

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.: 212-114	Project Type: Acquisition
Project Name: Clear Lake Acquisition	
Applicant: North Coast Land Conservancy	
Basin: NORTH COAST	County: Clatsop
OWEB Request: \$175,000.00	Total Cost: \$450,000.00

Application Description

NCLC requests \$175,000 to purchase a 42-acre property that includes a 7.5 acre interdunal lake, associated wetlands and forested uplands in Warrenton, Oregon.

The application states that the property is proposed for acquisition at a bargain sale price of \$450,000. The landowner is also looking at a 30-lot subdivision and sand mining from the site. NCLC intends to incorporate the property into their "Columbia Quiet Waters" string of conservation properties in the dune sheet west of highway 101 in Warrenton. Currently, NCLC holds 102 acres within the Columbia Quiet Waters area and is in negotiations for over 150 additional acres.

NCLC has an agreement with the landowner for a bargain sale. The application indicates due diligence will be developed between November 2011 and March of 2012. The appraisal and title report work will be completed in April 2012 through June of 2012. With scheduled completion of purchase in October 2012 through December of 2012.

The application states that the priority ecological systems proposed for conservation are: freshwater marsh and aquatic beds (7 acres); lowland depressional shrub wetlands (3.7 acres); lowland non-linear forested wetlands (11 acres); and Sitka spruce forest (7 acres).

The application states that the project will benefit the following at-risk plant communities: Sitka spruce/red alder/slough sedge/skunk cabbage, and Hooker's willow/crabapple/slough sedge/skunk cabbage.

The application states that the following species will be protected by this acquisition: bald eagle, band-tailed pigeon, Pacific-slope flycatcher, olive-sided flycatcher, rufous hummingbird, red-legged frog. The application states that the project is consistent with three of OWEB's conservation principles, and therefore will: stabilize an area on the brink of ecological collapse, secure a transition area, and complement an existing network of sites in the basin.

NCLC manages more than 40 conservation properties in Clatsop and Tillamook Counties, Oregon totaling more than 2,000 acres. NCLC has 25 years of history in the Northern Oregon Coastal area as a land trust. The NCLC has a strong working relationship with the City of Seaside and have been an integral part of raising estuarine awareness in the City and with visitors.

NCLC has four full-time paid staff and have more than 40 dedicated volunteers. NCLC is in the process of preparing for Accreditation by the Land Trust Alliance.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The RRT noted that over the past ten years and currently there are bald eagles on this property. The property is located adjacent to a neighborhood and two miles from a grade school. The interdunal lake on the property is stocked with large mouth bass and yellow perch, so there are not known native aquatic species on the property. The RRT noted the presence of waterfowl on and around the property, and that it is one of few interdunal lakes in the area not filled with invasive weeds. The RRT recognized the threat of development in Warrenton and the unique characteristic of the interdunal lake/wetland system. Considering the specific properties of the site, the RRT concluded the site had medium ecological value.

Access to the property is via the current property owner's driveway, thus an easement for access would be needed as part of the transaction. Members of the RRT agreed that due to its location within city limits and proximity to an elementary school the property had high educational value, assuming access is not a problem and that NCLC made educational use a priority. NCLC indicated a desire to use this property as an example to educate the public about the importance of conservation. The RRT concluded that the site had high educational value.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Medium Ecological and High Educational value.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.: 212-118	Project Type: Acquisition
Project Name: Schooner Creek Land Acquisition - October 2011	
Applicant: City of Lincoln City	
Basin: NORTH COAST	County: Lincoln
OWEB Request: \$458,860.00	Total Cost: \$621,814.00

Application Description

The City of Lincoln City resubmits its previously withdrawn request (OWEB #212-109) for \$458,860 to purchase an approximately 157-acre forestland property in the upper reach of the Schooner Creek watershed in Lincoln County. The application states that the total project cost is \$621,814. However, an appraisal has not been conducted. The property is owned by Lincoln County, which needs to generate operational funds and therefore plans to advertise the property for sale by the end of 2011. The application indicates that if the city does not purchase the property, the likely buyers of the property will be a commercial timber group.

The city plans to purchase the property in large part because Schooner Creek is a major source of the city's drinking water, and the City is concerned about the water quality impacts caused by timber harvest.

The application states that the project is part of a whole watershed initiative for Schooner Creek, developed by Ecosystem Services, LLC, the city's consultant. The initiative states that the city wishes to gain control of its municipal watershed, to help ensure the quality and quantity of its water supply. The city's water plant and associated infrastructure are located in the lower reach of Schooner Creek.

The application states that the city plans to use reserve funds set aside for open space acquisition for the required local match.

The application states that the property contains 35 acres of lowland riparian woodlands (22% of the total acreage) and one half mile of Schooner Creek. The application does not clearly state what the remaining acreage contains. At the RRT site visit, a forestry consultant hired by the city told OWEB staff that approximately two thirds of the property contains Douglas fir plantation, with red alder interspersed in some of the property's draws.

The application does not indicate that there are any at-risk plant communities on the property. However, it does state that the entirety of the property contains Coast Range fawn lily. The application states that coho salmon, Chinook salmon, and steelhead are present on the property and will benefit from the project. The application states the project will also benefit the following priority species, which are unknown but likely to occur at the property: Northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet, red tree vole, northern red-legged frog, clouded salamander, and Columbia torrent salamander.

The application states that the project is consistent with all of OWEB's conservation principles, and therefore will: protect a large intact area, stabilize an area on the brink of ecological collapse, secure a transition area, restore function, protect a site with exceptional biodiversity, improve connectivity of habitat, and complement an existing network of sites in the basin.

The application states that timber harvest would be conducted only to enhance the property's conservation values, and that the City will sell not ecosystem services credits generated from improved management of the land.

The application states that the city's Public Works department will be responsible for managing the property. However, the city plans to retain conservation management professionals to assist with management planning and restoration. No stewardship fund has been established for the property. The application states that funding for property management may come in part from the City's water service rate payers.

The property will be used by the city for education, in conjunction with the Salmon-Drift Creek Watershed Council, American Rivers, and local schools. The application states that the educational activities will inform water users (both city residents and tourists) about the value of protecting the city's water source. The application states that in the past, tent camping has been available to the public. The application implies that camping on the property would continue after the acquisition, but this point is not explicit. At the RRT site visit, the city staff clarified that it does not intend to allow camping in the future, nor does it plan to construct amenities on the property.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The RRT recognized the large-scale objective of the effort but did not think the proposed acquisition fit well with the ecological priorities set by OWEB. They indicated that in their opinion it had little currently existing habitat for spotted owls, marbled murrelet or red tree voles.

The RRT noted that the majority of the property is in Douglas fir plantation and of limited value to OWEB priority species. RRT members pointed out that Chinook salmon were observed during the site visit. The RRT concluded that the property proposed for acquisition, standing alone, had only low ecological merit alone and as part of the large-scale plan only medium ecological merit.

RRT members agreed that this project offers an excellent opportunity for the city schools to continue to use the property for environmental education, and that very good educational activities have been conducted to date on the property. Current educational uses of the property include a local elementary school that uses the property to study water quality and invertebrates.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Medium Ecological and High Educational value.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1014	Project Type:	Outreach
Project Name:	Lower Columbia Restoration and Outreach Project (Lower Columbia Project)		
Applicant:	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership		
Basin:	LOWER COLUMBIA	County:	Columbia
OWEB Request:	\$25,073.00	Total Cost:	\$54,180.00

Application Description

The Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership (LCREP) is requesting funds to continue their Watershed Stewardship Project; a program that will provide watershed involvement opportunities to over 600 youth and adults, including 24 fourth - sixth grade classes and the respective teachers. Each class will receive three classroom lessons and a unique watershed field experience that includes a learning element and an experiential field program. The program is designed so participants will learn about and develop an increased appreciation of their local watershed. Classroom lessons will address watershed issues; service learning opportunities will address watershed preservation and restoration; and on-river paddling experiences will provide the participants with a memorable experience that hopefully will build passion for their local water resources.

OWEB funds are requested for staff salaries (85%), travel (4%), field supplies (3%) and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized this proposal as the continuation of a relatively long running outreach program in the lower Columbia. They found the application to be well written and clear in its planned activities. They appreciated the cost per student and the program's ability to provide outdoor activities to the students and teachers. They thought this approach of a combination of classroom and field activities provided opportunities for all different learning styles. They also appreciated the involvement of parents on the field days, noting these opportunities for parent involvement provided multiple benefits for everyone in the program. The reviewers also appreciated the outside evaluation of the program that was provided in the application, conducted previously by staff from Pacific University, noting the evaluation was not only positive, the outside feedback provided direction useful to improve the program in future iterations.

The reviewers did have a few concerns however. While they appreciated the project's chance to interact with 600 students and 24 teachers, they were concerned about the limited amount of time for that interaction. They wondered about the effectiveness of three sessions of classroom time (one hour each for three days) followed by one day in the field, thinking this was a short time in which to provide students a significant learning opportunity. The reviewers wondered whether more time with fewer students wouldn't be a better learning model. They also thought everyone would benefit with more time spent in the field and the restoration work accomplished would be more meaningful and leave a longer lasting impression with the students.

The reviewers always find outreach projects interesting but regularly have difficulty making comparisons between different projects, often remarking that so much depends upon the staff implementing the program and, in the instances when schools are involved, the regular teachers involved and responsible for carrying the lessons further. They discussed their concerns about the limited time with the students in this project at length and finally circled back to the outside evaluation done previously and the strong letters of support submitted by teachers and administrators who'd been involved in the project in previous years. The

reviewers noted that input clearly indicated the program did achieve its goals and did have meaningful impact on the teachers, the students and the parents involved. They noted that this was the only project of its type for the communities in the lower Columbia region and funding the program was even more important for that reason.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. The amount of administration requested (\$2,669) exceeded the allowed 10% figure (\$2,240), so the correction was made. The revised administration amount is reduced to \$2,240 and the new grant request amount will be \$24,644.

Regional Review Team Priority

#3 of 5

Recommended Amount
\$24,644.00

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

The amount of administration requested (\$2,669) exceeded the allowed 10% figure (\$2,240), so the correction was made. The revised admin amount is reduced to \$2,240 and the new grant request amount will be \$24,644.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$24,644.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$24,644.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1021	Project Type:	Outreach
Project Name:	Stream Extension VI		
Applicant:	Jim Grano		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$12,452.00	Total Cost:	\$46,102.00

Application Description

Sixteen years ago, an ambitious and inspired teacher in the Siuslaw Middle School developed a class with the intent to teach 7th-grade students about the watersheds and natural resources of the area. His idea was to provide both classroom instruction and field trips where hands-on science activities dealing with watershed processes could occur. Originally the class he developed was an elective for a small segment of the 7th-grade but word quickly got out about how the students enjoyed the class and how much they learned, and the demand for the class grew. The class quickly expanded to serve the demand and within a few years all Siuslaw Middle School 7th-graders took part. For the first 10 years, the award-winning Siuslaw Middle School Stream Team program succeeded in part because of that inspired teacher but even when that teacher retired, the program continued with a new teacher and support from OWEB, ODFW, USFS, STEP, the Siuslaw Watershed Council and the Siuslaw SWCD.

The success of the program also served to highlight to the educators that for most 7th-grade students, the Stream Team class was their first encounter with an organized opportunity to learn about their watershed, its processes and its resources. The realization prompted the idea to provide a primer of the Stream Team course to elementary school students, grades 3-6, to provide a baseline understanding of the concepts and prepare them for the 7th-grade class.

In the school year 2006-2007, the creator of the Siuslaw Stream Team program, now retired, expanded the program into the Florence elementary school and has continued the elementary school effort since. This 2012 project would continue to fund the retired teacher to provide classroom instruction and materials, guest speakers, and 30+ field trips for approximately 550 students in grades 3-6, 8 and High School, including 18 teachers. Emphasis would be on hands-on experiences to introduce and reinforce watershed stewardship.

Partners include the Siuslaw School District, the USFS Mapleton District, Florence STEP, ODFW, ODP&R, OSP, BLM, Siuslaw SWCD, the Siuslaw Watershed Council and family volunteers. OWEB funds will be used for project management (50%), travel (26%), contracted services (15%) and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were very familiar with this program and remain enthusiastic about it. They understood the classes got students and parents involved in watershed stewardship and they recognized the high level of community support for the program. The reviewers greatly appreciated its coordination with the 7th grade Stream Team program, the class that began the Stream Team concept in the Florence area Middle School. They believe providing this extended program from grade 3 on up will strengthen the whole program and get the students ready for the larger 7th grade Stream Team class. The reviewers were extremely pleased to learn that previous Stream Team graduates had recently influenced administrators at Lane Community College (LCC) to develop and offer an associate degree program for training as a Watershed Technician. They remarked there was no need for any greater proof of the success of the Stream Team program than that new

LCC associate degree. The reviewers noted finally the relative low cost for this extended Stream Team program and enthusiastically recommended it for funding.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#1 of 5

Recommended Amount
\$12,452.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$12,452.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$12,452.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1022	Project Type:	Outreach
Project Name:	Siuslaw Watershed Exploration Camps 2012		
Applicant:	Siuslaw WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$14,765.00	Total Cost:	\$24,940.00

Application Description

The Siuslaw River watershed drains 504,000 acres and has roughly 18,000 residents. A number of different school systems serve the basin residents, including Siuslaw (Florence), Mapleton, and Triangle Lake. The three school systems now have some level of established in-school natural resource programs, but during the summer months there are few formal opportunities for students to further explore watershed health issues.

