

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-116</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Acquisition
<b>Project Name:</b>	South Eugene Hills Acquisition Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	City of Eugene		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$1,200,000.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$4,718,100.00

---

### **Application Description**

The City of Eugene (Eugene) requests \$1,200,000 to purchase two non-adjacent, primarily upland properties totaling 400 acres south of Eugene, in Lane County. The application is a resubmission of application #211-101, which Eugene withdrew because the Board determined that budget and staffing constraints made it infeasible to request due diligence.

The application refers to the properties as DAG Trust and South Eugene Meadows (SEM). The application states that the project is a key component of a multi-year partnership effort to conserve oak and prairie habitats, identified as a high priority in numerous conservation studies. The properties also have small amounts of riparian habitat, and a total of five miles of streams. The application states that DAG Trust contains a major tributary of Willow Creek and SEM contains a major headwater stream of Spencer Creek.

If the properties are acquired by Eugene, they will provide recreational and habitat connections between Eugene's Ridgeline Park System and the West Eugene Wetlands.

The application states that approximately half of each property currently contains OWEB priority ecological systems, for a total of 232 acres of priority ecological systems, as follows: upland prairie (93.0 acres), wet prairie (1.4 acres), oak savanna (41.7 acres), oak woodland (87.4 acres), and riparian forest (8.9 acres).

The properties have been degraded by past land uses and invasive species. Eugene estimates that, upon completion of restoration that will follow acquisition, each property will contain 80 percent priority habitats.

The application states that the project will benefit the following rare or at-risk plant communities, which preliminary surveys have shown are present on the properties: Roemer's fescue valley prairie (SEM only), white oak/poison oak/blue wildrye (SEM only), white oak - black oak/poison oak (DAG Trust only). The application also states that the project will benefit the following unconfirmed rare or at-risk plant communities, either upon acquisition or upon subsequent restoration: California oatgrass valley grassland, white oak/Roemer's fescue savanna, white oak/snowberry/sword fern, Oregon ash/dewey sedge – stinging nettle, and Oregon ash/spreading rush.

The application states that white-breasted nuthatch, western gray squirrel, and Kincaid's lupine have been documented on one or both of the properties, and that the project will benefit these species. The application also states that the project is likely to benefit the following species: chipping sparrow, Oregon vesper sparrow, western meadowlark, acorn woodpecker, American kestrel, purple martin, yellow warbler, red-legged frog, Fender's blue butterfly, white-topped aster, wayside aster, and Willamette Valley daisy.

The application states that the proposed project is consistent with all of OWEB's conservation principles. It explains that the Willamette Valley is an area on the brink of ecological collapse, and that the project can help to stabilize critically imperiled oak and prairie habitats.

The application states that the public's awareness of the Ridgeline Park System is very high due to recreational opportunities, volunteerism, partnership activities and events, and media coverage. Acquisition of the proposed properties will provide new opportunities to inform and educate the public about the natural values that Eugene is protecting and restoring. The application also states that structured educational opportunities exist due to the presence of local organizations that specialize in environmental education, such as the Willamette Resources and Educational Network (WREN) and Nearby Nature. Furthermore, one of the objectives of the Ridgeline Park System is to provide direct trail connections from nearby schools.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The RRT was, overall, very supportive of the project, noting its strong consistency with OWEB's conservation principles of protecting sites with high biodiversity and imperiled habitats. The RRT also felt that the project will enhance ecological connectivity and protect headwater streams, both of which will boost watershed function. The RRT concluded that the urban growth boundary's close proximity to the sites makes it likely that the properties will eventually be used for residential development if they are not acquired for conservation. The RRT recognized that Eugene has the funding and capacity to restore and maintain properties that it acquires. In general, the RRT felt that SEM is more important to acquire than DAG Trust because SEM seems more biologically diverse.

The RRT acknowledged that the project has strong community support. The RRT nonetheless felt that the project has good, not outstanding, educational merit because it seems unlikely that the properties will be used extensively for school-based activities.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

High Ecological and Medium Educational value.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3033</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Connecting People to Place: A Citizenry of Clackamanians		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Clackamas River Basin Council		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$40,249.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$355,844.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Clackamas River Basin Council (CRBC) proposes to create a “Citizenry of Clackamanians” by engaging audiences of all ages and backgrounds in a range of new and ongoing outreach activities designed to create a sense of place and pride in the watershed. Such activities include river cleanup events, educational displays, a watershed model and macroinvertebrate sampling activities. The project will engage people in on-the-ground work to enhance the Clackamas River Basin, and at the same time, raise awareness, improve knowledge and develop skills components outlined in OWEB’s Education and Outreach Strategy. Results will be measured through questionnaires, interviews and attendance records. Partners include Clackamas County Parks, ODFW, PSU and hundreds of volunteers. OWEB funds will be used primarily to support CRBC’s Education and Outreach coordinator and production items.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers appreciated the strong goal statement – to link residents in the watershed with a sense of place and an appreciation for watershed processes and health. The application builds on tried and true programs and offers new ones.

For some reviewers, the wide range of activities aimed at a variety of audiences seemed like a strength; but for others, it seemed ambitious, unfocused, and as a result, they wondered about staff capacity. But most reviewers noted that the applicant has a track record for pulling off large events like those described in the application, and all events were well detailed in the proposal. Overall they were impressed by the application’s show of energy, innovation, a willingness to take risks and even by its sense of humor.

A major weakness, perceived by all, was the cookbook element. While reviewers saw it as innovative, they did not see it as an effective tool for conveying the program’s goals and they questioned the appropriateness of using OWEB funds for it. Match in general appears not to be an issue, but reviewers felt that the in-kind volunteer match rate of \$20.25 seemed a little steep, noting that \$14-\$18 range was more reflective of how volunteer time should be accounted for.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced. Delete the cost of the cookbook for a total recommended award of \$34,749.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 5

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$34,749.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget. At that time, staff would recommend Fund Reduced. Fund at a reduced amount of \$34,749; do not fund the cookbook.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	211-3035	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Watershed Rangers Education Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Middle Fork Willamette WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	\$20,000.00	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$62,754.00

---

### Application Description

The Middle Fork Willamette Watershed Council seeks funding to continue its Watershed Rangers program. Initiated in 2007, the program offers field experiences and service-learning projects for 3<sup>rd</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students in rural communities of the Middle Fork Willamette watershed - an estimated 675 students and 27 teachers. Watershed Rangers' participation continues to increase (over 300 percent since 2007), and all participants take part in on-the-ground watershed enhancement projects. The applicant will measure results through record keeping, monitoring and surveys. OWEB funds will be used primarily for salaries and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### Regional Review Team Evaluation

This project was the top-ranked education and outreach project in the Willamette Basin. Reviewers uniformly liked the project, noting its growth and success in rural communities in the watershed. The need is clear, and reviewers appreciated the effort to expand offerings to junior and senior high school students. Reviewers particularly like that older students are involved as mentors to younger students; they have seen this working successfully. Field trips and restoration projects are planned.

The application was thorough and well written, the budget was appropriately conservative, and letters of support were many and enthusiastic. Match and partnerships are strong.

### Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

### Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 5

### Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b> \$20,000.00

### Staff Recommendation to the Board

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget.

### Staff Recommended Award

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

### Total Recommended Board Award

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3049</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Enhancing Student Engagement in Field-based Education in the Willamette Valley		
<b>Applicant:</b>	The Freshwater Trust		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$39,594.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$257,826.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Freshwater Trust will provide training, learning materials, and other resources to approximately 120 teachers in the Willamette River Basin to support them in delivering field-based learning experiences to 4,350 students. The project will provide educators with knowledge, skills and tools to engage students in field-based data collection and analysis that tie to educational benchmarks and the Oregon Environmental Literacy Plan. The project will also increase awareness and knowledge of watershed and native fish, improve skills related to field study and forge a stewardship ethic between students and their watersheds. The Student Stewardship Projects (SSP) offer more intensive field-based experiences than Salmon Watch. In addition, under SSP, students assume “career roles” for the duration of the project leading, for example, to the development of design elements, on-the-ground implementation of restoration projects, and to the development and implementation of pre- and post-restoration project monitoring elements. Quantitative results will be collected through the applicant’s “StreamWebs” database, and qualitative results will be measured through pre- and post-tests, interviews, and surveys. Partners include BLM, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Power several private foundations and volunteers. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management, contracted services and productions.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers liked the project, noting its strong partnerships and match. In particular, they found the concepts of student-teacher mentorships and SSP to be innovative and consonant with the applicant’s strong educational outreach in the Portland metropolitan area. The project builds on the very successful, long-running Salmon Watch program, which has offered hands-on, watershed-based learning to thousands of students for nearly 20 years.

Reviewers were especially intrigued by the idea that under the new SSP component, students will apply for “jobs” in which they will serve as volunteer instructors for elementary and middle school field trips. In particular, they will lead in the design, on-the-ground implementation and pre- and post-implementation monitoring elements.

The budget was reasonable, though one reviewer commented that the travel rate was incorrect and overall seemed excessive. Another felt that the project could benefit from a more concrete success matrix.

Not all reviewers were aware of the recent changes at The Freshwater Trust in which the organization has made the decision to terminate its outreach program in order to focus on other priorities. Reviewers were naturally concerned whether this project would be implemented if they recommended it for funding. The team discussed how to handle the application given the uncertainty of the program’s future. Some reviewers understood that the program is currently seeking other institutional support, and felt confident that this important education and outreach program would quickly find a home. Most reviewers concurred, and on

the strength of the program and its director, they recommended the project for funding on the condition that the program is assumed by a grantee eligible to receive OWEB funds.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund with Conditions. Applicant must be eligible to receive OWEB funds.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

3 of 5

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$39,594.00</b>

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

Following review, the applicant withdrew the application.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3054</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Creekshed Stewardship Initiative (CSI) A Creekside Stewardship Team Model Program for the Willamette Falls Watershed Region		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Pudding River WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Marion
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$29,552.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$57,714.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Pudding River Watershed Council proposes to develop a “Creekshed Stewardship Initiative (CSI) in a newly defined “Willamette Falls Watershed,” which encompasses portions of the Molalla-Pudding region. This collaborative project will engage landowners in four subwatersheds in a range of enhancement activities. Creekshed Stewardship Teams (CSTs) will be formed in each subwatershed. CSTs will identify potential projects in their subwatershed and then select one pilot project to implement in the subwatershed. Projects will address limiting factors. CSTs will receive trainings and hands-on work opportunities. Partners include the Cities of West Linn and Wilsonville, ODFW, Willamette Riverkeepers and Clackamas County. OWEB funds will be used primarily to support project management.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers thought that the concept of developing community teams on local creeks seemed worthwhile, but found the application to be somewhat confusing. On the one hand, it had a worthy educational component for a local high school; on the other, it appeared to be a technical assistance project, seeking funds to recruit and train new Board members for the watershed council. Both concepts have merit, however, reviewers felt the application was not clear on how citizens would be recruited and found the goals to be ambitious and unrealistic.

