed for temperature and dissolved oxygen in the Alvord Basin TMDL) are changed from a Category 5 listing to a Category 4A listing (Water Quality Limited – TMDL Approved). This does not necessarily mean that the stream now meets the standard, but rather that there are plans in place to meet the standards. In the future, when data show that water quality criteria have been met for these streams, they will be assigned to the Category 2 list (Attaining Water Quality Criteria).

The most current water quality assessment database was approved in 2010. This section discusses the water quality parameters on that list. Current information on the 303(d) list can be found at: *http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/assessment/rpt0406/search.asp*.

Table 3. Location and seasonality of documented water quality concerns in the Greater Harney Basin Management Area from the 2010 303(d) list[2].

Water Quality Criterion	Stream Segments on the 303(d) List	
Water temperature exceeds 64˚F or 68˚F during season of concern. (Some streams are listed under the old 64 ˚F criterion instead of the updated 68˚F criterion.)	**Silver Subbasin** Claw Creek (Mile 0-15.1)* Egypt Creek (0-8.9) Nicoll Creek (0-14.1) Salt Canyon Creek (0-1.2) Sawmill Creek (0-10.7) Silver Creek (8.3-63.6) Wickiup Creek (0-9) **Silvies Subbasin** Hay Creek (0-12.3) Little Bear Creek (0-5.8) Myrtle Creek (0-17.6) Scotty Creek (0-9.5) Silvies River (0-104.8) Skull	**Donner und Blitzen Subbasin** Ankle Creek (0-7.6) Bridge Creek (0-15.6) Bridge Creek Canal (0-1.5) Deep Creek (0-7.2) Donner und Blitzen River (0-77.3) Fish Creek (0-7.5) Indian Creek (0-4.2) Krumbo Creek (0-18.7) Little Blitzen River (0-12.8) McCoy Creek (0-26.2) Mud Creek (0-4.8) **Harney/Malheur Lakes Subbasin** Coffeepot Creek (0-10.3)

	Creek (0-5.9) **<u>Guano Subbasin</u>** Home Creek (0-21.3) Rock Creek (0-52.5) Skull Creek (0-13.3)	Coyote Creek (0-7.8) Mill Creek (0-7.1) Paul Creek (in the closed Barton/Dry Lake basin) (0-10.2) Rattlesnake Creek (0-15.1)
Biocriteria: Waters of the state must be of sufficient quality to support aquatic species without detrimental changes in the resident biological communities. (Year round)	**<u>Silver Subbasin</u>** Dodson Creek (0-8.4) Nicoll Creek (0-14.1) Rough Creek (0-10.6) Silver Creek (0-63.6)	**<u>Silvies Subbasin</u>** Antelope Creek (0-9.6) Bear Canyon Creek (0-6.4) Camp Creek (0-8.5) Van Aspen Creek (0-7.8)
Dissolved oxygen less than required (March 1 – June 30)	**<u>Silvies Subbasin</u>** Silvies River (Mile 0-104.8): <11mg/L and 95% saturation	
Heavy metals (sources unknown)	**<u>Donner und Blitzen Subbasin</u>** Bridge Creek (0-3.1) – iron, manganese Bridge Creek (0-15.7) – beryllium Little Blitzen River (0-12.8) - beryllium	
* River miles are measured from the mouth; the mouth is designated as Mile 0. The miles of river on this list may over-represent the actual miles with water quality concern because: 1) establishment of the location of the mouth may be arbitrary on intermittent streams and 2) many of the stream reaches included in this list contain intermittent sections.		

Water temperatures are critical to fish growth and survival at all life stages. Warm stream temperatures increase stress and disease, raise metabolism, lower growth rates, and enhance conditions for introduced non-native predators. Temperature affects the dissolved oxygen potential in water - the warmer the water, the less dissolved oxygen it can hold. Fish cope with thermal stress by adjusting their behavior during the warmer summer months. Sometimes coldwater fish will seek refuge during the heat of the day in nearby cooler waters that are fed by springs or ground water, while others may migrate great distances to seek out the cooler headwaters. Coldwater species of fish also adapt their body structure, chemistry, and physiology to become more efficient at the metabolic processes that regulate such things as swimming, avoiding predators, and nutrient intake during thermal stress.

The temperature standard has several different temperature requirements (criteria), based on the type of aquatic use being supported (OAR 340-041-0028). Waters supporting Redband and Lahontan Trout should not exceed 68˚F. Waters supporting the Borax Lake chub may not be cooled more than 0.5˚F, while waters supporting cool water species (non-trout-bearing streams in the Alvord and Upper Quinn subbasins) may not be warmed more than 0.5˚F, "unless a greater increase would not reasonably be expected to adversely affect fish or other aquatic life". Determining whether the stream temperature is above or below the temperature standard is based on the average of the maximum daily water temperatures for the stream's warmest, consecutive seven-day period during the year. Water temperature measurements must be taken with continuous recording temperature sensors, in well-mixed and representative locations of streams. A one-time measurement above the standard is not a violation of the standard. When stream flow is exceptionally low or air temperature is exceptionally high, the temperature criterion is waived (an example is when the flow is less than the expected ten-year low flow or the air temperature is above the 90th percentile of a seven-day average).

Landowners are only responsible for the condition of the vegetation on their property and not the temperature of the water that moves through their property. If monitoring shows that agricultural landowners have the streamside vegetation appropriate to site capability or there are no agricultural activities preventing the growth, recruitment, and establishment of riparian vegetation on the landowner's property, and the TMDL load allocations (i.e. temperature) are not being met, then DEQ will work with ODA to revise the TMDL.

Stream temperatures are influenced primarily by direct solar radiation, air temperature, and movement of groundwater into streams.[4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9] Basic approaches to minimizing increases in stream temperature include: provide shade where appropriate, keep the stream narrow, and keep water flowing.[4]

Elevated stream temperatures in the Management Area may be correlated with natural low flows, high ambient temperatures, water withdrawals, removal of streambank vegetation, and lack of groundwater recharge.[10] In addition, geothermal sources may elevate stream temperatures.[11]

Dissolved oxygen

Water must contain enough dissolved oxygen to support aquatic life. **Insufficient oxygen**[5] concentrations usually result from low stream flows, warm stream temperatures, and excessive nutrients. Streams get most of their oxygen from the air; slow-moving streams do not absorb as much oxygen from the air. Warm water cannot hold as much dissolved oxygen as cooler water. Excessive aquatic plant or algal growth can harm fish and other aquatic life by creating extremes in water pH and low levels of dissolved oxygen. (The death and subsequent decomposition of aquatic plants can consume large quantities of dissolved oxygen.) Excessive plant growth can be stimulated by the availability of nutrients, warm temperatures, and light, which in turn are often caused by low stream flow and lack of protective vegetative cover.

Dissolved oxygen is measured in mg/L of water or percent saturation. The water quality criteria vary depending on the type of stream system the standard is being applied to.

Metals

Elevated levels of iron, manganese, and beryllium were measured in 1999. The source of these metals in the water is unknown and could be natural. They will not be addressed in this Area Plan.

2.4.3 Basin TMDLs and Agricultural Load Allocations

Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that each state establish **TMDLs** for any Water Quality Limited waterbodies. TMDLs set maximum limits on the amount of pollutants allowed to enter state waters and still meet water quality standards. When establishing TMDLs, DEQ reviews existing data and collects additional data as needed to determine the location, amount, and source of pollutants. For nonpoint source pollution, a TMDL consists of both **Load Allocations** and a strategy that will ensure that waterbodies will attain and maintain water quality standards. In Oregon, DEQ generally develops TMDLs for subbasins not for specific waterbodies.

Load Allocations are limits assigned by DEQ to the different sectors that contribute to the water quality problem. Load Allocations may include such things as a required reduction in sediment expressed in tons/acre/year or site-specific recommendations for reduced water temperature. Land use types such as agriculture, private forestlands, federal lands, and urban areas in each TMDL area will be assigned a Load Allocation as appropriate. The agricultural sector is responsible for reducing agricultural water pollution to meet the load allocation assigned to agriculture.

As part of the TMDL process, DEQ identifies the Designated Management Agencies or parties responsible for submitting TMDL implementation plans. An agreement between ODA and DEQ establishes that Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plans serve as TMDL implementation plans.

DEQ developed TMDLs for temperature and dissolved oxygen for the Alvord Lake Subbasin in 2003. EPA approved the Alvord Lake Subbasin TMDLs in 2004. These TMDLs rely on streamside vegetation to meet water quality standards. This Area Plan is the implementation plan for the agricultural component of the Alvord Lake Subbasin and any future TMDLs that apply to the Management Area. Area Plan biennial reviews and revisions will address any new pollutant load allocations assigned to agriculture in future TMDLs.