This application seeks to expand a project that has been both popular and successful in its previous seven years. It would provide 13 days of “Watershed Camp”, broken into three sessions, geared for introductory campers (4 days), intermediate campers (4 days) and advanced watershed exploration campers (5 days). The Camps will be offered to students from grades 4 through 12. Each session will have a \$60 participation fee but scholarships will be available for participants who otherwise would not be able to participate.

The Camp workshops will focus on providing the campers with an overview of the need for watershed restoration projects as well as practical, hands-on experience with those types of projects.

Partners in the project include USFS-Mapleton District, Surfrider Foundation, local businesses, camper families, the Siuslaw SWCD and the Siuslaw Watershed Council. OWEB funds are budgeted for contracted services (69%) including camp program manager, 2 camp staff, bus driver and presenters), travel (17% - buses), project management (4%) and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized the project from previous years’ applications and were familiar with the intent and basic outlines of the program. They continued to appreciate the usefulness of the Camp program, agreeing that it provided a good opportunity to further engage students in watershed issues in an organized setting at a time of year when structured education activities were not otherwise available locally. The reviewers appreciated that students from grades 5-12 from communities throughout the basin could attend and the Camps were geared to three different levels of familiarity and knowledge of watershed issues. They also appreciated that while the students were the focus, the parents also got involved and learned about issues otherwise out of their day-to-day focus.

The reviewers did raise some concerns with the application however. They noted that previous applications had provided well outlined curriculum for the Camps, but this time there was very little detail of what the curriculum would be. They noted that previous Camp’s curriculum moved the students throughout the watershed from the estuary to the headwaters but this application had the campers visiting five restoration projects and provided no detail on the sites, the restoration work involved or what would be taught at any of the sites. The reviewers also were concerned that this application provided no information on how many campers attended the previous year, even though the reviews of previous applications clearly indicated the level of participation was a metric of interest.

While there was some discontent with the application, the reviewers understood part of the lack of curriculum detail may be a result of new OWEB guidance for outreach applications. The reviewers thought the applicant was probably still digesting the change and at the time of application had not yet finalized their plans for next summer's Camp. The reviewers were disappointed in the lack of information on participation in last summer's Camp and want to strongly recommend the applicant include in future applications not only the attendance numbers for the 2012 camp, but also to include attendance numbers for Camp 2011 and all previous years, so the attendance trend could be tracked over the project's life.

The reviewers were familiar with the applicant and the principals involved in the Camp project and were confident that the Camp would be successful in engaging the campers in watershed health as well the types of, the need for and the effects of different restoration projects. They recommend the project be funded.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#4 of 5

Recommended Amount
\$14,765.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The final completion report will include 1. A complete schedule for the campers. If there are multiple activities going on at once, the number of campers engaged in each. 2. A description of how camp activities are connected to or engage campers in restoration or monitoring activities.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$14,765.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$14,765.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1024	Project Type:	Outreach
Project Name:	Natural Resource Restoration Crews		
Applicant:	MidCoast WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lincoln
OWEB Request:	\$24,570.00	Total Cost:	\$220,011.00

Application Description

The MidCoast Watershed Council (Council) works in the watersheds of the central coast region. The area reaches from Cascade Head in the north to Heceta Head in the south and extends east to the crest of the coast range. It has five major basins: the Salmon, Siletz, Yaquina, Alsea and Yachats Rivers as well as numerous smaller direct-to-ocean tributaries. The area encompasses all or parts of five counties (Lincoln, Lane, Benton, Polk and Tillamook) and has six incorporated towns and numerous unincorporated rural communities. The six incorporated towns and several of the unincorporated rural communities in the area have elementary schools while Lincoln City, Newport, Toledo, Waldport and Alsea have Middle and High Schools as well. For the last thirteen years, the Council has implemented a watershed education program designed for the area's schools. Program managers have come and gone and the program has evolved over the course of the years.

Beginning nine years ago, the program added a component that provided an opportunity for students to learn and work outdoors. Mostly working with at-risk and alternative school youth, the Natural Resource Crew (NRC) program helped enable these students to understand the applicability and relevance of their studies by utilizing them in watershed assessment, monitoring and habitat restoration projects. The NRC students were paid a wage for their work. As the program gained experience and credibility, opportunities for the students to work under the supervision of scientists (from the Hatfield Marine Science Center and elsewhere) developed and in the last few years the students have gathered data on mud shrimp, New Zealand Mud Snails, Pearl Shelled Mussels, Silver Spot Butterflies and juvenile Chinook in their ocean life cycle strategies. The NRC students have also worked on nest box placements, meadow restoration, native tree planting and invasive plant species removal projects and conducted garbage surveys on forest roads and river banks in the region.

Due to the success of the NRC program and the expanding scope and cost of the larger education project, the Council decided to break their education program grant request into different applications and different grantors. This proposal to OWEB would fund staff to coordinate activities necessary to engage 4-6 crews of NRC students (6-8 students per crew) during the school year and 3 NRC student crews during the summer of 2012; instructors/supervisors; scientists; and restoration project managers in activities similar to those accomplished by NRC crews in previous years.

Partners in the project include the Community Services Consortium (crew and Instructor salaries, computer facilities), Hatfield Marine Science Center (crew and lead training, lab use), ODP&R (land access, training). OWEB funds will be used for staff (90%) and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized this proposal as a continuation of an ongoing program funded in part by OWEB. While they knew the history of the project's benefits, they had found previous applications poorly written and difficult to follow. In this case they found the application clearly written and easy to follow with the

process and plan clearly described, and they much appreciated the improvement. They recognized this project as significantly different from the region's other Outreach proposals, since it deals with at-risk youth and does so by engaging the at-risk youth in actual restoration and research work in outdoor settings, and pays them for the work accomplished. They recognized both the value and the risk of providing this type of program to this particular group of youth and hoped to see the program continue to succeed.

A few of the reviewers had personal experience with the program, and their impressions differed considerably. One of the reviewers was concerned that the crew on one of the jobs seemed to be out of control, with the supervisor providing little direction or discipline. In this instance the crew did not accomplish the work and it had to be redone by another contractor at a later date. Another reviewer had a much better experience with a different crew but agreed that the skills of the crew supervisor were a key component of the process and the quality of the work closely followed the leadership skills of the supervisor.

The reviewers discussed the difficulties, the promise, and the need for the program. They noted the past successes involving the students in meaningful scientific research and by doing so, providing the youth not only work experience but opportunity to interact with and learn from respected scientists. They recognized the benefit of educating the students on tool use, safety and the outdoors, as well as simple life and self organization skills. The reviewers understood that no program will succeed with all its students, but they also understood the benefit of reaching even a few of these youth was invaluable. They talked a bit about the issue of whether funding this type of program was a good fit for OWEB, or if it were better handled by another agency or non-profit. They came to no firm conclusion other than to recognize that the project did work with watershed health issues and did conduct watershed restoration activities and while it also involved greater social issues, because of its watershed links, qualified for OWEB Outreach funding.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#5 of 5

Recommended Amount
\$24,570.00

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

OWEB staff called a few agencies that had utilized the crews and heard that supervision was appropriate and projects were completed, and they are seeking the crews' assistance for future restoration work.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. In an effort to better understand the project's impacts on both the human and environmental aspects of this project, and to help the Grantee improve future applications, the grant agreement will require additional reporting to be included in the project completion report for this grant.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$24,570.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$24,570.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1033	Project Type:	Outreach
Project Name:	Siuslaw Middle School Stream Team		
Applicant:	Siuslaw School District 97J		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$8,297.00	Total Cost:	\$84,333.00

Application Description

The award winning Siuslaw Stream Team program takes place in Florence, in the 7th grade class of the Siuslaw Middle School. The program has been in place for sixteen years and has been successful in part because of support from OWEB, ODFW, USFS, STEP, the Siuslaw Watershed Council and the Siuslaw SWCD. The program provides hands-on learning activities including measuring stream flow and sediment load; physical and chemical analysis of streams; fish identification; identification and removal of invasive plants; hatchery operations; macro invertebrate analysis; and recreational uses of the watershed. Approximately 100 seventh-graders will be cycled through the Stream Team program throughout the year. Each student will receive 45 days of in-class instruction in watershed education and 3-5 field trips per quarter that will reinforce their classroom experiences.

The basin has a very active watershed council and SWCD who share education and restoration activities and partner together extremely well. Education and outreach efforts such as those exemplified by this project are key activities in the missions of both the Council and the District and are specifically identified in the watershed assessment and action plan.

Partners include the Siuslaw School District 97J, USFS Mapleton District, ODFW, ODP&R, Florence STEP, Siuslaw SWCD, the Siuslaw Watershed Council, Andrew Marohl and student's family volunteers. OWEB funds are budgeted for substitute teachers (48%), travel (17%), project management (14%), supplies (12%), and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

This project was no stranger to the reviewers. They recognized its long and excellent history and valued it accordingly. They were very pleased to see the continuation of excellence with the transition of the original teacher and the teacher who had replaced him. The reviewers noted the strong letter of support from the School District's Superintendent and they were aware of the equally strong support for the program throughout the community.

The reviewers had no issues or concerns with the application and greatly appreciated the project's low cost and high value. They only wished they could find a way to provide the same type of program elsewhere in the region and across the state.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#2 of 5

Recommended Amount
\$8,297.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$8,297.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$8,297.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1015	Project Type:	Monitoring
Project Name:	Tillamook Suspended Sediment Study Phase II		
Applicant:	Tillamook Estuaries Partnership		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Tillamook
OWEB Request:	\$127,100.00	Total Cost:	\$206,750.00

Application Description

The Tillamook Bay watershed has a number of entities partnering in restoration activities and the Tillamook Estuaries Partnership (TEP) is one of the significant partners. In 1999, TEP completed the Tillamook Bay Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, which identified excessive sedimentation as one of the four key problems within the watershed. In 2006, TEP initiated a three year study to characterize the current condition of sediment in the basin. The study focused on the Wilson and Trask Rivers (two of the five significant rivers in the basin) and indicated that large amounts of sediment were moving through the systems, tributaries and mainstem combined. Beginning in mid 2011, TEP, working with a \$50,000 OWEB grant (211-1025), partnered with the USGS Oregon Water Science Center, and began implementing a project to quantify and track the contribution of sediment from the individual tributaries to their respective mainstems and of the mainstems to the Bay.

This current proposal would continue the efforts begun under project 211-1025 and add additional components, including: assembling the data pairs of approved turbidity with concurrent sample concentrations (manual, depth integrated and corrected auto-sample), assemble unit values of approved streamflow and turbidity for water year 2012 (Oct 2011 – Sept 2012), and estimate any missing unit-values of streamflow and turbidity. The assembled data will be used in a model developed to calculate the suspended sediment load. In addition, due to heavy vehicle traffic and corresponding safety issues, a bank-operated cableway will be installed at the Wilson River gauge site for additional manual sampling.

Partners in the project include USGS Oregon Water Science Center and Tillamook County Emergency Management.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were familiar with this proposal from their review of the Phase I grant (211-1025). They remarked that the application was well written and they recognized the partner agency in this proposal, USGS, did top quality work and the data collected would be solid. The reviewers appreciated that sediment was an issue in the Tillamook Bay basin and the Wilson and Trask were the largest sub-basins to the Bay. They also recognized that getting a handle on sediment issues was difficult and they believed this project would provide useful baseline data. They appreciated that the two stations would also collect data on temperature and dissolved oxygen.

However the reviewers thought this an expensive project and while they recognized that the data would be high quality, they wondered about the ultimate use. They noted that the two stations (one in each sub-basin) were located upstream of all agricultural land and above almost all rural residences, and they commented that as a result the data would only provide information on forest lands, and with that limitation they wondered about the value of the information. They also noted that with only one station in each of the two rivers, there was no way to determine where in each system any sediment spike might be originating; that there was no way to differentiate specific contributions between tributaries.

The reviewers discussed the project limitations at length, but while wondering if there was a less expensive method to gather this type of data, they finally decided that while they couldn't clearly define the specific uses of the data, they recognized the lack of sediment information in the system and thought this baseline data could prove useful in the future.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#3 of 3.