Reviewers noted that most of the requested funding was to support the project manager whom they felt does not have the expertise or track record of success in either area. Reviewers did not think that the proposed manual, “How to Start A Creekshed Stewardship Team,” was needed. Some reviewers wanted to support a more limited pilot project with Wilsonville High School, which had provided a strong letter of support (though not on letterhead). However, in the end, reviewers decided the application as a whole was too weak and the overall objectives too unclear to merit support.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3060</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Slough School Education Program		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Columbia Slough WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,021.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$109,812.00

---

### **Application Description**

This project is a continuation of the Slough School Education Program, which for eight years has served students who live within, or attend school in, the Columbia Slough Watershed. The project will provide field-based science education for K-12 students in the Columbia Slough Watershed by providing habitat restoration opportunities for approximately 2,000 K-12 students, developing four workshops to improve teachers' content knowledge and outdoor teaching skills; 3) mentoring 50 interns and giving them the skills to enhance primary students' field experiences. Pre- and post-assessments will track knowledge acquisition and attitudinal shifts. Partners include METRO; and the Cities of Portland, Gresham and Fairview. OWEB funds will be used for primarily for personnel and travel.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The application describes a well-organized, long-standing program with strong partnerships, which reaches out to a largely underserved community of children. Reviewers liked the well-rounded nature of the offerings – from in-class activities to field-based restoration to peer-to-peer mentoring. Match and partnerships are strong.

While reviewers were sensitive to the difficulty organizations face in receiving support for their education and outreach activities, they noted that OWEB has been funding this program for many years. Reviewers would have liked to have seen the application provide more information on the results and benefits of the program, as well as on information about program adaptive modifications or improvements. It was noted that OWEB grants require reporting to OWEB, and that past funding for this project had resulted in strong reports with lots of information on participants.

Reviewers noted that about half the budget was for the education director's salary, and wondered whether this ongoing expense could be paid for by other organizational funds. They would have liked to have seen more letters of support.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

5 of 5

### **Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$49,021.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3062</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Education
<b>Project Name:</b>	Willamette Watershed Stewardship Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$29,749.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$58,806.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Willamette Watershed Stewardship Project will provide watershed educational and stewardship opportunities to 775 youth and adults, including twenty-four 4<sup>th</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup>-grade teachers and their students in Clackamas and Multnomah counties. Each class will receive four classroom lessons and one watershed field trip that includes a service learning element and an on-river paddling experience or nature hike. The service learning element will involve hands-on activities at a local 11-acre natural area to remove invasive plants, plant native trees and shrubs and maintain the plantings. An experienced staff of environmental educators will use successfully tested curricula. Participants will learn about their local watershed, watershed issues and develop an increased appreciation of their local watershed through project activities. Participant interviews, surveys, tests and extent of participation will determine project success. Partners include the City of Gladstone and student and parent volunteers. OWEB funds will be used primarily for salaries, contracted services supplies and transportation.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This project is a resubmission of an earlier proposal that was recommended for funding by the RRT, but which fell below the line for funding. The application was well written, providing good detail on the program. There appears to be strong support from local teachers, and the applicant's staff is qualified and experienced. The project builds on a long-standing program and promises to reach about 700 students in the region through a combination of classroom and field work. The project's educational and outreach offerings are diverse and linked to actual restoration activities.

Reviewers found the match and partnerships to be weak. They would have preferred to have seen the volunteer hours supplemented by cash match from other partners, but recognized that school budgets have been hit hard. The budget lacked detail on units and unit costs, which was later corrected by the applicant at the prompting of a reviewer. Another reviewer wondered whether the 2008 evaluation findings had actually informed programmatic improvements for this application. It was noted that the grantee is following up on lessons learned to modify the program, and that it would have been useful to include this information in the application.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

4 of 5

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$29,749.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3034</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	Willamette Headwaters Water Quality Monitoring Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Middle Fork Willamette WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$101,464.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$201,405.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Middle Fork Willamette Watershed has a paucity of water quality data, beyond temperature data, for most of the watershed. There is a need to establish targeted water quality monitoring in subwatersheds that lack sufficient data to enable local municipalities and residents to take action to improve water quality. The applicant proposes to collect two years of comprehensive water quality monitoring data at 18 locations throughout the watershed. The end result will be a Water Quality Monitoring Report that can be used in public outreach and education efforts and in local municipal action plans designed to improve water quality. Partners include Springfield Utility Board, DEQ, Meyer Memorial Trust, and three local municipalities. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management, in-house personnel, and contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project builds on data the applicant has collected over the past two years with DEQ funding and under an approved DEQ protocol. Reviewers liked the concepts behind the project, which will allow the applicant to identify restoration priorities, focus on how best to use limited resources, and integrate findings with those of the Model Watershed.

While there is a definite need for this type of information and how results from the data could make for more strategic investments in restoration actions, reviewers had too many questions to recommend the project for funding. The application did not explain what information the project will provide that the applicant had not already obtained during the previous two years of data gathering. Reviewers wanted a better understanding of how the locations and schedule were determined; and they wanted to see a plan for analysis, including proposed statistical methods (if known). There was no discussion of what has been learned to date, which might have helped the applicant better focus the application.

Reviewers did not see a clear explanation for why the applicant selected the monitoring parameters it did. They did not like the "scattershot approach" of what appeared to be an attempt to monitor everything everywhere. They discussed a preference for having the sampling parameters tailored to specific land uses, rather than measuring for the same thing across multiple land uses. Finally, the budget seemed high, especially in the areas of project management and in-house personnel.

Reviewers recommended that a future application share results of the DEQ-funded monitoring and discuss how those results have led to a more focused project. A revised application should focus on a few sites in the model watersheds with sampling parameters appropriately tailored to the land uses of those subwatersheds. Establish necessary partnerships with Weyerhaeuser and USFS, and incorporate relevant data that these groups might already have into the project. Train the designated management agencies to do their own monitoring and supply them with the necessary equipment. Finally, be clear about the link between water quality monitoring results and how they will inform future restoration activities.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3042</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	North Santiam, South Santiam and Calapooia Effectiveness Monitoring Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	South Santiam WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Marion
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$36,544.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$90,964.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Santiam and Calapooia watersheds are in a degraded condition and have declining populations of ESA-listed winter run steelhead and spring Chinook. The watershed councils are addressing current conditions with an active and expanding restoration program directed at improving instream habitat. Effectiveness monitoring must occur to ensure restoration actions are having the intended effect. Effectiveness monitoring will quantify pre- and post-treatment instream and riparian conditions at control and treatment (e.g. restoration) sites over a ten-year period. Project effectiveness will be determined by comparing data from the control and treatment sites. Monitoring data will inform future management decisions, thereby ensuring prudent restoration investments. Partners include Bonneville Environmental Foundation, Meyer Memorial Trust, and ODFW. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services (pre- and post-treatment data collection) and for supplies and materials (field gear for summer field technicians).

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers found this to be a well-written application that provides a clear and detailed discussion of what is proposed. The approach is reasonable, seeking to document measurable change over time at various restoration treatment reaches within the three partnering watersheds. The ten-year timeframe is realistic for what is proposed. Partnerships are strong and the match is excellent. Reviewers noted that project management is being paid completely by matching sources.

Reviewers generally felt the parameters to be measured were appropriate, though one reviewer commented that measuring temperature and substrate are not useful parameters for demonstrating project effectiveness. They encourage the applicant to focus on their other parameters, especially those for shade, fish and riparian condition. They also wanted to make sure that photo documentation (i.e., use of photo points) would be included in the monitoring. Finally, reviewers could not find mention in the application of an intention to share the effectiveness monitoring data with DEQ's Lasar database and wanted to make sure that occurs.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will specify that the applicant is to 1) provide photo documentation for their final project completion report using photo points, and 2) share all data collected with DEQ's Lasar database.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

3 of 4

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$36,544.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget. At that time, staff would recommend Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement would specify that the applicant is to 1) provide photo documentation for their final project completion report, and 2) share all data collected with DEQ's Lasar database.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3047</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	STREAM Water Quality Monitoring Program		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Coast Fork Willamette WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$127,195.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$193,715.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Coast Fork Willamette River fails to meet water quality standards for temperature, dissolved oxygen, bacteria and mercury. From 2008 to 2010, the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Council (CFWWC) built strong partnerships for action on water quality issues with local groups including a DEQ-funded volunteer monitoring program. Funding for this program will expire at the end of this year. This proposal seeks to continue funding, improve, and expand on the volunteer water quality monitoring program. Existing monitoring locations will be integrated into a statistically rigorous monitoring design, mercury sampling will be added to the parameters measured, temperature recordings will be used to identify cold water refugia, sampling locations will expand from 16 to an estimated 40, and landowners will be engaged with public outreach. Partners include the City of Cottage Grove, South Lane School District, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services and in-house personnel.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This project builds on an existing DEQ-funded project, seeking to develop a more rigorous and well-rounded picture of water quality issues in the watershed. The original project involved community volunteers in data collection, helping to advance the applicant's watershed outreach program.

Reviewers generally found the application to be too broad in scope, sampling water quality at about 40 sites for a number of parameters, including a new parameter for mercury. As a result, the budget struck reviewers as exorbitant, especially the contractor costs. Reviewers questioned the line item for six weeks of a contractor's time to update and expand the original Quality Assurance Project Plan, which they thought was too much time. They also noted that the lab analysis line item seemed particularly steep. Some reviewers questioned the practicality of using EMAP to randomly-select sites and weren't sure why as many as 40 sites were proposed. The comment was made that the monitoring needs to get more focused as the proposal is simply too broad. Another comment was made that they have sampling data and know the limiting factors, and their inventory work should allow them to identify the source of water quality problems.

With respect to the proposed mercury monitoring, reviewers thought that the application needed to provide a better explanation of how the data would support the food web model. Also, the dams are known to accumulate mercury behind them, so monitoring for that parameter won't necessarily tell us anything we don't already know.

Reviewers encourage the applicant to have a tighter scope with more focused objectives. In general, reviewers prefer to see a close link between monitoring and restoration work that has already occurred or that is planned. Finally, the budget needs to be tighter.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3055</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	Middle Willamette Water Quality Characterization		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Polk SWCD		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Polk
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$18,730.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$31,660.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Local Advisory Committee to the Mid-Willamette Agricultural Water Quality Management Area (AWQMA) is interested in assessing agricultural impact to streams in the Mid-Willamette AWQMA. Past monitoring has focused on the mainstem Willamette, Marys and Luckiamute rivers, but the information from these sites does not provide a clear picture of the agricultural impacts to water quality in the Mid-Willamette AWQMA. Improved information will provide a clearer understanding of the nature and extent of the problems and would help guide future restoration and improvement work. The applicant seeks to add seven monitoring sites to be monitored six times a year for two years to better characterize water quality in these areas. Partners include Benton SWCD, Luckiamute and Marys watershed councils, Western Oregon University, DEQ, and ODA. OWEB funds will be used primarily for supplies and materials.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers generally saw this as an important project, providing useful, low-cost information in key subwatersheds on the impacts of agriculture to water quality. Reviewers liked the involvement of Western Oregon University students in collecting the data.