2.4.4 Beneficial Uses and Parameters of Concern

Beneficial Uses
State agencies use the term "beneficial use" in different ways.

The CWA of 1972 requires states to designate beneficial uses related to water quality that must be protected for the public interest. The beneficial uses of water for Oregon are codified in OARs and are listed in Table 1 below. This Area Plan addresses issues associated with these uses.

The Oregon Water Resources Department uses the term "beneficial use" in a different manner. Water rights are issued by this department based upon its definitions of beneficial use, which is water used for a "beneficial purpose without waste." Adjudicated surface water rights in the Management Area are for: irrigation, livestock, domestic, power generation, and to maintain a designated meander line in Malheur Lake (1908 certificate). Ground water has never been adjudicated in Oregon; all those uses are allowed through the permit process. Permitted uses for surface and groundwater in the Management Area include, but are not limited to: domestic, livestock, irrigation, refuge management, fire protection, recreation, stored water, commercial, and municipal.

While the issue of water rights is outside the scope of this Area Plan, the LAC stresses the importance of water rights. This Area Plan should not be construed as an infringement upon these rights.

Beneficial uses, as they pertain to water quality, generally apply basin-wide to all the waters of the state. Waters of the state include lakes, bays, ponds, impounding reservoirs, springs, wells, rivers, streams, creeks, marshes, inlets, canals, and all other bodies of surface or underground waters, natural or artificial, public or private (except those private waters which do not connect to natural surface or underground waters) within Oregon (from ORS 468B.005(10)).

Table 1. Beneficial uses (related to the Clean Water Act) in the Management Area that have to be supplied from a water source (OAR 340-41-0190).		
Beneficial Use	**Natural Lakes**	**All Rivers and Tributaries**
Public Domestic Water Supply[1]		**X**
Private Domestic Water Supply[1]		**X**
Industrial Water Supply		**X**
Irrigation	**X**	**X**
Livestock Watering	**X**	**X**
Fish & Aquatic Life[2]	**X**	**X**
Wildlife & Hunting	**X**	**X**
Fishing	**X**	**X**
Boating	**X**	**X**
Water Contact Recreation	**X**	**X**
Aesthetic Quality	**X**	**X**
[1]With adequate pretreatment (filtration and disinfect ion) and natural quality to meet drinking water standards. [2]Fish Use designations are detailed in Table 190B. The only designations that apply are: Redband Trout, Lahontan Trout, Borax Lake Chub, and cool water species.		

Some of these beneficial uses may not be attainable in waterbodies due to natural conditions. For instance, many of the natural lakes are too alkaline to provide livestock water; some streams and lakes may be naturally too warm to support some species of fish.

Beneficial Uses Most Likely to be Adversely Affected[1]

The focus of this Area Plan is to encourage the positive management of streams and riparian areas to support beneficial uses, including irrigation. Salmonids, resident fish, and aquatic life are affected by the greatest number of water quality parameters (primarily temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, pH, sedimentation, and turbidity). Waters within the Management Area are listed for not meeting Oregon's water temperature and dissolved oxygen criteria (see next section)[2]. Temperature is a concern for 'salmonid fish rearing and spawning' and 'resident fish and aquatic life'. However, some native fish within the Management Area tolerate or thrive in warmer waters.

Redband trout and Lahontan cutthroat trout are the two native salmonids within the Management Area. Redband trout are distributed throughout the Management Area whereas Lahontan cutthroat live east to south of the Steens Mountain Range. Other fish of concern within the Management Area include: Malheur mottled sculpin, Alvord chub, Catlow Tui chub, and the Borax Lake chub. Table 2 provides information as to the origin, status, and general water temperature requirements for all the fish species found in the Management Area.

Table 2. Fish Species of the Greater Harney Basin[1,3].				
Common Name	**Scientific Name**	**Temperature Preference***	**State Status**	**Federal Status**
Native Species				
Lahontan cutthroat trout	*Oncorhyncus clarki henshawi*	Cold	Threatened	Threatened
redband trout	*O. mykiss* ssp.	Cold	Sensitive	NA
mountain whitefish	*Prosopium williamsoni*	Cool	NA	NA
bridgelip sucker	*Catostomus columbianus*	Cool	NA	NA
largescale sucker	*C. macrocheilus*	Cool	NA	NA
northern pikeminnow	*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*	Cool	NA	NA
chiselmouth	*Acrocheilus alutaceus*	Cool	NA	NA
speckled dace	*Rhinichthys asculus*	Cool	NA	NA
longnose dace	*R. cataractae*	Cool	NA	NA
Malheur mottled sculpin	*Cottus bendirei*	Cool	Sensitive	NA
mottled sculpin	*C. bairdi*	Cool	NA	NA
redside shiner	*Richardsonius balteatus*	Cool	NA	NA
Tui chub	*Gila bicolor*	Cool	NA	NA
Alvord chub	*G. alvordensis*	Cool	Sensitive	NA
Catlow Tui chub	*G. bicolor* ssp.	Cool	Sensitive	NA
Borax Lake chub	*G. boraxobius*	Warm	Endangered	Endangered
Non-native Species				
bluegill	*Lepomis macrochirus*	Warm	NA	NA
brook trout	*Salvelinus fontinalis*	Cold	NA	NA
brown trout	*Salmo trutta*	Cold	NA	NA
brown bullhead	*Ictalurus nebulosus*	Warm	NA	NA
common carp	*Cyprinus carpio*	Warm	NA	NA
largemouth bass	*Micropterus salmoides*	Warm	NA	NA
smallmouth bass	*M. dolomieui*	Warm	NA	NA
pumpkinseed	*Lepomis gibbosus*	Warm	NA	NA
white crappie	*Pomoxis annularis*	Warm	NA	NA
yellow perch	*Perca flavescens*	Warm	NA	NA
goldfish	*Carassius auratus*	Warm	NA	NA

*Approximate water temperature ranges are: cold <65 ˚F, cool 65-72˚F, and warm >72˚F
NA = not applicable

Parameters of Concern

Sediments carried in streams can adversely affect aquatic life by increasing water temperature through thermal absorption, reducing light penetration and visibility, reducing water infiltration through stream substrate (harming incubating fish eggs), and irritating gill filaments. Sediment deposition can also change the width:depth ratio of a stream, which directly influences stream temperature.

Turbidity is a measure of the cloudiness of water and is often used as a surrogate measure for suspended sediment.

Rill and gully **erosion** is not a significant problem in the Management Area due to low precipitation and nearly level slopes that are farmed[10]. However, it can be locally significant in areas of high runoff and steep gradients. It is also aggravated by storm events, including summer thunderstorms and springtime ice flows caused by sudden thawing. Irrigation-induced erosion is also not a significant problem because

irrigated lands are predominately flat and used for hay and pasture, which provide permanent cover that minimizes erosion. Poorly managed livestock grazing has contributed to streambank erosion in some areas. When the riparian areas are degraded, significant sediment loads are transported during spring runoff and flood events.

High levels of **bacteria** can cause human illnesses under the right circumstances. Thus the most sensitive beneficial use protected by the bacteria standard is water contact recreation (activities such as swimming or fishing where people could swallow or have water touch open cuts or sores). The bacteria standard does not allow bacteria in numbers high enough to interfere with waters used for domestic purposes, livestock watering, irrigation, or other beneficial uses.

Two other factors related to fish habitat can influence water quality, although these factors have been determined not to require establishment of a TMDL. **Reduced stream flows** can contribute to a general reduction in available habitat and interfere with fish migration. In addition, low flows can contribute to warmer water, increased pH, reduced dissolved oxygen, Slow-moving streams are more susceptible to warming and they are less turbulent, all of which can contribute to reduced oxygen levels. Removal of dense juniper stands through prescribed fire and other means increases soil moisture and increase water flows, which can decrease water temperature.[11] **Modification of physical habitat** can harm all aquatic life. Channelization reduces the amount of habitat (stream length is usually reduced as meanders are eliminated), as well as the instream habitat complexity such as the normal mixture of pools, riffles, and runs. Loss of riparian vegetation often destabilizes streambanks, which results in increased erosion, increased stream sedimentation, loss of instream habitat complexity and cover, and the loss of future large woody debris that naturally falls into streams.

2.5 Prevention and Control Measures

OAR 603-095-3300 through 603-095-3360 were developed for the Management Area (Area Rules) and complement the voluntary strategies in the Area Plan. ODA will pursue enforcement to gain compliance with the Area Rules **only** when reasonable attempts at a voluntary solution have failed.

The *Area Rules* are enforceable by ODA and are cited here for your information. The *Area Plan* is not enforceable; it provides an overall proactive strategy for meeting the Plan's water quality objectives and for complying with the Area Rules.

