# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-113** | **Project Type:** | Acquisition |
| **Project Name:** | Gotter Prairie Floodplan Expansion (GPFE) | | |
| **Applicant:** | Metro | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Washington |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$479,000.00** | **Total Cost:** | $2,500,000.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Metro requests $479,000 to purchase a 253-acre floodplain property adjacent to the Tualatin River at approximately RM 29 in Washington County. The property is a piece of a larger property, and Metro is negotiating an Option Agreement with the landowner that will include property line adjustments. Metro is pursuing the property line adjustment to clearly separate the floodplain property from upland portions of the larger property. An appraisal has not been completed; however the property that Metro proposes to buy has an estimated value of $979,000. Metro has obtained a $500,000 grant for the acquisition match and will use approximately $1,521,000 of Metro bond funds to acquire the remainder of the property.

Metro owns and manages Gotter Prairie Natural Area just 800 feet downriver and they are negotiating with the owner of the property between the two for a possible future purchase. The Gotter Prairie Floodplain Expansion property has the potential for approximately 105 acres of wet prairie, 54 acres of freshwater marsh, 43 acres of riparian forest and shrub, and 50 acres of oak woodland. Because the property has been farmed (cattle grazing and haying) the majority of the property will require some form of habitat restoration.

Metro is pursuing the property line adjustment process through Washington County. The landowner is cooperating on the process. Metro expects to execute an agreement by January 2012 and order appraisals at that time. Separately, Metro was awarded $500,000 of North America Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) funds for this acquisition in 2011. Metro anticipates the property line adjustment will take at least 6 months and anticipates closing around the end of 2012.

The application states that the priority ecological systems proposed for conservation are: oak woodland (50 acres currently); Willamette Valley wet prairie (none currently; 105 acres after restoration); Riparian forest and shrubland (22 acres currently; 43 after restoration); and Freshwater emergent marsh (0 acres currently; 54 acres after restoration). The property floods on a regular basis with the entire 243 acres within the 100 year flood plain. A significant portion of the property is characterized by hydric soils indicating historic wetland conditions.

The application states that the project will benefit the following rare or at-risk plant communities: Wet prairie, Emergent wetland, White oak savanna, and Riparian forest.

The application states that while few priority species occur at the present time, restoration will benefit winter steelhead, Nelson's checkermallow, Northern red-legged frog, western meadowlark streaked horned lark and white breasted nuthatch.

The application states that the project is consistent with 4 of OWEB's conservation principles, and therefore will: protect a large intact area, restore function, improve connectivity of habitat, and complement an existing network of sites in the basin.

# REVIEW PROCESS

## Regional Review Team Evaluation

The RRT was, overall, very supportive of the project, noting that it is a great opportunity to restore wetlands by restoring hydrology on the property. The RRT also pointed out that this project will protect 7200' of Tualatin River frontage and is adjacent to the successful Gotter Prairie Natural Area. They concluded that the Gotter Prairie Floodplain Expansion project had very high ecological value.

The RRT felt that the project has good, not outstanding, educational merit. It was recognized that Metro uses the Gotter Prairie Natural Area for outdoor educational purposes. Metro is well organized to provide extensive outreach opportunities to its natural area properties. While the property will disperse the impact of the outdoor camps on the adjoining property, it will not, standing alone, provide new or distinct educational opportunities from that area. The RRT noted that Metro hopes to use the property to educate neighboring landowners about conservation opportunities in the area.

## Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

High Ecological and Medium Educational value.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-116** | **Project Type:** | Acquisition |
| **Project Name:** | North Santiam River Acquisition Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Marion |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$1,250,000.00** | **Total Cost:** | $3,500,000.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Withdrawn by applicant prior to review.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

**Application No.:** 212-3027 **Project Type:** Outreach
**Project Name:** Meldrum Bar Restoration and Outreach Project (Meldrum Bar Project)
**Applicant:** Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership
**Basin:** WILLAMETTE **County:** Clackamas
**OWEB Request:** **$27,935.00** **Total Cost:** $60,891.00

---

**Application Description**
The project is a continuation of current OWEB-supported work at the Meldrum Bar Natural Area. The applicant and others are currently working with support from the City of Gladstone to engage citizens in activities that increase understanding of watershed issues. The project will sustain and expand progress by engaging 775 local youths and adults in habitat enhancement activities at the 11-acre site. Students, teachers, and parent chaperones from 24 fourth-sixth grade classes, and community volunteers, will remove invasive plants and install native trees and shrubs in the natural area. Field trips and volunteer days address a lack of on-going opportunities for citizens to engage in such activities, and they help the City of Gladstone improve and manage a unique natural area along this downriver stretch of the Willamette River. Project assessments, participant numbers, and enhancement results will determine project success. Partners include the City of Gladstone and student and parent volunteers. OWEB funds will be used primarily for in-house personnel and contracted services.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
Reviewers ranked this application in the top three outreach projects in the Willamette Basin. This is a continuing effort with strong results in Clackamas and Multnomah counties. Reviewers found the application to be well written, providing good detail and strong letters of support. They felt that the program is well-rounded with diverse offerings linked to actual restoration activities. In addition, it meets state education standards and reaches a large number of students. The program leads are qualified and experienced. While reviewers found the program assessment process to be adequately detailed, they nevertheless found it lacking in terms of paying attention to teacher feedback. They encourage the applicant to continue honing the program through rigorous assessment.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
3 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$27,935.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund with Conditions. The final completion report should include a description of the canoe/hike trip including its connection and importance to the students' understanding and appreciation of the service learning project.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$27,935.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$27,935.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3034** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | McKenzie Watershed Outreach Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | McKenzie WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$24,648.00** | **Total Cost:** | $118,346.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Since 2007, the applicant has pursued the development of a program that integrates watershed education with active watershed enhancement and monitoring. The program targets middle and high students from three school districts within the McKenzie Watershed and private landowners within four priority areas. Students participate on a number of different teams: Water quality, stream habitat, riparian restoration, and riparian assessment. Landowners are recruited through direct contact, public meetings, and distribution of monitoring data. The educational aspects of the program are integrated directly into collaborative monitoring and enhancement activities. Not only will students be working on existing restoration projects, but data from student monitoring will be used to inform and prioritize new restoration projects. Student collected data will also help form the basis of outreach to private landowners in an effort to involve them in voluntary enhancement projects. Partners include Eugene Water and Electric Board and USDA Forest Service. OWEB funding will support project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This is a continuing effort with strong results in Lane County. Reviewers like the broad reach of the program, across two school districts, involving middle and high school students. The program is popular and has dynamic leadership. Reviewers found the application to be well-written, and appreciated the large cash match. They noted that the project has a successful track record and well-qualified program leads.

Reviewers noted that parts of the application seemed somewhat scattered and lacked focus particularly around the landowner recruitment. They noted that the applicant had submitted a separate technical assistance application for landowner recruitment, some of which is to occur in the same area (Cedar Creek) as this application. Reviewers sought to have this discrepancy cleared up and directed the regional program representative to look into it following the RRT meeting.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

4 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$24,648.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will provide that, prior to a first payment, Grantee will document in writing that funds from this grant will not be used for direct landowner outreach efforts conducted for Cedar Creek landowners. Cedar Creek landowner recruitment is recommended for funding through application 212-3035.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$24,648.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$24,648.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3040** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Youth Engaged - Schools Building Habitat | | |
| **Applicant:** | Johnson Creek WC | | |
| **Basin:** | LOWER COLUMBIA | **County:** | Multnomah |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$22,785.00** | **Total Cost:** | $44,557.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Teachers seek opportunities to engage students in meaningful service learning opportunities, but finding the time and available funding for field trips are difficult. Students learn best with multiple styles/approaches, and need more opportunities to engage in hands-on projects. This project will involve students in service learning, provide teachers with curriculum to do this work while meeting state standards, and improve watershed health by improving habitat. By providing funding to help with field trips, as well as opportunities for on-campus restoration projects, OWEB support will make outdoor education accessible to teachers and students in the watershed, and involve parents and community members to help raise broader awareness of watershed health. Partners include East Multnomah SWCD and the WHH Foundation. OWEB funds will be used from project management, contracted services, and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This is a continuing effort with good results in Clackamas and Multnomah counties. The application noted that this grant will help expand the program. Reviewers were divided on this application. In general, they liked the partnership with Portland State University, the strong restoration component, and recognized that the program's reach has expanded. But reviewers also found the application to be lacking detail, especially on its accomplishments to date. They noted that the budget did not always align with the narrative. One reviewer questioned the low budget for supplies and materials given the amount of field work planned. Several reviewers questioned the wisdom of growing a program in a relatively small watershed when other, more well-established, far-reaching programs already exist in the metropolitan area. Other reviewers disagreed, noting that despite the array of outreach opportunities in the metropolitan area, there still are not enough, and moreover, they tend to focus on their own missions and interests. In the end, given the tight budget climate, reviewers chose not to recommend funding. They instead encourage the applicant to look to creating efficiencies by partnering with other well-established efforts.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3046** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Willamette Futures: A public awareness campaign on basinwide conservation needs | | |
| **Applicant:** | Freshwaters Illustrated | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Multnomah |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$40,000.00** | **Total Cost:** | $240,000.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The target audiences for Willamette Futures are landowners, active citizens, and students in the Willamette Basin who are lacking general literacy on watershed conservation needs and who may have low awareness of the work of watershed conservation groups. The project is focused on the strategic dissemination of an educational film through a series of local screening and discussion events, widespread classroom use, and public television broadcasts. The film will provide viewers with a perspective of the entire Willamette basin as an ecosystem, a working landscape, and as fertile ground for restorative efforts that are reviving its ability to provide clean water, and support healthy native communities of aquatic and riparian species. Partners include Meyer Memorial Trust, BLM, USDA Forest Service, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and numerous smaller foundations. OWEB funds will be used to support postproduction.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

OWEB's updated guidance for outreach applications, disseminated to potential applicants in July 2011 and discussed with this applicant, states that stand-alone "media" such as video production are not eligible for OWEB funding. OWEB staff discussed the eligibility questions with the review team. Reviewers liked the idea for the video, but thought that it was not an appropriate request because it is not an outreach project under OWEB's guidance; the applicant requested OWEB to fund only the production of the video and the application and budget did not include any match for outreach activities. Reviewers also commented that even if there was going to be outreach to landowners using this video, which was not clear from the application or the budget, the project had a very weak connection to on-the-ground restoration.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3050** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Urban Watershed Mentors | | |
| **Applicant:** | West Multnomah SWCD | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Multnomah |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$21,474.00** | **Total Cost:** | $29,659.00 |

**Application Description**

This training program will foster the creation of knowledgeable and engaged watershed leaders. Through a series of trainings, the program will create volunteer leaders with the ability to usher a project idea from planning to implementation. The program will use a mentor model to provide new volunteer leaders with community support and guidance. Outreach activities will occur in Southwest Portland and in the Tryon Creek and Tualatin River watersheds. Field trips and watershed enhancement projects will also be conducted in the target watersheds (Tualatin and Tryon) in Southwest Portland. Partners include Tualatin River Watershed Council and OSU Extension. OWEB Funds will be used to support staff time to coordinate the program, transportation, speaker fees, fiscal and grant administration and education materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers liked the purpose of the project to train restoration leaders and increase participation in restoration work. They appreciated the needs assessment and the effort to ensure participant follow-through by requiring a sign up. But after much discussion, reviewers concluded that the application did not give them confidence that the investment would achieve the stated goals. They noted that the applicant does not have a track record for this work. While they believed the applicant would work hard to achieve the results, they were skeptical based on their own experiences working in similar efforts that adequate follow-through would occur. They wondered why the applicant – or its partner, OSU Extension – simply didn't charge for the training and then refund a portion to those volunteers who follow through. They found a weak connection between the class and resulting on-the-ground work. They noted that the budget showed no costs to OWEB for on-the-ground activities, and the narrative did not identify any project sites, which increased their skepticism that the training would result in meaningful on-the-ground work.