Recommended Amount
\$127,100.00

Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation

The OPMT appreciated the fact that this monitoring attempts to address a major gap in sediment monitoring knowledge of riverine systems. The team also recognized the situation in Tillamook Bay and how this project ties in with existing USGS gauges to collect high quality data and possible linkage to other watershed scale work that is continuing in this area. There was discussion about the need to track this information from a long-term view and reviewers were enthusiastic about early information from this project. There was concern about the model relationships that would be developed from this work and if the sediment to flow relationship would be expected to remain stable over time.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: High

Certainty of success: High

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$127,100.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$127,100.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1030	Project Type:	Monitoring
Project Name:	Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Program 2011-2013		
Applicant:	Siuslaw WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$8,315.00	Total Cost:	\$20,623.00

Application Description

The 504,000-acre Siuslaw River basin empties to the ocean at the town of Florence. Historically, the basin produced more coho than any river in Oregon other than the Columbia. The basin has few incorporated towns, although it has a number of rural communities and roughly 18,000 residents. The major land use in the basin is timber production, although there is considerable agriculture in the upper portion of the basin as well as in the bottomlands of the mainstem and major tributaries. Major landowners/managers in the basin are the USFS Siuslaw National Forest, BLM and various industrial timber companies.

The Siuslaw Watershed Council (Council) has a completed watershed assessment and action plan and supplements those documents with juvenile salmonid abundance and distribution snorkel surveys and data from a variety of on-going water-quality monitoring projects. Both the assessment and the action plan identify water quality monitoring activities as a priority action for the council. The Siuslaw is water-quality limited per 303(d) listings year-round for temperature and dissolved oxygen (RM 0 – 105.9) and for fecal coliform year-round from RM 5.7 to 105.9. Sediment issues are cited as one of the priority water-quality impairments in the basin. This project, now entering its thirteenth year, will use trained students from the Mapleton schools and volunteers from communities throughout the basin to monitor dissolved oxygen, turbidity, bacteria, salinity, temperature and weather conditions at eleven sites. The long-term monitoring goals include characterizing water quality conditions for each fifth-field HUC in the basin, and to use the data to target problem areas for restoration efforts. The Council has been successful in developing several restoration projects targeting issues and areas identified through the past monitoring efforts.

Partners in the project include the watershed council volunteers, the Mapleton School District, Dunes City, Surfrider Foundation, Siuslaw National Forest and DEQ. OWEB funds are budgeted primarily for project management (84%), a small amount for travel (4%) and supplies (2%) and administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized this as the continuation of a volunteer water quality monitoring program that has been in place for 12 years. They understood that one of its strong values is the outreach component, due to its involvement of volunteers throughout the basin as well as the involvement of students and teachers in several schools. They understood that although the data was being collected by volunteers, the project had a good Quality Assurance/ Quality Control program and the data was high quality. The reviewers appreciated that after a decade of baseline data collection, the program is identifying areas of concern and the applicant has developed restoration projects to address the issues identified. They thought the program provided excellent value for a very low investment.

The only issue raised was the monitoring occurs only two days a month and all the water samples are simple grab samples. The reviewers appreciated that since volunteers are used, meeting collection schedules can be challenging and they hoped the applicant would consult with the DEQ basin coordinator to see if equipment capable of gathering continuous data for some parameters such as temperature and dissolved oxygen might

be available. They recommended the applicant consider these concerns and if additional equipment is necessary, to include the costs in the next application.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#1 of 3

Recommended Amount
\$8,315.00

Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation

The OPMT identified with the need for long-term data. This project and the linkage to developing effectiveness of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) that is being implemented in this basin was discussed. This project fills a need for local outreach and helps local connection to the watershed. This project would most likely identify areas of concern in the watershed. However, there was some struggle with the application and the possible disconnect of the application to actual monitoring that is occurring on the ground. Overall, the project could benefit from a long-term monitoring plan and a consistent level of investment from local staff and volunteers.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: Medium

Certainty of success: High

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$8,315.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$8,315.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1037	Project Type:	Monitoring
Project Name:	Mid Coast Monitoring Project		
Applicant:	Lincoln SWCD		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lincoln
OWEB Request:	\$116,969.00	Total Cost:	\$147,583.00

Application Description

Lincoln County includes all or portions of the Salmon, Siletz, Yaquina, Alsea and Yachats River watersheds as well as numerous smaller direct-to-ocean tributaries. For the past fifteen years, the Lincoln SWCD (District) has employed two skilled aquatic habitat surveyors for a variety of tasks, including conducting Aquatic Habitat Inventories (AQI) and spawning surveys of spring and fall Chinook, coho and steelhead.

The information collected by the project has been useful to the District and its partners in restoration in the basin. The MidCoast Watershed Council, ODFW, NRCS, the Siuslaw National Forest and a variety of private landowners have all utilized the data collected, often coupling it with data from juvenile salmonid abundance and distribution snorkel surveys. The synthesis of this information has been used to identify and prioritize restoration sites, help establish proper types of restoration activities for those sites and sequence the development and implementation of projects.

This proposal would fund the continuation of another year of AQI and spawner survey data collection, and data entry, by the same two surveyors. Partners in the project include ODFW, NRCS, the MidCoast Watersheds Council and Bio Surveys. 83% of the requested OWEB funds are budgeted for the surveyor wages, 7% is budgeted for surveyor mileage and administration is budgeted at 9%.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

This project is well known to the review team, as they have reviewed and recommended the previous 12 iterations. They noted the many benefits involved: the project is well integrated into the community; it provides good outreach to landowners, at times gaining access to properties unavailable to agency staff; the quality of the data is excellent; and the data is used by ODFW Districts and Research, the SWCD, watershed councils, consulting firms and landowners. The reviewers understood the spawning survey data contributes to setting salmon harvest limits and the aquatic habitat inventory (AQI) data helps identify status and trends of stream habitat as well as sites of restoration potential.

The reviewers appreciated the many benefits of having a trained pair of surveyors available in the mid coast area, but several reviewers wondered if 13 years was long enough for OWEB to fund this project and perhaps other areas in the region could benefit from similar work. They noted that with this application, OWEB would have provided 1.1 million dollars to the program over the years. Some discussion ensued on the issue, but while everyone agreed other basins would benefit from similar efforts, and 13 years of OWEB funding was a comparatively long time, they also agreed that OWEB could not simply move this project elsewhere and there were no other groups submitting applications for similar work elsewhere in the region.

The reviewers agreed this program provided information useful for many purposes and entities, and while unique to the Lincoln County area, that limitation shouldn't be held against it. They agreed it should be recommended for funding. They noted the amount of administration seemed high and wanted the amount justified.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#2 of 3

Recommended Amount

\$116,969.00

Oregon Plan Monitoring Team Evaluation

The OPMT acknowledged the long-term nature of this project. The data collected by this monitoring program is used by the ODFW to augment salmonid sampling in the mid coast, which would not be possible without this project. Some of the salmonid surveys are targeted by local ODFW regional fish biologist's and serve to generate local knowledge as well as inform monitoring results at a more broad scale. The OPMT also raised some concern with the level of funding over the last 13 years and at what point or at what level does this project need funding in future cycles. There was also a need to integrate the data more clearly to develop both project level effectiveness and status and trends over this period.

Benefit to Oregon Plan: High

Certainty of success: High

Staff Follow-Up to Review Team Comment

Staff contacted the applicant and requested further detail on the amount requested for administration. The applicant responded with detailed information on the admin costs expected over the course of the project and that detail was put into the project file for reference.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount

\$116,969.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$116,969.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1016	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Roy Creek Fish Passage		
Applicant:	Lower Nehalem WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Tillamook
OWEB Request:	\$669,816.00	Total Cost:	\$982,216.00

Application Description

Roy Creek enters the mainstem Nehalem River at RM 8, very near the head of tidal influence. Historically, Roy Creek supported populations of Chinook, coho, chum, steelhead and cutthroat trout. The stream has roughly 2.5 miles of low-gradient habitat for salmonid spawning and rearing. Except for one summer cabin located 300 feet upstream of the confluence with the Nehalem, land use in the sub-basin is entirely industrial timber. When Foss Road was constructed in 1934 along the northern shore of the mainstem Nehalem, a timber bridge was used to cross the creek. A railroad track connecting Tillamook and the Willamette Valley also used the timber bridge.

In 1947 the bridge was replaced with two 4 foot diameter culverts, far undersized for the size of the creek. Over time these culverts collapsed and to repair the situation two more side-by-side culverts were stacked on top of the earlier pipes. The current crossing consists of two 6-foot diameter side-by-side culverts, stacked again on top of multiple smashed and derelict culverts. The current pipes are undersized for the stream flow, impede sediment transport, present a velocity barrier and are perched at low flows. In addition, the legacy of more than a half century of undersized pipes created a sediment plain upstream of the crossing for hundreds of feet up the valley bottom.

Besides the heritage of culverts in various stages of failure, the County roadway and the Port of Tillamook Bay's railroad track, there are a multitude of other issues involved in the crossing. A waterline for the nearby communities of Wheeler and Manzanita is buried in the roadfill, as is a Nehalem Telephone Company communication line and a WCI Cable fiber-optic line. Above ground are power poles and electrical lines.

ODFW rates the correction of the Roy Creek / Foss Road crossing as one of the highest priority restoration projects in Tillamook County. The Lower Nehalem Watershed Council (Council) has been working on finding a solution to the problems for a number of years. In 2001 the Council was awarded a Technical Assistance grant from OWEB (201-101) to design a new crossing. The Council brought all the different interests to the table and worked to find a way through the tangle of issues, but was ultimately challenged by the construction timeline requirement that the Port of Tillamook Bay's railroad not be closed down for more than 24 hours at any time. Because of the construction timeline considerations and implementation costs, the project stalled.

However, as a result of the winter storm of 2007, a window of opportunity opened. The storm caused extensive damage to the railroad, including washing out the bridge over the Salmonberry River (located roughly 14 miles upstream of the Roy Creek /Nehalem confluence) as well as several significant sections of track throughout the Salmonberry basin. Plans to repair the railroad were put on hold and ODFW and the Council opened discussions with all the interests once again to see if the opportunity to fix the Roy Creek crossing, now that the railroad was not in operation, could be seized.

Subsequent to those discussions a Technical Assistance project to develop engineered plans and construction cost estimates for a crossing sized correctly for the stream was submitted to OWEB, funded and implemented (211-1009). Now, in this Restoration project application, the Lower Nehalem Watershed Council, in

partnership with Tillamook County Public Works, ODFW, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Tillamook Estuaries Partnership and the Port of Tillamook Bay requests funding to remove all the failed culverts at the Roy Creek crossing and replace them with a 36ft wide, bottomless, single-span culvert, with vertical concrete abutments and wing walls, which will allow unrestricted fish passage and much improved passage for substrate and other natural materials. The structure will be aligned to reconnect the up and downstream stream reaches, thereby eliminating the two 90 degree turns in the current streamflow. A small amount of riparian planting in the newly cleared work area, and some large wood placement near the upstream edge of the project is also planned.

OWEB funds will be used for culvert removal and bridge placement work, mobilization, construction engineering and administration.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Almost all of the reviewers had been on the project site at some time, and were well aware of the issues and the history of the project. They were extremely pleased to see all the partnerships involved, public and private, and recognized the importance of having the Tillamook County Public Works fully engaged and leading the project implementation. The reviewers were excited about the resource value potential, noting Roy Creek's confluence with the mainstem Nehalem right at the head of tide. They understood the value of opening 2.5 miles of cold water habitat to not only adult spawners of all the Nehalem's different salmonid species, but to all the downstream migrating juveniles from throughout the basin as they near their adjustment to a salt water environment. The reviewers also appreciated the amount of work that had gone into the project designs, remarking that the design process had been rigorous and the end result excellent. They understood the new crossing had been designed for a 500 year event and they greatly appreciated that approach.

There were some concerns with the project noted however. Everyone recognized the high price tag of the project, and they commented that the current downturn in OWEB's grant funding increased their angst with the price of this project. But, they also agreed that the habitat value was well worth the cost. Several reviewers understandably looked for increased funding involvement by other partners, primarily the Railroad and the County, and questioned whether additional funding from those parties couldn't be available at a future time and, perhaps if OWEB held off funding at this time other funds would become available. The reviewers also wondered about the future of the railroad and if it were possible it would be discontinued or abandoned as a result of the destruction caused by the 2007 storm event. Their thinking was if that were to occur, the need for the additional engineering to accommodate railcars over the bridge would be unnecessary, which in turn would allow the design to be downsized and cost less as a result. The reviewers also noted that a design issue on the bridge wing-walls had been raised during the last site visit, as had concerns about the planned placement of large wood in the rip rap planned for the sides of the bridge entrance. During the site visit they found the planned placement of large wood at the entrance to present far more risk to the proposed new structure than it would provide habitat benefit for fish and recommended that aspect of the project be eliminated as a result.