Any actions related to determination of noncompliance with Area Rules or enforcement are taken up directly by ODA, as outlined in OAR 603-090-0000 through 603-090-0120.

All landowners conducting agricultural activities on lands (including timber lands) that are neither federal lands nor held in Tribal Trust must comply with the Area Rules (OAR 603-095-3300 through 603-095-3360). '*Landowner'* includes any landowner, land occupier or operator (ORS 568.903). The landowner's responsibility is to implement measures that ensure compliance with these Area Rules. ODA can issue sanctions if a landowner is out of compliance with the Area Rules.

Some Area Rules may become more specific over time, as information becomes available on land conditions and water quality.

Limitations (OAR 603-095-3340(1))

Landowners must comply with OAR 603-95-3340(2) through (3) within the following limitations. A landowner is responsible for only those conditions resulting from activities controlled by the landowner. A landowner is not responsible for conditions resulting from activities by landowners on other lands. A landowner is not responsible for conditions that: are natural, could not have been reasonably anticipated, or that result from unusual weather events or other exceptional circumstances.

2.5.1 Waste Management

ORS 468B.010 to 468B.050 lays out a broad framework under which **water pollution is defined and controlled** to protect beneficial uses of water. State water quality standards (temperature and *Escherichia coli* (bacteria) are set at levels sufficient to protect beneficial uses.

Waste Management (OAR 603-095-3340(3))

Effective on rule adoption, no person subject to these rules shall violate any provision of ORS 468B.025 or ORS 468B.050.

The Waste Management Rule references existing state law (ORS 468B.025 and ORS 468B.050). ORS 468B.025 states that no person shall:

(1) (a) Cause pollution of any waters of the state or place or cause to be placed any wastes in a location where such wastes are likely to escape or be carried into the waters of the state by any means.

(b) Discharge any wastes into the waters of the state if the discharge reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards established by rule for such waters by the Environmental Quality Commission.

(2) Violate the conditions of any waste discharge permit issued under ORS 468B or ORS 568.

DEQ is responsible for enforcement of ORS 468B, except as provided below under ORS 561.191 for agricultural practices that affect water quality.

ORS 468B.050 refers to situations when permits are required, such as for certain confined animal feeding operations.

2.5.2 Desired Streamside Riparian Condition

Desired Streamside Riparian Condition (OAR 603-095-3340(2))

(a) Effective January 1, 2006, consistent with site capability, persons shall allow regeneration and growth of riparian vegetation along natural waterways to provide for:

- **(i) Bank stabilization,**
- **(ii) Filtration of sediments and nutrients,**
- **(iii) The sustainability of riparian community integrity through spring runoff and larger storm events, and**
- **(iv) Shade and aquatic habitat.**

(b) Part (a) allows water gaps, livestock watering, and hardened livestock crossings in streams that otherwise have desired streamside riparian conditions.

(c) Part (a) does not apply to natural waterways, such as sloughs and backwater areas that only hold water for short periods of time during spring runoff.

(d) Technical criteria to determine compliance:

- **(i) Management activities maintain or improve streambank integrity, with a goal of withstanding a 25-year storm event; and**
- **(ii) Ongoing renewal and growth of riparian vegetation demonstrates sustainability and vigor.**

(e) Compliance will be determined through objective methods using commonly accepted monitoring protocols.

(f) Definitions that apply specifically to OAR 603-095-3340(2):

- **(i)** ***Riparian*** **means a wetland transition zone that connects riverine aquatic habitats to upland areas.**
- **(ii)** ***Natural waterways*** **are streams or rivers that were created through natural processes. They may be altered by human activities, but not created as a result of human activities. Irrigation ditches that contain water diverted from the main channel are not natural waterways.**
- **(iii)** ***Riparian Community Integrity*** **is the sustainability of a healthy and vigorous riparian community over time.**

2.5.3 Maintain or Improve Riparian Vegetation along Streams

Riparian vegetation consists of plants that depend on or tolerate the presence of water near the ground surface for at least part of the year. Riparian vegetation can include sedges, willows, cottonwoods, and other plants, depending on conditions at the site such as soil type, slope aspect, stream gradient, elevation, and water table characteristics.

Adequate riparian vegetation helps:

- Minimize streambank erosion by increasing the cohesiveness and structural strength of streambanks and by reducing flow velocities.[1,2,3]
- Reduce maximum summer water temperature.[4,5]
- Maintain late season flows by increasing the ability of the adjacent soils to store water during runoff seasons.[6,7,8]
- Moderate winter stream temperatures through the inflows of relatively warmer groundwater from adjacent soils.[9]
- Filter out and process excess nutrients, bacteria, and sediment in runoff that could pollute adjacent streams.[10,11,12,13]
- Keep riparian soils cool for moisture retention.[14]

Adequate riparian vegetation should:

- Include a variety of plant species and ages. Land managers and agency personnel should recognize that differing climate, soils, and water regimens within the basin precludes all streams from having the same vegetative site capability. In addition, fire, flood, and drought may significantly influence short-term site capability.
- Include plants that have root masses capable of withstanding high streamflows, e.g. sedges and willows.
- Provide adequate cover to protect the streambank and dissipate energy during high flows.
- Include sufficient ground cover to filter out excess sediment or nutrients in overland flows.

Management options to consider that may help improve riparian vegetation include:

- Providing off-stream watering areas for livestock**.**
- Early-season flood irrigation to recharge groundwater and sub-surface water storage which will help augment late season stream flows.
- Control of noxious weeds.
- Planting of willows and other riparian shrubs.
- Leaving a buffer of un-harvested grass when haying next to creeks.
- Leaving a buffer of untilled ground when farming next to creeks.
- Change season-of-use of pastures to improve livestock distribution. Use of herding and fencing to better control livestock access to riparian areas.
- Developing alternative forage for wildlife.

2.5.4 Soil Erosion Prevention and Control

Effective management practices for controlling soil erosion and sediment delivery include but are not limited to:

- Conservation tillage (crop residue management) - reduced tillage, minimum tillage, direct seeding, modified conventional tillage, reservoir tillage, sub-soiling, or deep chiseling,
- Nutrient management – soil testing and fertilizer placement,
- Cover crops – perennial or annual,
- Contour farming practices - strip cropping, divided slopes, terraces (level and gradient), cross-slope tillage,
- Crop rotations,
- Early or double seeding in critical areas,
- Vegetative buffer strips -filter strips, grassed waterways, field borders, contour buffer strips,
- Irrigation scheduling - soil moisture monitoring and application rate monitoring,
- Prescribed burning,
- Prescribed grazing,
- Weed control,
- Road design and maintenance,
- Sediment retention basins and runoff control structures,
- Reforestation,
- Tree thinning - commercial and pre-commercial,
- Streambank protection.

2.5.5 Management Intent and Optional Practices

Water quality is and should be maintained or enhanced through a combination of landowner education and implementation of appropriate Management Measures. Management Measures include both Optional Management Practices (included in this section) and the mandatory Area Rules (cited in Section 2.5.1 and 2.5.2).

Voluntary efforts are and should be the primary means to prevent and control agricultural sources of pollution. With adequate funding and staff, SWCDs are the main support agencies at the local level. NRCS, Harney County Watershed Council, Harney County Weed Board, Harney County Weed Management Partnership, Oregon State University Extension, Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station, ODA, DEQ, Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Farm Service Agency, Burns Paiute Tribe, and others may provide information and/or technical and financial assistance.

Landowners have flexibility in choosing management approaches and practices to address water quality issues on their lands. Landowners may choose to develop management systems to address identified problems on their own, or they may choose to develop a voluntary conservation plan to address applicable resource issues. Landowners may seek planning and financial assistance from any agency or a consultant.

Natural factors that may limit improvement in riparian condition may include: area precipitation patterns, severe weather conditions, the presence of noxious weeds, soil types, channel morphology, destruction by wildlife and wild horses, and the condition of uplands.

Management Intent

To help achieve water quality standards in the Management Area, an effective strategy should be based on site capability and will result in the maintenance or improvement of:

- **Riparian vegetation along streams**
- **Stream channel morphology**
- **Wet meadows and seasonal wetlands**
- **Upland condition**

The Greater Harney Basin LAC believes that this strategy will result in the greatest improvements in stream temperatures. Also there may be positive effects on other water quality parameters such as: algal growth, dissolved oxygen, sediments, turbidity, and bacteria. Properly managed livestock grazing can be a useful part of this strategy.

Noxious weeds displace desired vegetation by creating monocultures, and severely disrupt the proper structure and function of riparian and upland ecosystems. Noxious weeds generally provide less shade, filtering capacity, and stabilizing root mass than the plants they replace[15].