Unfortunately, the application was poorly written, providing inadequate background information and little detail in the budget on how OWEB funds will be used. The itemized Western Oregon University budget did not correspond with the figure entered in the OWEB budget.

Still, reviewers appreciated the small-scale approach targeting locations that lack good information on agricultural impact to water quality in the Willamette Basin. Additionally, the selection of the Tum Tum as the control system and the parameters to be monitored at all sites is appropriate. The applicant is following standardized protocols, has good partnerships and submitted several letters of support. The sampling will take into account and will compare the different land uses that occur on the different streams, which will allow the applicant to assess whether agricultural effects are localized or widespread. DEQ and ODA are providing necessary oversight.

Understanding that copper is ubiquitous throughout the Willamette Basin and a serious toxin to salmonids, reviewers sought to condition the proposal to include copper as an element to be sampled.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund with Conditions. Applicant to look into the feasibility of adding copper sampling.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$18,730.00</b>

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

Given the short time frame, the applicant was not able to confirm the cost of adding copper sampling in time for OWEB to consider the information. Staff encourage the applicant to find match support for this important parameter for this project. Further, they would like to make sure that copper sampling is part of any future such applications to OWEB.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	211-3056	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	Upper Molalla River Rapid Bio-Assessment		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Molalla River Watch Inc		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	\$26,700.00	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$39,750.00

---

### **Application Description**

Recovery plans have identified the need to recover all historic populations of spring Chinook in the Upper Willamette ESU, including the Molalla River. The applicant proposes to contract with Bio-Surveys to implement Year 1 of the Molalla Watershed Rapid Bio-Assessment (RBA). The first year will cover the upper watershed, with plans to cover lower watershed in the second year and the whole watershed the third year. Currently, salmonid population abundance and distribution in the Molalla River Basin is poorly known. With the upcoming Upper Willamette River Recovery Plan, the applicant seeks to inventory Molalla salmonid populations to document current abundance and distribution to help identify habitat restoration opportunities and measure progress toward recovery goals. Year I of the RBA will quantify the abundance and distribution of ESA-listed spring Chinook and coho salmon, winter and summer steelhead, and rainbow and cutthroat trout in 100 miles of the Upper Molalla River. Partners include ODFW and the Bureau of Land Management. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers saw this project as a high priority, closely tied to Willamette Basin salmonid recovery objectives. The need for information on juvenile salmonid use is great as there is a paucity of aquatic information for this watershed. The schedule seems realistic and the contractor is experienced. ODFW and BLM staff will provide project management, and the latter is providing good cash match for this first phase. Landowner contacts will be invaluable for setting the stage for future restoration. Reviewers wanted to make sure that the RBA identifies, prioritizes and results in on-the-ground projects.

Reviewers were concerned by the lack of Weyerhaeuser participation and hoped that they could be brought along in future phases. They encourage the applicant to keep the company informed as the project progresses. Some reviewers felt that the fiscal administrative costs could be reduced, given that the invoicing will be straightforward and limited.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 4

### **Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$26,700.00</b>

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

Staff recommend reducing Fiscal Administration to \$1,800, or 7.5 percent of the total OWEB request. Further, the grant agreement will specify that the RBA identifies and prioritizes potential future restoration projects.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget. At that time, staff would recommend Fund Reduced with Conditions. Fund at a reduced amount of \$26,100. Staff recommend reducing Fiscal Administration to \$1,800, or 7.5 percent of the total OWEB request. Further, the grant agreement would specify that the RBA identifies and prioritizes potential future restoration projects.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3058</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Monitoring
<b>Project Name:</b>	Freshwater Mussels in Johnson Creek		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Johnson Creek WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$30,966.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$53,347.00

---

### **Application Description**

A 2010 pilot survey coordinated by the Xerces Society and partners indicates that freshwater mussels may constitute the largest living, megafaunal biomass in Johnson Creek. But, almost nothing is known about the populations, status and distribution of these organisms. Because the life history of freshwater mussels is so closely tied to native fish, and because these vulnerable and threatened organisms play critical ecological roles in aquatic habitats, a better understanding of them is needed to guide future project planning and management decisions in Johnson Creek. Partners include several cities, Metro, the Xerces Society, and several state and federal agencies that manage parts of the Johnson Creek Watershed. OWEB funds will be used primarily for in-house personnel and contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers generally liked the application, seeing it as an appropriate expansion of the current pilot. Very little is known about the populations, status and distribution of freshwater mussels in the Willamette Valley; a better understanding could help guide future project planning and management decisions in the watershed. Freshwater mussels are important water quality indicators, and most reviewers felt it would be important to establish baseline data.

Reviewers particularly liked the inclusion of community volunteers in collecting the data. The supervising staff have strong aquatic science backgrounds, helping to ensure the integrity of the sampling process. The spatially balanced sampling design is a plus. Several reviewers asked that the applicant make a point of teaching volunteers to recognize invasive mussels so that they could remove them altogether while conducting sampling. While some reviewers objected to OWEB being asked to pay for the guides, others liked that the applicant would be developing an accessible, standardized protocol that could be shared with other groups. The application was well written and nicely documented with maps and photos. The budget seemed reasonable, though some reviewers questioned 26 weeks of salary support, which seemed excessive.

There was some discussion about how the pilot data are being used to inform collection at the 20 new sites, and how the data from these new sites will actually be used to guide future project planning and management decisions. Reviewers wanted to make sure that this project does not become a “feel good” volunteer exercise, but that it actually will contribute to long-term watershed health.

In the end, reviewers were content with the project as submitted and saw it as the top monitoring priority in the Willamette Basin.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

1 of 4

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$30,966.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$ 0.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3031</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Zena Forest Oak Habitat Restoration Phase II		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Willamette University Business Office		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Polk
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$244,023.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$328,698.00

---

### **Application Description**

This is a 3-year oak savanna and oak woodland habitat restoration project at the 1600-acre Zena Forest in the Eola Hills of the central Willamette Valley. Most research suggests that less than ten percent of these habitats remain in the Valley. In Phase 1, the grantee removed invasives and restored 35 acres of oak savanna and oak woodland habitat. In Phase 2, the applicant will complete work on the 35 acres and begin work on another 60 acres of oak woodland through invasives species control and thinning. The applicant will also begin restoration on 109 acres of wet prairie and begin instream work on 1.6 miles of tributaries. Phase 1 effectiveness monitoring will be expanded in Phase 2 into wet prairie and riparian areas. An avian monitoring program will be introduced. Partners include the landowners, Oregon Community Fund and USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services for the restoration work, effectiveness monitoring and education and outreach.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This large-scale restoration project addresses several watershed limiting factors. The project design is thoughtful. Project partnerships, match and letters of support were all strong. The commitment and enthusiasm of the landowners is impressive, and the educational benefits are unusually strong due to the project's university connection.

The project seems to be applying lessons learned from the first phase of the project, for example, it was learned that activities cost more than projected. The focus of Phase 2 is to finish the work planned for Phase 1. Reviewers noted that it is an important project and it needs to continue in order to realize the benefits of the investment to date. However, after a lengthy discussion, reviewers concluded that the applicant needs to finish the work they have started to assess the lessons learned in Phase 1, including how to do the work correctly. As a result, reviewers determined that this second application is premature. They also noted that the schedule for implementation was too ambitious, and in that sense, could impinge on the educational benefits to be had from the on-site activities.

Reviewers questioned the need to replace the culverts, feeling that the applicant doesn't have a good handle on the site's hydrology. They recognized that the tributaries provide some benefit to cutthroat trout, but the tributaries are seasonal, and are further impeded by at least seven downstream barriers lower in the watershed and off the project site. One reviewer suggested that the applicant should consider addressing the aquatic component in a technical assistance application designed to analyze the site's aquatic habitat values and channel conditions. From there, the applicant could possibly have a stronger case for replacing the culverts, and/or under taking some other restoration work in the wet prairie area.

Several reviewers felt that while monitoring is a good educational tool, in this case, it did not strike them as particularly useful in terms of informing the long-term sustainability of the site. These reviewers wanted to eliminate the monitoring piece altogether.

Reviewers had many questions about the budget. Their main concern was that the per-acre treatment is expensive, especially for a site that does not address the needs of any particular listed species. They felt the contractor's rate was steep and they wanted fiscal administration to be closer to five percent of the subtotal. Finally, they did not understand why OWEB was being asked to purchase capital equipment, given that the contractor would be providing necessary equipment.

In the end, reviewers continued to be enthusiastic about the project, but thought it was important for the applicant to slow down and have a better understanding of results from Phase 1 work. The applicant should reassess the aquatic piece and the effectiveness monitoring component. They wanted to see a tighter budget for future submissions and would like the applicant to consider the possibility for the university and OWEB to share the costs of salary support for university staff.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3032</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Delph Creek and Porter Road Fish Passage Improvement Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Clackamas River Basin Council		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$76,422.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$362,234.00

---

### **Application Description**

Two, 4-foot metal culverts on Delph Creek near Estacada are barriers to fish passage due to a shallow downstream pool, the slope of pipes, and a 2-foot perch at the outlets. This proposal is to replace the culverts with a full-spanning bridge, which will be 1.5 times bankfull stream width. This will open approximately 4.5 miles of high-quality spawning and rearing stream habitat to winter steelhead, coho salmon, and cutthroat trout. The bridge will be designed to pass a 100-year storm event. Clackamas County will monitor the crossing annually, as well as after significant storm events. The county will also conduct fish presence/absence surveys for three years after construction. Other partners include USDA Forest Service and the Fish America Foundation. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services and supplies and materials.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

This stream provides habitat for coho, steelhead and cutthroat trout. While reviewers would have liked the application to explain why removal of this culvert is such a high priority, they nevertheless found the proposed work to be straightforward with excellent match and a reasonable budget. For the most part, the applicant responded to previous review team concerns, and reviewers on the site visit found it very helpful. The adjacent landowner is supportive of the project.

The current application shifted the focus from a safety issue (flooding) to a more appropriate focus on fish passage and habitat. Reviewers now had a better understanding of the downstream “cascade” and recognized that good habitat in fact exists above the culverts. The application could have provided more detail on the planting plan.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

The replacement of both culverts on Delph Creek in the Clackamas Basin watershed will open nearly five miles of high-quality spawning and rearing habitat to winter steelhead, coho salmon, and cutthroat trout. Riparian plantings will decrease sediment loading and improve water quality.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

7 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$75,822.00</b>			<b>\$ 600.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced. Non-capital funds are eliminated due to very limited availability of non-capital funds.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$75,882.00</b>			

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$75,882.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3036</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Willamette Confluence Invasive Control Project: Phase I		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Friends of Buford Park & Mt Pisgah		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$123,706.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$222,146.00

---

### **Application Description**

In this Phase 1, the applicant proposes to begin invasives species control work on 103 acres of the former “Wildish Lands” – a 1,270-acre parcel recently acquired by The Nature Conservancy with in part OWEB funding. Where feasible, the applicant will prep the site through use of prescribed fire. Oak savanna areas will be replanted with native grasses, bromes, and wildflowers; riparian forests will be replanted with native grasses and a variety of shrubs and trees. Partners include The Nature Conservancy, Oregon State Parks, Land County Parks Division, ODFW, Meyer Memorial Trust and the Bonneville Power Administration. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services, supplies and materials, and plant establishment.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The site is a “landmark” acquisition with adjacent land under protection. Much restoration work needs to occur at this heavily altered site, and the applicant has good experience in invasives control methods that are light on the environment. Volunteer support seems strong.