The reviewers discussed these issues at length. Those most familiar with the project and the economic potential of the local partners addressed the funding issues by noting that the railroad was the property of the Port of Tillamook and at present the railroad was only running as a weekend sightseeing / dinner trip between Garibaldi and Rockaway Beach, a distance of roughly 5 miles, generating very little revenue as a result. They also noted that while it may be possible in the near future for the railroad to extend its current run for another few miles to include the community of Wheeler, that possibility wouldn't provide much additional revenue. The reviewers learned of another possibility, where the railroad would be purchased by a company that would use that same reach of track for a training facility, a possibility under consideration since there would be no need to factor in the schedule for other trains. The reviewers recognized that while this option might provide the opportunity to reduce the Roy Creek project cost, there was no firm offer for the purchase in hand and even if it were to occur, the portion of track that includes the Roy Creek reach may

very well be continued in the new venture, negating the possibility of downsizing the Roy Creek crossing. The reviewers then considered the chance that the railroad would be abandoned and the right of way easement returned to the state, thereby making it unnecessary to build the Roy Creek crossing to railroad specifications and reducing the current projected costs as a result. That possibility was quickly rejected since not only was eliminating a transportation option in Tillamook County highly unlikely, the timing of any such decision was totally unpredictable at this time. The reviewers also learned that the inclusion of the railroad construction issues added roughly \$35,000 to the project, a comparatively small amount everyone agreed and not worth derailing the project any longer.

The reviewers then turned their attention to the County's potential to provide additional funding for the project. That idea was quickly put to rest by those reviewers familiar with the county's fiscal difficulties. They provided their understanding that if the project did not get implemented this year, the source of the county funds now committed to the project would no longer be available and any future funding for the County was highly unlikely under the current economy.

The issue about the large wood placement at the bridge entrance was then discussed for the benefit of the reviewers unable to attend the site visit where it had been raised with the engineer and project designers. The issue was simply that the quality and amount of fish habitat to be made available by putting logs and rootwads into the rip rap at the bridge entrance was negligible in the scheme of things and the risk of possibly undermining or otherwise threatening the new structure by placing the wood at the entrance was both real and needless. The reviewers noted that while the wood was new the risk was not great, but over time, when the wood rotted and disintegrated, the hydraulics would change and the threat of erosion become real. The reviewers understood the risk far outweighed any habitat benefit and there was simply no need to risk the investment. They did note the irony that this advice was coming from fish biologists who almost always were large wood proponents and rip rap opponents.

The last remaining issue was the proposed design of the wing walls, where at present they would be installed parallel and flat to the roadbed. The reviewers believed this design would encourage turbulence around the wing walls at high flows and the turbulence could erode the roadbed behind the walls. They suggested instead a design that would angle the wing walls to help channel the stream into the bridge entrance. The engineer at the site visit later sent an email indicating that change was agreeable and that the reason for the original flat design was due to right-of-way (ROW) concerns and the possible need to purchase additional property to increase the ROW to allow for the design change. After the site visit, the engineer recalculated and found that enough room existed in the current ROW to angle the wing walls sufficiently to address the possible turbulence concern. While the reviewers appreciated that email exchange from the engineer, they wanted to make sure the design change was made and decided to condition the possible grant award accordingly.

Before ending their discussions, the reviewers noted the amount requested for administration in the application (\$28,562), remarking it seemed high, particularly when it appeared the County would be managing the project. They requested staff look into the issue.

Once all the possibilities and design issues were resolved to everyone's satisfaction, the reviewers enthusiastically recommended the project for funding.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Removing all the undersized, misaligned barrier culverts at the Roy Creek site, current and historical, and replacing them with a 38 ft wide bridge aligned with the natural stream channel will allow unrestricted fish passage to the full Roy Creek sub basin and allow for near natural material transport and stream function.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Large wood shall not be placed at the entrance to the bridge and the design for the bridge wing walls, changed from flat to angled to lessen potential turbulence at high flows.

The RRT requested staff discuss the amount requested for administration with the applicant to see if it were possible to reduce those costs.

Regional Review Team Priority

#2 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$ 669,816.00		

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

After the RRT meeting, staff discussed the requested fiscal administration costs with the applicant’s fiscal personnel (the applicant’s coordinator had resigned to take another job earlier the previous month). The applicant’s fiscal staff advised OWEB staff that the amount of administration costs could be reduced to \$8,500, a reduction of \$20,062. However, further discussion with the applicant about the costs of this complex project led OWEB staff to recommend moving some of the fiscal administration cost savings into supplies and materials.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will document that large wood shall not be placed at the entrance to the bridge and the design for the bridge wing walls is changed from flat to angled to lessen potential turbulence at high flows. Fiscal administration costs are reduced by \$20,062. Of that amount, \$15,000 will be moved to Supplies/Materials for purchase and installation of streambed gravels. The new grant total request is \$664,754.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$ 664,754.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 664,754.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1017	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership		
Applicant:	Tillamook Bay WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Tillamook
OWEB Request:	\$58,402.00	Total Cost:	\$84,242.00

Application Description

The Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership (Partnership) is made up of eleven NW Oregon watershed organizations that, in 2002, began collaborating to grow and distribute native plants for riparian restoration in their respective basins. The primary objective of the Partnership is to promote healthy forest/riparian ecosystem conditions on priority sites in the partner's respective watersheds. Currently the Partnership encompasses roughly 4,000 square miles within Tillamook, Clatsop, Columbia, Washington and Yamhill counties. Assessments and action plans developed by all the partners clearly indicate the need for healthy vegetation in the riparian zones of the respective streams and rivers in order to reduce pollutants, stabilize streambanks and lower stream temperatures.

Current partners include Salem BLM's Tillamook Resource Area and Horning Seed Orchard, Upper and Lower Nehalem Watershed Councils, Nestucca/Neskowin Watershed Council, Oregon Youth Authority, Scappoose Bay Watershed Council, Tillamook Bay Watershed Council, Tillamook County SWCD, Tillamook Estuaries Partnership, Tualatin Watershed Council, and the Greater Yamhill Watershed Council.

The Partnership has established an annual commitment of 20 miles of streamside planting to restore degraded riparian habitats. It currently provides approximately 60,000 genotypic native plant species specific to each watershed, many of which are not available on the open market. The partners coordinate technical aspects of collecting seeds and vegetative reproductive material that supports genetic variation and local adaptation within each species. Large one-gallon native plants are produced using nurseries established and maintained by the partners at the BLM Horning Seed Orchard in Colton and the Oregon Youth Authority Camp in Tillamook.

In 2012, the Partnership will expand dramatically in scale and scope, adding 15 – 20 additional partners, including OP&RD, City of Newburg, Lincoln SWCD, Columbia SWCD, Necanicum Watershed Council, North Coast Watershed Association, Lower Nehalem Community Trust, North Coast Land Conservancy, and the Central Coast Land Conservancy.

Staff and volunteers of all the partners provide the workforce for seed collection, potting and, with considerable help from Camp Tillamook Work Crews and the Columbia River Youth Corps, planting into containers to grow until out-planted in the different restoration projects. Currently three staff members from different partners work together to manage the project and with the expected increase in the number of partners and the resulting increase in demand, they are struggling to keep up. In this rather unusual Restoration application, the Tillamook Bay Watershed Council seeks funding to hire one 20 hour/week staff for two years to coordinate the logistics of managing the Partnership, with a focus on coordinating the distribution of the plants to partners in seven counties in NW Oregon for use in restoration projects. 90% of the OWEB funds would be used for salary for the new position.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers found this to be a well written application and those familiar with the project over the years gave it extremely high marks. They all agreed of the need for local plants and trees and the fact that most of the native species were not available in local genotypes on the open market. They noted that using local genotypes increased the survivability and growth rates of the plants, making the restoration projects utilizing these plants more likely to succeed. The reviewers understood the project history shows it produces larger and healthier trees for planting and the larger trees require less maintenance, resulting in less long term expense. They remarked the project has been critical to the success of the watershed councils northwest restoration program and has great support from its members. The reviewers also noted the project provides these plants free-of-charge to the restoration projects, an obvious enormous savings from having to purchase plants on the open market and a huge benefit to the partners, the projects and the common goals.

The reviewers also discussed the education benefits of the project, mentioning not only the work with the Youth Corps (Tillamook and Lower Columbia), but also the education of the project partners themselves as they interacted and experimented with seed collection, potting and planting, all the while sharing the lessons each learned through failures and successes in their respective projects. The reviewers noted that not only were the different groups' staff beneficiaries, but the many volunteers that worked in all aspects of the process shared in learning new facts and skills. One of the reviewers noted that several of the youth corps kids had gotten full time jobs in local nurseries after their time in the program and continued to be employed.

The reviewers were impressed with the planned expansion and agreed that not only was it enormously promising, the template of the existing project provided an excellent organizational foundation upon which to build. They also recognized that up until now, the management of the operation had fallen on three individuals, all of whom had other jobs, and as the program succeeded and grew, the management responsibilities also would grow, and change needed to occur.

While the reviewers were enthusiastic about the application, they raised several issues of concern. The first concern was whether OWEB should fund tree nurseries. The second concern dealt with match issues. Trees and plants from the existing project were often used as match for OWEB projects. The reviewers wondered if OWEB funded this project, could the trees be used as match for future OWEB funded restoration projects? Their third concern was the sustainability of the project.

The concerns were complex and the discussions were thorough. The first issue of whether OWEB should fund nurseries was resolved by understanding that this application would not fund the development, construction, purchase of material or labor of a nursery. The application was seeking funding for two years for a 20 hr/week manager whose task would be to coordinate the overall program; to communicate with all the project partners to determine the numbers, species, and sizes of plants and trees, when the materials were going to be needed, where the plants could be grown and specifics of the distribution of the ready-to-go containers, as well as coordinating the volunteers and scheduling their seed collection, potting and planting activities. With as many as thirty partners across seven counties, the need for coordination staff was clear. The reviewers determined this wasn't funding a nursery; it was funding a project coordinator / manager.

The second issue of using trees and plants grown in the different nurseries as match for other OWEB funded projects was stickier. While different approaches were offered, the review team came to the conclusion that OWEB would have to figure out the policy issues itself and the issue was outside their purview and didn't effect any decision on recommending funding.

The third issue of sustainability of the project if OWEB were to fund this application took the longest to work through. The reviewers all were aware of the current downward funding trend and were understandably reluctant to begin another project that could easily be expected to regularly return for funding in the future. As much as they valued the overall project, they did not want to commit to long term funding. The first solution to be offered was to make this two-year project a one-time award and to condition it as such,

directing the grantee and the partners that any future application for funding the position would be turned down and the program had to become self-sustainable quickly. While that suggestion had considerable traction, a number of the reviewers thought the approach was overly harsh and unrealistic in practice. The ensuing discussion noted that the amount of funding being requested, if divided equally between 30 partners broke out to approximately \$2,000 each, spread over two years, a number that most of the reviewers agreed should be achievable for each of the proposed partners. But, it was noted that the number of partners was not yet solid and the dollar figure per each would increase as partner numbers decreased, so assumptions based on a “do-able” dollar figure might be problematic.

The reviewers took a number of different approaches to the sustainability issue and finally ended up with the decision to condition the funding recommendation, which they all wanted to make, with the requirement that the final report provide a clear description of the progress achieved down the road to sustainability. The reviewers also wanted to include a condition that the final report includes detailed information on the number of trees and plants distributed by the project over its course, with the information broken out by partner, county and restoration project.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project funds a manager for a collaborative partnership that grows and distributes local genotype native trees and plants for riparian restoration work in seven counties in NW Oregon. The use of local genotype native trees and plants in riparian restoration projects insures the materials are the same as those upon which the current ecosystem was based, which should ensure the continuation of natural process and function.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. The final report must provide a clear description of the progress achieved down the road to sustainability of funding for continuation of the project. The final report must also include detailed information on the number of trees and plants distributed by the project over its course, with the information broken out by partner, county and restoration project.

Regional Review Team Priority

#3 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$58,402.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The final report must provide a clear description of the progress achieved down the road to sustainability of funding for continuation of the project. The final report must also include detailed information on the number of trees and plants distributed by the project over its course, with the information broken out by partner, county and restoration project.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$58,402.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$58,402.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1018	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Jetty Creek Fish Passage		
Applicant:	Lower Nehalem WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Tillamook
OWEB Request:	\$294,529.00	Total Cost:	\$527,716.00

Application Description

Jetty Creek enters the Nehalem estuary less than a third of a mile from the ocean. The creek is the first tributary adult salmonids encountered in their journey up the Nehalem and the last tributary available for out-migrating juveniles to stop and acclimate before entry to the ocean. Jetty Creek has roughly 2 miles of high quality freshwater salmonid habitat and historically supported its own runs of coho, steelhead and cutthroat trout. Its proximity to the ocean would indicate that chum salmon once used it as well but no records exist to verify that probability.