Noxious weed infestations tend to spread rapidly to adjacent lands in uplands, riparian areas, and flood zones – especially on bare and degraded lands. Once noxious weeds have invaded, control can be very problematic and expensive. Noxious weed management issues need to be addressed in the early stages of restoration and enhancement projects. Cooperative efforts among landowners and agencies are critical to the control of noxious weeds. For a list of weeds of concern in the Greater Harney Basin, see the Harney County Noxious Weed List (see end of this section) or the list for your county.

Maintain or Improve Stream Channel Morphology[16,17]

A stream is considered stable if its banks maintain their integrity during a 25-year storm event. Channel morphology is key to streambank stability.

Channel morphology refers to the shape and physical characteristics of a stream. These include: how much the stream meanders ("sinuosity"), the slope of the streambanks, and how deeply cut ("incised") the stream is. Morphology is influenced by natural features such as geology and climate, valley shape, the maturity of a stream (recently-developed streams rarely meander), wildlife access, and human activities.

Again, it is important to point out that not all streams in the Management Area have the same potential for channel morphology and that climate, valley shape, soils and water regimen make each subbasin unique. The following are general characteristics:

- As riparian vegetation matures, stream channels are expected to narrow and deepen (known as a 'low width-to-depth ratio'). These stream channels will have less water surface area exposed to solar radiation (thereby reducing heating rates during summer) and will be more connected to their floodplain.
- Better floodplain connectivity has the added benefit of increasing storage during periods of high streamflow.
- Streams with a low width to depth ratio may also meander more, which will reduce flow velocities and reduce the damage from flooding.
- Streams with a low width to depth ratio should have well-vegetated banks, where possible, that resist damage during high streamflows.
- Some streams with a low width to depth ratio have been incised to bedrock. They must be allowed to regain their meanders within the incised channel and capture sediment to build up the streambed.
- Streambanks naturally change in form or location over time; some bank instability usually occurs in undisturbed streams. Excessively unstable streambanks can contribute to:
    - Sediment in the stream channel caused by slumps and surface erosion.
    - Fine sediment in the water.

- Wider channels, which increases exposure of water to solar radiation.
- Decreasing stream depth and alteration of fish habitat.
- Confining a stream within its banks during high flows so it can't access its floodplain and dissipate its energy.

Management options to consider that may help improve stream channel morphology site-specifically include:

- The proper design, location, installation and maintenance of roads, culverts, bridges, stream crossings and upstream storage systems.
- Increasing riparian vegetation to aid bank stability.
- Maintaining a vegetative buffer.
- Leave large, woody debris in streams.
- Removal of livestock from riparian areas when banks are unstable and livestock have been identified as a contributing factor or will prevent recovery.

Maintain or Improve Wet Meadows and Seasonal Wetlands[18]

Flood irrigation of meadows is a long-practiced method of irrigation in the Management Area. The well-managed capture and diversion of high spring flows by ranchers to irrigate meadows mimics natural hydrologic processes and benefits both man and wildlife. The capture and diversion of high spring flows mimics natural hydrologic processes. Diverted water eventually returns to the river channel via overland flow or groundwater percolation. The diverted water creates shallow seasonal wetlands that attract hundreds of thousands of migrating waterfowl, shorebirds and wading birds during spring migration. Groundwater percolation of diverted irrigation water serves to cool and augment late summer stream flows.

Traditional flood irrigation is an economical approach to irrigating hay crops. In systems where there is little or no water storage, flood irrigation using high spring flows is an efficient use of that water; in many instances, may be the only method of irrigation available to a landowner.

The loss of traditional flood irrigation practices would cause both environmental and economic hardships in the Management Area. Thousands of acres of wildlife habitat, specifically seasonal wetland/wet meadows, would be lost. Presently, about 100,000 acres of wetlands are lost annually to development in the continental U.S. In the arid Intermountain West, up to 75 percent of the historical wetland habitats have been lost to development. Two of the wetland types most heavily affected by development are seasonal wetlands and wet meadows. Therefore, each acre of existing wetland/wet meadow habitat is extremely important. Working cooperatively with private landowners to maintain traditional flood irrigation of meadows is one step in mitigating for the loss of these wetland habitats. In addition, other methods of irrigation are more costly.

However, irrigation water withdrawals should be managed so that aquatic life, especially native fish, is not harmed by low flows.

Management options to consider that may help improve wetlands include:

- Improve efficiency of irrigation water delivery.
- Improve the quality of surface water return flows through creation of treatment wetlands.
- Improve fish passage and protection. Work with partners to develop more economically feasible fish screens.
- Use cross dikes and leveling to improve irrigation water distribution and increase efficiency.
- Build up bottom of streams in incised channels to: reactivate floodplains; raise water tables below wet meadows habitats; reclaim wet meadows that have been lost to encroachment of upland vegetation; and improve instream fish habitat complexity.

Maintain or Improve Upland Condition[19,20,21,22,23]

'Upland areas' are the rangelands, forests and croplands upslope from the riparian areas. These areas extend to the ridge tops of watersheds. The upland portion of the Greater Harney Basin is primarily made up of public lands.

With a protective cover of grass, shrubs or trees consistent with site capability, these areas will capture, store and safely release precipitation thereby reducing the potential of excessive soil erosion or pollution in spring and augmenting the volume of late season stream flows. Again, noxious weeds are undesirable[15].

Expansion of juniper stands threatens the integrity of plant and animal communities and late summer stream flows in the Management Area. Junipers were naturally restricted to rocky ridges and cliffs where there was little grass to fuel fires. Recent efforts to suppress fires have allowed juniper stands to expand and replace more diversified plant and animal communities throughout the uplands. Diverse plant communities support more wildlife; help supply cleaner, cooler water for streams; and provide forage for livestock. Juniper domination leaves the soil more exposed to rapid runoff and erosion. Juniper may use enough water during the summer to reduce aquifer recharge, an indispensable factor in maintaining late season stream flows. Increased late season flows would help improve water quality.

Lack of disturbance can create vegetative monocultures that reduce the landscape diversity needed to support wildlife[24] and watershed health. For example, numerous studies have shown that sagebrush control increases soil moisture levels, especially in the lower portions of the soil profile.[25]

Proper management of upland vegetation considers physical and biological conditions of the management area, controls soil erosion, and minimizes transport of soil and nutrients to the stream. Upland management also considers livestock production while protecting fish and wildlife habitat.

To limit erosion and augment late season stream flows, upland management should consider the following:

- Minimize bare or exposed soil. Soil surface should be occupied by a healthy grass plant, forb, shrub, or tree; areas should be covered by decaying plant litter.
- In forested areas, optimize tree spacing to best utilize tree productivity and snow storage. Dense stands of trees catch too much snow on the branches and lose the precipitation to sublimation and limit storage on the surface. Stands that are too open lose forest productivity and do not provide enough shading to preserve snow pack late into the spring. Proper tree density is site-specific.
- Healthy stands of perennial grasses are better at filtering sediments and limiting erosion than stands of annual grasses.

Management options to consider that may help improve uplands include:

- Thinning or removal of overstocked stands of trees and brush.
- Controlled burning.
- Seeding of perennial grass plants.
- Manage pastureland so that areas on the soil surface not occupied by perennial grass plants are covered with decomposing plant litter ('take half, leave half').
- Control of noxious weeds.
- The construction of well-designed off-stream water impoundments.

HARNEY COUNTY WEED CLASSIFICATION (updated March 2012)

Noxious weeds for the purpose of this policy shall be rated "A", "B", or "C".

"A" Pest - A weed of known economic importance known to occur in the county in small enough infestations to make eradication practicable, or not known to occur but its status in surrounding counties makes future occurrence seem imminent. *Species not yet known to occur in the county.
ACTION - Infestations are subject to eradication where found with possible County assistance when funds are available.

"B" Pest - A weed of known economic importance and of limited distribution in the county, and is subject to intensive control or eradication where feasible at the county level.
ACTION - Infestations are handled at county discretion with possible County assistance when funds are available.

"C" Pest - A weed of known economic importance and of general distribution that is subject to control, intensive control, or eradication as local conditions warrant.
ACTION - Infestations handled at owners discretion.