In the end, reviewers concluded that the project was worthy, but was seen as more of a risk than established projects with successful track records.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

**Application No.:** **212-3054** **Project Type:** Outreach
**Project Name:** Green Team for Watershed Health (project #GT.11-12)
**Applicant:** SOLV
**Basin:** WILLAMETTE **County:** Clackamas
**OWEB Request:** **$20,925.00** **Total Cost:** $43,363.00

---

**Application Description**
SOLV's Green Team program will engage approximately 180 high school science classes in Clackamas and Multnomah counties on stream restoration projects. Green Teams commit to stewardship activities at a SOLV restoration site for the duration of the school year, doing invasive removal, native planting, photo-point and vegetation monitoring, macro-invertebrate sampling, and bioengineering. Green Team projects create shade and reduce erosion by replacing non-native plant species with native plants and through bioengineering. The Green Team works closely with science teachers both in the classroom and in the field to develop appropriate watershed-based curriculum. Stream enhancement efforts will benefit habitat for coho and Chinook salmon. Students will become empowered and water conditions enhanced for salmon and wildlife. Partners include Umpqua Bank, State Farm Insurance, Weyerhaeuser Foundation, Clackamas River Basin Council, and ODOT. OWEB funds will be used for project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
Reviewers ranked this application in the top three outreach projects in the Willamette Basin. This is a continuing effort with strong results in Clackamas and Multnomah counties, including riparian planting, invasives removal, erosion control, and monitoring on Rinearson and Beaver creeks. Reviewers found this to be a solid application with attention to detail, excellent partnerships and match, and strong letters of support. This is a holistic effort, involving classroom and service learning, with well-established pre- and post-testing. Reviewers particularly liked the innovative blog concept, which they felt would have broad appeal among students.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
2 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$20,925.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$20,925.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$20,925.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3058** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Watershed Rangers Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Middle Fork Willamette WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$22,300.00** | **Total Cost:** | $48,800.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The target audience is 3rd-12th grades in the Middle Fork Willamette watershed, an estimated 700 students and 30 teachers. The project addresses a need for students to make the connection between outdoor experiences, in class studies, and local conservation issues by providing field experiences and service-learning projects. By providing students with hands-on experiences, working side by side with professionals in resource management, the project gives youth the necessary tools to become future leaders in restoration, monitoring, and protection of watershed resources. The project takes place in three elementary schools and three junior/senior high schools and in various sites outside of the schools. Partners include Meyer Memorial Trust, US Army Corps of Engineers, USDA Forest Service, BLM and OPRD. OWEB funds will be used for project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This is a continuing effort with strong results in mainly suburban and underserved rural areas of Douglas and Lane counties. Reviewers like the approach of teaching teachers to lead the program, as well as the interactive ways for teachers to participate. Partnerships and match are strong. They appreciated the variety of project sites where restoration work will occur and the diversity of activities, such as riparian planting, invasives removal, white oak and native grass habitat enhancement, and monitoring. The map showed both the schools and the sites to be visted and worked on.

Reviewers were disappointed that the application did not do a better job discussing a coherent process for evaluating and improving the program. Reviewers would have liked some discussion on what has been accomplished to date. Native plant costs were steep; reviewers felt that this established program could have negotiated plants at a much lower cost.

Despite the weaknesses in the application, reviewers were familiar with the track record of this project and felt comfortable recommending it for funding.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund with Conditions. The final completion report should include; 1. A table detailing a schedule for the activities provided: which schools, how many classes visited, how many times, theme/subject of the lesson including when kids taken outdoors and what they did. 2. For the outdoor activities, a description of the student monitoring or restoration activities and the objectives (learning or ecological) for conducting the activity. 3. A copy of the curriculum that was developed should be provided to "EEAO" – Environmental Education Association of Oregon, and provided to OWEB for inclusion on the OWEB website.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$22,300.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$22,300.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$22,300.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3059** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | South Santiam Youth Watershed Council | | |
| **Applicant:** | South Santiam WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Linn |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$9,152.00** | **Total Cost:** | $27,152.00 |

---

**Application Description**
The nationally recognized STEWARDS Youth Watershed Council program will engage students from Sweet Home High School in civic and watershed enhancement activities as they learn about watershed ecology, watershed councils, and how to create change in their own communities. Youth Watershed Council members will be encouraged to attend the South Santiam Watershed Council meetings throughout the school year, as well as to present their in-service projects to the community. Partners include Sweet Home Community Foundation, Sweet Home School District, and USDA Forest Service. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
Reviewers ranked this application as the top outreach project in the Willamette Basin. This is a continuing effort with strong results in Linn County. Reviewers greatly appreciated the low cost to OWEB. This program is marked by strong civic involvement in meaningful watershed habitat restoration activities. Students who have completed the program have gone on to become trainers of younger students. The partnership with the USDA Forest Service is a great example of cost sharing. Reviewers would have liked more letters of support, but the letter from USFS was very strong. The application was weak on measures for program improvement and reviewers would like to see an expanded discussion in future applications. They would also like a little more information on past projects; one reviewer commented that "the project names sounded really interesting."

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
1 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$9,152.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$9,152.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$9,152.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3060** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Central Linn Youth Outreach Program | | |
| **Applicant:** | Calapooia WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Linn |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$25,444.00** | **Total Cost:** | $71,260.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The Central Linn Youth Outreach Program is a partnership between the Calapooia Watershed Council and the Central Linn School District. It will reach 450 elementary school students, as well as educators and community members. This young target audience resides in the highest priority sub-basins and mainstem reaches of the Calapooia where most of the Council's restoration and conservation work occurs. While adult awareness of watershed health has increased, the local elementary school lacks a watershed program. The program's direct link to associated content standards, field activities, stream and restoration monitoring activities, and the Outdoor School, will help raise watershed awareness. Partners include the Grey Family Foundation, Spirit Mountain Community Fund, and Central Linn School District. OWEB funds will be used for project management and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers had a high opinion of Outdoor School (one had even experienced it as a student many years ago!), but noted that the program has a broader "outdoor" focus rather than a watershed restoration focus They found the restoration component to be vague and not well thought out and found little evidence in the application of a strong tie to watershed restoration or monitoring activities.

The budget did not always align with the narrative. While match appeared to be strong, they thought some of the pending funds might be optimistic. Central Linn Fundraising showed $12,000 pending, but reviewers noted that the group had provided just $3,000 previously and the letter of support made no dollar commitment.

Reviewers appreciated the goals and community involvement in the project, but the lack of a strong tie to watershed restoration combined with the concern about the weak match led them to recommend that OWEB not start funding a whole new program (new to OWEB). Reviewers commended the applicant for not reinventing the wheel by proposing to base the effort on the successful, neighboring South Santiam STEWARDS program. They wondered whether the applicant could work more closely with South Santiam's effort. Reviewers appreciated the thoughtful clarifications provided by the program assistant to their pre-review requests for additional information.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3061** | **Project Type:** | Outreach |
| **Project Name:** | Marys River Outdoor Classrooms: A Collaborative Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Marys River WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Benton |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$46,059.00** | **Total Cost:** | $83,209.00 |

---

**Application Description**
The target audience is 240 4th-8th graders from four schools, eight teachers, and at least 25 volunteers. The applicant will provide a total of ten field visits centered on riparian and upland restoration, supported by in-classroom and greenhouse instruction. Student restoration projects will be located on the Greenbelt Land Trust's Evergreen property, part of a larger conservation effort. On-the-ground restoration projects will be completed in each of the two funding years and increased knowledge will be revealed in improvement in compiled pre-and post-test results. Partners include Greenbelt Land Trust, Oregon Community Foundation, and Benton SWCD. OWEB funds will be used for project management, contracted services, and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
Reviewers liked that this program was building on a previous OWEB acquisition and that it was creating efficiencies by combining with another seasoned outreach group. The educators are experienced and match is excellent. However, they found the application to be very expensive, far exceeding the average for most Region 3 outreach requests. The budget seemed top-heavy in personnel/contracted service support. Reviewers were unclear as to what each person would be doing and wondered whether there was overlap. In the end, they recommended a fund with the condition of reducing the award to no more than $25,000 for a one-year pilot.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Total request of OWEB not to exceed $25,000.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
5 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$25,000.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Total request of OWEB not to exceed $25,000.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$25,000.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$25,000.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

**Application No.:** **212-3063** **Project Type:** Outreach
**Project Name:** St. Helens School Partnership Service Learning Project
**Applicant:** Scappoose Bay WC
**Basin:** WILLAMETTE **County:** Columbia
**OWEB Request:** **$29,953.00** **Total Cost:** $52,153.00

---

**Application Description**
The target audience will be 540 high school and middle school students in the St. Helens School district that are studying natural resource science courses. There is a critical need to provide a hands-on connection between what students are learning in the classroom and how that knowledge can be applied in the field. Many students are disconnected from natural resources issues and are intimidated by the technical nature of science classes. The project will enhance a wetland and will provide valuable water quality and macroinvertebrate data that will be used to monitor the health of Milton Creek. Partners include the St. Helen's School District. OWEB funds will be used for project management, contracted services, and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
The program shows a strong indoor/outdoor component and builds on a successful, integrated effort started by two area teachers. Partnerships and match are strong.

Reviewers would have liked more information on the program's accomplishments to date. Reviewers were not keen about the long list of supplies; they felt the eight GPS units were not critical and that four units ought to suffice. They did not think it appropriate for OWEB to pay for any costs associated with the trail/boardwalk. They questioned the sense of OWEB paying more for the project manager than for the field staff. Finally, they felt that the cost to OWEB for guide production was excessive, and recommended a 50 percent cut.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Remove all costs associated with the trail boardwalk, OWEB to pay for no more than four GPS units, reduce guide production by 50 percent, resolve the line item costs for the project manager and coordinator.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
7 of 7

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$22,498.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document that OWEB funds must not be used for any trail building work; OWEB will pay for no more than four GPS units, guide production costs are reduced by 50 percent.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$21,824.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$21,824.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3028** | **Project Type:** | Monitoring |
| **Project Name:** | Wapato Lake Restoration Monitoring | | |
| **Applicant:** | Hillsboro Water/Joint Water Commission | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Washington |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$179,094.00** | **Total Cost:** | $401,045.00 |

**Application Description**

Wapato Lake is a seasonally flooded lakebed located in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon. Proper land management is vital to the ecological health of the lake, as well as downstream in the Tualatin River. In 2008, water discharged from Wapato Lake released toxic blue-green algae and zooplankton into the Tualatin River, causing treatment problems for water utility providers. To avoid similar events in the future, land managers with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have developed a Comprehensive Conservation Plan to guide future strategies for the Wapato Lake area. As part of this plan, land managers would like to monitor water-quality conditions in and out of the lake. Interested shareholders in this research include the USFWS, the U.S. Geological Survey, and Clean Water Services. The project will collect water samples for nutrient analysis, including dissolved and total phosphorous, dissolved ammonia and carbon, nitrite plus nitrate, total nitrogen, algae, zooplankton, and other parameters. OWEB funds will be used for project coordination and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The area is part of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge and ecologically significant for its rich peat soils and wildlife habitat. Partnerships and match are strong. No fiscal administration is requested.