Seven hundred feet upstream from the estuary, the City of Rockaway Beach owns and operates a Water Treatment Plant (WTP) on Jetty Creek and diverts its water from that site. The city holds two water rights on Jetty Creek for municipal use, each with a flowrate of 1.0 cfs. An instream right of 0.5 cfs also exists. One of the city's rights is senior to the instream right, while the city's second 1.0 cfs water right is junior to the instream right. Summertime streamflows typically are sufficient to allow the city to withdraw a minimum of 1.0 cfs and allow for the instream right of 0.5 cfs; however no gauge exists in the system, making managing for the different water rights a challenge. When the city built their WTP, Jetty Creek's alignment was altered to provide water flow into the diversion impoundment. The impoundment was excavated in the floodplain, the original stream channel was plugged, a concrete dam built and the stream rerouted into the impoundment. An attempt was made to provide fish passage by constructing a fish ladder within the footprint of the dam but the design was flawed and the newly constructed ladder failed to provide successful fish passage through the impoundment structure. The impoundment not only stopped fish passage, it also disconnected the streamflow, resulting in the sediment load from upstream dropping out in the impoundment and starving the downstream reaches of gravels and sediment. The subsequent accumulation of sediment in the impoundment requires the city to frequently dredge, removing organic and inorganic material from the stream system.

Downstream of the WTP, the creek used to flow through an undersized fish passage barrier culvert under Hwy 101, but in 2008 ODOT replaced the culvert with a bridge, and unimpeded passage was once again available for the stream reach from the estuary to the WTP diversion dam. The city recognized the opportunity provided by the bridge construction and acquired funding from Water Resources Department to conduct an engineering and financial feasibility study on the possibility of restoring the stream to its original channel to improve fish passage and sediment transport while assuring the city's water needs continue to be met. Key components of the feasibility study included a site evaluation, geotechnical investigation, hydrologic analysis and biological inventory.

Following the completion of the feasibility study, the city partnered with the Lower Nehalem Watershed Council (Council) and ODFW on a Technical Assistance (TA) grant from OWEB (210-1017) to develop a technical design solution to reconnect Jetty Creek to its original alignment, eliminate the fish passage barrier, provide a reliable delivery of water to the WTP, improve instream flow conditions and enhance aquatic habitat by improving structural complexity and bedload transport. In this Restoration application the Council, again in partnership with the city, is applying for OWEB funds to implement the designs developed through the TA grant. The original stream channel will be restored, allowing unimpeded fish access to 1.8 miles of habitat upstream of the Water Treatment Plant; the city's off-channel impoundment will be improved; the

diversion will be upgraded with a fish screen and stream flow gauge designed to facilitate water rights management; and the existing fish ladder and dam structure will be modified to ensure fish utilize the restored stream channel and not attempt to gain access to the city's impoundment pond.

Partners include the City of Rockaway Beach, ODFW Fish Passage & Screening Program, ODFW R&E, Tillamook Estuaries Partnership and the Native Plant Cooperative. OWEB funds will be used for work at the point of diversion, excavation, construction, mobilization, erosion control, project management and administration.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were familiar with the site through the earlier TA grant and site visits. Everyone agreed the expected restoration of full fish passage to 1.8 miles of good habitat would be an excellent outcome and they greatly appreciated the City's effort to pull together an application that met the resource needs while helping the City improve their water supply and its management. They also appreciated that the new diversion structure would include a flow gauge, enabling the City to better manage the multiple water rights involved, and the reviewers expected that would enable the stream to retain flow throughout the year through the 0.5 cfs instream right. The reviewers understood the City's need for increased storage capacity, recognizing the stream is marginal for the City's water supply, to the point that under current storage capacity the City couldn't "fight fires and flush toilets" at the same time, as one reviewer familiar with the situation put it. They understood the new fish screens, flow gauge, diversion structure and larger and lined storage pond should enable a win-win solution for fish and the City. They found the concept extremely promising.

However, they found the application frustrating in its presentation and lack of detail. They noted that the watershed council staff expected to have project manager responsibilities had taken another job in Washington State and was no longer available, leaving a large gap in the institutional memory of the project's development. They noted the site visit had been confusing, with the lead engineer unavailable that day and the staff onsite unable to answer questions on several significant issues raised by the reviewers. The reviewers noted that not only were many of the questions on significant design issues unable to be addressed on the visit, a simple question on whether a derelict culvert in the berm was to be removed was answered incorrectly, according to the plans and the lead engineer in a follow-up communication.

The reviewers raised other concerns. They noted the movement of the diversion point would require a point of diversion transfer permit, a process that can take a great deal of time. Reviewers familiar with the process indicated that if the City hired a consultant experienced in the transfer process, the permit could be accomplished in a six month period. The rest of the reviewers noted the need for "a consultant experienced in the transfer process" who was yet to be hired and they did the math involved. They came to the conclusion that even if the grant was to be awarded in late March 2012, the quickest the project could be expected to begin would be in 2013, not the upcoming summer of 2012 as projected in the application.

On the issue of permits, one of the concerns raised on the site visit was whether the project could fit under SLOPES, or whether it would need to go through an individual consultation with the necessary federal agencies. That question, while unanswered on the site visit, was answered at the review meeting and the reviewers were pleased to know that the SLOPES process could be used, opening a door to a shorter timeframe that would have otherwise been the case. However, the reviewers recognized the timing involved in the point-of-transfer permit remained.

The reviewers noted that the project was very complex and required a great deal of design. Even after the site visit, confusion and doubt surrounded the construction of the new stream channel and the enlarged storage pond. The reviewers understood the current storage pond lost a large quantity of water simply through seepage, clearly indicating the substrate was permeable. They noted that the new stream channel would be three feet higher than the current channel and they wondered if the stream flow would simply disappear from the new channel and flow subsurface to the pond. They noted the design indicated the constructed stream bed

was to be compacted but there was no information to indicate the level of compaction either necessary or planned. They considered whether the level of groundwater in the area would be high enough so their concerns of flow going subsurface would be alleviated, but the application provided no information on groundwater levels to expect throughout the year.

The reviewers discussed the possibility of stream flow going subsurface during the late summer low flow periods, even with the ability for the WTP to manage for only 1cfs being withdrawn. They noted that in the current situation, the City had no way to determine the amount of water being withdrawn and whether it was exceeding the water right, and that the existing dam and failed fish ladder created a total fish passage barrier, a combination of factors that couldn't get much worse with any proposed solution. They then noted the new diversion would include a flow gauge that would guarantee instream flow all the time that the total stream flow exceeded 1.0 cfs. While they all understood that with the information in the application they couldn't determine if the water left in the new channel would go subsurface during extreme low flow periods and cause the new channel to become a passage barrier itself, they all agreed, should that occur, those possible instances would be expected to be few, of short duration, and happen during the time of year when fish passage through the reach was not absolutely critical. They agreed that eleven months of fish passage was far better than zero months of fish passage.

The reviewers remarked that a project this highly designed and this complex would require constant on-site supervision as the work was implemented. They saw no indication of the funding necessary for that level of construction oversight, nor did they see any mention of constant checking as-built against the design plan. Having recently experienced a few failures of highly designed projects, due in part to lack of effective construction oversight or closely following the as-built against the design plans, they were very concerned about the lack of information for these activities in this project.

The combination of a poorly detailed application, the confusion encountered on the site visit, the lack of information on construction oversight, and the inability for the reviewers to get answers to their many questions caused them to decide to not recommend funding the project at this time. They made this decision reluctantly because they wanted the project concept to be implemented; they wanted the fish to once again have access to 1.8 miles of good habitat and they wanted the City to be able to manage their diversion to maximize the stream benefits to fish and humans alike. They also recognized that even if the project were to get funded this round, the actual on-the-ground work wouldn't begin until 2013 at the earliest and they believed that schedule created an opportunity for a better application to be developed and submitted in the April 2012 round of applications. They were confident such an application could be developed and wanted all the project partners to understand that the review team encouraged the Council and the City to make the effort and address the issues raised during the review of this application.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1019	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Colewort Creek Wetland Restoration		
Applicant:	CREST		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Clatsop
OWEB Request:	\$166,925.00	Total Cost:	\$510,930.00

Application Description

Colewort Creek is a small creek that drains to the Lewis and Clark River, entering from the west roughly 2.5 miles upstream of the Lewis & Clark's confluence with Young's Bay, which in turn is located low in the Columbia River estuary in the northwest corner of Clatsop County. The reach where Colewort joins the Lewis & Clark is well within the tidal zone and the lower reaches of Colewort are tidally influenced. The entire lower reaches of the Lewis & Clark River once contained significant Sitka Spruce swamp habitat, extensive estuarine marshes, and freshwater tidal wetlands. Historical land use, recent rural development and hydraulic manipulation, through construction of levees and channel dredging, now prevents natural tidal interactions between the river and adjacent lands, resulting in the fragmentation of habitat critical to the lifecycle of salmonids and other estuarine dependent species.

The restoration site in this application is within the boundaries of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Park, and in 2007, using an OWEB grant (207-269), the Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce (CREST) partnered with the National Park Service (NPS) to replace a tidegate structure at the Colewort Creek site with a free-span bridge. That restoration project improved the function of the 45 acre wetland complex at the site, however the ground elevations on 15 acres of the south side of the complex, which had been previously filled for agricultural purposes, remained above the tidal prism and were therefore unable to be restored to the desired historic wetland habitat.

In this application, CREST, partnering with BPA and NPS, is proposing to combine three techniques to maximize habitat restoration potential in all areas of the Colewort Creek site. Project actions include: 1) enhancement of the existing tidal marsh through channel shaping and large wood placement; 2) restoration of filled historical wetlands by removing fill and recreating tidal channels and; 3) reconnection of isolated wetlands with tidal hydrology through culvert replacement.

90% of the requested OWEB funds would be used for construction activities (erosion control, surveying, dewatering and stream diversion, tidal channel excavation, and marsh plain lowering), with the remainder budgeted for administration and project management.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers found this a well-written application and many of them remembered the work accomplished during the 2007 grant when the tidegate was replaced with a bridge. The site visit for this application showcased the benefits of that conversion and they appreciated how well the property had responded. The increase in tidal influence and volume of restored marsh and wetland was apparent and the number and diversity of waterfowl using the site was both apparent and impressive. The long-time reviewers noted that the work proposed in this application was responding to observations made during the review of the 2007 project when the review team recommended the 15 acres of the property previously filled for use as pasture also be restored to maximize the amount of historic tidal wetland possible at the site.

The reviewers appreciated the educational opportunities available at the site, recognizing since it is part of the Park property and located immediately adjacent to the main road in the area it would be expected to be highly visible. They believed the Park would maximize the education options possible. They also appreciated the benefit this work could provide to chum salmon should chum repopulate the creek as hoped, noting that the Lower Columbia Recovery Plan had a special emphasis on chum salmon reintroduction to the tributaries of the lower Columbia. On the site visit, one of the reviewers walked much of the mainstem of Colewort

Creek and a bit of the tributary, and upon return remarked that the mainstem had good gravel deposits and was very low gradient, a combination that chum salmon would find appealing. While no adult coho or chum were found during the site visit, the reviewers learned juvenile chum had been captured in a test seine done low in the stream the previous year. They also learned that mainstem Colewort might provide chum or coho habitat, but the tributary was too small to offer significant fish habitat benefit.

While the reviewers found a lot to like in the application, a few issues were raised. The reviewers would have appreciated some brief discussion on the restoration activities in the project budgeted for Match funds. They noted that the Match funds were significant and the activities using those funds were important to the project's success. They wanted enough detail on those activities to understand the whole project, not just the part OWEB would fund. Two specific items on which they wanted more information were: the disposal method and location for the fill removed during the project and; detail on the revegetation plan for the land to be restored.

Because of the possible limits to the amount of funding available for this round of applications, the reviewers noted that the property was in public hands and there was no threat of the property's habitat values declining further if this project did not occur under the proposed timeline. Even though they knew they were going to recommend the project for funding, and they recognized the benefits of the work proposed, they also recognized that there were other excellent projects competing for funds this round and their benefits were understood to be greater. They ranked the project accordingly.

Before leaving the project, the reviewers noted the amount requested for administration (\$15,175) and recommended the amount be reduced or the applicant provides detailed justification for the amount.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Tidal and freshwater wetlands are the highest priority restoration targets in the region where this project site is located. A large majority of tidal marsh habitat in the area has been converted for other land uses. The entire lower reaches of the Lewis & Clark River once contained significant Sitka Spruce swamp habitat, extensive estuarine marshes, and freshwater tidal wetlands. Historical land use and hydraulic manipulation through construction of levees and channel dredging, as well as recent rural development, now prevents natural tidal interactions between the river and adjacent lands, resulting in the fragmentation of habitat critical to the lifecycle of salmonids and other estuarine dependent species. Restoration of every acre of this habitat type is important to provide the historic rearing and acclimation habitat for the area's salmonids as well as rearing and feeding areas for the multitude of other estuarine dependent species.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Reviewers recommend the amount requested for project administration is reduced or the applicant provide detailed justification for current the amount.