"A" Rated Weeds	
African rue	*Peganum harmala*
Black henbane	*Hyoscyamus niger*
Diffuse knapweed	*Centaurea diffusa*
*Leafy spurge	*Euphorbia esula*
Musk thistle	*Carduus nutans*
Orange hawkweed	*Hieracium aurantiacum*
Purple loosestrife	*Lythrum salicaria*
*Rush skeleton weed	*Chondrilla juncea*
Salt cedar	*Tamarix ramosissima*
Scotch broom	*Cytisus scoparius*
Spotted knapweed	*Centaurea maculosa*
*Squarrose knapweed	*Centaurea virgate*
Tansy ragwort	*Senecio jacobaea*
Yellow starthistle	*Centaurea solstitialis*
Yellow toadflax	*Linaria vulgaris*

"B" Rated Weeds	
Dalmatian toadflax	*Linaria dalmatica*
Hounds tongue	*Cynoglossum officinale*
Mediterranean sage	*Salvia aethiopis*
Perennial pepperweed	*Lepidium latifolium*
Puncture vine	*Tribulus terrestris*
Russian knapweed	*Acroptiln repens*
Scotch thistle	*Onopordum acanthium*

"C" Rated Weeds	
Canada thistle	*Cirsium arvense*
Halogeton	*Halogeton spp.*
Klamath weed	*Hypericum perforatum*
Medusahead rye	*Taeniatherum caput-medusa*
Morning Glory	*Convolvulus arvensis*
White top	*Cardaria draba*

List subject to change at the discretion of the Harney County Weed Board

Chapter 3: Measurable Objectives and Strategic Initiatives

Mission

To promote agricultural management that maintains, improves, or protects water quality in the Greater Harney Basin while sustaining a viable agricultural economy and community.

The primary strategies to reduce water pollution from agricultural and rural lands are:

- Educational programs regarding land treatment, and
- Encouragement of desirable agricultural management practices.

Goal

Proposed: Prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities and soil erosion, and to achieve applicable water quality standards.

3.1 Measurable Objectives

3.1.1 Management Area Measurable Objectives

ODA will work with the SWCD and the technical advisory team over the next two years and develop a Management Area Measurable Objective.

3.1.2 Demonstration Area Measurable Objectives

ODA will work with the SWCD and the technical advisory team over the next two years and develop a Demonstration Area Measurable Objective.

3.2 Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Initiatives consist of focused work in small geographic areas. The Management Area has Demonstration Area/Focus Areas, but no Strategic Implementation Areas (SIAs) or Pesticide Stewardship Partnerships. Demonstration Areas/Focus Areas are selected by SWCDs and all landowner participation in projects is voluntary. SIAs are designated by ODA and include a compliance evaluation with follow-up site visits as necessary.

3.2.1 Silvies River Demonstration Area/Focus Area(s)

At the request of the Greater Harney Basin Ag Water Quality Management Area's (GHBAWQMA) Local Advisory Council (LAC), Harney Soil & Water Conservation District (HSWCD) board developed a Steering Committee to identify an area within the county to propose as a demonstration area/focus area to assess the effectiveness of conservation actions yielded through the implementation of the GHBAWQMA's Plan. Silvies River Watershed, the lower portion of the Silvies Subbasin located within Harney County, has been selected as the Demonstration Area/Focus Area. HSWCD's Steering Committee gave highest consideration to the watersheds within the county where HSWCD has historically had a presence and has had the greatest success in landowners' willingness to participate. LAC technical advisors, Dustin Johnson, OSU extension and Dr. Chad Boyd, Ag Research Service, along with Riparian Consultant, Dr. Wayne Elmore were integral partners in developing the ecosystem-based approach to water quality assessment and monitoring methodology for this Demonstration Area/Focus Area. The

Harney SWCD developed an Action Plan using the State and Transition Model for the current biennium that outlines the key components of the Demonstration Area/Focus Area process.
The State and Transition Model approach is completed by stratifying the demonstration area/focus area into assessment and monitoring units that require gathering any of the following background information that exists: aerial photographs, satellite imagery, written and oral histories, disturbance history (e.g., burn maps), management history, property maps, plant species lists, ecological sites and site descriptions, and soil maps. The demonstration area will be stratified by management unit (typically by pasture and/or field). Each management unit will then be stratified into the three primary ecological types (i.e., high elevation sagebrush rangeland, low elevation sagebrush rangeland, and riparian) using a combination of existing knowledge and/or data, ecological site descriptions, GIS techniques, and field reconnaissance. For the purpose of this Area Plan, the SWCD will report on riparian ecological states. Catagories will be as follows:
Ecological States:

- State A:≥70% ground cover of deep rooted riparian vegetation and anchored rock. Width to depth ratio appropriate for the Rosgen classification of the stream. Annual flow usually reaches floodplain.
- State B:50-69% gound cover of deep rooted riparian vegetation and anchored rock. Width to depth ratio appropriate for Rosgen classification. Annual flow usually reaches floodplain
- State C:<50% gound cover of deep rooted riparian vegetation and anchored rock. Width to depth ratio not within desireable range for Rosgen classification. Annual flow does not reach flood plain.
- State D:<50% ground cover, vegetation inundated with non desireable species. Stream entrenched and highly unsable. Annual flow does not reach the floodplain.

The Harney SWCD will report the results to ODA at the end of each fiscal biennium via the Action Plan. As part of the Biennial Review, ODA will summarize the results in Chapter 4, discuss and evaluate progress with the LAC, and use adaptive management to adjust implementation strategies if needed. To request a copy of the Action Plan, please contact the Harney SWCD.

3.2.2 Strategic Implementation Area

ODA is implementing a SIA approach in Oregon to help prevent and control water pollution from agricultural activities by working with agricultural landowners and natural resources partners in small watersheds. SIAs are priority areas where ODA identifies and assists those who may need help complying with water quality regulations. Through SIAs, ODA systematically conducts agricultural water quality out reach, measures land condition changes over time, and conducts compliance efforts that may lead to enforcement.

ODA completed a characterization for watersheds at the 6th field hydrologic unit code (HUC) level statewide on agricultural lands. This characterization calculates scores for temperature, bacteria, nutrients, sediment, and aquatic species of concern (salmonid species and other native aquatic species endemic to Oregon) for each 6th field HUC with surface water and agricultural land. The scores are combined for comparison and allow ODA to identify high priority 6th field watersheds to be considered for SIAs in the 2015-2017 biennium.

Currently, there is no SIA in the Management Area.

3.2.3 Pesticide Stewardship Partnership

After significant pesticide levels were detected in Hood River, DEQ experimented with a voluntary approach to reduce pesticide levels using water quality monitoring and crop management changes. This first PSP in 2000 started partnerships around Oregon. These voluntary partnerships help avoid the need for a regulatory approach, and provide flexibility and control for Oregon's producers. The PSPs utilize a diverse group, focused on farmers and including Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Watershed Councils, Oregon State University Extension Service, and state agencies such as DEQ, ODA, and ODF.

Currently, there is no PSP in the Management Area.

3.2.4 Harney County Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurance (CCAA) for Greater Sage Grouse

Though the CCAA is focused on the uplands and does not include water quality criteria, it is worth noting the efforts of the SWCD and landowners committment to conservation. The basic conservation approach of Harney County's programmatic CCAA is an ecologically-based approach to maintain current sage-grouse habitat and to improve deficient habitat. This approach relies on habitat models that describe factors that impact plant community composition and structure over time. These models indicate specific threats that can be influenced by management to improve habitat quality for sage-grouse; these threats are in-turn, the basis for habitat-related conservation measures. Also identified are species-specific threats and the associated conservation measures for non-habitat factors that directly and indirectly impact sage-grouse populations (e.g. West Nile virus, insecticide use). Additionally, every watershed or subbasin assessment completed for Harney County has identified vegetation conversion as a limiting factor and has established related objectives or action items. Many of these assessments linked these vegetation conversions to the decline in sage-grouse and/or established specific objectives for sage-grouse habitat enhancement.

Site Specific Plans (SSPs) developed by the Harney SWCD must comply with ORS192.501 (33) Public records conditionally exempt from disclosure. *The following voluntary conservation agreements and reports are exempt from disclosure under ORS192.410 to 192.505 unless the public interest require disclosure in the particular instance:*
(33) Land management plans required for voluntary stewardship agreements entered into under ORS543.423. However, as of February 2014, House Bill 4093 amends ORS192.501 (33) to read:
(33) The following voluntary conservation agreements and reports:

- *(a) Land management plans required for voluntary stewardship agreements entered into under ORS 541.423; and*
- *(b) Written agreements relating to the conservation of greater sage grouse entered into voluntarily by owners or occupiers of land with a soil and water conservation district under ORS 568.550.*

3.3 Strategies and Activities

To the greatest degree possible, prevention and control of agricultural pollution is encouraged in a cooperative spirit through the voluntary efforts of landowners, aided by information and technical and financial assistance from local, state, and federal agencies, and others.

Education is the key to the success of this Area Plan. The groups and agencies mentioned in Section 2.5.4 should and do work together to provide landowners in the Management Area and the interested public with information about the goals and objectives of the Area Plan and requirements of the Area Rules. The following are strategies to reduce water pollution from agricultural and rural lands:

- Recognize agriculture's positive contribution to water quality
    - Limit erosion and sediment delivery from agricultural and rural lands to waters of the state.
    - Limit nutrient and bacteria loading from agricultural and rural lands to waters of the state.
    - Manage livestock access to streams, wetlands, and the riparian areas.
    - Promote streambank stabilization and enhancement of wetlands and riparian habitat consistent with site capability.