While the project seeks to address a site-specific water quality problem, reviewers could not discern from the application whether it is a priority for the watershed. For many reviewers, the objectives seemed unclear; algal blooms occur frequently in nature and don't always result in fish kills. Reviewers acknowledged that the monitoring could provide useful baseline information, but they felt that the underlying issue is a nutrient problem related to grazing, the ponding of water in the fall/winter, and the timing of spring/summer releases. They saw this as a management issue more than anything else, requiring a hard look at how water is stored and released and working to restore the natural function of the lake. For a much more cost-effective solution, reviewers recommended changing the management on site and monitoring the outlet of the lake.

In budget issues, reviewers found the USGS rates to be exceedingly high. While they are aware of the agency's high-quality work, the budget, nevertheless, seemed steep for monitoring at just six locations. As a result, some reviewers suggested reducing the number of parameters to be monitored or the frequency of sampling. The travel budget category appeared to exceed the state's reimbursement rate.

In the end, reviewers concluded that timing for funding this proposal was not critical. They suggested that the applicant consider a much scaled back request linked to the soon-to-be completed USFWS Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the reserve, and in addition, seek more funding partners.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation**

The OPMT recognized the unique situation of water quality in the Tualatin River and possible negative impacts from Wapato Lake on water quality. There was also conversation about the impact from possible agricultural sources on the water quality in Wapato Lake and that there is a knowledge gap on the processes that are currently affecting water quality in this area. There was interest in possibly developing a less expensive alternative to collecting baseline information. It was also discussed that the property is now managed by a federal agency and there may be alternatives for future monitoring collaboration in the basin.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: Medium

Certainty of success: Medium

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3041** | **Project Type:** | Monitoring |
| **Project Name:** | Molalla River & Milk Creek Rapid Bio Assessment | | |
| **Applicant:** | Molalla River Watch Inc | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$37,880.00** | **Total Cost:** | $58,057.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The applicant plans to contract with Bio-Surveys LLC to implement year two of the Molalla Watershed Rapid Bio Assessment (RBA). The first year covered the upper watershed; year two will cover the Molalla mainstem and Milk Creek, as well as conduct a spawning gravel inventory of the Upper Molalla to complete baseline surveys of the entire watershed. Salmonid abundance and distribution throughout the watershed is poorly documented. A basin scale inventory of Molalla salmonid abundance and distribution will provide a foundation to identify and prioritize habitat restoration actions that support ESA recovery goals. Year two of the RBA will quantify the abundance and distribution of ESA-listed spring Chinook salmon, winter steelhead, coho salmon, and resident rainbow and cutthroat trout in 140 stream miles of the watershed. Partners include BLM and ODFW. OWEB funds will be used for contracted services, project management, landowner outreach, and fiscal administration.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This was the top-ranked monitoring application in the Willamette Basin. Reviewers were generally pleased with the proposal, seeing it as a strategic, step-wise approach from previous assessment work in the upper watershed, now to the lower watershed. They applauded the adaptive approach to the previous grant, where the assessment revealed a lack of gravel in some upper reaches and noted that the applicant will be taking steps to address that. The application was light on describing the RBA protocols, the project sampling locations, and the plans for outreach. Weyerhaeuser was listed as a supporter, but no letter of support was included. Nevertheless, reviewers saw this proposal as an essential effort to learn more about fish distribution in this major stream system, which to date, has been little studied. The information collected should help identify priority salmonid restoration areas. Reviewers appreciated the reasonable cost to OWEB from the contractor, noting that altogether the project will assess 140 miles.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

1 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$37,880.00** |

**Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation**

The OPMT appreciated the fact that this RBA was completing the lower portion of the Molalla River and combined with the RBA from a previous cycle would develop a clear picture of the salmonid distribution in this river. There was also discussion about previous RBAs and how consistently those results are being implemented as a decision support tool for identifying future restoration opportunities. The team would like to see some component of habitat assessment combined with future RBAs.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: High

Certainty of success: High

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$37,880.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$37,880.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3052** | **Project Type:** | Monitoring |
| **Project Name:** | Tryon Creek Water Quality Monitoring 2012-2013 | | |
| **Applicant:** | Tryon Creek Watershed Council | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Multnomah |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$7,019.00** | **Total Cost:** | $87,699.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The Tryon Creek watershed, located in southwest Portland, is largely undeveloped and publicly owned. Tryon Creek historically supported a number of native fish species, many of which are now either extirpated or rare. Fish passage barriers, especially Highway 43, and degraded habitat are believed to be the cause of fish declines here. Restoration actions have occurred and will continue to occur in the watershed, but overall progress is not tracked. This program will 1) monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of restoration, including improvements to the Highway 43 crossing, 2) develop a baseline characterization of the watershed, 3) establish a long-term citizen-based monitoring program by engaging citizens in the health of the watershed. Results of this monitoring will help inform plans for improving the Highway 43 crossing. Partners include USFWS and Friends of Tryon Creek. OWEB funds will be used to coordinate the effort and purchase basic equipment.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This exceedingly reasonable request for a citizen-based monitoring program is piggy-backing on ongoing USFWS surveys and using the agency's protocols. One reviewer challenged the reliability of citizen-collected data, but others felt that useful data could be collected noting that USFWS protocols are volunteer-friendly and still scientifically rigorous. Volunteer training and shadowing will help ensure data collection rigor. There was some concern expressed about a bacteria problem; reviewers encourage the applicant to monitor for E. coli, as well. Reviewers did not think much of the line item requests for the State of the Watershed event, but left them untouched, given the small amounts requested. Match and partnerships are strong.

Reviewers recommended it for funding, but wanted to be sure that there would be appropriate QA/QC, including data collection and cross-checking. They also sought to include monitoring for E. coli throughout the year with a slight budget increase.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Increased with Conditions. Monitor for E. coli; use appropriate QA/QC, including data collection and cross-checking.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

3 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$8,819.00** |

**Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation**

The OPMT approved of the use of the random sampling design to identify monitoring locations throughout the watershed. The team also recognized the issues in Tryon Creek and this monitoring was a good approach to identify some of the baseline conditions that exist. The monitoring being done to collect turbidity and temperature is important and it appears that the design will allow that information to be tied back to fish monitoring that is also being conducted. The data being collected will be valuable and will be used elsewhere and the team appreciated that fact. The team elected to add funds to the monitoring program to include macroinvertebrate sampling.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: High Certainty of success: High

**Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment**

In following up with the RRT after the meeting, staff will condition the grant agreement to have the applicant monitor for E. coli at four sites, once a month, for 12 months. Award to be increased by $1,800, mainly to cover lab costs for the 48 samples.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Increased with Conditions. Monitor for E. coli at four sites, once a month, for 12 months; award to be increased by $1,800, mainly to cover lab costs for the 48 samples. Use appropriate QA/QC, including data collection and cross-checking. The grant agreement will specify these conditions and the project completion report will need to address results of E coli monitoring in addition to results for the other parameters being monitored. Also monitor for macroinvertebrates at a minimum of five different sites, once per site. Ideally, sampling locations for macroinvertebrates will overlap with sampling locations identified for fish monitoring. The grant award has been increased by $2,000 to cover sampling and analysis costs. Sampling should follow the protocol described in Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's Water Monitoring and Assessment Mode of Operations Manual, March 2009. Technical assistance can be provided by OWEB and/or DEQ Monitoring staff. The project completion report will include results from the macroinvertebrate monitoring.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$10,819.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$10,819.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3062** | **Project Type:** | Monitoring |
| **Project Name:** | Santiam-Calapooia Water Quality Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | South Santiam WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Marion |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$93,805.00** | **Total Cost:** | $360,656.00 |

---

**Application Description**

There are numerous waterways within the North Santiam, South Santiam and Calapooia River basins that do not meet state standards for water quality and that are listed as impaired under section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) plan for the Willamette Basin has established the amount of allowable pollutants for the basin"s waterways. However, TMDL implementation by local Designated Management Agencies (DMAs) is stymied by a lack of water quality data. The project proposes to establish baseline water quality data at multiple locations through an intensive sampling effort. A diverse partnership includes five municipalities, two state agencies and three watershed councils. OWEB funds will be used to pay for sample collection, processing and preliminary data analysis.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This is an ambitious and comprehensive monitoring program, the results of which will help guide future collaborative restoration investments across three Model Watersheds. Forty sampling locations are distributed evenly among the three watersheds and will occur at a total of 40 locations above and below several cities and in agricultural areas. The applicant appears to be monitoring for all the right elements, including the large water quality culprit of E. coli, and data protocols are consistent with DEQ and EPA standards. Data will be used to support Upper Willamette River Fish Recovery recommendations to implement TMDL water actions in urban and rural areas. Partnerships, letters of support, and match are strong.

Reviewers felt that the AOI fish sampling was unnecessary. Reviewers also suggested eliminating the data loggers line item, which can be obtained gratis from DEQ. Reviewers encouraged the applicant to work with ODA staff in selecting monitoring sites. Although several cities provided letters of support, their overall match was very light, implying limited participation.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Eliminate AOI fish sampling, and look into whether project management can be reduced as a consequence. Eliminate data loggers line item; adjust fiscal administration accordingly.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$53,420.00** |

**Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation**

The OPMT identified with the need for this water quality monitoring and the connection to TMDL development and implementation and overall data integration. There was conversation of the applicant

working with smaller municipalities to collect water quality data and the importance of beginning those contacts. The team also discussed that the template for this monitoring work was adapted from the City of Eugene and it has proven successful in that city. There was a high confidence level that this project would succeed. There were some questions about macroinvertebrate sampling locations not identified in the application. Most likely, the information on macroinvertebrate sampling location would be identified in the Quality Assurance Project Plan that will be reviewed with DEQ.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: High Certainty of success: High

**Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment**

The applicant subsequently submitted a greatly reduced budget, but made a persuasive case for the need to keep project management at the original amount.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document the following changes to the project: Eliminate AOI fish sampling, eliminate data loggers line item; adjust fiscal administration accordingly.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$53,420.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$53,420.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3029** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Mt. Pisgah Prairies & Oak Savanna Restoration Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Friends of Buford Park & Mt Pisgah | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$146,471.00** | **Total Cost:** | $291,645.00 |

### Application Description
The project is located on Lane County's 2300-acre Buford Park (Howard Buford Recreation Area). The project site is near the confluence of the Coast and Middle fork Willamette rivers, adjacent to The Nature Conservancy's "Willamette Confluence Project," acquired in 2010. This park contains one of Oregon's largest publicly-owned expanses of "globally endangered" Willamette Valley upland prairie and oak savanna. OWEB funds will be used to restore and enhance 350 acres of upland prairie and oak savanna by controlling invasive blackberry and other weeds, thinning Douglas fir, using prescribed fire, and sowing native's grasses and wildflowers. Partners include Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah, The Nature Conservancy, Lane County, ODFW, ODA, ODF, and USFWS.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
Reviewers found the application to be well written and important for the area. Match is strong and at least half of it is secured. The park is a key biological diversity zone for upland prairie and oak savanna. The applicant has a good track record and the outreach component is sensible for this high-use public area. Prescriptions seemed very specific and thoughtfully planned though some reviewers had concern about the timing of tree thinning. In other comments, reviewers questioned the need for travel and the appropriateness of charging OWEB for the applicant's own nursery stock.