In general, reviewers found the application to be poorly written, providing minimal detail in terms of context, measurable objectives, specific treatments, alternatives considered, plans for measuring success, plant establishment, etc. Specifically, reviewers commented that the application should have identified specific areas that are proposed to be worked in and the expected results of work in those areas. It was noted that there is no OWEB-required acquisition management plan yet in place, and that management planning has just started. Reviewers recognized that the area needs work, but the proposal seemed premature, given that the management planning has just started.

While match was generally good, some reviewers would have liked to have seen stronger match from The Nature Conservancy, the new owner of the property. The budget seemed excessive in terms of project management hours, mileage, plant costs, and fiscal administration. In particular, reviewers noted the high per-plant cost, which seemed odd given that the applicant operates a nearby nursery. Reviewers had the impression they were being asked to support the costs of operating the nursery.

In the end, the project simply struck reviewers as too expensive for weed control work, especially since so much weed control remains to be done at this site. They concluded that the project is premature since no management plan is yet in place. They would like to see a management plan for the entire property so that they have a sense of the overall work needed, how that work will be prioritized, and an activity schedule over time with an endpoint. Chipping away at invasives without this bigger picture framework seemed ill-conceived.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3037</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Upper Poodle Creek Fish Passage, Channel and Riparian Restoration		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Long Tom WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$210,573.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$324,236.00

---

### **Application Description**

The project is located in the upper Poodle Creek drainage in the Long Tom Watershed, and will address the following issues: 1) a fish passage barrier culvert blocking access to 1.5 miles of excellent cutthroat trout spawning habitat; 2) 500 feet of historically straightened/channelized stream which has reduced the amount of instream habitat available to cutthroat and other native fish, decreased floodplain interaction, increased erosion, and altered natural sediment transport processes; and 3) insufficient riparian forest area. The proposed solution includes replacing the culvert with a counter-sunk, stream-simulation culvert; abandoning 500 feet of straightened channel and creating 2,400 feet of new, meandering channel in the landowners' pasture; and creating a nine-acre riparian/wetland forest at the confluence of Jack Hays and Poodle creeks. Effectiveness monitoring will involve pre- and post-project stream channel surveys, macro-invertebrate community surveys, and snorkel surveys to evaluate fish species composition and abundance. Project partners include the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Farm Services Agency (CREP), Meyer Memorial Trust and volunteers. OWEB funds will be used to pay for the channel restoration components of the project, which will entail design, permitting, channel excavation, supplies and materials, effectiveness monitoring, plant establishment and project management.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Poodle Creek is a very productive cutthroat trout stream. Some good work has already occurred on this property and reviewers would like to support a reasonable effort to prevent cutthroat from stranding in the field after high-water events. Reviewers appreciated that a strength of the proposal is its continued focus on a particular stream until that reach has been restored. They noted that the stream has been straightened and is lacking pools, structure, and fish habitat. They also noted that it would be a good demonstration project for landowners showing how remeandering can work.

Despite these favorable comments, reviewers also had significant concerns. Reviewers noted that several issues, that they had raised in a previous submission, were not addressed here. Specifically, they commented that the cost of the project - a concern with the first submission - actually rose slightly with this submission. The applicant also had not reduced the high fiscal administration cost, which the team had previously recommended to be reduced. Finally, reviewers noted that the resubmitted application did not respond to their recommendation to reduce the design costs, and did not contain a good analysis of alternatives.

After a lengthy discussion, reviewers concluded that \$186,000 to meander less than a half-mile of stream was not cost effective or competitive with other applications. While the boulders had been removed from the budget, as requested by the previous evaluation, reviewers thought that the number of proposed structures remained excessive given the size of the construction area.

Reviewers then spent some time debating whether it would be possible to have a lighter touch and still achieve the same, or similar, benefits. In particular, they noted that remeandering is an expensive

undertaking by its very nature. They would like the applicant to explore with the engineer a more creative and less costly approach. For example, if the contractor simply blocked the current stream, could it reactivate the historic channel on its own with less engineering and fewer structures? Since there is a lower risk of meandering and downcutting at this site, reviewers thought that alternative approaches might be more cost-effective and successful.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3038</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	McKenzie Oxbow Restoration		
<b>Applicant:</b>	McKenzie WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$66,489.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$96,734.00

---

### **Application Description**

Over the course of the last sixty to seventy years the installation of flood control dams in the McKenzie River and associated tributaries, along with a variety of land use practices such residential development, agriculture, and forestry, have altered natural processes necessary for the creation of diverse floodplain habitat critical to a wide variety of native fish and wildlife. The project is located on a 33-acre parcel on the McKenzie River, two miles due east of the City of Springfield. The parcel is a former OWEB acquisition, now owned by the McKenzie River Trust. The applicant proposes to add large woody material in backwater channels, control invasive vegetation on 20 acres and plant native vegetation in an effort to enhance habitat for native fish and wildlife, including ESA-listed spring Chinook salmon and Oregon chub. Project partners include the Trust, ODFW, Eugene Water & Electric Board and the McKenzie Watershed Council. Partners will work collaboratively to monitor the site for fish use, water temperature, invasive control and replanting success over time. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services, project materials, project management and plant establishment.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The application provided excellent context and did a good job of describing the problems and causes. The project offers good benefits to chub. The largest population of Oregon chub in the McKenzie system is in the oxbow on this property. The oxbow lacks complexity and is overgrown with reed canary grass. A management plan is complete and approved by OWEB. Partnerships are strong and the project will involve the public in innovative ways, such as helping to control the bullfrog population by working with staff to collect egg masses.

Reviewers had a lengthy discussion about the proposal. They recognized the value of the area and liked the goal of enhancing connectivity and improving habitat. However, there were a lot of questions about the prospects for success of the project as proposed.

Because this is a very dynamic site with a partially revetted side channel, reviewers did not have a high degree of confidence that restoration work would result in long-term sustainability of the site's biodiversity values. Many reviewers felt that invasives control and planting would have little success outside the water margin. It was noted that mowing and hand grubbing won't control reed canary grass; it needs to be treated prior to a flood event with the hope that it then gets scoured out. Reviewers would have liked more detail on where the logs were to be placed and how the applicant expects them to provide habitat for native species over time. And while the Plant Establishment section was generally informative, reviewers would have appreciated knowing where the applicant was proposing to put specific plant types. In both regards, a map showing the various planting and log jam locations would have been beneficial.

The budget was vague, with the use of lump sums under contracted services. There was no explanation of the roles of the land steward and council coordinator, which on the surface seemed duplicative. The council

coordinator appears twice in the budget under Project Management and In-House Personnel. These costs and the travel costs seemed high to reviewers.

In the end, reviewers had too many questions to recommend funding at this time.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3039</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Salmon River Aquatic Habitat Restoration Project - Upper and Lower Miller Quarry		
<b>Applicant:</b>	The Freshwater Trust		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$678,209.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$1,420,387.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Freshwater Trust (TFT) and its partners seek to restore habitat to benefit federally-listed spring Chinook, coho, and winter steelhead on the Salmon River, an ecologically significant tributary of the Sandy River. After a major flood in 1964, reaches of the Salmon River were straightened, rip-rapped, and diked. This channelization, coupled with the loss of large wood from the river corridor, decreased overall habitat diversity, complexity, and floodplain connectivity. The project will increase pool habitat, pool tailout habitat, floodplain connectivity, and large wood on 3,700 feet of the Salmon River, and will restore surface flow and channel complexity to 1,200 feet of side channel habitat. The proposed work is on public land, will provide local economic benefits, and features a unique education component. This effort builds on the successful completion of similar multi-landowner projects by the partners between 2008 and 2010 (a current OWEB grant, 210-3005, is still under way). Much of the Salmon River is in a similar condition to the project site, and this work is designed to serve as a restoration template for future work, providing long-term benefit to the area. Partners include Fish America Foundation, National Forest Foundation, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Ecotrust, Portland Water Bureau, Bureau of Land Management and the USDA Forest Service. OWEB funds will be used primarily for pre-implementation, contracted services, supplies and materials, effectiveness monitoring, and plant establishment.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project is being conducted in a high-priority basin and builds on the 2009 Salmon River Assessment and Restoration Plan. The plan has been peer reviewed and takes into consideration the recommendations of the peer reviewers. The partnership is strong and partners are working on complementary projects elsewhere in the basin. The contractor has a strong track record with instream projects. Match and outreach potential are strong.

Reviewers on the site visit were impressed with Phase 1 work, but were concerned that the logs used instream were too small for site velocities. They observed some failure of the installed log jams after last year's two-year event. A discussion ensued about whether this application is premature, coming before the effects of Phase 1 could be fully assessed. Other issues concerned whether the proposed effectiveness monitoring addresses the needs of recovery planning. The short project reach seemed to be over engineered, saturated with proposed habitat structures. One reviewer recommended that the applicant spread out the effort over a longer stretch of the river.

Reviewers were deeply concerned about the overall project costs. Immediately prior to the review team meeting, the applicant submitted a proposed reduction of about \$96,000, but reviewers still were not satisfied. Mostly, they thought that costs for personnel and contractors in all three budgets (Implementation, Effectiveness Monitoring, and Plant Establishment) were top-heavy and at times redundant; permitting support and regulatory and stakeholder coordination seemed excessive. Also, they wondered why the

council executive director would need to spend ten days on the planting project at \$250 a day. In addition, they noted the planting costs were excessive for an area that will most likely exhibit strong vegetative resiliency on its own. Reviewers wondered whether the effectiveness monitoring was needed, and thought the monitoring as proposed was excessive, both in the number of parameters monitored and in the frequency of monitoring. During the discussion, reviewers concluded that the proposed monitoring appeared not to be using ODFW protocols, so it would not fit into recovery monitoring plans.

Reviewers were unclear as to why \$20,000 was needed to mobilize what appeared to be just two pieces of equipment (excavator and dump truck). On page 13, the narrative says the boulders will be donated, but they end up in the budget as a \$116,200 cost to OWEB (subsequently reduced to \$51,040). Fiscal administration costs also seemed very high.

Reviewers came close to rejecting the project. In addition to the application’s many budget issues, reviewers had concerns about the size of wood and the design, and thought the application was premature. But in the end, they wanted to support the momentum achieved in Phase 1 for this important salmonid recovery zone. They would like the applicant to slow the project down to assess results and inform adaptive management for the final phase (Phase 3).