- Focus on education, not regulation
    - Develop strategies to provide landowners with information and technical and financial assistance.
    - Continue to include landowners, land managers, and the communities in the development and implementation of the Area Plan and the associated Area Rules.
    - Inform the general public about beneficial agricultural practices.

These goals will be achieved by land management and having:

- Land conditions that limit the movement of nutrients and bacteria from agricultural and rural lands to state waters.
- Land conditions that reduce sedimentation of streams due to soil erosion.

3.3.1 Community Awareness

Create a high level of awareness and an understanding of water quality among the agricultural community and general public, in a manner that minimizes conflict and encourages cooperative efforts, through education and technical assistance:

- Incorporate Area Plan implementation as a priority element in the SWCDs' Annual Work Plans and Long Range Plans, with adequate funding and staff and support from partner organizations.
- Inform landowners of the Area Plan and Rules.
- Showcase successful strategies and systems; conduct tours for landowners, the general public, and the media.
- Recognize successful projects and strategies through appropriate media and newsletters.
- Conduct educational programs to promote public awareness of water quality issues and their solutions.
- Offer and provide site evaluations on any lands within the Management Area to assess conditions that may affect water quality.
- Prioritize sub-watersheds within the Management Area for targeting implementation strategies.

3.3.2 Conservation Planning and Conservation Activities

Limit water pollution in the Management Area through planning and implementation of technically sound and economically feasible conservation strategies (see section 2.5.4 Management Intent and Optional Practices).

3.3.3 Funding

Identify funding sources to achieve Area Plan goals and objectives. Where possible, combine or build-in private-entity revenue-generating aspects of projects to extend benefits from funding sources and create sustainable jobs in the local economy.

Costs of implementing this Area Plan are difficult to assess in the absence of detailed, site-specific inventories of resource problems and quantification of nutrient and sediment loadings and other water quality issues of concern.

To implement this Area Plan, the SWCDs need support and resources for staff to conduct the following:

- Educational programs (production and presentation).
- Identification of high priority areas for implementation.
- Ongoing evaluation of Area Plan progress toward achieving water quality goals.
- Coordinated planning and implementation activities with other agencies, organizations, and individuals working on similar goals.
- Watershed assessments.
- Water quality monitoring.
- Meeting management and facilitation.

Landowners need financial and technical assistance to meet Area Plan objectives and Area Rule requirements. Technical and cost-sharing assistance for installation of certain management practices may be available through current USDA conservation programs such as Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) and Continuous Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and other programs such as the Environmental Protection Agency's nonpoint source implementation grants, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). Other agencies may also be available to provide technical assistance or financial assistance to private landowners.

Education and technical assistance are the key methods for meeting the goals of this Plan. ODA is a primary resource for information and technical advice and assistance. ODA staff regularly participates in site visits where they help design water quality improvement practices, evaluate a grant application that corrects water quality problems, or advise a landowner who is planning to correct a problem. These visits are not considered to be compliance investigations.

3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

Any monitoring program should be peer-reviewed and use the scientific method.

Monitoring is encouraged for landowners who want to document improvements in their riparian vegetation and stream conditions. Those wishing to do so should contact their local SWCD or watershed council. Photomonitoring (keeping a record with photographs) is a simple and effective method.

Water quality in the Management Area currently is monitored on a limited basis by: DEQ, ODFW, US Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. These groups primarily measure water temperature; although some of them monitor fish and aquatic insect populations, physical stream habitat, turbidity, and air temperature.

<u>Surface Water</u>
Water quality monitoring related to agricultural water quality on private lands consists of one site tracked by DEQ: Silvies River at West Loop Road, from 2013 to the present. See Section 4.4 for trend and analysis.

<u>Groundwater</u>
The Harney County Watershed Council in partnership with Oregon Water Resources is conducting water level monitoring for wells in the Dog Mountain, Crane/Buchanan and Princeton areas of the Harney Basin. Wells will be monitored four times per year for five years. A Groundwater forum was presented in May of 2015. Over 130 people attended to hear Water Resources discuss their new monitoring program in the Harney Basin. The Council has submitted a Place Based Planning letter of interest to Water Resources for funding to begin future water planning in the Harney Basin. This project was funded at the February 2016 Water Resources Commission meeting. The Watershed Council along with the Harney County

Court, High Desert Partnership, Harney SWCD and other stakeholders will be starting on a collaborative effort of water planning that is designated in Oregon's Integrated Water Resources Strategy.

Land Conditions

All land condition assessments are done in the Demonstration Area/Focus Area. Additional Demonstration Areas/Focus Areas will be selected as others are wrapped up.

Chapter 4: Implementation, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management

ODA is responsible for tracking overall Area Plan implementation and compliance with the Area Rules and for evaluating Area Plan effectiveness (improvements in water quality and land conditions). Progress and success of implementation efforts are assessed through compliance with Area Rules and state standards and the measurement of landscape and water quality improvement over time. Monitoring of land conditions related to water quality is the responsibility of ODA, with appropriate permission from private landowners.

Every two years, ODA, in cooperation with the LMA, LAC, and DEQ will assess the progress of Area Plan implementation toward achievement of plan goals and objectives. These assessments will include:

- A review of projects, demonstrations, and tours used to showcase successful management practices and systems;
- An evaluation of outreach and education programs designed to provide public awareness and understanding of water quality issues;
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of technical and financial assistance sources available to the agricultural community;
- Documentation of violations of the Area Rules and subsequent corrections;
- An evaluation of available current water quality monitoring data and sources of pollution in the Management Area; and
- A review of load allocations as found in any completed TMDL for the Management Area and the anticipated effectiveness of this plan in meeting the load allocations as described in that TMDL.

4.1 Progress Toward Management Area Measurable Objectives

ODA will work with the SWCD and the technical advisory team over the next two years and develop a Management Area Measurable Objective.

4.2 Progress on Demonstration Area/Focus Area

The measurable objective was just determined this Biennial Review so there was no milestone to meet in 2015. In the last two years, conservation activities within the Demonstration Area/Focus Area consisted of:

- 55.64 stream miles of the private agricultural lands within the DA has been evaluated. The SWCD will evaluate the remaining 94 stream miles by October 2016.
- There are 124 stream miles of private agricultural lands in the entire Demonstration Area. The SWCD has evaluated a total of 45% of agricultural stream miles within the Demonstration Area.
- 13 landowners contacted by visits.
- Projects installed: See Biennial Review Activities listed below.

Additional projects are underway and planned.

To help achieve the Area Plan goal and the measurable objective stated in 3.1, the following milestones and timelines were developed in cooperation with ODA, LMA, and LAC technical advisors, Dustin Johnson, OSU extension and Dr. Chad Boyd, Ag Research Service:

- By July 1, 2013, a Demonstration Area was identified within the Management Area, where the local SWCD will focus outreach and technical assistance work for the next two years. - **COMPLETED**
- By August 31, 2014, ODA and/or the SWCD will complete the State and Transition Model in the initial sample area representing seven landowners as a pre-assessment. - **COMPLETED**
- Current Conditions: As of July 1, 2015, HSWCD completed the pre-assessment for 20% of the Demonstration Area. These preliminary results indicate that 98% of stream miles are in Ecological State A (highly stable) or B (moderately stable).
- By June 30, 2016, HSWCD will complete pre-assessment for the remaining 80% of the Demonstration Area.
- By June 30, 2016, once pre-assessment is complete SWCD will determine what percentage of State C, D could transition to State A,B by June 30, 2017. SWCD will develop milestones and timelines once completed.
- Milestone 1: By June 30, 2017 - 75% of private agricultural lands in the Demonstration Area/Focus Area are in State A or B.
- Milestone 2: By June 30, 2019 - 85% of private agriculutral lands in the Demonstration Area/Focus Area are in State A or B.

Measureable Objective: ODA will work with the SWCD and the technical advisory team over the next two years and develop a Demonstration Area Measurable Objective.

ODA and the SWCD will report back to the LAC on the status of land conditions, and outreach and technical assistance efforts in the area, at the next biennial review in December 2017.