### Ecosystem Process and Function
The project will enhance plant species abundance and diversity, thereby contributing to improved habitat for neotropical songbirds.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund with Conditions. The applicant is to implement its planned tree-thinning activities outside the seasonal window for bird species nesting. If the applicant plans to use a private seed source, they will need to abide by procedures outlined in Exhibit A of the OWEB grant agreement and in the Billing Instructions packet. These conditions will be outlined in the grant agreement.

### Regional Review Team Priority
6 of 12

### Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$146,471.00** | | **$13,640.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will document that applicant is to implement its planned tree-thinning activities outside the seasonal window for bird species nesting. If the applicant plans to use a private seed source, they will follow procedures outlined in Exhibit A of the OWEB grant agreement and in the Billing Instructions packet.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$146,471.00** | | **$13,640.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$146,471.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3030** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Willamette Valley Oak Habitat Enhancement | | |
| **Applicant:** | The Nature Conservancy | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$305,337.00** | **Total Cost:** | $619,332.00 |

**Application Description**

The project occurs at five Willamette Valley sites: Four in the southern Valley and one in the north Valley. Of the former, three are TNC preserves (Willow Creek, Willamette Confluence, and Coburg Ridge), and one is City of Eugene property (Murray Hill). The site in the northern Willamette Valley occurs at TNC's Yamhill Oaks Preserve. Approximately 90 percent of the pre-settlement oak savanna and woodland habitat in the Willamette Valley has been lost to agricultural conversion, residential expansion, and encroachment of Douglas-fir. As a result, 155 plant and wildlife taxa are considered imperiled and six have been listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. Conservation and restoration of oak habitats is a priority in the Oregon Conservation Strategy, the NWPCC Willamette Subbasin Plan, and many local watershed plans. The proposed work at these sites, all identified as priority locations for oak conservation, will support restoration of 765 acres of savanna and woodland habitat. This project addresses the fundamental limiting factors for these habitats, i.e. stand density, fir encroachment, and large stature weeds. OWEB funds will be used to enhance areas identified in 1950s aerial photos as savanna or woodland, using a variety of hand and mechanical methods to remove weeds, reduce stand density, and increase native plant cover. The Bonneville Power Administration is the principal partner with letters of support from numerous groups.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The sites to be enhanced are in important areas, including the confluence of the Middle Fork Willamette and Coast Fork Willamette, Willow Creek and Yamhill Oaks with Fender's blue butterfly and Kincaid's lupine, and Coburg Ridge Preserve. Reviewers thought the budget was reasonable for 765 total acres of oak enhancement. Good detail was provided for all four sites, and one reviewer commented that the alternatives discussion was superb. Match funding is significant and mostly secured.

Despite the high quality of the proposal, reviewers spent time discussing priorities for funding since the application contained separate, unconnected sites. One reviewer commented that the Confluence site is a candidate for Willamette SIP funding, and therefore, should be considered instead through that program. When it was pointed out that Willamette SIP covers only floodplain areas, reviewers noted that the map attached to the application indicated that some work would occur in the floodplain areas. This was confusing to reviewers who understood from the site visit that the project would be solely an upland oak enhancement project.

After a long discussion, reviewers concluded that the opportunities for funding the Confluence site through the Willamette SIP or other Willamette funding should be explored. The application did not mention a management plan for the site, so this further suggested to reviewers that work on this large site could be postponed pending approval of a management plan.

One reviewer noted that a cost for native seed appeared to be missing from the budget, either as a cost to OWEB or as match. If the applicant plans to use a private seed source, they will need to abide by procedures outlined in Exhibit A of the OWEB grant agreement and in the Billing Instructions packet.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**
By enhancing canopy and understory vegetation conditions, numerous Oregon focal species are likely to benefit, including Western rattlesnake, Western gray squirrel, and several bird species.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund Reduced. The project is recommended for funding minus the Confluence site. Fiscal administration to be reduced to no more than $15,000.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
3 of 12

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$200,793.00** | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will show that the applicant will work on all four sites for the reduced amount of $200,793. At the Confluence site, all work on this grant will occur in upland portions only, which will be detailed in a separate grant agreement.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$200,793.00** | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$200,793.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3031** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Hobart Natural Area Wetland Restoration and Bradshaw's Lomatium Recovery | | |
| **Applicant:** | City of Sweet Home | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Linn |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$114,731.00** | **Total Cost:** | $185,133.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Willamette Valley prairie is one of the most endangered habitats in Oregon, and as such, is home to many rare species, including the state and federally listed Bradshaw's lomatium. The Hobart Natural Area in Sweet Home, Oregon, contains a 15-acre wetland that hosts one of the few populations of Bradshaw's lomatium left in the Willamette Valley. The wetland area (and the Bradshaw's lomatium population) has been impacted by non-native vegetation, woody plant encroachment, and illegal vehicle usage. The applicant proposes to develop a management plan for this site, improve creek and wetland function, enhance Bradshaw's lomatium habitat, and augment the population of this listed species within the natural area in an effort to help meet recovery objectives. Effectiveness monitoring will assess creek health, plant community composition, and establishment of introduced Bradshaw's lomatium. OWEB funds will be used for creek and wetland restoration activities; Bradshaw's lomatium seed collection, cultivation, introduction and monitoring; installation of fencing and/or boulders to restrict vehicle access. Partners include the South Santiam Watershed and Youth Watershed Councils, Institute for Applied Ecology, ODA, and USFWS.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers found the application to be well-written. The city has demonstrated a commitment to improving ecological process and function as evidenced by a successful river restoration project at a former mill site in the heart of downtown. This is an important recovery site within the Corvallis East Recovery Zone for listed Bradshaw's lomatium. The site is rapidly deteriorating.

While reviewers liked the project and felt some urgency to restore it, they had concerns that the applicant did not necessarily have a good grasp of what needs to occur initially and over the long term. They felt the applicant did not have a clear picture of how to address the "creek" running through the middle of the site. Reviewers saw it as nothing more than a ditch, originally dug to drain water from the site. They suggested filling it in so that water can be retained to enhance the wetland. They understood that outreach had been occurring, but were dismayed by the lack of any apparent effort to prevent, or at least reduce, illegal use of the site. They felt that the area could benefit from a management plan, especially since there is the potential to add to the site over time.

Regarding the budget, reviewers found management costs to be high, and there appeared to be some overlapping activities for the Community Development Director, listed twice under Project Management and In-House Personnel. Reviewers wondered why there was so much time budgeted for ODA staff, noting it was unclear what ODA's specific tasks would be, how many hours were needed, and why so much time was needed from both city staff and ODA staff. The Contracted Services line item for ODA lumped too many different activities that belonged elsewhere in the budget. Reviewers assumed that the three signs were partner signs (as opposed to interpretive signs) and found them to be expensive. The travel line item indicated reimbursement would be for city personnel, but since the site is in town, this line item seemed odd. Reviewers did not feel that effectiveness monitoring was necessary.

In the end, despite feeling a need to move forward quickly on this site, reviewers wanted to see a management plan for the site. They recommended that the applicant work with USFWS on a strategic restoration approach and with OWEB staff on crafting a tight budget for a resubmission.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3033** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Wapato Marsh Restoration Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Washington |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$146,600.00** | **Total Cost:** | $1,009,332.00 |

**Application Description**

The project is located at Jackson Bottom Wetland in Hillsboro. Open to the public, the marsh is important to wildlife, but is severely degraded and suffering from altered hydrology and massive infestations of reed canary grass. This project will restore the natural hydrology and native vegetation communities to 140 acres of floodplain wetlands at Jackson Bottom. Hydrology will be restored by removing drainage structures and creating low-profile cells to trap and hold floodwaters. Native vegetation will be restored using an aggressive restoration technique that depends on intensive site preparation and high-density planting and seeding of native vegetation to prevent re-invasion of canary grass. OWEB funds will be used to purchase a portion of the native plant materials (native wetland seed) necessary for the project's success, and to pay for a portion of restoration activities and five years of plant establishment. Partners include Clean Water Services, Ducks Unlimited, Big Trees Today, PGE, City of Hillsboro, and Metro.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers found the application to be well written with good match and partnerships. The project is ambitious for a challenging site. The project is already under way with other funding and has demonstrated some early success.

Although prior work to control reed canary grass appeared to be working, reviewers were skeptical that it could be successful over the long term. They wanted to know more about the proposed control of the site's hydrology, and noted that the application made no mention of nutrient loads and their influence on silting in the site over time. One reviewer commented that the partners are making changes to how the site is draining by re-grading it. But another reviewer argued that building berms in floodplains to control reed canary grass is an unproven science, and in any case, tends to entrap fish. This reviewer said that the focus should be on restoring the floodplain forest prairie and not on constructing artificial structures to trap water. Current gaps in cultural resource compliance need to be addressed.

The site visit raised some concerns about the applicant's proposal to trap beaver in order to protect new plants. Reviewers were adamant that this is not appropriate - especially for high public use area managed in part for community education. Following the site visit, a reviewer provided information to the applicant on ODFW trapping policy, and reviewers hope that will dissuade the applicant from this unnecessary activity. Beaver are a keystone wetland species, and if wetland restoration is the true objective, then they must be accommodated. After much discussion, reviewers concluded the application is not ready for funding at this time.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3042** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Milk Creek In-Stream and Riparian Enhancement Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Clackamas SWCD | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$38,660.00** | **Total Cost:** | $204,830.00 |

### Application Description
The project is on Milk Creek, a major stream in the Lower Molalla River watershed in western Clackamas County. The project encompasses about 5 acres, running through three adjacent private properties on both sides of the creek. Milk Creek is a primary production stream for coho, listed spring Chinook, and listed winter steelhead, as well as resident cutthroat trout. Assessment, TMDL, and salmon recovery plans for the Molalla and Milk Creek watersheds recommend riparian and in-channel restoration, sediment reduction, large wood placement, and restoration of channel hydrology. The project proposes to address: lack of in-stream habitat, simplified channel structure, changes in stream hydrology, sediment inputs from bank erosion, high water temperature, and need for watershed stewardship education of local residents. Proposed solutions: bank shaping; placement of a vegetated log matrix; removal of invasive non-native vegetation; heavy planting of native trees, shrubs, and cuttings; outreach and education. OWEB funds will be used principally for contracted services and supplies and materials. Partners include: Clackamas SWCD, NRCS, CREP, Oregon DEQ, ODFW, and Molalla River Watch.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
Reviewers noted this area is important for Chinook, coho, and lamprey, and suffers from water quality temperature problems. The project has good match and partners, and contained many strong letters of support. Reviewers were especially pleased that the applicant had revised the application, heeding reviewer input from the previous evaluation. The applicant made a concerted effort to work with a review team member and its partners to strengthen the application.