Regional Review Team Priority

#6 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$166,925.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line. Staff does not recommend this application for funding since it falls below the staff-recommended funding line, but if a grant were to be awarded, the amount of fiscal administration would need to be reduced or justified.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1023	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Upper Yaquina Restoration - Phase II		
Applicant:	MidCoast WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lincoln
OWEB Request:	\$452,975.00	Total Cost:	\$569,012.00

Application Description

The Yaquina River flows to the ocean at Newport, on the central Oregon Coast. The upper Yaquina is the area targeted in this multiple landowner and multiple restoration activity project. The upper Yaquina is the sub-basin upstream of the confluence of Little Elk River with the mainstem Yaquina, at Yaquina RM 36 in the community of Eddyville. The upper Yaquina drains roughly 21,000 acres and includes three 6th-fields: Buttermilk, Spindle (Spilde) and Yaquina headwaters. Within the area are eleven Yaquina tributaries that provide habitat for coho. Land ownership in the uplands is private industrial and State of Oregon forestland, while much of the valley floor is pastureland and hayfields, with scattered rural residences along the stream corridors. The upper Yaquina sub-basin has an extensive low-gradient network of small and moderate sized streams, with high potential for coho and other salmonids.

In 2007, the MidCoast Watershed Council (Council) contracted for a Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) of the upper Yaquina sub basin to: 1) identify the processes and habitat characteristics that are currently limiting coho smolt production and; 2) develop a prioritized list of actions to address those limitations. The primary limiting factors were identified as elevated summer water temperatures; reduced channel complexity, inadequately functioning riparian areas and; passage impediments to juvenile salmonids seeking cold water refuge in multiple tributaries during high temperature summer flows in the mainstem Yaquina.

In 2010 the Council implemented a project to conduct outreach to residents of the upper Yaquina with the hope and expectation of developing individual and community wide support for restoration projects designed to address the sub-basin's limiting factors. The result of the LFA and Outreach projects was an extensive restoration project (211-1030-8537) implemented in 2011 in which a variety of restoration activities were conducted on multiple sites on properties of nine different landowners on six tributaries and the mainstem Yaquina. Restoration actions included culvert removal, culvert replacement, culvert to bridge replacement, riparian planting, large wood placements, and the construction of graded riffles to improve passage on several culverts not scheduled for replacement.

This Phase II proposal is designed to address the mainstem Yaquina temperature limitation by targeting the three largest livestock operations in the upper Yaquina basin by implementing a multi-faceted plan to restore a functional riparian canopy on those properties. Activities planned for those three properties will include fencing to exclude all livestock from 4 miles of mainstem Yaquina, then planting the newly fenced riparian area and, for three years, maintaining the riparian plantings. A bridge will be installed on one of the properties to end the negative impacts of regular equipment fording of the mainstem. Two other properties (4.1 acres) will also be planted and the two most important upper mainstem Yaquina salmon anchor sites will be treated by helicopter with full spanning large wood. Two tributaries will also be treated with excavator placements of large wood.

Partners in the project include several landowners, USFWS, BLM and ODF. OWEB funds are budgeted for contracted services (42%), materials (41%), project management (7%), plant establishment (6%) and administration (3%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were familiar with the sub-basin and the work previously accomplished in Phase I. They appreciated this Phase II submittal and were pleased to see the continued momentum and the involvement in this new application of several of the largest landowners in the basin. They understood that the upper Yaquina was temperature limited during the summer months and that much of this Phase II project was designed to address that issue, and that sediment and bacteria issues would be addressed as well through the same temperature related work. The reviewers also appreciated the continuing outreach throughout the sub-basin, recognizing that the success of the Phase I work, when coupled with the continuing outreach effort, was a large part of the reason these large landholders were now willing to implement restoration work on their properties. The reviewers recognized that a significant portion of the mainstem upper Yaquina was now involved in restoration activities. They also appreciated the involvement of ODF and BLM and the contribution of large whole conifer trees for the helicopter in-stream large wood component of the project.

The reviewers noted that while on the early December site visit, lots of fish were seen, Chinook and coho, actively building redds and spawning in several reaches. They remarked that everywhere there was gravel, there were fish, driving home the reality that gravel retention was an important part of any restoration plan for the area and they were pleased to see the inclusion of some large wood placement work in Phase II to address this issue.

However, on the site visit, the reviewers began to question the proposed fence setbacks on some of the properties and during the review meeting the issue arose again. The difference between the setback numbers proposed in the application and the numbers suggested by a few of the reviewers were not very far apart (24 ft vs. 30 ft), but it was noted that in this stream reach the gradient was very low and 24 ft was well within the expected meander zone and, as a result, any trees planted or fence built in the zone could easily be expected to be captured by the stream in the future as it migrated across its floodplain. That likelihood, when coupled to the cost of the fencing and planting work in this project, led them to strongly favor the larger setback.

The reviewers found the overall cost of the project, as well as the individual component costs, to be extremely high in comparison to other projects and the application did not provide detail on why the costs were so different. They noted that the helicopter work was budgeted at \$63,500, including move-in. With 83 trees planned for helicopter placement, they did the math to determine each tree would cost \$765 to place. They did the same math for the tree planting component and found that, not including the follow up tree release work with its own budget of \$27,753, the purchase, prep, planting and protection of the 3,345 trees would cost \$60,728 or \$18.15 per tree. At a 70 percent survival rate, the reviewers found the cost then went up to \$25.93/tree.

The reviewers then discussed the bridge purchase and installation proposed for one of the properties. They noted the total cost for bridge purchase and installation was \$117,200 and they wondered about the benefit to cost ratio of this project component. They understood that the bridge would eliminate the daily crossing of the mainstem by livestock and farm equipment via a rock ford and would also eliminate the reach of farm road now going down to the rock ford, thereby eliminating a source of sediment and bacteria transport to the river. The site visit provided the reviewers with an understanding of the issues involved in placing a bridge at the site, as well as the landowner's need to have a structurally sound bridge capable of supporting the equipment involved in the farm's long term plans. The reviewers came to no conclusion from their discussions on the cost compared to the ecological benefit involved, other than to note that this comparatively small piece of the overall project was a significant portion of the overall project cost.

The reviewers discussed the many ecological pluses of the overall project and then compared them to the cost issues and the lack of detail on the reasons for the comparative high costs. They discussed the fact this project was submitted at a time that happened to coincide with several other expensive projects in the region

and also coincided with a downturn in the overall restoration grant program budget. They talked about the need to keep momentum going in the sub-basin, but then balanced that desire with the recognition that the upcoming April round of applications could provide an opportunity to resubmit an application that offered more detail on the individual labor and materials cost component and provided opportunities for the reviewers to better “cherry-pick” individual project activities should the need to do so arise. They thought the momentum could be maintained with that approach, and hoped that a hiccup of six months time wouldn’t bring all progress in the sub-basin to a halt.

After much of the discussion on project costs had occurred, some of the reviewers noted that many of the fencing and planting costs could be addressed through the CREP program and they wondered if that approach was considered. Reviewers familiar with the area noted the social issues in the sub basin that have made it a difficult area in which to develop restoration projects. Those reviewers also noted that the applicant and the contractors were well aware of the CREP program, having used it in projects in other areas, and would have been expected to have discussed those options with the landowners. They suspected in this case the landowner’s distrust of government programs in general may very well be the reason for the lack of CREP involvement.

Due to their concerns and questions with the project costs, the reviewers thought the best approach to take at this time was to not recommend the project for funding, but to convey their strong enthusiasm for the work proposed for this priority sub-basin, and their desire to help the applicant keep the restoration momentum going in the area. They wanted the applicant to know they found much benefit in the planned work and very much wanted to see that work occur. They encourage the applicant to submit another application in the upcoming April round, one with either the problematic costs reduced or, if not, sufficient detail provided on why those costs are necessary. They also wanted the applicant and the contractors to consider taking another run at involving the CREP program with the landowners, thereby lowering the overall cost to OWEB. The reviewers appreciated the comprehensive nature of this current proposal but also hoped the new application could be structured so that, if necessary, the reviewers could easily pull the application apart and pick elements and their individual budgets out for funding while leaving others behind. They wanted to emphasize this possible practice was not their first choice, but it might be necessary and could allow some work to proceed.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1025	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Spout Creek Watershed Restoration		
Applicant:	Lincoln SWCD		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lincoln
OWEB Request:	\$423,849.00	Total Cost:	\$588,374.00

Application Description

Spout Creek is a tributary of Big Elk, itself a major trib of the Yaquina River. Spout Creek joins the Big Elk from the north at approximately RM 23, right in the center of the community of Harlan in Lincoln County. The Spout Creek sixth-field basin drains 6,900 acres; supports populations of Chinook, coho, steelhead, cutthroat trout and lamprey; and has a total of 11.3 miles of coho distribution, mainstem and tributaries combined. The county road linking Harlan to civilization via Highway 20 at Burnt Woods follows mainstem Spout Creek for much of the mainstem's approximate 6.5 miles. Numerous rural residences dot the valley floor and the hillslopes are managed for timber production by a variety of owners. The Siuslaw National Forest also has ownership within the basin.

Data from a 2009 Yaquina basin Rapid Bio-Assessment (RBA) project implemented by Bio-Surveys indicates that the Spout Creek sub-basin is a very productive coho system with the longest distribution of juvenile coho in the Yaquina system. Most of the 2009 production occurred in the mainstem (54%), followed by Johnson Creek, Spout's major tributary. There are several tributaries in the Spout Creek sub-basin with good quality habitat that are not being utilized due to fish passage barriers that limit upstream access.

A variety of restoration projects have been accomplished in the upper Big Elk basin by several different organizations over the course of the last decade. The Spout Creek sub-basin has presented some difficult social issues which precluded some restoration work in the past, but due to outreach efforts those issues are clearing and a whole sub-basin scale restoration project is now possible. In this application, the Lincoln SWCD is partnering with the Lincoln County Public Works Department, ODFW, ODF and several landowners to address 10 problematic culverts, spread across 6 tributaries and the upper mainstem. The work would increase fish access to at least 9.7 miles of habitat. The project would also improve stream complexity by placement of instream wood structures over 2.75 stream miles and would enhance basking habitat of the only documented population of Western Pond Turtles in Lincoln County by placing 16 logs into the old Harlan mill pond. OWEB funds are requested for materials (59%), contracted services ((36%), administration (3%) and project management (2%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Many of the reviewers were familiar with the sub basin from the earlier TA project in which designs of two culverts involved in this application were developed. The reviewers liked the project's whole watershed approach to culvert replacements and appreciated the attempt to restore passage and connectivity throughout the sub basin. They also appreciated the partnerships and number of landowners involved. The early December site visit attended by seven of the reviewers provided ample evidence of the need for replacement of the existing culverts at all the sites. The site visit also provided good evidence of fish in the mainstem and the reviewers understood the benefits of opening full passage to restore access to a significant number of miles of spawning and rearing habitat.

However, the reviewers found this a poorly presented application, with little detail provided on the design of the majority of the culverts. They noted the two designs produced by the earlier TA project, but wanted more detail than was presented on the other culverts involved. The site visit provided a number of questions on the planned alignment of several of the proposed new culverts and those questions were unanswered. The reviewers also thought the sizing of the replacement culverts was inadequate, noting that while the new culverts were sized to meet bankfull width (1 X 1), they would have much preferred the recommended 1.5 X 1, in order to provide more room for extreme events and to lower the amount of maintenance a 1 X 1 sized pipe could be expected to require. They understood the increased costs issues involved with their preferred larger sizing but felt that approach to be wiser than the smaller sized pipes approach currently proposed. They wondered how the original decision had been reached and if there were reasons other than cost for the choice. The application provided no explanation or indication those discussions occurred.

While the reviewers appreciated the inclusion on some instream large wood work in the project, they found the proposed work to be weighted heavily towards the use of boulders and didn't find any adequate explanation in the application for the need for the approach. They would have appreciated more wood and fewer boulders and believed the habitat benefits would be increased as a result.

On the site visit, the reviewers looked at the site proposed for an engineered riffle. They found the proposed riffle was to be constructed immediately below a culvert that had been poorly designed and placed 15 years earlier on private land. They understood while the existing culvert outlet presented a barrier to juvenile upstream passage, the landowner didn't want to replace the existing pipe because it was relatively new. The reviewers understood the goal of the engineered riffle was to raise the stream level below the culvert thereby eliminating the outlet drop creating the juvenile barrier, but they found the proposed correction to be seriously flawed. They recognized the site as heavily modified with the stream straightened and pushed against one hillslope to allow for a road in the valley bottom and saw little if any benefit to watershed function with the planned riffle, even if it were successful in achieving its goal. They believed the site required a more comprehensive approach if it were to be restored to full function and they did not agree to this small band-aid approach. They recognized that if the riffle wasn't constructed, the current situation would continue, but they also recognized that the current pipe would need to be replaced within 10 or 15 years and at that time would be required to be sized and placed appropriately.