Silvies River Demonstration Area: Status of States

Demonstration Area State-and-Transition	**2015 (post July 1)** (24% of DA)	**2018**	**2028**
% of states maintaining trend or with an improving trend in **riparian** areas	97%		
% of states maintaining trend or with an improving trend in **upland** areas	100%		
% of states with a declining trend in **riparian** areas	3%		
% of states with a declining trend in **upland** areas	0%		

Lotic Riparian Systems: Ecological State A, B, C, D Results in Stream Miles

State	2013-2014 Pre-Assessment Results (21% of DA)	2015 Pre-Assessment Results Continued (24% of DA)	2016 Pre-Assessment Results Continued (100% of DA)	2017 Interim-Assessment Results	Percent Change During 2015-2017 Biennium
A - Highly Stable	18.5	28.63			
B - Moderately Stable	3.2	1.01			
C - Unstable	4.3	-			
D - Unstable	0	-			
Not Ag	157.3	157.3	157.3	157.3	
TOTAL	**183.3**	**186.94**			

*See 3.2.1 for ecological state definitions

2015 Biennial Review Activities

By the 2015 biennial review, ODA and the SWCD will compile information about the number and size of water quality improvement projects completed in the Demonstration Area since Area Plan and Rules adoption as resources allow.

- Within the Demonstration Area the following projects were completed:
  - Installation of 2,640' of riparian pasture and 12' rubber tire troughs to meet riparian objectives.
  - Installation of 2,500' of barbed wire fencing with three off-channel water troughs.
  - Placement of rock and wood structures in the stream channel at three locations on Natural Corral Creek (a perennial tributary with the Demonstration Area). These structures were designed with size and slope specifications that would trap sediments, armor the banks and allow for fish passage. Rock dimensions in the 12" to 18" category were placed in the key way and pit run gravel was placed on the downstream side of the structures. Each structure was placed at current active head cuts that are approximately 100' apart. Additionally, along both sides of the stream channel juniper trees were anchored with the tree tops pointing downstream. Placed junipers were anchored with pointed wood posts driven into the stream banks. No rock structure was placed at site #2 due to inadequate banks in which to anchor the rocks. Instead, extra junipers were placed along the banks at that location.
- By the 2015 biennial review, the SWCD will have offered technical assistance to all landowners in the Demonstration Area with lands where agricultural activities do not appear to allow streamside vegetation to provide WQ functions.
  - All landowners within the DA were offered technical assistance. As yet during the assessments, there has been no areas where agricultural activities are not allowing streamside vegetation to provide WQ functions.
- By the 2015 biennial review, the SWCD will report back to the LAC and ODA on the amount of outreach and education that was provide to landowners in the Demonstration Area.
  - The education and outreach provided to landowners has been solely through direct contact or communication as well as periodic newspaper articles. The SWCD currently has the capacity to 'ramp up' the education and outreach efforts beginning in winter 2016 to local stakeholders through community meetings.
- By June 2017, ODA and/or the LMA will complete a status report in the Demonstration Area and evaluate land condition changes over the two-year period.

4.3 Activities and Accomplishments

Many conservation activities and implementation monitoring tasks have been implemented to benefit water quality. The SWCD and NRCS track activities that have been implemented through quarterly reports to ODA and through a NRCS database, respectively. Projects that have received funding from the OWEB are tracked in OWEB's restoration database. In addition, partner agencies can submit reports of projects and activities in the Management Area that improve water quality.

Demonstration Area/Focus Area activities are captured in 4.2.

Basin-wide Actions/Implementation Summary:

Outreach and Education:

- SWCD
  - Developed and submitted one article to the Burns Times Herald.
  - Held one meeting for CCAA outreach.
  - Conducted outreach for the last two years at Harney County Fair booth.
  - A direct calling outreach occurred within the demonstration area. We were able to make contact with eight landowners and have scheduled riparian surveys for 2016. (It is also noteworthy that because phone calls and visits were made as opposed to mass letters or a news statement, tense situations were able to be completely diffused and all questions were able to be addressed leaving the few resistant landowners open for further interaction in the future).
- Watershed Council:
  - Provided youth education focusing on rangeland management for the High Desert Youth Range Camp and Sagebrush Steppe Camp.

Planning and Projects:

- SWCD:
  - Sage grouse CCAA- Received signups from 58 landowners for Site Specific Plans (SSP) within Harney County. Provided technical assistance to 38 landowners, which included conducting threat assessments, site evaluations, etc.
  - SAGECON- Participation in statewide planning efforts for ESA listing decision for Sage grouse.
  - AGWQM- Participation in statewide coordination of program TA/Implementation efforts on 6+2 committee.
    - **SWCD Rangeland health project(s)**
      - Conducted 4 rangeland health assessments.
      - Removal of 792.4 acres of western juniper.
      - Provided native & introduced grass seed for re-seeding pile burn areas.
      - Installation of 21,077' of pasture cross fencing to promote livestock distribution.
      - Treatment of 5,000 acres of invasive species.
    - **SWCD Riparian and water quality improvement project(s)**
      - Installation of 9056' of riparian pasture fence.
      - Install 13 off-stream watering facilities.
      - Installation of 4 spring developments with associated protective enclosures.
      - Watershed Council: Treating 640 acres of knapweed, perennial pepperweed, scotch thistle, and whitetop along Cottonwood Creek.

- Watershed Council:
    - Letter of Interest submitted to OWRD to begin a groundwater initiative to address current and future water needs in the Harney Basin.
    - Started strategic planning to help prioritize projects within the seven sub-basins that the council covers.
    - Kimball Grazing Improvement: installed solar water pump, developed well and grazing management plan, installed cross fencing and conducted weed treatments.
    - Craft Point Juniper Burning: Improving mule deer habitat by cut and piling 233 acres of juniper located in prime winter habitat.

Monitoring:

- SWCD
    - Assess Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) (i.e. dimension, pattern, and profile) and riparian vegetation composition and stability rating. Conduct review, collect baseline range monitoring information, establish photos points, and develop measurable monitoring goals with Dr. Wayne Burkhardt; Steve Leonard; and Wayne Elmore on 8 miles of stream outside of the AQWQM Demonstration Area.
    - In September 2015 Steve Leonard and Wayne Elmore conducted training for Edwin Sparks to perform riparian assessments for the AWQMP. Training was conducted on sites that were previously assessed by Steve and Wayne in order to monitor any changes at these sites.
    - Upon completion of training, Edwin conducted surveys on 30 stream miles in the focus area. These surveys brought the total amount of stream miles assessed to 56 leaving an estimated 94 miles to be completed by October 2016.
    - GIS assessments were completed to determine a preliminary Non-Ag figure from non-private lands in the focus area. Completion of assessment indicated approximately 157 miles of Non-Ag stream within the focus area.
- Watershed Council
    - Monitoring well water static levels in Dog Mountain, Crane-Buchanan, and Princeton over the next five years.

Funding and Grants:

- **The district was able to secure 20 grants totaling $1,082,000 from OWEB and Federal sources.**
- USDA NRCS- Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) was also secured to implement conservation planning and implementation of conservation measures within the Silvies River Demonstration Area to improve both riparian and upland habitats.
- A $5.0 million dollar request for Focused Investment Partnership funds from OWEB has been requested by Malheur, Harney & Lake SWCDs for technical assistance and implementation funds for CCAA plans.

4.4 Water Quality Monitoring—Status and Trends

The Silvies River at West Loop Road has been monitored recently; from 2013 to the present. The only problem this site has is a few high Total Phosphorus concentrations (0.17 mg/l) and one elevated turbidity reading of 35 in March 2013. Otherwise, the other water quality parameters are good. It is challenging to find water quality monitoring funds. The LAC recognizes the need to for additional water quality monitoring.

4.5 Biennial Reviews and Adaptive Management

The LAC met two times for the 2016 Biennial Review (03/14/2016 and 04/06/2016). The biennial review meetings consisted of updating language throughout the Area Plan as well as discussing the New Chapter Format and Measurable Objectives.

ODA presented the program updates from the past two years. This included Demonstration Area/Focus Areas, Strategic Implementation Areas and the new Chapter Format for the Area Plans. ODA presented the major edits of the Area Plan to the LAC.

There are no enforcement actions in the Management Area.

References

Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. 2012. Assessing the Health of Streams in Agricultural Landscapes: The Impacts of Land Management Change on Water Quality. Special Publication No. 31. Ames, Iowa.