One reviewer noted that the application made no mention of the history of splash damming and log driving on the Molalla River – a major limiting factor that has stripped parts of the entire river down to bedrock. This reviewer felt that without a better understanding of the geomorphic constraints of the lower river, the applicant could not realistically tout the project as a model of restored stream complexity. Others, however, felt that any amount of work done in the lower Molalla system and held up as a model for stewardship would be beneficial. In any case, it was duly noted that the applicant was asking OWEB to fund only the riparian portion of the restoration work.

### Ecosystem Process and Function
Controlling invasives and replacing them with native plants will increase the structural complexity of the riparian buffer while shading the stream and enhancing fish and wildlife habitat.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Some instream-related line items need to be removed from the budget in addition to other small changes. Remove the "install controls at side channel" and the "erosion and turbidity control" line items. Reduce outreach to $600, tree and shrub protection to $1,000, and post-implementation status reporting to $600. Do not use tree and shrub tubing in the floodplain area as this material typically ends up downstream after a high-flow event.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
4 of 12

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$30,580.00** | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document the following changes: remove the "install controls at side channel" and the "erosion and turbidity control" line items. Reduce outreach to $600, tree and shrub protection to $1,000, and post-implementation status reporting to $600. Do not use tree and shrub tubing in the floodplain area as this material typically ends up downstream after a high-flow event.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$30,580.00** | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$30,580.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

**Application No.:** **212-3043** **Project Type:** Restoration
**Project Name:** Newell Canyon Middle Segment Restoration Project
**Applicant:** Greater Oregon City WC
**Basin:** WILLAMETTE **County:** Clackamas
**OWEB Request:** **$70,445.00** **Total Cost:** $141,788.00

---

**Application Description**
The project is generally located at the intersection of Hwy. 213 and Beavercreek Road near Oregon City. Newell Creek aquatic, riparian, and upland habitats are degraded, due largely to urbanization, logging, storm water issues, noxious weeds, and the lack of complexity in the upland conifer and deciduous forest. The proposed solution is to introduce in-stream large wood placement, weed treatment and revegetation elements aimed at restoring water quality, quantity, fish habitat, and aquatic health throughout the 219 acres of Newell Canyon. OWEB funds will be used for in-stream work, project engineering oversight and certification, permits, contracted services, education and outreach, travel to and from and from the site, fiscal administration, and general project management. Partners include The Nature Conservancy, Oregon City, Clackamas County SWCD, Metro, and ODFW.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
One reviewer described this as a "gem" in the heart of an urbanized area. This reviewer noted that the project builds on previously successful weed control work in the Metro area. The application was well written, with good partners and a thoughtful plan for outreach.

The proposed fix appeared to be straightforward with a reasonable budget. However, most reviewers felt that efforts to control reed canary grass on this site would be ineffective over the long term. One reviewer commented that Newell Creek is not a key fish-bearing tributary. Overall, reviewers felt the project provided a reasonable bang for the buck, but simply wasn't a high enough priority.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**
The project has a modest potential to increase vegetative diversity. The introduction of woody debris can stabilize banks and accelerate sediment deposition that can help improve water quality.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
10 of 12

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$70,445.00** | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3045** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Lower Clear Creek Habitat Restoration Project - Phase I | | |
| **Applicant:** | Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$263,524.00** | **Total Cost:** | $734,136.00 |

**Application Description**

The applicant seeks to improve water quality and restore aquatic habitat in Clear Creek - a free-flowing tributary to the Clackamas River, and home to a variety of fish species, including federally threatened and endangered coho salmon, Chinook, and steelhead. Lower Clear Creek has lost 90 percent of its historic wetland area, is 303d-listed as temperature limited, lacks adequate riparian cover to regulate hydraulics and temperature, and has minimal large woody material throughout the reach. Three phases of restoration are planned from the creek's confluence with the Clackamas River upstream 5.5 river miles. Phase I involves 1.7 miles of stream enhancement, including instream habitat treatments and restoration of native vegetation across 48 acres of adjacent riparian, floodplain, and upland habitat. Instream treatments will occur on property owned by Metro. The ecological benefits of this project are increased access to flood plain and off-channel habitat for ESA-listed species; higher quality summer and winter rearing refugia for migrating juvenile coho, spring and fall Chinook, and steelhead; restoration of natural flood storage capacity; and reduction of in-stream temperature. OWEB funds will be used to design, permit, and construct instream treatments and revegetation of adjacent riparian, floodplain, and upland habitat. Five years of plant establishment are planned. Partners include Clackamas RBC, The Nature Conservancy, PGE, Metro, and ODFW.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers recognized this to be a priority salmonid recovery area, addressing both instream and upland limiting factors. The area is important for late run coho population and summer and winter refugia. The applicant will work on both sides of the stream, creating sizeable riparian buffers. The site has good reforestation potential. Match and partnerships are strong, and local landowners have been, and will continue to be, engaged.

Reviewers were not keen that the partners had selected a contractor without going through an RFP process; they found the engineering and design costs to be excessive. One reviewer questioned whether the ground water analysis is necessary, and if so, did it need to be so expensive (this reviewer noted a lack of units and unit costs associated with that line item). Another reviewer felt the alcoves will only fill in in such a low-gradient system; others felt that the applicant was aware of the risk and would be taking measures at alcove entrances to understand the hydraulics and to design wood structures to help keep the alcoves backwatered. One reviewer wondered whether simply "roughing up" the floodplain would provide the desired outcomes.

Much discussion occurred around the Shade Our Streams match, which reviewers understood to be a PGE credit mitigation program, and therefore, potentially rendering OWEB funding for plant establishment ineligible. They directed staff to find out more about the nature of the partnership. They felt that the plant establishment budget was too costly and that work could easily be accomplished for $900-$1,000 an acre.

They found the proposed herbicide amounts for the restoration work, and especially for the plant establishment work, to be wildly excessive. Following the initial mow and spray in the restoration phase, any spraying in the plant establishment phase should be limited to an initial ring and follow-up spot spraying.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**

When completed, this project should contribute to improved stream complexity, riparian vegetation structure and vegetative ground cover, plant species diversity, habitat for migrating juvenile salmonids, sediment transport and nutrient recycling, and overall water quality.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Engineering and design cost to OWEB not to exceed $28,465; plant establishment to be reduced to between $900-$1,000 an acre; adjust fiscal administration accordingly for both budgets.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 12

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$226,128.00** | | **$63,516.00** |

**Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment**

Staff followed up on the mitigation issue and was satisfied that OWEB funds will not be used for mitigation credits. The applicant reduced plant establishment work to slightly more than $1,000 an acre, which the RPR approved. In an effort to achieve further cost savings, staff requested the applicant look into the review team issues of reducing the herbicide costs in both the restoration and plant establishment budgets, and justifying the need for the groundwater site analysis in the restoration budget. The applicant subsequently greatly reduced the amount of herbicide. The applicant made a persuasive case for the groundwater analysis so the line item was left in the budget.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document the following changes: engineering and design cost to OWEB not to exceed $28,465; plant establishment to be reduced to between $900-$1,000 an acre; adjust fiscal administration accordingly for both budgets. Also, the grant agreement will document that grant funds may be used only on Metro sites, and not on private sites affiliated with the Shade Out Streams program.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$226,128.00** | | **$63,516.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$226,128.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3047** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Cougar Creek Fish Passage | | |
| **Applicant:** | McKenzie WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$59,436.00** | **Total Cost:** | $692,736.00 |

---

**Application Description**
The project is located on Cougar Creek, a perennial tributary to the South Fork McKenzie River; 3.5 miles below US Army Corps-operated Cougar Dam. The existing creek crossing consists of a 1949-built bridge, which does not meet highway load requirements, and a culvert underneath a parallel bypass road built directly downstream of the bridge to accommodate heavy loads. The culvert underneath the bypass road is undersized and is a seasonal barrier to fish. The proposed project will replace the existing bridge with a concrete-span bridge and remove the existing bypass road and culvert. The project will open 2.1 miles of habitat suitable for rainbow and cutthroat trout rearing and spawning, spring Chinook salmon rearing, Pacific lamprey spawning and bull trout foraging. USFS biologists will monitor upstream fish use and streambed function for two years after project completion. OWEB funds will be used for contracted services associated with removal of bypass road and culvert, restoration of streambed, project management and fiscal administration. The primary partner is the Willamette National Forest (USFS).

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
As the last remaining fish passage barrier below the dams in the Upper McKenzie River, this culvert removal struck reviewers as a "no brainer." Reviewers, in fact, gave this project the highest ranking priority in the Willamette Basin as it will provide clear spawning and rearing benefits to ESA-listed steelhead and other fish species. The applicant has partnered with the USDA Forest Service, which is covering the vast majority of the cost through its Forest Service Legacy Roads funding. OWEB will pay for the removal of the bypass road and associated perched culvert, which is otherwise in good condition.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**
The project should contribute to improved stream complexity, riparian vegetation structure, sediment transport, water quality, and species migration patterns.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
1 of 12

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$59,436.00** | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$59,436.00** | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$59,436.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3051** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Nettle Creek Stone Bridge Culvert | | |
| **Applicant:** | Tryon Creek Watershed Council | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$69,268.00** | **Total Cost:** | $116,944.00 |

### Application Description
The project is located on Nettle Creek, a tributary to Tryon Creek in the lower Willamette, and within Tryon Creek State Park in southwest Portland. The culvert has a 36" perch and presents a barrier to fish. This culvert is on the list of high priority culvert replacements for Oregon State Parks. Most of Nettle Creek has excellent riparian canopy and is habitat principally for steelhead and cutthroat trout. There are three miles of perennial low-gradient stream above the culvert, 2000" of which are protected within the state park. OWEB funds will be used to replace the culvert with a bridge, place large wood instream to counteract down cutting, and revegetate the disturbed area. Partners include Friends of Tryon Creek State Park and Tryon Creek State Park.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
Reviewers were torn about this application. On the one hand, the project is a high priority for OPRD and the culvert to be replaced is highly visible due to its park setting. On the other hand, some reviewers wondered whether the cart was being put before the horse. These reviewers felt that even though the project site occurs in designated ESUs, the project would end up benefiting only a relative handful of ESA-listed fish, given the Highway 43 partial barrier, lower down in the system.

Reviewers wished that the design solution had been somewhat more definitive by the application stage. Regardless of the solution, they wanted assurance that it would support flows 1.5 times the channel width. They felt that trail-related costs in the budget were not appropriate charges to OWEB. As a rule, reviewers would prefer to see appended budget detail from the contractor rather than budget units expressed as lump sums.

In the end, reviewers were persuaded that the Highway 43 fix is still several years away, and that this highly visible project could offer useful outreach opportunities while providing some benefits to listed fish species.

### Ecosystem Process and Function
The project has a small potential to contribute to improved stream complexity, riparian vegetation structure, plant species diversity, floodplain connectivity, and species migration patterns.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Design the culvert replacement structure to support flows of 1.5 times the channel width and remove the trail materials and restoration costs from the budget.