As noted earlier, the reviewers appreciated the application's attempt to restore passage and connectivity throughout the sub basin, and even with the problems noted, they looked for ways they could recommend funding at least a few of the culverts. But, they couldn't find enough detailed fish information for each stream in the application to determine how they might prioritize the sites, nor did the application present any prioritization for their consideration.

With all the problems identified in their discussions, the reviewers reluctantly decided to not recommend the application for funding. But, they would strongly encourage the applicant to address the issues identified and develop a better detailed application complete with some level of designs for all the new culverts, not just the two county road culverts designed through the previous TA project.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1026	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	S.F. Nehalem Riparian Enhancement Project		
Applicant:	Lower Nehalem WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Tillamook
OWEB Request:	\$55,052.00	Total Cost:	\$76,452.00

Application Description

The South Fork Nehalem Riparian Enhancement project is located in the community of Mohler, just east of the towns of Wheeler and Nehalem on the lower Nehalem River. The property is located roughly between RM 4.5 and RM 6.5 of the mainstem Nehalem, is all under one ownership and is operated as a dairy farm. The reach of river is tidally influenced and the upstream property line is very near the head of tide. The Nehalem basin supports populations of Chinook (spring and fall), coho, chum, steelhead, cutthroat trout (resident and sea-run) and lamprey. The river is temperature limited for almost its entire length and the lower reaches of the river are particularly devoid of healthy riparian vegetation.

In this proposal, the Lower Nehalem Watershed Council (Council) is working with the SF Nehalem Dairy Company to plant 6,000 native conifers and 2,000 native shrubs along roughly 3 miles of the lower Nehalem River. The BLM Native Plant Nursery will donate the native plant stock. OWEB funds are budgeted for tree planting labor (35%), three years of tree release labor (12%), project management (28%), materials (15%) travel (4%) and administration (6%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were initially extremely pleased to see this application, noting the length of mainstem Nehalem to be treated and the landowner involved. They appreciated the riparian planting work would be addressing the known limiting factor of excessive water temperature in the basin, that almost three miles of the mainstem would be treated and that the landowner involved was a well known and respected dairy operator. They thought 6,000 trees was an ambitious number to plant, but believed if successful the project would help with bacteria and sediment issues and would provide shade, cover and food for juvenile salmonids rearing in the area.

However, on the site visit the reviewers found numerous fatal flaws to the application. They noted that the property was an active dairy farm, with several hundred cows, and there was no fencing proposed in the application. Other than some wire cages to protect against beaver predation, they found no plan for protecting the 6,000 trees from the dairy cows. The site visit also provided ample evidence of the application's accuracy in describing the problems with blackberries and knotweed, but the reviewers found the plan to address the invasive plant issues inadequate in both its technical approach and in the time necessary for follow-up treatment to allow the new trees and shrubs to get to free-to-grow stage.

On the site visit the reviewers discussed the need for fencing with the applicant and the contractor. The landowner was not available for the discussion at the time, nor was there enough information to even begin to estimate the costs for the fencing that would be necessary for a project of this size. The reviewers noted that an island in the mainstem was included in the planting plan and while they agreed planting the island made sense, they also recognized that if cows were to continue grazing the island any plantings would have to be fenced. But, the reviewers also recognized this island is in a portion of the Nehalem River that flooded regularly and if any part of the island were to be fenced any future flooding would likely destroy the new

fence. Recognizing that building an expensive fence on the island was a bad idea, the decision for the reviewers then became if cows graze the island, planting should not be done because the plants could not be protected. They understood the decision whether the island would continue to be grazed was one that only the landowner could make and they asked the applicant and contractor to have that discussion with him. Several of the reviewers local to the area offered to work with the contractor and the landowner to see if a suitable plan for fencing the riparian area of the property could be developed in time for review.

At the review team meeting everyone learned that a short follow-up meeting had occurred but the landowner was not involved nor had he provided advice to the contractor on the type of fencing to be installed nor its setback distance or placement.

The reviewers noted the plan proposed to deal with knotweed and blackberries was to cut, till and burn. The site visit showed large patches of both plants, with some intermixing. The reviewers thought the cut, till and burn approach could work for treating blackberries, but the approach was guaranteed to fail with knotweed infestations and could easily make the situation worse as each small piece of cut knotweed, stem or root, could restart itself and begin another patch. Noting that not only would it be impossible to collect the entire knotweed root mass, in order to thoroughly burn the cuttings and tillage, they would need to be spread and dried. The reviewers were concerned the material then could get dispersed across the landscape and create an even greater problem. Discussions on site with the contractor and applicant indicated a lack of familiarity with the issue of dealing with knotweed infestations, and the reviewers were not able to provide specific costs for other approaches without further study of the situation.

Besides the initial site prep concerns dealing with invasives, the reviewers thought the tree establishment plan was short both on detail and time, noting their experience with the sheer tenacity of both blackberries and knotweed. They thought the plan needed to be extended, or more explanation provided on why a shorter time frame would be expected to succeed. They also noted that more detail on the method and timing of follow up release activities was needed.

With all the problems and unanswered questions, the decision on whether to recommend the application for funding was easy. The reviewers recommended the application not be funded, but they also wanted to convey their desire for the applicant to work with the landowner and develop specific information on fencing. The reviewers also wanted any future application to include a better plan for dealing with the invasive blackberries and knotweed.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1027	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Mabel Creek Floodplain Restoration and Cutthroat Trout Passage		
Applicant:	Youngs Bay WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Clatsop
OWEB Request:	\$93,062.00	Total Cost:	\$388,212.00

Application Description

Mabel Creek is a tributary of the Young's River, located near Astoria in Clatsop County in the NW corner of Oregon. Young's River is one of four rivers emptying into Young's Bay, an arm of the Columbia River estuary. Seven miles upstream of the Young's River confluence with the Bay is Young's River Falls, a 65ft tall near vertical basalt wall that effectively cuts off all anadromous fish passage, except for lamprey and perhaps cutthroat trout that survive the downstream plunge. Above the falls, Young's River meanders another 13 miles through extremely low gradient habitat until the mainstem and S. Fork come to their headwalls on the eastern and northern slopes respectively of Saddle Mountain. Mabel Creek joins the mainstem approximately 11 miles above the falls and drains 1.8 square miles of the Young's River basin. Landownership in the basin above the falls is an interesting mixture of state forest, industrial timber and very secluded, very small rural communities. Timber harvest is the predominate land use.

Isolated by the falls, the upper basin has 36.5 miles of combined mainstem and tributary habitat to support its healthy population of coastal cutthroat trout. And, while there's only anecdotal evidence of adult Pacific lampreys climbing the falls, those most familiar with lamprey behavior indicate there's no reason to expect they don't successfully surmount the falls and spawn in the habitat upstream.

Coastal cutthroat trout have the most complex life history strategy combinations of any salmonid. Four life-history types generally recognized present in the north coast are: resident, fluvial, adfluvial and anadromous. Recent research indicates some plasticity between life history types, which enables interchange of individuals from one life history form to another. The research is particularly relevant to this project since it suggests that the isolated resident fish may, if they survive the downstream passage over the falls, make significant contributions of individuals to augment the anadromous life history component of cutthroat trout in the streams and rivers throughout the Columbia estuary, a population that in the early 1990 was petitioned for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Subsequent to the 1999 decision to not list, in 2002 the USFWS found the subspecies not warranted due to the strength of the resident population that is important in contributing individuals to the anadromous life form.

Young's River is on the 303(d) list for excessive water temperature and sediment impairment. Sediment input from roads is a major contributor to water quality impairment throughout the watershed. Logging has occurred in the Mabel Creek sub-basin since the early 1900s. A section of the mainline forest road runs immediately alongside Mabel Creek from its confluence with Young's River upstream for ¾ mile. The road is so close to Mable Creek that road sediments, in many places, have direct entry to the stream during the wet season. The logging and stream cleaning history in the area have combined to seriously limit the amount of large wood in the stream, conspiring with the road constraint to the creek's ability to access its floodplain to further limit stream complexity.

In this application, the Young's Bay Watershed Council, working in partnership with the Campbell Group, USFWS, Trout Unlimited, Western Native Trout Initiative, ODFW, DEQ and North Coast Watershed Association volunteers, proposes to obliterate the ¾ mile section of the Mabel Creek mainline forest road that runs immediately alongside the creek, fully remove four culverts to restore floodplain function, replace

two culverts on other roads to restore fish passage to over one mile of stream, and place 80 key pieces of large wood instream along with 190 filler pieces. OWEB funds would be used to fund road obliteration, floodplain restoration, large wood placement, one fish passage culvert replacement and erosion control materials and labor.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers found this to be an extremely well organized and written application. They appreciated the work put into it and they also appreciated the amount of match involved. The reviewers understood that the project would eliminate a significant source of sediment to the system and that sediment was one of the issues identified as limiting water quality in the basin. They also understood that water temperature was another of the creek's 303(d) listed parameters and they recognized the tree planting component of the project, over the long term, would help address that issue. They noted the project would restore full connectivity and floodplain access throughout Mabel Creek and remarked that this project was permanent watershed restoration.

The reviewers discussed their opinion that if this project was proposed for a stream with salmonids such as coho or chum, and not only coastal cutthroat, the application would be a slam dunk do-fund recommendation and would likely be ranked at the top. However, they noted it was a cutthroat only stream and the project's benefits would be limited to cutthroat, though they did recognize the project's improvements to water quality would benefit the entire basin, including the seven mile reach below the falls.

During the discussion the reviewers were reminded that the Western Native Trout Initiative ranked this project #1 out of all the projects submitted, not just from Oregon, but from all the eleven states involved in the Initiative. They also learned that a recent USGS survey found lots of lamprey throughout the system, and although the survey did not identify the lamprey by species, the reviewers found the information interesting. The reviewers discussed the possibility of cutthroat surviving the plunge over the falls and recognized that not only was it possible, it was extremely probable, noting the ability of salmonids to survive much higher drops off many of the dams throughout the northwest. With that recognition, the project's value to the region's larger cutthroat population, including the anadromous life history form, rose considerably in the reviewer's estimation.

The reviewers had nothing but praise for the application and quickly recommended it for funding. The application's subsequent ranking at #5 was the result of the excellence of four other projects, all of which benefited multiple species of salmonids, including cutthroat trout.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Removal of culverts and obliteration of the roadbed will allow full connectivity and restore natural function to the creek. The addition of large wood to the system will provide temporary complexity to the creek until the new trees grow enough to provide that function. The new trees will also provide shade to the stream and help keep stream temperature lower than if the reach were left unshaded.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

#5 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$93,062.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount

EM Portion

PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1028	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Merrill Creek Floodplain Restoration		
Applicant:	Columbia SWCD		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Columbia
OWEB Request:	\$132,624.00	Total Cost:	\$184,750.00

Application Description

Merrill Creek is a tributary of Tide Creek in Columbia County. Tide Creek flows into Deer Island Slough before joining the Columbia River at RM 81, roughly five miles downstream of St. Helens. Upstream of its confluence with Tide Creek, Merrill Creek has roughly seven miles of stream suitable for salmonids, approximately five miles of which is low gradient coho habitat. A road runs alongside a portion of Merrill Creek, beginning roughly at RM 1 and terminating at roughly RM 2.2. A number of rural residences and small hobby farms are scattered along the valley floor in this reach, including several structures built at the very stream edge of the active floodplain. The upper reaches of Merrill Creek are in industrial timber company ownerships. Due to anthropogenic activities in the basin, including logging, agriculture and rural development, the habitat and fish populations of Merrill Creek have degraded and declined significantly.

In 2008, the Columbia SWCD began working with the community in the Tide and Merrill Creek drainages to identify and implement habitat restoration projects within the area. Surveys of Merrill Creek conducted in 2009 by staff from USFWS showed surprising numbers of coho and lamprey juveniles. The surveyors were pleased to also find large numbers of freshwater mussels. The stream historically should have supported chum populations but the recent surveys provided no sightings of that species.

In 2010, the SWCD began work on an OWEB funded streambank restoration project (211-1004) on a couple of properties in the rural residential stream reach, and also started a technical assistance project (211-1020) to address several complex culvert replacements in the reach. In this Restoration project, the SWCD, in partnership with BLM, ODFW and two landowners, is proposing to restore 2,000 linear feet of incised streambank by excavating a new active floodplain, reducing bank angles, planting native vegetation in the riparian area, creating new off-channel habitat and increasing stream complexity through the use of logs and boulders. The work would be accomplished on properties adjacent to the ones worked on in the previous project. OWEB funds would be used for project design, construction, riparian restoration, plant establishment, project management and administration.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were familiar with the Merrill Creek sub basin as a result of previous applications, including a funded restoration project (211-1004) and also a funded TA project (211-1020). They appreciated the applicant's plan to continue focusing restoration efforts in Merrill Creek, recognizing the potential benefits to both aquatic and terrestrial resources should natural watershed function and process be restored to the system. The reviewers were reminded of Merrill Creek's existing fish resources, including coho, steelhead, cutthroat trout and lamprey (Pacific and brook), as well as the healthy population of fresh water mussels (Oregon Floaters) in the sub basin, and there was discussion on the plan to restore chum populations in the lower Columbia, possibly including Merrill Creek.