2.3.3 – Pages 23-29

[1]Oregon Climate Data (Oregon State University). www.ocs.orst.edu/ocs_data.htm
[2]*USDA Report on Water and Related Land Resources, Malheur Lake Drainage Basin, Oregon*. United States Department of Agriculture. April 1967. 171 pages.
[3]*Malheur Lake Basin*. Oregon State Water Resources Board. June 1967. 110 pages.
[4]Greater Harney Basin Local Advisory Committee. Personal communications, 2002.
[5]Larry L. Hubbard. *Hydrology of Malheur Lake, Harney County, Southeastern Oregon*. United States Geological Survey. Water Resources Investigations 21-75. 1975.
[6]*Harney County Water Analysis, Harney County, Oregon*. Harney County Planning Department. August 28, 1995.
[7]Tim Smith, Registered Geologist and LAC member. Personal communication, 2002.
[8]L.A. Fuste' and S.W. McKenzie. *Water Quality of the Malheur Lake System and Malheur River, and simulated water-quality effects of routing Malheur Lake water into Malheur River, Oregon, 1984-85*. United States Geological Survey. Water Resources Investigations Report 86-4202. 1986.
[9]Silver Creek Subbasin Assessment. Harney Watershed Council. May 2000.
[10]Silvies Sub-Basin Assessment. Harney Watershed Council. October 2000.
[11]*Regional Economic Benefits of Ecotourism and Operation Associated with the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge*. Northwest Economic Association. 2001.
[12]Mike Zwart, Oregon Water Resources Department-Groundwater Division. Personal Communication. 2002.
[13]Anadarko Petroleum Corporation. *Pueblo Valley Geothermal Project: Plan of development, utilization, production, injection and disposal*. Report submitted to Burns District Bureau of Land Management. 1995.
[14]U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Recovery Plan for the Borax Lake Chub, Gila boraxobius*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 57 pp. 1987.
[15]Cummings, M. L. and A. G. Johnson. *Analysis of data for Borax Lake, Harney County Oregon: Boundaries of and exclusion and elevated performance standards zones*. Department of Geology, Portland State University. 74 pp. 1997.
[16]Burns Paiute Tribe. Personal communication, 2002.
[17]*Malheur National Wildlife Refuge Master Plan and Environmental Assessment*. US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1985.
[18]Population Research Center – Portland State University *http://www.pdx.edu/prc/annual-population-estimates*
[19]Economic Data. Oregon Economic and Community Development Department. *http://www.oregon4biz.com/Oregon-by-the-numbers/oregon-economic-data/*
[20]Oregon State University Extension Service, Oregon Agricultural Information Network. http://oain.oregonstate.edu/SignIn.asp
[21]Mitch Lewis, Oregon Water Resources Department; Watermaster for Harney County. Personal communication, 2002.
[22]Rick Roy, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Supervisory Biologist. Personal communication, 2002.
[23]Behnke, R. J. 1992. Native trout of western North America. American Fisheries Society, Monograph 6, Bethesda, Maryland.

2.4.2 – Pages 30-32

[4] Moore, J.A. and J.R. Miner. *Stream Temperatures: Some Basic Considerations*. Oregon State University Extension Service. EC 1489. May 1997.
[5] Allen, J.D. *Stream Ecology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. 2001.
[6] Kirkpatrick, L.D. and G.F. Wheeler. *Physics: A World View*. Harcourt Brace College Publishers. 1995.
[7] Stoneman, C.L. and M.L. Jones. A simple method to classify stream thermal stability with single observations of daily maximum water and air temperatures. N. Amer. J. of Fish. Managem. 16:128-131. 1996.
[8] Larson, L. and P.A. Larson. The natural heating and cooling of water. Rangelands 19:6-8. 1997.
[9] Mohseni, O. and H.G. Stefan. Stream temperature/air temperature relationship: a physical interpretation. J. Hydrol. 28: 128-141. 1999.
[10] *Harney County Water Analysis, Harney County, Oregon*. Harney County Planning Department. August 28, 1995.
[11] Greater Harney Basin Local Advisory Committee. Personal communication, 2002.

Additional references can be found in: Larson, P. *DRAFT Literature Review of Best Available Science on Statitstics (sic), River Systems, Water Science and the Physical Laws, Livestock use of Riparian Communities, Nutrients & Sediments in the Riparian Communities, Fish*. Oregon Cattlemen's Association. January 2002.

2.4.4 – Pages34-36

[1] Steve Namitz, LAC member and Burns Paiute Tribe fisheries biologist. Personal communication, 2002.
[2] *Oregon's 2010 Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Waterbodies*. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.
[3] Bruce Hammon. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, TMDL Basin Coordinator. Personal communication, 2002.
[10] *Harney County Water Analysis, Harney County, Oregon*. Harney County Planning Department. August 28, 1995.
[11] Greater Harney Basin Local Advisory Committee. Personal communication, 2002.

2.5.5 – Pages 40-42

[1] Green, T.R., S.G. Beavis, C.R. Dietrich, and A.J. Jakeman. Relating stream-bank erosion to in-stream transport of suspended sediment. Hydrological Processes 13:777-787. 1999.
[2] Selby, M.J. *Hillslope materials and processes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. 1982.
[3] Abernathy, B., and I.D. Rutherford. Where along a river's length will vegetation most effectively stabilize stream banks? Geomorphology 23:55-75. 1998.
[4] Beschta, R.L. Riparian shade and stream temperature; an alternative perspective. Rangelands 19:25-28. 1997.
[5] Bilby, R.E. Characteristics and frequency of cool-water areas in a western Washington stream. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 2:593-602. 1984.
[6] Auble, G.T., J.M. Friedman, and M.L. Scott. Relating riparian vegetation to present and future streamflows. Ecological Applications 4:544-554. 1994.
[7] Hirschi, M., R. Frazee, G. Czapar, and D. Peterson. *Sixty ways farmers can protect surface water*. North Central Regional Pub. 589. University of Illinois, Urbana, IL. 1997.
[8] Whiting, P.J., and M. Pomeranets. A numerical study of bank storage and its contribution to streamflow. Journal of Hydrology 202:121-136. 1997.
[9] Stringham, T., J. Buckhouse, and W. Krueger. Subsurface irrigation: Field measurements of return flow and impact on stream temperature. p. 77- 90. *In* W.C. Krueger, T.K. Stringham, and C.E. Kelley (eds.) *Environmental and management impacts on stream temperature. Final report*. Dept. of Rangeland Resources, Oregon State University. Corvallis, OR. 1999.
[10] Godwin, D. and J.A. Moore. *Manure management in small farm livestock operations: Protecting surface and groundwater*. Extension Bulletin EM 8649. Oregon State University Extension Service. Corvallis, OR. 1997.
[11] Munoz-Carpena, R., J.E. Parsons, and J.W. Gilliam. Modeling hydrology and sediment transport in vegetative filter strips. Journal of Hydrology 214:111-129. 1999.
[12] Castelle, A.J., A.W. Johnson, and C. Conolly. Wetland and stream buffer size requirements: A review. Journal of Environmental Quality 23:878-882. 1994.
[13] Hjelmfelt, A. and M. Wang. Modeling hydrologic and water quality responses to grass waterways. Journal of Hydrologic Engineering 4:251-256. 1999.
[14] Bruce Hammon. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, TMDL Basin Coordinator. Personal communication, 2002.
[15] Lacey, J.R., C.,B. Marlow, and J.R. Lane. Influence of spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*) on surface runoff and sediment yield. Weed Technol. 3:627-631. 1989.

[16] Rosgen, D.L. *Applied River Morphology*. Wildland Hydrology. 1996.
[17] *Riparian Area Management: Process for Assessing Proper Functioning Condition*. Bureau of Land Management. Technical Reference 1737-9. 1993.
[18] Rick Roy, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Supervisory Biologist. Personal communication, 2005.
[19] Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health, NRCS Technical Reference 1734-6. 2000. Available at: *ftp://ftp.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/pub/glti/IntIndRangeHealth.pdf*
[20] Miller, R.F. and J.A. Rose. Historic expansion of *Juniperus occidentalis* (western juniper) in southeast Oregon. Great Basin Natur. 5591): 37-45. 1995.
[21] Miller, R.F., T.J. Svejcar, and J.A. Rose. Impacts of western juniper on plant community composition and structure. J. Range Manage. 53:574-585. 2000.
[22] Wall, T.G., R.F. Miller, and T.J. Svejcar. Juniper encroachment into aspen in the northwest Great Basin. J. Range Manage. 54:691-698. 2001.
[23] Owens, M.K., R. Lyons, and C. Kneuper. Evaporation and interception water loss from juniper communities on the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Area. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service Quarterly Report. April 2, 2001.
[24] West, N.E. Strategies for maintenance and repair of biotic community diversity on rangelands. In: *R.C. Szaro and D.W. Johnson (eds.), Biodiversity in Managed Landscapes: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, New York. 1996. Page 340.
[25] Branson, F.A., et al. *Rangeland Hydrology*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, IA. 1981. Pages 189-190.

<u>Additional references can be found in</u>: Larson, P. *DRAFT Literature Review of Best Available Science on Statistics (sic), River Systems, Water Science and the Physical Laws, Livestock use of Riparian Communities, Nutrients & Sediments in the Riparian Communities, Fish*. Oregon Cattlemen's Association. January 2002.