### Regional Review Team Priority
12 of 12

## Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| $61,787.00 | | |

## Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

## Staff Recommended Award

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

## Total Recommended Board Award

**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3053** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | GC Sheelar Property Enhancement Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Tualatin River WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Washington |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$84,936.00** | **Total Cost:** | $186,986.00 |

**Application Description**

This project is located in a one-mile stream reach of lower Gales Creek. Watershed problems include: 1) lack of channel complexity in the mainstem; 2) lack of off-channel refugia for migrating adult and juvenile steelhead; 3) invasive riparian plant species; and 4) higher stream temperatures due to a general lack of canopy. The proposed solution is to: 1) place five large wood structures at two locations in a 0.3 mile reach to enhance existing side channel and backwater alcove habitat; 2) decommission a 0.07-mile creek access road to the side channel and stabilize the site; 3) treat invasive plant species and plant, maintain, and monitor native shrubs and trees located within the one-mile project area. Partners include the landowner, Tualatin SWCD, Clean Water Services, and ODFW. OWEB funds will be used for materials and construction of engineered logjams, road decommissioning, project management, and fiscal administration.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project builds on previous work in the system as well as at an adjacent land ownership. The site offers decent habitat complexity for steelhead, but faces flow and temperature issues in summer. The landowner is motivated and owns significant property in the watershed. Match is secured and the partnerships are strong. Enhanced CREP and the VEG-BACC programs have increased riparian canopy on 1.5 miles of stream length on the main stem.

Reviewers thought the road decommissioning is important, but were less convinced by the proposed riparian and instream work. They felt that the riparian area is in fairly good shape, and that the creek at this reach provides fairly good complexity with a deposition of gravels that are not seen downstream of the area where the channel tends to have finer sediments and is more confined. Reviewers were concerned that much bank disturbance in the relatively intact riparian area would have to occur to key in logs for the proposed wood complexes. Moreover, they felt the size of the wood proposed for the complexes is not adequate for such a flashy system. In the end, they felt that the cost might outweigh the benefit.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**

The project has the potential to enhance stream complexity and floodplain connectivity, and to improve riparian vegetative structure.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

11 of 12

## Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| $84,936.00 | | |

## Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

## Staff Recommended Award

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

## Total Recommended Board Award

**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3055** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Still Creek Habitat Restoration - Compression Project Area | | |
| **Applicant:** | The Freshwater Trust | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$324,651.00** | **Total Cost:** | $612,342.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Still Creek is a tributary to the Zig Zag River, located entirely within the Mt. Hood National Forest, in Northwest Oregon near the town of Rhododendron. Historically, Still Creek provided high-quality spawning and rearing habitat for native coho, spring Chinook, winter steelhead, and cutthroat trout, and has been identified by the Sandy River Basin Partners as high-quality anchor habitat for coho and winter steelhead, providing key spawning and rearing habitat. Poor riparian conditions and lack of floodplain roughness have resulted in a loss of stream sinuosity and an increase in average gradients. Over time, the channel has simplified with few pools, side channels, or off-channel habitat. This project seeks to accelerate recovery of naturally functioning conditions within stream channels and riparian areas to improve fish habitat. OWEB funds will support the construction of large wood complexes, addition of wood to existing structures as well as floodplain and off-channel areas, restoration of side channel/off-channel habitat, and riparian restoration. Partners include the City of Portland and the USDA Forest Service.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project occurs in an important area for coho and steelhead. A strong partnership exists with the USDA Forest Service.

Reviewers struggled with this application. Other than the handful of cabins in the lower floodplain, the site looked to be in excellent, nearly pristine condition, with a relatively intact upper floodplain and much sizeable wood already instream. While there is always room for improvement, reviewers generally felt that the project is a lot of money for a small ecological bump. And they noted that the applicant would seek to apply for more phases in the future. With the project need not immediately apparent, reviewers commented on the very thin alternatives discussion, which could have provided better insight into the partners' rationale for why this work is needed and what the benefits would be. One reviewer noted that the stream is incised and the work would help lift the stream onto the floodplain and that this is one of the top three basins in the Sandy watershed for salmonid recovery. It was acknowledged that the creek is already productive and that increasing the side channels would help with fish rearing.

One reviewer objected to the plan to thin hardwoods, noting that they are an important part of riparian areas, and that conifers can be released naturally, over time, as the hardwoods fall down. Most agreed that it would not be a good use of OWEB funds to remove hardwoods and plant conifers.

Reviewers had serious concerns with the budget. They wondered why so much USFS staff time was needed for the project, and they found the time budgeted for the project manager to be hugely excessive. During the site visit, reviewers requested a revised budget to bring down the cost to OWEB. The applicant subsequently submitted three alternative budgets prior to the RRT meeting, with the preferred alternative representing just a four percent decrease. While the two other alternatives represented greater reductions, the bottom line for reviewers was that the project remained too expensive for what was, in their opinion, a slight ecological gain.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3056** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Snake-Deford Creek Fish Passage | | |
| **Applicant:** | North Santiam WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Linn |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$109,098.00** | **Total Cost:** | $151,703.00 |

### Application Description
Snake-Deford Creek is a tributary to the North Santiam River with sections designated as Essential Salmonid Habitat for Chinook salmon and steelhead. The project builds on a previously funded technical assistance grant to develop a restoration strategy for the creek. The project will replace three, undersized culverts with bridges provided by Linn County Road Department. The bridges will meet SLOPES IV and ODFW fish passage requirements. Replacing crossings will provide fish passage to limited stream habitat and improve material transport. Supporting funds from other grants will be used to restore riparian buffers that will increase future large wood recruitment and shade. Linn County is the principal partner. OWEB funds will be used mainly for contracted services needed to install the bridges.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
This tributary to the North Santiam River is important for winter steelhead spawning and for Pacific lamprey. The project builds on good work, especially CREP enrollments, already occurring in the area. The target streams are at risk due to long-term development trends and this project helps focus attention on restoration and maintenance of the riparian and in-stream values. Partnerships with the county and landowners are strong.

While the project reach is generally in poor condition, the culverts do not present full passage barriers. Reviewers felt that the project is fairly spendy for less than a mile of improved habitat, but acknowledged that it would benefit winter steelhead and lamprey. Nevertheless, they did not see this project as an especially high priority.

### Ecosystem Process and Function
The project has a small potential to improve fish habitat, riparian vegetative structure, sediment transport, and water quality.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund.

### Regional Review Team Priority
9 of 12

### Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$109,098.00** | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3057** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Brush Creek Habitat Enhancement | | |
| **Applicant:** | Calapooia WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Linn |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$105,439.00** | **Total Cost:** | $438,665.00 |

**Application Description**

Brush Creek, a major tributary to the Calapooia River near the town of Crawfordsville, has been consistently identified as a high-priority stream for salmonid habitat enhancement primarily due to its role as crucial thermal refuge for migrating salmonids in the mainstem Calapooia. 2006 ODFW habitat surveys and recent technical team inventories revealed that Brush Creek sub-basin is severely lacking in large woody debris. The project will increase salmonid habitat at four reaches throughout the sub-basin by placing 127 logs along 3.09 miles of stream, as well as by planting two riparian acres. Habitat enhancement will yield both substantial benefits for existing winter steel head and Chinook salmon within the stream, as well as boost the stream's temperature-reducing capacity. OWEB funding will be used for materials and labor. Partners include the landowners, Linn County Roads Department and USDA Forest Service.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Brush Creek is an important cool water refuge for Chinook salmon and winter steelhead, and is clearly in short supply of instream wood. Some large investments in riparian plantings – particularly CREP enrollments – have already occurred. The project has good landowner relationships, partnerships, and match, though several reviewers objected to the applicant's "total footprint" approach to match; match needs to be more directly related to the proposed project.

Reviewers agreed that the system lacks wood, but felt that the applicant has not really given much thought to underlying issues and a long-term vision. It was unclear to what extent the applicant has incorporated the incised channel conditions into a strategic approach for the entire Brush Creek system. Adding wood instream, in and of itself, will not address the changes in channel morphology that have occurred over the last 50-100 years. Reviewers felt that focusing on a few large wood placements will not reduce channel incision, and may in fact, increase erosion and sediment transport by putting pressure on the banks. The proposed riparian planting seemed inconsequential and needs to be a much greater part of a strategic approach to restoring this stream.

Reviewers recommended a more thoughtful approach with long-term goals and objectives that can be monitored over time. They thought that a technical assistance application might be more appropriate as a starting point for this system. This would allow the applicant to get a more comprehensive picture of the entire system, what the specific challenges are, how fish are currently using the system, and what the best long-term fixes might be.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3064** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Owens Cr. Fish Passage & Instream Restoration | | |
| **Applicant:** | Long Tom WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$179,420.00** | **Total Cost:** | $415,273.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The project will improve fish passage at six barrier stream crossings and enhance 0.4 miles of instream habitat in the Owens Creek drainage, a major tributary to Bear Creek with flows into the Long Tom River downstream of Fern Ridge Reservoir. The project will ultimately reconnect 14.5 miles of spawning and rearing habitat on Owens Creek, including 9.7 miles of high-quality spawning and summer refuge habitat. Of the six barriers, one will be removed, two will be replaced with rocked crossings, another will be replaced with a bridge, and the final two will be replaced with concrete arch spans. Instream habitat complexity is poor in the proposed log placement segment when compared to a nearby reference site. Thirty logs, half with root wads attached, will be installed to improve habitat for aquatic species. OWEB funds will be used for supplies, materials, and contracted services associated with the fish passage projects, contracted services for the large wood placement, and project management, travel, and fiscal administration. Partners include the landowners, Lane County, and BLM Eugene District.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This well-written application made clear that the proposed culvert replacements are the highest priorities in a high-priority system within the watershed. Much good data had already been gathered and informed the rationale for the application. Match is strong and secured.

The application claims that 14.5 miles of spawning and rearing cutthroat habitat will ultimately be opened up as a result of the project, but reviewers felt the real gain would be considerably less, given the impassable barrier just above the uppermost project site. Nevertheless, they felt that real gains could be had and they were very impressed by the highly motivated landowners. Reviewers continued to find budgeting (time) for project management to be unnecessarily high, and recommended that it be reduced by 25 percent.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**

Barrier replacement will enhance species migration patterns. Large wood placement will enhance stream complexity and floodplain connectivity, will help retain organic matter, and reduce sediment transport.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced. Reduce project management 25 percent, or by $3,825. Adjust fiscal administration accordingly, retaining the 8.5 percent rate.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

5 of 12

## Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| $174,615.00 | | |

## Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. The grant agreement will document the following changes: reduce project management 25 percent, or by $3,825; adjust fiscal administration accordingly, retaining the 8.5 percent rate.