**Ecosystem Process and Function**

The project will enhance ecosystem process and function along 3,700 feet of the Salmon River – an ecologically significant tributary to the Sandy River. Specifically, the project will enhance stream complexity, floodplain connectivity, water quality, riparian vegetative structure and ground cover, species diversity and sediment transport.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced. Do not fund effectiveness monitoring; reduce project management and project oversight costs, mobilization costs, planting costs and fiscal administration.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

8 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$458,445.00</b>		<b>\$27,474.00</b>	

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

Subsequent to the review team meeting and in response to the team’s conditions, the applicant submitted a reduced budget. However, around this time, a major storm compromised the integrity of most of the instream structures completed in 2010 under Phase 1. Following the storm, staff requested and received a preliminary status report on the Phase 1 structures, which revealed that the vast majority of them had disappeared downstream. After consulting by email with review team members, staff came to the conclusion that it would not be a responsible use of OWEB funds at this time to support the instream construction activity of the Phase 2 application. Staff informed the applicant that OWEB would recommend reduced funding only for the side-channel reactivation activity and requested another revised budget. Staff encouraged the applicant to return to OWEB in the spring with a technical assistance application with a request for funding to support the development of less risky alternatives.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced. Fund at a reduced rate of \$176,221. Fund only the side channel reactivation work. No effectiveness monitoring or plant establishment are included.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$176,221.00</b>

<b>EM Portion</b>

<b>PE Portion</b>

<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$176,221.00**

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3040</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Kime Oak Savanna and Prairie Restoration		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Long Tom WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$110,380.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$148,420.00

---

### **Application Description**

The 253-acre Kime property is located about ten miles southwest of downtown Eugene. The property is centrally located among several sites previously restored by the applicant, the City of Eugene, the Bureau of Land Management and the Nature Conservancy. This proximity to previously restored and protected lands will allow the site to provide valuable habitat connectivity. The applicant seeks to restore 168 acres of the oak savanna and upland prairie present on-site. Both of these habitat types are exceptionally rare in the Willamette Valley, and host a variety of dependent wildlife and flora. The applicant seeks to restore these habitat types by removing encroaching invasive species (notably Douglas fir and Scotch broom) and thinning incense cedar, ponderosa pine and small, dense clusters of oaks. The landowner will use light, rotational grazing to keep woody vegetation from reestablishing and to encourage the growth of native grasses and forbs. Partners include the landowner and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management, contracted services, supplies and materials and effectiveness monitoring.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers noted that the project has the potential to contribute good watershed function to Spencer Creek. The site has high ecological value: it is a good remnant of native prairie, it lies within a Kincaid's lupine recovery zone and it is within dispersal distance of The Nature Conservancy's Willow Preserve. The landowner is motivated, giving the project good community outreach potential. The applicant has a good track record of successful prairie restoration projects.

The applicant is seeking to demonstrate the efficacy of grazing and restoration, but one reviewer noted that the application does not address the real process issue – lack of fire. Reviewers agreed that light, rotational grazing alone will not be sufficient for long-term success; adding periodic controlled burns to the mix of management activities on this site would ensure long-term conservation of the site's biodiversity. It was unclear if the applicant is planning a second phase, and if so, what is envisioned. Some reviewers felt that the proposed monitoring, while nice, is not essential. They wanted to see more of a plan for using the data to inform future restoration projects using rotational grazing as a management tool. The team noted that monitoring information should be provided to ODFW's species coordinator. Reviewers also commented that they would have liked to have seen additional letters of support, beyond the landowner's.

Despite concerns for the site's long-term sustainability, in the end, reviewers were willing to support the project for the reasons stated in the opening paragraph.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

Restoration of 168 acres of rare Willamette upland prairie and oak savanna will enhance biodiversity and provide essential habitat for Fender's blue butterfly in the Coyote Creek subbasin of the Long Tom Watershed.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

6 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$109,138.00</b>	<b>\$5,460.00</b>		<b>\$1,242.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will require the applicant to provide ODFW with all relevant data obtained from the monitoring. Non-capital funds are eliminated due to very limited availability of non-capital funds.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$110,380.00</b>	<b>\$5,460.00</b>		

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$110,380.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3041</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Canyon-Owl Steelhead Habitat Improvement Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	South Santiam WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Linn
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$163,962.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$410,112.00

---

### **Application Description**

Canyon Creek is a major tributary to the South Santiam River above Foster Dam. Owl Creek is the largest tributary to Canyon Creek, and its confluence is in the upper subwatershed. Both are two of the primary areas in the watershed used for spawning and rearing above Foster Dam by Upper Willamette winter steelhead, a species listed as “threatened” under the Endangered Species Act. Proper functioning of these creeks is critical in the support of this steelhead population. Very little quality spawning and rearing habitat is present for steelhead in the South Santiam watershed. The proposed solution is to improve the quality of rearing habitat, increase spawning habitat, and add features that will enhance ecosystem resiliency. The project seeks OWEB funding to place 150 full length trees into approximately 4.5 miles of Canyon and Owl creeks. Pre- and post-project surveys will be conducted to monitor changes in channel features, substrate, and to allow for adaptive management if needs arise. Surveys will include longitudinal profiles, gravel sampling and photo point monitoring. The USDA Forest Service is the primary partner, contributing the instream logs. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services and project management.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The review team ranked this project as its top restoration priority in the Willamette Basin. The application provided good detail and showed excellent match. The budget is reasonable. The project is identified as the second highest priority for fisheries restoration work in the watershed. The proposed activities will exceed the minimum size class of the ODFW wood placement guidelines. The partnership is strong and reviewers have confidence in the Forest Service lead on the project. The applicant and project partners have previously demonstrated a successful track record with large wood placement projects.

Reviewers who participated in the site visit appreciated the opportunity to tour the previously funded Moose Creek instream project, noting that the wood had stayed in place and seemed to be performing as intended. Site visit reviewers also greatly appreciated the handy overview materials the applicant provided at the start of the tour.

For this project, reviewers would have liked more detail on the general location of the wood placement; a conceptual map would have helped in that regard.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

Instream restoration work along the 4.5 miles of Canyon and Owl creeks in the upper South Santiam Watershed will improve habitat conditions for threatened Upper Willamette ESU winter steelhead and for the core genetic legacy population above Foster Dam.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

1 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$163,962.00</b>			

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$163,962.00</b>			

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$163,962.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3043</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Calapooia River Middle Reach 2 Restoration		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Calapooia WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Linn
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$176,231.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$319,061.00

---

### **Application Description**

In its 2004 Action Plan, the Calapooia Watershed Council identified the Middle Reach of the Calapooia River, from Sodom Dam (RM 28) to the former Brownsville Dam site (RM 36), as a “dynamic river corridor for protection and restoration”. The action plan divided the eight-mile section into four reaches. Reach 2 (R2), located in the City of Brownsville, is a 1.3 mile section of river with significant side channel and mainstem salmonid rearing habitats and winter refugia. Through extensive planning efforts, the council has completed USFS Title 11-funded designs for all five landowners within R2. This will complement multiple, large-scale, OWEB-funded instream restoration and riparian conservation easement projects immediately downstream in Reach 3. Fish species that will benefit include spring Chinook, winter steelhead, cutthroat trout, and other native non-salmonids. OWEB funds will be used to improve riparian function, add instream habitat complexity, and decrease sedimentation using innovative stabilization techniques on City and private land, and will complement three other recently funded upstream R2 projects slated for construction summer 2011. Partners include the City of Brownsville, participating private landowners, USDA Forest Service, and the Meyer Memorial Trust. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The application was generally well written and demonstrated strong local support and match. The project is a continuation of a technical assistance project that developed and prioritized designs for the eight-mile reach between the former Brownsville Dam and the soon-to-be-removed Sodom Dam. The project builds on and complements restoration work already implemented immediately downstream. The applicant is working closely with the State Historic Preservation Office. The project location, at a city park, affords excellent outreach and education opportunities.

The application did not provide much detail on the engineered log jams, especially on their location, which made it difficult for reviewers to assess their efficacy. Reviewers thought that 4,000 feet of vegetated soil lifts were excessive, and could be used more selectively to still allow the river some flexibility. In an area already suffering from a lack of streamside vegetation, they did not endorse the plan to remove 14 large trees, shown in the Bank Modification Plan.

Mainly, reviewers felt that the proposed fix is a band-aid solution. The river is constrained through this stretch, bounded on one side by a city park seeking to stabilize the banks to prevent further erosion and on the other side by a rip-rapped, privately owned stream bank. During the site visit, the project engineer stated that this rip-rapped bank is the main culprit of bank erosion at the city park, and reviewers were therefore reluctant to invest in stabilization techniques on the city park side without a fix to the rip-rapped bank, as well.

Finally, reviewers discussed how this project might be affected by impacts to the channel (and by extension the city park banks) following removal of the Sodom Dam. Whether the channel will become less tortuous

in its meander pattern once sediment transport processes are restored with the removal of the dam is a fundamental question that can't be answered until the dam comes out.

Ideally, a resubmission will discuss the effects of dam removal on Reach 2. In the absence of that information, reviewers would entertain a resubmission that focuses more on habitat creation than on bank stabilization. Reviewers would need to know in a resubmission that the engineer is reasonably certain that the thalweg and meander radius are not likely to shift further into the upland terrace. Then, perhaps the worst erosion is over and some less aggressive bank planting treatment might be appropriate. Finally, the proposed engineered log jams, properly designed and installed, could reduce further bank erosion at the park site without the addition of soil lifts or the removal of existing trees, while at the same time providing habitat.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3045</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Cedar Creek Culvert Replacement		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Lane County Public Works		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$240,730.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$722,460.00

---

### **Application Description**

Cedar Creek is a perennial tributary to Cottage Grove Reservoir, which is an impoundment of the Coast Fork Willamette. Fish species found in the stream include cutthroat trout, large-scale sucker and brook lamprey. Three side-by-side culverts, located approximately seven miles south of the City of Cottage Grove, pass under a county road and a parallel Weyerhaeuser haul road. The condition of one culvert is considered serious with a remaining life of five years. The other two culverts are assumed to be in similar condition but have not been evaluated. However, all three culverts are undersized and perched, making them velocity and fish passage barriers that do not meet current ODFW fish passage requirements. The proposed project consists of replacing the culverts with a box culvert at the county road crossing and a bridge at the Weyerhaeuser crossing (the applicant and partners determined that a single spanning bridge across both roads would be cost prohibitive). This will open approximately 9.5 miles of fish habitat. ODFW will conduct pre- and post-fish monitoring to assess fish movement through the new structure and species abundance above the project site. Partners include Weyerhaeuser, ODFW and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. OWEB funds will be used to match costs of the construction of the county box culvert, the Weyerhaeuser bridge, and the stream enhancement in between both roads and immediately upstream of the box culvert.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

In general, reviewers found this to be a poorly written application, lacking detail on the current condition of the culverts, an explanation of why Weyerhaeuser needs a bridge and the county finds box culverts acceptable, and other details. The site visit was helpful and cleared up many of the questions. Reviewers appreciated that OWEB was asked for no fiscal administrative support.