## Staff Recommended Award

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| $174,615.00 | | |

## Total Recommended Board Award

**$174,615.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3065** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Upper Greasy Creek Multi-Partner Restoration | | |
| **Applicant:** | Marys River WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Benton |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$119,827.00** | **Total Cost:** | $235,187.00 |

---

**Application Description**
The project targets the recovery of aquatic function for resident and fluvial cutthroat populations in the Greasy Creek Model Watershed near Corvallis. The project proposes to improve access to cold water refugia and spawning and rearing habitat by: 1) installing graded riffles to backwater three perched, undersized culverts; 2) replace two degraded agricultural crossings with squash pipes; 3) replace a perched, undersized culvert at a private drive crossing with a squash pipe; 4) retrofit a 3.5-foot-high concrete diversion dam (WRD-permitted) with a pool/riffle complex; 5) remove a failed culvert on Gray Creek; and 6) improve floodplain connectivity and increase off-channel habitat by placing full-spanning large wood instream at two sites. Partners include five private landowners, USFWS, National Forest Foundation, ODFW, Meyer Memorial Trust, and the Salem District BLM. OWEB funds will be used for project management, final designs, contracted services and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
This is multi-faceted, ambitious project occurring across several private landownerships. Landowner buy-in is good and match is strong. The project is strategic and will result in three miles of improved habitat for cutthroat trout.

The council demonstrates a comprehensive approach to restoration with large-scale planning linked to watershed priorities. Leadership is strong and well-organized and community support is high. The project works with local landowners and has a built-in outreach component, which enhances the overall objectives.

Reviewers found the executive director's hourly rates to be high. While they appreciated the outreach component, they sought to reduce the coordinator's hours and felt that the fish friendly signs were nice, but not necessary. They wanted fiscal administration reduced to 8.5 percent.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**
Replacement or retrofit of the various culverts and dam will allow full access in all seasons for juvenile and cutthroat trout. The addition of large wood will increase stream sinuosity and complexity and improve floodplain connectivity.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Fund Reduced. Remove the line item for fish friendly crossing signs; halve the outreach coordinator's time to $20 hours/$900; reduce fiscal to no more than 8.5 percent of the OWEB subtotal.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
7 of 12

## Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$116,586.00** | | |

## Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. The grant agreement will document the following changes: remove the line item for fish friendly crossing signs; halve the outreach coordinator's time to $20 hours/$900; reduce fiscal to no more than 8.5 percent of the OWEB subtotal.

## Staff Recommended Award

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| **$116,586.00** | | |

## Total Recommended Board Award

**$116,586.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3066** | **Project Type:** | Restoration |
| **Project Name:** | Beaver Creek Restoration Phase II | | |
| **Applicant:** | Marys River WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Benton |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$65,751.00** | **Total Cost:** | $111,077.00 |

### Application Description
Beaver Creek is a tributary of Muddy Creek in the Marys River Basin. The project is focused on the Upper reach of Beaver Creek where the stream morphology and current conditions provide the best opportunity to restore natural function and improve fish habitat. Riparian conversion for agriculture and residences, and channel simplification associated with historic channel manipulation and removal of large conifers, have reduced instream wood structure. The proposed solution is to: 1) install 33 log structures over 2.5 miles to trap and store mobile bedload to keep low summer flows moving subsurface through a gravel lens rather than passing over exposed bedrock; and 2) increase off-channel winter habitat by reconnecting two historic alcove sites. Partners include four private landowners, USFWS, ODFW, and Meyer Memorial Trust. OWEB funds will be used for pre-implementation activities, project management, equipment operation (log placement, alcoves, and riparian site preparation), and riparian planting.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
The applicant continues to show a solid strategic approach to the watershed with this application. Several private landowners are involved and match is strong. The contractor, present on the site visit, is taking a holistic approach to the system. The council and contractor have given site-specific attention to the placement of structures instream while recognizing fluvial and hydrologic processes at work in the system. They are proposing adaptive approaches to addressing incised streams in alluvial settings in a strategic, cost-effective manner.

During the site visit, reviewers noticed what appeared to be a leaking septic system on one of the properties and asked that the applicant work with the landowner to get it fixed or moved away from the stream. At the very least, they sought to prevent any alcove work near this effluent. They again objected to the hourly rates for the executive director and the amount of time for the outreach coordinator; they sought to reduce outreach and fiscal administration.

### Ecosystem Process and Function
The addition of large wood will increase stream sinuosity and complexity and improve floodplain connectivity.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund Reduced with Conditions. Remove the line item for signage; reduce the number of tours to one and allow no more than $450 for this line item; reduce fiscal to no more than 8.5 percent of the OWEB subtotal. Work with the landowner on the leaking septic and report back to OWEB.

### Regional Review Team Priority

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| $62,759.00 | | |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount | EM Portion | PE Portion |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3035** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Cedar Creek Landowner Recruitment | | |
| **Applicant:** | McKenzie WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$13,874.00** | **Total Cost:** | $25,629.00 |

### Application Description
The Cedar Creek Project is a multi-agency, multi-faceted effort to restore water quality and fish habitat in lower Cedar Creek in the McKenzie Watershed. Project activity will support outreach to landowners to secure landowner agreements that will allow access for monitoring and future restoration. Partners include The Freshwater Trust, ODFW, Lane County, Eugene Water & Electric Board, Springfield Utility Board, Springfield Public Schools, City of Springfield, Cedar Creek Irrigation Association, Willamalane Parks and landowners. OWEB funds will be used to provide partial support for professional assistance to conduct outreach, travel, printing promotional materials, and fiscal administration.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation
This application struck reviewers as a reasonable request with good partnerships and match. Reviewers, however, found the application to be poorly written; more explanation of existing conditions and ODFW's involvement would have cleared up much of their confusion. (The lead reviewer obtained much of his understanding of the proposed work by consulting separately with the ODFW STEP biologist.). The discussion of why outreach is needed and how it will occur was thin. Reviewers also would have liked more detail on what has been accomplished to date and a review of existing data to make a better case for why the applicant believes the project will produce tangible results.

There was much discussion about the application's connection to the Metro Wastewater Management Commission's shade credit, temperature mitigation program. The program will focus on 2-3 large private acreages with south bank frontage along either the main stem Cedar Creek and/or North Branch Cedar Creek. This proposal will complement the credit program by targeting approximately 50 different landowners in the same general area. Reviewers wanted the applicant to keep a bright line between the 50 landowners generally recruited and the few recruited for shade credits.

In the end, reviewers saw this as a high-priority area in the watershed with the potential to make a difference for Upper Willamette Chinook salmon.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff
Fund with Conditions. Grant funds may not be used to recruit landowners for any future restoration to be paid out of mitigation funds. Maintain documentation on all recruited landowners and keep separate records on those recruited for future mitigation restoration and those recruited for future non-mitigation restoration. The project completion report will require a final list of landowners recruited for these two purposes. These terms will be specified in the grant agreement.

### Regional Review Team Priority
1 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$13,874.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund with Conditions. Grant funds may not be used to recruit landowners for any future restoration to be paid out of mitigation funds. Maintain documentation on all recruited landowners and keep separate records on those recruited for future mitigation restoration and those recruited for future non-mitigation restoration. The project completion report will require a final list of landowners recruited for these two purposes. These terms will be specified in the grant agreement.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$13,874.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**$13,874.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3036** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Row River Implementation Planning Project | | |
| **Applicant:** | Coast Fork Willamette WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Lane |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$36,900.00** | **Total Cost:** | $54,190.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The applicant will convene the Row River Technical Oversight Committee (TOC) to conduct a restoration planning/project prioritization process in the Row River/ Mosby Creek sub-watersheds in the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed. Beginning in 2013, $523,000 will become available for fish habitat restoration within this planning area due to a settlement agreement associated with the Dorena hydroelectric project. A collaborative restoration planning process and project prioritization plan will develop a clear and focused effort for future improvements to habitat for spring Chinook, winter steelhead, Pacific lamprey, and cutthroat and rainbow trout. Partners include ODFW Springfield, Riverbank Power, USFS, BLM, Weyerhaeuser and the Coast Fork TOC. OWEB funds will be used for project management, in-house personnel, contracted services, supplies, production, equipment, and fiscal administration.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers felt that this application is premature. The need is there, but objectives and the approach to be taken were unclear; they had little sense from the application that OWEB funds will be well spent. Reviewers suggest that the applicant get the TOC convened and focused on the task and then return to OWEB with a better application with clear goals, objectives, a revised timeline for completion, and an end product that will guide future restoration. One reviewer recommended that the applicant confer with neighboring Model Watersheds for a successful model to guide the collaborative planning process. Another suggested that the applicant talk to ODFW to see if the Settlement Agreement can allow the agency to provide greater monetary assistance to the planning effort.

The budget was top heavy with personnel. Reviewers were unclear who would be facilitating the TOC meetings and the level of expertise required. More clarity is needed on the rationale for two cameras and a projector. Reviewers had great difficulty making sense of this application, and noted that this is frequently the case with this applicant's requests. They strongly encourage the applicant to make sure that at least one other person with the time and skill review applications before they are submitted to OWEB.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3037** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | North Unit Wetland Restoration and Enhancement | | |
| **Applicant:** | CREST | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Benton |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$50,000.00** | **Total Cost:** | $204,166.00 |

---

**Application Description**
The project is located within the boundaries of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area, northwest of Portland. Water control structures were installed throughout the island to increase available waterfowl habitat and to impede the spread of invasive plant species by inundating the plants during critical growth periods. While many of these structures have been effective in achieving the desired goals, three structures have been ineffective at impeding invasive plant growth largely because of site-specific topographic conditions and alterations to estuary flows. They have also negatively impacted wildlife habitat by reducing water quality, altering sediment processes, and reducing or eliminating juvenile salmonid access to hundreds of acres of historical fish habitat. The project proposes to design a series of actions that will result in an accessible mosaic of tidal wetland habitats suitable for juvenile salmonids, waterfowl, and other priority species. Partners include ODFW, Multnomah SWCD, and the Bonneville Power Administration. OWEB funds will be used for contracted services (topographic survey, modeling scenarios, conceptual plans, and 30 percent design) and project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
This is an important confluence area for the two largest river systems in Oregon. The project cost is high, but the issues are complex. The potential to connect to good habitat for juvenile salmonids is high. Match from BPA is strong.

Reviewers found the application to be lacking detail and had difficulty discerning why the water control structures have not been effective. They found the stated objectives to be in conflict with each other, noting the difficulty of eradicating reed canary grass without stranding ESA-listed fish. To that end, they felt that ODFW needs to have a clearer idea of its management objectives and provide more clarity on the goals and purposes of the project. How does this proposal complement the Sauvie Island Management Plan? Reviewers felt that the technical committee should be more involved in approving the designs. They wanted a better sense that OWEB funds would be used to develop designs that will be implemented.

Regarding budget issues, reviewers in general found the project to be a high cost for a feasibility and alternatives analysis. They found the budget to be lacking detail and noted unhelpful lump sums in the budget. There are 605 hours for Project management with little explanation. A line item for "CREST Administrative Staff" was duplicative of the Fiscal Administration budget category.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3038** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Butte Creek Subwatershed Assessment and Action Plan | | |
| **Applicant:** | Pudding River WC | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$32,797.00** | **Total Cost:** | $80,287.00 |

---

**Application Description**

Butte Creek Subwatershed in the Pudding Watershed supports populations of Upper Willamette River Chinook and steelhead. The applicant seeks funding for a comprehensive Butte Creek Subwatershed Assessment and Action Plan. This subwatershed is considered high-quality habitat for salmonids by ODFW, and the Butte Creek confluence area is contained within ODFW"s Conservation Opportunity Area for the Lower Pudding River. The applicant will collate existing information relevant to understanding watershed processes and the range of constraints affecting aquatic habitat structure and overall subbasin function. Another key component of the project will be support for the applicant's "Creekshed Stewardship Team" to drive project implementation and long-term public participation. The project will yield new datasets addressing current gaps in hydrologic modifications, including but not limited to: barrier assessments, road density analysis, floodplain fragmentation, anchor reach evaluations, and site-specific topographic data. In part, the result of the proposed action plan will be identification of 12-20 potential restoration projects for future implementation. Partners include Clackamas SWCD, ODFW, and the City of Salem. OWEB funds will be used principally for project management, contracted services, and production.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This is a priority subwatershed with the potential to involve local citizens and yield benefits for steelhead. The use of advisory committees is good and letters of support were many and strong. Some planning and outreach are already under way.