For the review team, however, the proposed solution was a lot of money for what appeared to be essentially a dual road system. The culverts are not complete barriers to fish passage, and in any case, they are located above the reservoir, making them less of a priority for replacement. More importantly, there was clearly no coordination with the local watershed council in advance of the application submission, indicating that the project lacked local involvement and evaluation of need in the watershed. Reviewers also noted that the lump sum budget contained no cost breakouts, which they like to see to better understand and evaluate proposed activities and costs.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3048</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Hollyer Prairie Enhancement Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Coast Fork Willamette WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$27,050.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$60,350.00

---

### **Application Description**

This 31-acre project is located on Upper Camas Swale Creek, nine miles west of its confluence with the Coast Fork. Historically, the wide, low-gradient Camas Swale basin was an extensive wetland supporting at-risk species like Kincaid's lupine and Fender's blue butterfly. Previous on-site agricultural practices created ditches and plowed under parts of the native prairie, resulting in reduced hydrologic function, native biodiversity, and wetland habitat for endemic species. Good wetland character and connectivity still exist on private lands making this project site a high priority. The applicant proposes to restore about 25 acres of wetland habitat and control invasives on an additional 6 acres of upland habitat. The project is a resubmission that reflects a scaled-back approach to channel enhancement. To that end, the applicant has secured culvert design funding from the Department of State Lands' In Lieu program. A plant survey was conducted in spring 2010 at the landowner's expense. The survey identified three populations of Kincaid's lupine on site and recommended immediate action to protect them from invasive oxeye daisy. Other partners include the US Fish and Wildlife Service. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management, invasive species control, and seeding and bulb planting.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The review team ranked this project as one of its top three restoration priorities in the Willamette Basin. Reviewers were generally pleased with the revised application, which has been greatly modified from the original. The revised application now focuses primarily on controlling invasives on rare habitat types. Reviewers were pleased to see the use of fire in the mix of management activities. The budget is reasonable. Reviewers especially liked that there is a conservation easement on much of the property, which will go a long way toward protecting and sustaining the site's overall biodiversity values.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

Restoration of 31 acres of upland and wet prairie and of 7 acres of native ash forest and Oregon white oak woodland will enhance biodiversity and floodplain reconnection in the Camas Swale subbasin of the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

2 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$26,250.00</b>			<b>\$ 800.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund. Non-capital funds are eliminated due to very limited availability of non-capital funds.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$27,050.00</b>			

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$27,050.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3050</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Clear Creek Large Wood Placement Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Tualatin River WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Washington
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,600.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$69,900.00

---

### **Application Description**

The project is located in the City of Forest Grove on a one-mile stream reach of Clear Creek, a tributary to Gales Creek. The majority of the Clear Creek subwatershed is owned and managed by the City of Forest Grove for municipal water supply and sustainable forestry. Watershed problems include: 1) lack of channel complexity and rearing habitat (pools) for spawning native winter steelhead trout, non-native Coho salmon, Pacific lamprey and other native fish; 2) a barrier to juvenile fish passage due to an obsolete concrete water gauging structure and 3) lack of instream structure for migratory adult fish to more easily access the Clear Creek fish ladder at intake structure. The proposed solution is to: 1) place up to 86 logs and/or whole trees in the stream to create pools and scour for fish habitat; 2) remove the obsolete water gauging structure from the stream; and 3) develop a small graded riffle at the Clear Creek intake structure to provide easier access for migrating adult fish. Partners include Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the City of Forest Grove and its watershed manager, Trout Mountain Forestry. Following project construction, Rapid Bioassessment Inventories will be performed to evaluate fish passage for the treated reach. OWEB funds will be used for transportation and placement of the logs, removal and disposal of the concrete structure, purchase of materials, construction of the graded riffle, and project management.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The city of Forest Grove actively manages the subwatershed for conservation (sustainable forestry) and water quality (municipal drinking water supply). The project is relatively straightforward and cost effective with clear benefits to winter steelhead, cutthroat trout and non-native Coho. Wood for instream placement will be available in summer 2011, making this a timely project. Partnerships and match are adequate. The budget is reasonable.

During the site visit, reviewers requested the project expand to a disabled downstream pipe crossing the riverbed. At little extra cost, this pipe could be removed. In addition, they noted that the applicant had neglected to budget for permits and outreach to private landowners in the area. Finally, reviewers appreciate the five percent fiscal administration cost to OWEB, but pointed out that "final reporting" is not a function of in-house personnel, but of fiscal administration.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

Instream restoration along the 4.2 miles of Clear Creek, a tributary to Gales Creek in the Tualatin Watershed, will provide important stream channel complexity and pool-rearing and spawning habitat for several species of fish. The removal of the abandoned pipe and gauging station will aid in juvenile fish passage.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Increased. Revise the budget to include costs for removing the abandoned downstream pipe, permitting, and outreach. Staff to investigate whether the line items under Project Management for Biosurveys and Trout Mountain Forestry are duplicative.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

5 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$55,963.00</b>			<b>\$150.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Increased. Fund at an increased rate of \$56,113 to include costs for removing the abandoned downstream pipe and permitting. Applicant subsequently satisfied RRT concerns about potential duplication of project management activities. Non-capital funds are eliminated due to very limited availability of non-capital funds.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$56,113.00</b>			

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$56,113.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3053</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Veteran's Park Habitat Restoration		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Scappoose Bay WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	<b>WILLAMETTE</b>	<b>County:</b>	Columbia
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$279,937.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$459,937.00

---

### **Application Description**

This project is located on South Scappoose Creek in Veteran's Park within the Scappoose Bay Watershed. Past land use practices, including filling historic floodplains and secondary channels and straightening and realigning the creek, have profoundly altered the ecosystem's process and function. Currently, a 1,500-foot section of the creek is experiencing extreme bank erosion and is resulting in heavy sedimentation being deposited downstream. In addition, the reach has an inadequate riparian buffer, dominated by invasives. These conditions limit the creek's ability to support populations of Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, steelhead, and cutthroat trout. The applicant proposes to stabilize the banks by laying them back where feasible to create a floodplain bench of 20-100 feet, depending on available space; place large wood instream to create habitat complexity, enhance a small, nearby wetland; plant four acres of riparian floodplain and conduct effectiveness monitoring over a 5-year period to measure changes in the biological and geomorphic conditions at the site before and after implementation. Partners include the City of Scappoose, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, ODFW and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. OWEB funds will be used for project construction, riparian restoration and plant establishment, project management, administration and effectiveness monitoring.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project is linked to a large-scale restoration plan for South Scappoose Creek. Located in the city's one public park, the project has excellent education and outreach potential. Partnerships are good and match is strong. Reviewers appreciate the work of this active watershed council and its successful projects. Reviewers on the site visit appreciated the side excursion to the South Scappoose Creek Enhancement project where they were able to view a completed project similar to the one proposed. While the two projects have their differences, some reviewers nevertheless, wished that this application had contained lessons learned, if any, from the South Scappoose Creek project.

For a relatively small site, the proposed activities and budget struck reviewers as excessive. For the cost, they would have liked to have seen a less ambitious project expanded to a larger area. But they had no sense that the applicant had engaged up and downstream landowners for this particular project. One reviewer suggested that the focus should have been more on selective bank grading at high-risk areas, extensive revegetation and plant establishment - dropping the instream wood component altogether. But another thought that extensive bank grading is appropriate at this challenging, much-used location. This reviewer did not want to see the system locked into a degraded state by revegetation before the floodplains are created, but did support revegetating as much of the site as possible after construction. A better alternatives analysis might have helped reviewers reconcile their diverging views. Given the area's high use, reviewers felt the addition of a split rail fence along the riparian area would be important to discourage stream bank trampling. The site visit revealed that park personnel were using the riparian area to dump their grass clippings; outreach and education to the agency charged with maintaining this park seems in order.

In terms of the budget, the design and permitting costs seemed inflated, but it was difficult to tell as they appear together as a lump sum. The hourly rate for project management and in-house personnel seemed adequate, but the number of hours seemed excessive. The waste material haul and disposal costs seemed high. If these materials could be disposed of on site, the project would realize substantial savings. Reviewers felt that quality plants could be obtained for less than \$3 each. The monitoring partnership with the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program is a plus, but reviewers felt that in this instance only the geomorphology monitoring and photo points would provide relevant, useful information. Fiscal administration at eight percent (\$19,077) still seemed too high.

Reviewers genuinely wanted to support the city with its one park, but they identified important concerns with both the project approach and budget. They encourage the applicant to examine less costly alternatives at this site, provide a thorough discussion in the proposal about any alternatives that are explored with the rationale behind the approach selected, further describe the benefits of restoration in this reach within the context of the larger watershed, and to tighten up the budget. Also, reviewers recommended exploring opportunities for permitting and design assistance, and permitting costs, by getting assistance from the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3057</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Sandy Basin Anchor Habitat Vegetation Restoration Project Phase 2		
<b>Applicant:</b>	The Nature Conservancy		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$284,433.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$443,276.00

---

### **Application Description**

This project is part of a basin-wide, seven-year plan to restore a series of riparian natural areas prioritized for the recovery of at-risk fish species, including Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead. Over the last eight years, the project has conducted outreach to and partnered with more than 500 private landowners in the Sandy Basin to conduct invasive species surveys and treatments. Human use of the watershed has altered channels, damaged habitat for fish and wildlife, introduced invasive species, and degraded water quality. The project focuses on restoring long-term processes associated with healthy, native riparian vegetation, including stream shading, large-wood recruitment, habitat and channel complexity, and erosion control. Phase 1 of the project, implemented in 2009, controlled invasive species, thinned deciduous trees and planted wide riparian buffers with native vegetation. Phase 2 will maintain and enhance restoration efforts at eight sites that were initiated during Phase 1 of the project, and will restore two additional sites in the vicinity. All told, 700 riparian acres and 500 upland acres will be treated for invasives, 50 riparian acres will be planted and 12 miles of riparian streambank will be treated. Major partners include The Nature Conservancy, East Multnomah SWCD, Metro, Bureau of Land Management and the Oregon Department of Agriculture. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management, contracted services, supplies and materials and plant establishment.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The project is being conducted in a high-priority basin at a scope and scale necessary for effective long-term recovery of the watershed. The partnership has engaged in extensive planning to identify priority sites. The applicant has a well-established process for handling large, multiple project sites. It provided good documentation of activities and plans for follow-up. Partners are working on complementary projects elsewhere in the basin. The project addresses a long-term process issue while engaging hundreds of private landowners.

While the per-acre cost of restoration is reasonable, the overall budget is considerable, given the scope and scale of the project. Reviewers wanted to have a better understanding of how Early Detection, Rapid Response (EDRR) strategies will be funded over the long-term. They encourage the applicant to work through the partnership to find a means for establishing a weed management authority for the basin. Reviewers would like to see more reliance on professional work crews rather than youth crews, which can end up being more costly if not adequately supervised all the time. They wanted to see a third-party inspection of site conditions to remove any potential biases in the assessment of progress. One reviewer urged that the applicant use a ring spray around plants in the early spring before bud breakout, rather than waiting until summer leaf out.

Reviewers wanted to make sure that the proposed work is cost effective, especially given all the work currently occurring in this basin. They discussed the budget at length, and concluded that because the applicant is working in volume, they should be able to purchase trees and shrubs at a much lower, discounted

rate. They did not support the line item cost to OWEB for kayaks (\$1,100) as an appropriate use of agency funds. They noted that fiscal administration of the project would be fairly straightforward so that the cost to OWEB could be reduced to five percent.

**Ecosystem Process and Function**

Restoration of 1,200 acres of riparian natural areas will help in the recovery of threatened anadromous fish populations (Chinook, coho, and steelhead). Moreover, the project will enhance riparian vegetative structure and ground cover, species diversity, sediment transport, water quality, instream complexity, and hydrologic and nutrient cycling.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund Reduced. Reduce Fiscal Administration to five percent, reduce the per plant costs to \$1.00 each, and remove the kayak line item.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

4 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$260,899.00</b>		<b>\$50,820.00</b>	

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

Subsequent to the Review Team meeting, staff requested a revised budget to address review team conditions. The applicant submitted a satisfactory revised budget that reduced the overall cost to OWEB, as noted below.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund Reduced. Fund at a reduced rate of \$260,899. Reduce Fiscal Administration to five percent, reduce the per plant costs to \$1.00, and remove the kayak line item.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$260,899.00</b>		<b>\$50,820.00</b>	

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$260,899.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3065</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Major Gregory Young Memorial Salmon Enhancement Project		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Scappoose Bay WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Columbia
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$110,425.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$147,555.00

---

### **Application Description**

The project is located on Milton Creek approximately 6 miles upstream of where it flows into Scappoose Bay. Historically, the Milton Creek subwatershed was one of the most productive salmonid subwatersheds of the Scappoose Bay Watershed. A legacy of splash damming and log drives down the creek severely altered the subwatershed's ecological process and function. The primary goal of the project is to restore salmonid habitat within Milton Creek, which hosts a diversity of at-risk species including coho, steelhead, and cutthroat trout. Specifically, the project will place 80 pieces of large wood within the channel to improve fish habitat and floodplain connectivity along a 2,850 linear foot reach; reestablish five acres of riparian floodplain forest; and remove/control of exotic invasive plants on the property. Effectiveness monitoring will measure changes in the riparian floodplain community before and after implementation over a 5-year period. Partners include the Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. OWEB funds will be used for project construction, riparian restoration, project management, and effectiveness monitoring.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Withdrawn.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3067</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Restoration
<b>Project Name:</b>	Shotpouch Creek Restoration Phase 1: Fish Passage		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Marys River WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lincoln
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$203,061.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$255,894.00

---

### **Application Description**

Shotpouch Creek, draining from the west slope of Marys Peak in Lincoln County, provides some of the highest quality cutthroat trout habitat in the Marys River basin. Cutthroat trout are one of four conservation targets under the Marys River Model Watershed Action Plan (2010). The Council proposes to replace six barriers to fish passage on the creek, providing access to an additional 4.5 miles of high-quality spawning habitat and summer thermal refugia to cutthroat trout. Five undersized culverts on spawning tributaries will be replaced with culverts capable of passing 50-year flood events. One crossing on the mainstem Shotpouch Creek will be replaced with a pre-stressed concrete slab bridge. Effectiveness monitoring will include repeat snorkel surveys to assess changes in juvenile and adult cutthroat distribution and instream habitat surveys. Partners include Lincoln County Public Works, which will provide in-kind culvert installation and a portion of the rock, and the Meyer Memorial Trust. OWEB funds will be used primarily for pre-implementation, project management, and contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The review team ranked this project as one of its top three restoration priorities in the Willamette Basin. The application was well written and thorough with clear ecological benefit for the cost. The project builds on a previously funded Rapid Bio-Assessment and takes a comprehensive approach, addressing all aspects of watershed function, from instream complexity to floodplain connectivity to riparian health.

The project is located in the upper Marys River Watershed along a fairly isolated stretch of Shotpouch Creek. Historical land management practices have been poor, and outreach to modern-day landowners has been challenging, but nonetheless highly successful. Reviewers wanted to make sure that the engineer will check all culvert sizes for adherence to ODFW guideline, stamp the bridge design, and be available during installation. In addition, they wanted the applicant to look into having a geotechnical expert involved in the installation of the bridge footing.

The cost of the bridge (\$92,510), with 100 percent of it to be borne by OWEB, provided some sticker shock. Reviewers would have liked to have seen some match on the cost. The site visit was informative, though reviewers felt that the applicant had had adequate time to obtain and receive permission from participating private landowners for access to all culverts. One reviewer on the site visit suggested the applicant look into BLM match support for the bridge since the over-passing road is mainly a logging access road to BLM forestland. Though the fiscal administration is at eight percent (\$14, 975), reviewers felt it was still higher than necessary. The application was lacking letters of support, which seemed especially important in this case, given the challenges faced in recruiting the private landowners.

### **Ecosystem Process and Function**

Replacement of the six barriers along Shotpouch Creek in the upper Marys River Watershed will reduce sedimentation and provide access to an additional 4.5 miles of high-quality spawning habitat and summer cool-water refugia to cutthroat trout.

**Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund. Reduce fiscal administration. Staff to look into the need for a geotechnical assessment.

**Regional Review Team Priority**

3 of 8

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$203,061.00</b>			<b>\$1,000.00</b>

**Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review**

The applicant subsequently informed staff that they will review all available geological data. If their review proves inconclusive, they will reduce the scope of the project in order to undertake a geotechnical assessment. Also, at the request of staff, the applicant subsequently reduced fiscal administration to 4.5 percent of the OWEB request.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund. Fiscal administration is reduced and the non-capital request of \$1,000 is eliminated, but the applicant requested and received permission to have these line item savings put toward engineering design.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
<b>\$203,061.00</b>			

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$203,061.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3030</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Native Plant Materials Coordination		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Institute for Applied Ecology		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,886.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$66,965.00

---

### **Application Description**

A major limiting factor to successful restoration in the Willamette Valley is the limited availability and high cost of appropriate native plant materials. Plant material production currently consists of multiple, relatively uncoordinated entities working to meet small-scale restoration needs. The success of these efforts can be greatly improved through coordinated native plant materials production. Such an effort has not been effectively accomplished to date. A higher degree of success in restoration can be achieved through the coordination of supply and demand for plant materials. The applicant proposes to assemble a team of public and private partners to develop solutions for the centralized coordination of native plant material supply and demand in the valley. Partners include the Greenbelt Land Trust, ODFW, NRCS Corvallis Plant Materials Center and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. OWEB funding will recruit producers and restoration practitioners and coordinate their needs and capacities to provide a stable, affordable supply of plant materials for restoration.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers liked the concept of creating cost efficiencies around plant production, and felt that the need for such coordination is pressing. Letters of support were strong.

Reviewers found the application and budget to be poorly conceived. The application needed more details on specific tasks and timelines to help reviewers understand the activities and the end product of the funding. Reviewers did not think the application made a case for the need to fund three staff positions when one should be sufficient. The application did not capture as match the many contributions of its various partners to the project. One reviewer wanted to know how the project relates to the Native Seed Network. Reviewers noted that the budget used lump sums in some instances and they would have wanted to see cost breakouts to be able to better evaluate the proposed budget.

Reviewers would welcome a resubmission, but urge the applicant, in addition to revising the budget, to be very clear on what the end product will be and what area will be covered under this coordination. Reviewers had a number of ideas that the applicant could explore further prior to resubmitting the application, such as the creation of an on-line blog and general advice on how to establish grow contracts with local nurseries. They recommend the applicant touch base with OWEB's regional program representative to discuss these ideas.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3044</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Calapooia River Reach 4 Project Designs and Permitting		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Calapooia WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Linn
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$50,000.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$68,975.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Calapooia Watershed Council completed its OWEB-funded Middle Calapooia River Project Implementation Plan in 2007. The plan divides the eight-mile Middle Reach, which extends from the former Brownsville Dam site to Sodom Dam, into four subreaches. Reach 4 ends at Sodom Dam, which is slated for removal in summer 2011. This 2.3-mile-long, dynamic section of the river has significant ecological uplift potential in side channel and mainstem salmonid rearing and holding habitats (notably, spring Chinook, winter steelhead, cutthroat trout, and Pacific and western brook lamprey). Accelerated erosion is occurring in areas lacking riparian vegetation. The goal of this project is to complete restoration designs, permit applications and an archaeological survey for up to five floodplain and instream restoration projects on private lands in Reach 4. In Reaches 2 and 3, project construction will occur during the instream work windows of 2010 and 2011. Project partners include landowners, Bonneville Environmental Foundation, Meyer Memorial Trust and ODFW. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services.

## REVIEW PROCESS

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers generally liked the application, noting that it was well written and contained good outreach components. They were pleased to see the applicant had contacted the tribes ahead of time, and encourage the applicant in general to pre-screen sites for cultural significance before contracting for design work. Reviewers commented that the applicant is a strong council, with good leadership and technical support that has been doing a great job, including lots of landowner outreach. They liked that the application ranked sites and ideas by priority and explained the priority ranking system.

There was some discussion about where “bank stabilization” projects fall in the general scheme of regional priorities. Some reviewers noted they are not high priority due to their “band-aid” approach and high cost. One reviewer saw a “slippery slope” in trying to stabilize the outside meander of every low-gradient channel in the Willamette Valley. This reviewer said that pulling back banks and planting 20-50-foot deep is not a long-term solution for this particular system. In this reviewer’s opinion, the area needs to have its cottonwood gallery restored as much as possible.

With respect to the budget, reviewers wondered whether fiscal administration could be reduced to five percent since there are just two contractors with straightforward tasks.

In the review of 211-3043 (Reach 2), reviewers expressed a desire to hold off on restoration until after the removal of Sodom Dam. With this application, discussion similarly occurred about whether it too is premature. In the end, reviewers concluded that even though this application is for design only, the reach’s relative proximity to Sodom Dam could still have an impact on design work. As a result, they opted not to recommend funding for the application at this time.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3046</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Row River Floodplain Restoration Phase I		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Coast Fork Willamette WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Lane
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,100.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$67,350.00

---

### **Application Description**

The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Floodplain Restoration Feasibility Study has identified the Coast Fork Willamette as one of two tributaries essential to Willamette floodplain restoration. The Row River, a tributary to the Coast Fork Willamette, is one of the few places remaining where serious floodplain restoration can occur. Row River Nature Park is a 56-acre floodplain site on the Row River that is managed by the City of Cottage Grove for wildlife habitat and nature recreation. In 2008, the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Council began vegetation enhancement on 42 acres of the park. The applicant now proposes to conduct site surveys and develop 60 percent designs for Phase 1 of the floodplain restoration work. The work will entail large woody debris placement and channel reconnections. Partners include the City of Cottage Grove, Lane County Waste Management Division, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which has already funded a 30 percent designs. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services for channel mapping, geomorphic analyses, invasive species mapping and detailed designs.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers found this to be a confusing application with an unclear end result. Specifically, they noted that after reading the application they did not understand what products the work would produce. They were particularly confused by the line item for a geomorphic analysis when the USACE has already completed such an analysis upstream and downstream of the site. They wondered why the application is for another 30 percent design on top of the 30 percent already completed; the first 30 percent should have generated alternatives from which the applicant and its partners could select a final design for OWEB consideration. The budget for contracted services was vague and lacking detail.