Reviewers were pleased that the applicant addressed previous RRT concerns, but they found this application to be vague and lacking detail. For example, it was not clear how data collection would ultimately lead to the identification of the proposed 12-20 projects. The applicant identified a preferred "on-call" consulting firm, but did not name the firm or contractor. Reviewers wanted an RFP vetted through the TAC. Reviewers were unclear on the different roles of the project manager and contractor and thought the hours for each were excessive. No explanation could be found for the "workshop (video summary)."

One reviewer commented that restoration of the subwatershed is being sacrificed for too much planning and outreach. This reviewer was frustrated by the vague timeline and wanted to start seeing projects on the ground. Overall, though, reviewers were in favor of seeing some activity in the watershed and sought to encourage its continuation.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. RFP to be developed for a contractor and shared with OWEB staff prior to posting; members of the TAC to be identified and shared with OWEB staff at the same time; members of the TAC to review proposals and select the contractor; schedule for project completion to be submitted prior to release of the grant agreement if the project is funded; no funding for the video; fiscal administration reduced accordingly.

**Regional Review Team Priority**
3 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$32,377.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$ 0.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3039** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Molalla River Culvert and Barrier Study | | |
| **Applicant:** | Molalla River Alliance | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$49,639.00** | **Total Cost:** | $71,939.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The Molalla River watershed provides essential spawning and rearing habitat and cold water refugia vital to two ESA-listed anadromous fish: wild winter steelhead and spring Chinook salmon. The project proposes to produce a comprehensive fish barrier assessment for the Molalla Watershed, resulting in an annotated and prioritized database for key salmon and steelhead tributaries of the Molalla River. Results will include a prioritized approach to removing key barriers having the greatest recovery benefit to target species. Existing data sources will inform the process and prioritization of subbasins for future restoration. Restoration project recommendations will be directly tied to limiting factors identified in the Upper Willamette River Conservation and Recovery Plan (Aug. 2011). Ranking criteria will be compiled through a review of successful barrier inventories in western Oregon and vetted by the applicant and representatives from ODFW, NOAA, NMFS, Molalla RiverWatch and Native Fish Society. Partners will also help establish key restoration priorities and landowner relationships for barrier assessments. The applicant will work with PC Trask and Associates throughout process. Data will be available to restoration practitioners in the Molalla River basin. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services and project management.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The Molalla River is an important watershed for recovery of listed steelhead and Chinook. The Molalla River Alliance has attracted and is actively coordinating with several partners. The proposed database will identify barrier removal priorities and will be easy to update.

The application was concise with appropriate partners and secured match. Some reviewers, though, found the application lacking detail on the contractor's relevant experience, factors to be used (e.g., stream velocities) in prioritizing future projects, and how data will be obtained from private ownerships. The application needed to evidence more coordination with ODFW. Reviewers thought the application was premature, stating that the proposed work should wait until the completion of upper, and especially the lower, RBAs. They felt that the RBAs information on fish distribution throughout the system will be a critical piece in establishing barrier removal priorities. They found project management to be expensive with inflated hourly rates. They noted that the hourly rate for the council coordinator's outreach differed significantly from the rate the coordinator showed in the monitoring application to OWEB. The ODFW hourly rate should have been $65, not $125.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3044** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Molalla River Large Wood Placement Project Development | | |
| **Applicant:** | Molalla River Alliance | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Clackamas |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$49,924.00** | **Total Cost:** | $75,669.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The Molalla River Watershed provides essential spawning and rearing habitat and cold water refugia vital to two ESA-listed anadromous fish: wild winter steelhead and spring Chinook salmon. Key limiting factors, identified in the Upper Willamette River Conservation and Recovery Plan (August 2011) to be addressed by this project include significantly reduced habitat complexity and high summer temperatures. OWEB funds will be used to work with ODFW, NOAA, NMFS and other partners to choose up to three specific high-priority sites for large wood placement in the watershed. Funds will also be used to work with key landowners and engineers to develop specific design concepts ready to submit to restoration funders (30% designs).

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The Molalla River is an important watershed for recovery of listed steelhead and Chinook. The Molalla River Alliance has attracted and is actively coordinating with several partners.

While reviewers appreciated the applicant's efforts, they concluded that the application was not ready for funding at this time. Overall, they wanted to see the applicant do a lot more coordination with agency partners, specifically fish biologists, in developing project proposals. The application lacked letters of support. Reviewers wondered about the restoration expertise and experience of the contractor listed in the application.

Some of the specific concerns about the application included what appeared to be unsubstantiated claims about the role of BLM in the proposed in-stream project. The $12,500 listed as in-kind support from BLM was intended to support recreation development in the Molalla River Corridor, not instream enhancements. The application mentions that ODFW and BLM have a list of potential sites, but these were not identified nor discussed.

The application did not explain why TA funding is needed for design of LWD, noting that agency partners can often provide designs for LWD depending on the size of the system, infrastructure, etc. The application needed to make the case on why design is needed based on the system and location of the LWD sites. Also, assuming design is needed, they would prefer to see 60% designs for sites that are known and selected, not 30% design for unknown sites. Reviewers did not see the point in asking OWEB to pay nearly $50,000 to digitize existing information and to hold coordination meetings. The budget lacked detail. Finally, reviewers said they wanted to see any instream work tied to the recently completed Molalla River Action Plan and the continuing RBA work.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No.:** | **212-3048** | **Project Type:** | Technical Assistance |
| **Project Name:** | Greater Yamhill Watershed Action Plan | | |
| **Applicant:** | Greater Yamhill Watershed Council | | |
| **Basin:** | WILLAMETTE | **County:** | Yamhill |
| **OWEB Request:** | **$48,860.00** | **Total Cost:** | $63,346.00 |

---

**Application Description**

The Yamhill Basin supports populations of listed Upper Willamette River Chinook and steelhead. The basin currently has no comprehensive action plan that identifies habitat restoration and protection priorities for the watershed. This project brings together diverse community stakeholders and technical specialists to develop for the basin a prioritized restoration action plan, with a five-year time horizon. The planning process will examine priorities by subwatershed, reach, and site, as well as by project type and effectiveness. The resulting document will detail specific restoration projects prioritized by subwatershed. These projects will be implemented at a rate of at least one a year. Partners include: BLM, ODFW, OWRD, Yamhill SWCD, Polk SWCD, City of McMinnville, Linfield College and Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde. OWEB funds will be used for coordination, contracted services, and fiscal administration.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This was a well-written proposal making a clear case for the need for an action plan. This is a critical watershed in need of a "road map" for moving forward. Reviewers felt that enough information exists to develop an action plan without a full-blown assessment. As a result, they sought to reduce the number of contractor hours. They did not feel that OWEB should pay separately for contractor mileage. They encouraged the applicant to incorporate relevant activities from the local SWCD upland habitat conservation plan, scheduled for completion later this year. The contractor has a long track record with assisting councils, and reviewers encourage the applicant to use him as a facilitator to help the council arrive at priority areas and activities.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Contractor to facilitate a process with the council that results in an action plan only (i.e., no assessment); contractor hours not to exceed 200; no travel funding; coordinate with Yamhill SWCD by incorporating recommendations from the District's developing conservation plan into the council action plan.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 3

| Recommended Amount |
|---|
| **$30,360.00** |

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document the following changes to the project: Contractor to facilitate a process with the council that results in an action plan only (i.e., no assessment); contractor hours not to exceed 200; no travel funding; coordinate with Yamhill SWCD by incorporating

recommendations from the District's developing conservation plan into the council action plan. The final report to OWEB will include a list of prioritized areas and projects for restoration work.

**Staff Recommended Award**

| Recommended Amount |
| --- |
| **$30,360.00** |

**Total Recommended Board Award**
**$30,360.00**

# October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
## Central Oregon Review Team (Region 4)

**Application No.:** **212-4036** **Project Type:** Monitoring
**Project Name:** Wetland restoration and the Rare Oregon Spotted Frog in the Klamath Basin
**Applicant:** Klamath Basin Rangeland Trust
**Basin:** KLAMATH **County:** Klamath
**OWEB Request:** **$226,055.00** **Total Cost:** $415,056.00

---

**Application Description**
This project would build on several years of monitoring Oregon Spotted Frog (OSF) populations at two locations in the Upper Klamath Basin. The OSF is a State Sensitive-Critical and Candidate for Federal listed species. The Crane Creek site underwent restoration in 2009 and OSF studies have been on-going and the Jack Creek site is proposed for restoration in 2012. Pre-treatment monitoring will continue there followed by post-treatment to determine population response to these habitat restoration projects. Treatment of completing species and OSF response will be monitored as well. These studies will guide future OSF restoration/recovery efforts.

## REVIEW PROCESS

**Regional Review Team Evaluation**
The review team agreed that the proposal is well written. The work on Jack Creek may provide useful information. The USGS does very good work in the Klamath Basin. The budget has been reduced. The OSF is a candidate species for listing by the USFWS and studies on the spotted frog are generally lacking.

While reviewers supported the concept and need for monitoring related to the spotted frog, they had concerns with the overall proposal. Reviewers first discussed the proposed monitoring at the Crane Creek site. Unfortunately, in this area, bullfrogs have moved in and are eating the spotted frogs. Once the bull frogs moved in, the study design lost its ability to distinguish causes and results - it is not clear that that portion of the study would be valid with respect to spotted frog populations and restoration actions, unless the entire bull frog population is eliminated. Reviewers were not comfortable recommending the Crane Creek site for monitoring funding under the circumstances.

Reviewers then discussed the idea to fund only the Jack Creek site. After discussion they concluded that for a small footprint, the proposed monitoring had a high cost. They spent some time discussing whether they could recommend funding for the Jack Creek site only at a reduced cost, but concluded that the budget and schedule lacked sufficient detail about tasks and costs for them to feel comfortable recommending funding. If the application is resubmitted, reviewers indicated they would consider a revised project for the Jack Creek portion of the current proposal, with more detailed breakout of tasks and costs and more information about the duties of the project leader and the field staff collecting data and how that affects the budget.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**
Do Not Fund.

**Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation**
The OPMT acknowledged the importance of this native species coupled with sensitive-critical listing with the State of Oregon and a candidate species for protection under the federal ESA. There is very little information on the Oregon Spotted Frog populations and almost no information on how these species respond to wetland restoration. The team appreciated the fact that pre-restoration has already been collected for one of the sites. It has traditionally been very difficult for projects such as this to compete for funding. There was discussion about support from local groups on this monitoring effort and is regionally important issue.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: Medium Certainty of success: Medium

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**
Do Not Fund.