Reviewers recommended that the applicant get a third-party review of its applications to ensure better clarity. If a technical committee was not used in this capacity, it should have been; if it was used, the applicant needs to work with the committee to ensure a more rigorous review.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3051</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Gales Creek Restoration Plan		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Tualatin River WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Washington
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$48,493.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$69,183.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Gales Creek subwatershed provides valuable habitat for winter steelhead. To date, the Tualatin River Watershed Council has focused restoration efforts in the subwatershed on five miles of lower Gales Creek. The council seeks funding to develop a comprehensive restoration action plan for the subwatershed to guide and prioritize future restoration activities in the watershed. The action plan will use a science-based approach to identify limiting factors to salmonid production in the watershed. Project recommendations and prioritization will be directly tied to the limiting factors. Most of the information used to inform the limiting factors analysis will be derived from existing data collected by council partners. Supplemental field work will focus on data gaps and identification of projects. An action plan document will be the primary product along with matrices identifying limiting factors, projects, and prioritizations. Washington County Land Use and Transportation is a partner. OWEB funds will be the primary source for development of the plans with partners providing the data necessary to evaluate limiting factors such as barrier information, spawning success, and water quality.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers liked the project goal of obtaining information for the purpose of being more strategic. They noted that a technical advisory committee (TAC) has already been formed, and agreed that there is a need for the project. There were, however, some basic weaknesses that could be easily corrected in a resubmitted application.

Reviewers were concerned that the application as proposed was not well thought-out and not cost-effective. Contracted services were excessive for a project that largely entails compiling existing data. Reviewers wondered if some tasks could be given to the TAC, or to other council volunteers instead. The contractors are named in the budget, but the narrative on page 5 mentions that an RFP will be prepared. The lead contractor appears twice in the budget – once under project management and again as the lead under contracted services. The schedule made no mention of any field work that might be conducted. Letters of support were lacking.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3052</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Butte Creek Subwatershed Assessment and Action Plan		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Pudding River WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Clackamas
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,800.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$86,985.00

---

### **Application Description**

Butte Creek Subwatershed, in the Pudding River Watershed, is considered high-quality habitat for salmonids by ODFW (notably steelhead and chum). Additionally, the Butte Creek confluence area is contained within ODFW's Conservation Opportunity Area for the lower Pudding River. The Pudding River Watershed Council is seeking funds to support the development of an assessment and action plan to help it identify and prioritize future restoration actions. The proposed data collection and restoration opportunities analysis will focus on enhancement solutions for flows, riparian areas, and stream habitat. Another key component of this project will be extensive landowner outreach and community education events to drive future long-term public participation and project implementation. The result will be a road map to salmon and steelhead recovery in the subwatershed, and the prioritization of approximately 20 related projects. Partners include the City of Woodburn, ODFW, Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde and NRCS. OWEB funds will be used primarily for project management for landowner outreach and contracted services for the assessment and action plan.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers found this to be a well-written narrative with good detail and strong partnerships. They liked that the council is focusing in on a priority subwatershed.

However, reviewers were disappointed that the applicant did not address their budget concerns, raised in a previous application. For example, the previous review recommended reducing the 433 hours for a consultant by 50 percent, but the application did not make any reduction in consultant hours or provide any explanation for why the original number of hours had been retained. Another budget concern was that reviewers could not tell how much of the cost was for assessment and how much was for education and outreach with landowners, making it hard to evaluate the project and the budget. Further, they noted that the applicant did not respond in a timely fashion to all staff/reviewer questions prior to the review team meeting.

One reviewer felt it was inappropriate to return to OWEB for funding to fill data gaps that should have been addressed under the previous OWEB-funded action plan. Another reviewer commented on the attached detail budget showing \$3,504 to "develop GIS layers," noting that GIS data layers are already available. Finally, one reviewer felt that for the project's stated objectives, all that is really needed is an understanding of what parts of the subwatershed fish are using. This reviewer concluded that the applicant should instead be requesting funds for a Rapid Bio-Assessment – a statement that resonated with other reviewers.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3059</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Tacoma Street Fish Habitat Enhancement Design		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Johnson Creek WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Multnomah
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$49,790.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$128,365.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Johnson Creek Watershed Council seeks Technical Assistance funding to develop engineered design of fish habitat features on the mainstem Johnson Creek next to the future Tacoma Street light rail station in southeast Portland. The design goals are to improve in-stream fish habitat and channel complexity; design will emphasize placement of large wood structures, floodplain reconnection, and excavation of off channel habitat. The future restoration project will benefit steelhead and Chinook and coho salmon. The technical assistance activity will consist of a professional river restoration firm working with the applicant and its partner, TriMet, to develop a study, design alternatives and ultimately complete construction drawings and technical specifications that meet the above design goals. In addition to TriMet, the City of Portland is a project partner. OWEB funds will pay primarily for contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers noted that this project complements other restoration work in the area and would provide good visibility. It is a priority for the City of Portland, and the partnership between the council and TriMet is strong.

However, reviewers noted that the project area is very small, and the application did not indicate that alternatives would be considered. Reviewers wondered about TriMet's mitigation obligations to balance cut and fill for floodplain effects from development, and thought this is work that TriMet probably has to under take anyway. This led to the comment that reviewers would have liked to have seen more match and commitment to restoration elements from TriMet. Moreover, reviewers felt that a future restoration project would not be competitive with other OWEB applications as the reach in question is quite short and highly constrained. Reviewers did appreciate that fiscal administration to OWEB was less than five percent.

While reviewers thought that OWEB is perhaps not the best source of funds for this particular project, they nevertheless wanted to encourage the applicant to work with TriMet to go above and beyond its basic mitigation requirement at this site. The site's high visibility is an excellent opportunity to showcase the creek as a valuable natural resource in the urban area.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3061</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Recruiting Landowners Beyond Early Adopters		
<b>Applicant:</b>	North Santiam WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	<b>WILLAMETTE</b>	<b>County:</b>	Linn
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$38,500.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$269,400.00

---

### **Application Description**

Private landowners comprise on average 66 percent of the Calapooia and North and South Santiam watersheds. Recruiting these landowners for participation in streamside restoration is vital to the health of these watersheds. The three councils are collaborating through the Meyer Memorial Trust (MMT) Willamette Model Watershed Program to improve habitat for upper Willamette spring Chinook and winter steelhead, as well as to reduce stream temperatures through increased shading. The project proposes to recruit landowners living along streams listed as Essential Salmonid Habitat and on the 303(d) list for exceeding water temperature standards. For the past few years, the Councils have recruited landowners to implement on-the-ground projects to improve riparian buffers. These early adopters provide a base upon which the councils can build to reach additional landowners living in these basins. The councils will assist at least 30 landowners in implementing restoration activities using leveraged grant dollars from other sources. Partners include MMT, DEQ, The Nature Conservancy, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and multiple landowners. OWEB funds will be used primarily for a shared project manager to recruit the landowners across the three watersheds.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

Reviewers noted that the application is well written and easy to understand, presenting a good plan that explains their methods and activities. Match is excellent and reviewers appreciated that the applicant had put some match funds toward travel, as previously requested.

The project is building on tremendous momentum with local landowners. Specific comments included, “it’s working,” “it’s highly successful,” and that it has resulted in a number of restoration projects. Reviewers were especially complimentary of the increased use of CREP in Linn County. The councils are achieving multiple benefits through their landowner contacts, using the contacts as an opportunity to educate, as well as to involve in specific projects.

For future applications, the review team would like a better understanding of approximately how many more landowners remain to be recruited. Also, reviewers wanted to make sure that the councils are working closely with local CREP agencies; as CREP ramps up in these watersheds, letters of support from the relevant CREP-sponsoring agencies demonstrating that the councils are in fact collaborating with them and that there is a strategy in place among all the partners to address increased CREP signups.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Fund.

### **Regional Review Team Priority**

1 of 1

**Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$38,500.00</b>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Fund.

**Staff Recommended Award**

<b>Capital Amount</b>	<b>EM Portion</b>	<b>PE Portion</b>	<b>Non-Capital Amount</b>
			<b>\$38,500.00</b>

**Total Recommended Board Award**

**\$38,500.00**

## **October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Willamette Basin Review Team (Region 3)**

<b>Application No.:</b>	<b>211-3064</b>	<b>Project Type:</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>Project Name:</b>	Scappoose Landing Reconnection		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Scappoose Bay WC		
<b>Basin:</b>	WILLAMETTE	<b>County:</b>	Columbia
<b>OWEB Request:</b>	<b>\$50,000.00</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	\$98,000.00

---

### **Application Description**

The Scappoose Bottomlands represent one of the last freshwater tidal systems not drained, diked and converted to farmland in the basin. ODFW has identified five listed ESU fish species known to use the bottom lands for rearing habitat. The project site, though still tidally connected, experiences minimal flooding due to region-wide modifications of the Willamette and Columbia rivers' flow regimes by upstream hydro power facilities. This has led to a disconnection of Multnomah Channel from Scappoose Bay via historic sloughs in all but the highest flood events. By re-opening some of these historic sloughs and establishing a grazing management plan, the applicant will restore the vegetative community and create off-channel habitat for migrating and rearing salmon. Funding this project would allow the applicant to complete collecting hydrologic data at the site, model the hydrologic impact of the project, and refine a design concept that would restore the site's ecological process and function. Partners include Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. OWEB funds will be used primarily for contracted services.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Regional Review Team Evaluation**

The purpose of reconnecting Multnomah Channel and Scappoose Bay would be to restore ecological function to a greatly compromised site. However, reviewers were not convinced that such a connection would achieve desired results, given the known contamination of the bay's sediments. They also struggled to find clear objectives in the application and noted that the application did not explain why the proposed work was needed. No design component was included, and since technical assistance projects are meant to result in a restoration project, reviewers wondered whether this project would be a good investment of OWEB funds.

The proposed assessment work was expensive, and some reviewers questioned the need for a FLO-2D hydrographic model when a one-dimensional HEC-RAS model would suffice. It was noted that the applicant should be able to get to a 30-60 percent design with information that has already been collected. Reviewers recommended that the applicant bring a number of different, relevant agency personnel out to the site to explore alternatives, all with an eye to finding a solution that is consistent with ODFW's recovery planning.

### **Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff**

Do Not Fund.

### **Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Do Not Fund.