The early December site visit provided the reviewer's starting point for the discussion. They noted that the application accurately depicted the limiting factors in the sub basin: specifically the lack of stream

complexity; poor riparian conditions leading to increased water temperatures, unstable stream banks with resulting sediment issues; and undersized and poorly designed culverts leading to unnatural stream function and limited material transport. The reviewers appreciated the applicant's attempts to work with the landowners to develop acceptable restoration projects on different properties and they were pleased to learn the TA project to design new culverts for the problem locations was in process.

However, the reviewers thought this current restoration project jumped the gun a bit. They strongly believed the culvert TA work...and the follow-up culvert replacement work... needed to occur before any additional stream bank restoration work begins. They thought that once the culverts were replaced, with the accompanying size increase and significant realignment of the pipes, that restoration work in the basin could then be better designed and scheduled. They believed the proper approach to restoration in the sub basin would begin with instream large wood projects in the upper reaches of the stream, then be followed by riparian and stream channel restoration work in the lower reaches. From discussions with the applicants during site visits for previous applications, the reviewers understood that due to flooding concerns in the reaches with the undersized and misaligned culverts, the rural homeowners were reluctant to allow any large wood restoration work to occur anywhere in the sub basin for fear material would float downstream and plug the undersized culverts.

The reviewers believed since the culverts were the underlying issue to the landowner's flooding concerns, in order for restoration projects addressing stream complexity to occur in the sub basin, the culvert problems had to be fixed first. The reviewers noted that once the culvert issues were fixed, restoration work could be planned for the preferred approach of working from the top of the basin to the bottom. The reviewers understood the stream reach currently being focused on provided migratory and some rearing habitat for salmonids, but the stream's primary spawning and rearing habitat was upstream from the reach and restoration work upstream would provide more benefit than would streambank stabilization work currently proposed in the lower reach.

Discussion with the applicant on the site visit included the reviewer's belief the planned alcove work was unnecessary, since the stream reach involved was extremely low gradient and provided slow water habitat already. They also noted the locations planned for the alcoves had no tributary flow source to keep the alcoves from filling in during high water events. That information was shared at the meeting with the full review team. The reviewers, at both the site visit and the review team meeting, also discussed the planned bank stabilization work planned for the project's upstream property and wondered if there weren't other options possible, options that weren't so heavily engineered and dependent on rock. They understood that the problem at the upstream property site was the result of previous stream manipulation from the time when a railroad ran down the valley, and they would have preferred more discussion on work that could restore the historic stream channel and by doing so alleviate the current threat to the structure resulting from the earlier radical stream manipulation. While the reviewers recognized the clear threat to the house in the existing situation, they saw no ecological benefit to the stream bank protection offered in the application. They thought there were sources of funding other than OWEB possible for that type of work, but they wanted to be clear that OWEB funds would certainly be eligible for efforts to restore the historic stream channel and address the problem in that manner.

While the reviewers appreciated the applicant's desire to keep momentum moving forward in the sub basin, they were clear in their recommendation that the culvert work needed to be addressed first, and suggested the momentum be carried ahead with that work. They recommend the applicant implement the culvert work and use the additional time to consider alternative options and designs for the stream bank stability concerns in the reach.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1029	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Cleveland Creek Railroad Culvert Replacement		
Applicant:	Siuslaw WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$446,607.00	Total Cost:	\$578,501.00

Application Description

Cleveland Creek is a small tributary draining hillslopes on the north side of the lower Siuslaw River just above the head of tide. The two-mile long creek joins the Siuslaw just upstream of RM 26 in the rural riverfront community of Tide, about five miles upstream of Mapleton. Before spilling into the Siuslaw, Cleveland Creek has to pass through a culvert under a railroad and quickly thereafter through another culvert under Hwy 36. The railroad culvert is undersized, perched and its bottom rusted through in multiple spots, a combination that presents a complete barrier to fish passage. Cleveland Creek has roughly 1.5 miles of spawning and cool water rearing habitat upstream of the railroad culvert.

The railroad was originally built in the early 1900s, linking the coastal communities of Coos Bay, Reedsport and Florence to Eugene. Ownership of the railroad has changed over the years; most recently with the Oregon International Port of Coos Bay (Port) acquisition of the line in 2009. In the previous three decades, as timber harvests in the coast range slowed, use of the railroad declined dramatically. As railroad use slowed, maintenance of the line stopped and when the Port acquired the railroad, it also acquired the need for significant repairs before trains could run safely once again. The silver lining in this trouble was the ability to address longstanding issues with fish passage through culverts running under the railroad. The Siuslaw Watershed Council (Council) had been trying for years to work with the railroad's previous owners on a variety of restoration opportunities but enjoyed no success. When the Port took control of the railroad, the Council knocked again and this time the door to restoration partnerships quickly opened.

In 2009, the Siuslaw Watershed Council (Council), working with ODFW, completed a survey of railroad stream crossings in the Siuslaw River and coastal lakes basins. The Cleveland Creek culvert was identified as a high priority. In early 2011, the Council was awarded a Technical Assistance project to contract with an engineering firm with expertise in railroad infrastructure to design a replacement culvert for the Cleveland Creek site complete with construction specifications and a price estimate for construction. Based on successful implementation of that TA project, and the added impetus of the Port's success in getting the railroad running once again (first trip between the coast and the valley accomplished in early December 2011), the Council is now proposing to replace the undersized barrier culvert with an open-bottom concrete structure that meets both railroad structural standards as well as federal and state fish passage requirements, thereby opening access to 1.5 miles of spawning and rearing habitat. OWEB funds will be used for final engineering tasks; construction; purchase of the open bottom structure; project management; and administration. Partnering with the Council on the project will be the International Port of Coos Bay, USFS and ODFW.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers were familiar with this site as a result of their review of the previous Technical Assistance (TA) project (211-1038) and they were pleased with the applicant's rapid and successful implementation of that project. They understood that while the TA project was being implemented, the Port was also successful in its process of making the railroad operational and in early December the train made its first transit between

the coast and the valley. At the January 4th review meeting, the reviewers learned that the train was now running twice a week and beginning to ramp up its business.

The reviewers found the designs from the TA project acceptable and appreciated the applicant's recent information that the project cost could be reduced by \$30,000 as a result of the ability to shorten the new culvert to just the length required for the railroad track bed. They understood the applicant had been successful in gaining permission to daylight the stream on the downstream side of the railroad by eliminating the abandoned road that ran parallel to the railroad. They appreciated not only the reduced cost but the increased ecological benefits of daylighting an additional portion of the stream.

The reviewers discussed the issue of the ODOT culvert located another couple of hundred yards downstream, between the railroad and the mainstem Siuslaw, recognizing that culvert remained a barrier to juvenile salmonid upstream passage. They understood that while the issue remained, adult salmonids could easily pass the ODOT pipe and replacement of the railroad culvert would open access to 1.5 miles of good quality habitat. While they would have liked to fix the ODOT culvert either before or at the same time as replacing the railroad culvert, they recognized the window of opportunity for the railroad was now, and the window would close long before ODOT could address its pipe.

Several reviewers expressed their concerns about the project cost and wondered why, if the culvert was currently rusted and failing, the railroad was not providing more match since sooner or later the culvert would become a safety issue and the railroad would have to fix it themselves. Further discussion provided the information that the Port had only recently purchased the railroad, had done nothing other than spend more money repairing both the line and the equipment and had yet to earn a dime from its operation. The reviewers also noted that having the railroad as a willing partner to restoration was very different from previous experience and a positive experience with Cleveland Creek should lead to more partnerships in the future.

The reviewers noted the amount of admin requested (\$14,000) and asked staff to discuss the issue with the applicant.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Replacing an undersized and rusted through fish passage barrier culvert with one sized and aligned correctly will provide full passage to 1.5 miles of good habitat to all aquatic species as well as provide much improved transport of substrate and other materials to the reach downstream.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. According to the 12/15/11 letter from the applicant to the Review Team, the applicant has worked with the landowner (Port of Coos Bay) and the company that has the easement for the road running parallel to the railroad to abandon the road and decrease the length of the culvert, thereby daylighting that portion of the creek previously confined to the culvert section under the road and reducing the amount requested from OWEB by \$30,000.

Regional Review Team Priority

#4 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$415,912.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. The grant agreement will document that the applicant has worked with the landowner and the company that has the easement for the road running parallel to the railroad to abandon the road and

decrease the length of the culvert, thereby daylighting that that portion of the creek previously confined to the culvert section under the road and reducing the amount requested from OWEB by \$30,000. Fiscal administration costs are reduced by \$695.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$415,912.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$415,912.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1031	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Upper North Fork Siuslaw Integrated Watershed Restoration		
Applicant:	Siuslaw WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$581,110.00	Total Cost:	\$1,079,020.00

Application Description

The North Fork Siuslaw is a major tributary of the Siuslaw River, draining roughly 42,000 acres. It enters the mainstem just east of the town of Florence, approximately a mile from the ocean. The North Fork has a considerable estuary and a wide, flat valley bottom that extends north and inland for roughly 10 miles, after which the valley begins to narrow, stream gradient gradually increases and land use slowly changes from agriculture to timber. A mix of private residences and active cattle operations comprise most of the land use in the valley bottoms while the uplands lie primarily in the Siuslaw National Forest, although there is a considerable amount of private industrial timber holdings in the upper basins as well. The basin supports populations of chinook, coho, steelhead, chum (small population), coastal cutthroat trout, and Pacific lamprey.

The Siuslaw Watershed Council Watershed Assessment indicates that the N. Fork sub-basin has some of the best remaining habitat for anadromous fish in the entire Siuslaw basin. Stream habitat surveys document that the mainstem N. Fork and its tributaries, although containing some of the best habitat in the basin, have levels of large wood significantly below what is considered necessary for proper stream function. In 2004 the Siuslaw Watershed Council (Council) partnered with the Siuslaw National Forest (SNF) on a helicopter large wood project on portions of the mainstem N. Fork and 5 tributaries (McLeod, Porter, Condon, Uncle and Elma). Periodic monitoring of those sites indicates that fish habitat is improving, with spawning gravel accumulating and diverse habitats being created. But, not only was the approach somewhat conservative with the number of logs, sites and logs-per-site, large sections of the upper mainstem and the tributaries were not treated at all.

In this application, the Council and the SNF are partnering again, along with Plum Creek Timber and several other private landowners, to implement a multiple component restoration project in the upper N. Fork Siuslaw and three of its tributaries (McLeod, Porter and Sam's) to address: 1) lack of large wood instream; 2) sediment issues from a forest road running alongside Porter Creek; and 3) a variety of WQ issues involved with 5 different dispersed campsites. To address #1), 200 mature trees (26-32 inches DBH) and 454 plantation trees (13-20 inches DBH) with rootwads attached will be placed into sites in McLeod, Porter and Sam's Creek and the upper mainstem N. Fork. To address #2), 1.1 mile of the Porter Creek road will be decommissioned with all fill removed and banks pulled back to their natural slopes. And, to address #3) the dispersed camp sites will either be closed or redesigned and/or modified to protect the riparian areas. Native trees will be planted for shade and future large wood recruitment. OWEB funds will be used for helicopter and excavator contract time; landowner outreach; contract and materials for the road decommissioning and dispersed campsite modifications; project management and administration.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

All the reviewers recognized the North Fork Siuslaw as a high priority basin, and were pleased to see the combination of public and private lands to be treated in this project. They appreciated the mix of activities planned for the project, in particular the Porter Creek road decommissioning. The reviewers recognized the

N. Fork sub basin supported important populations of Chinook, coho, chum, steelhead and cutthroat trout as well as Pacific and brook lamprey and all the myriad species of fish and wildlife that utilize the Siuslaw estuary, and they valued this opportunity to build on previous restoration efforts in the basin.

While the reviewers found the application generally well written, they did find a number of items where more detail would have been appreciated. The reviewers liked all aspects of the project, but because of OWEB's current declining budget for restoration grants the reviewers were keen on making certain all the project budget components were understood and reasonable. Again because of OWEB budget constraints, during the discussions on the project's different aspects, the reviewers considered which activities were most immediate and which could be delayed for a period of time with little negative impact.

After the early December site visit, where the general budget concerns were discussed with the applicants, they responded with a letter to the reviewers offering a significant budget reduction; from the original request of \$581,110 down to \$411,560. The reduction was the result of decisions to: 1) only place 500 "plantation" trees instream and to do so using a smaller helicopter than the one necessary for the originally planned mature trees; 2) the elimination of tree cutting and instream tree placement by excavator activities; and 3) a reduction in costs of the dispersed campsite modifications. The reviewers greatly appreciated the applicant's willingness to reconsider the project to find ways to make it less expensive, but the reviewers recognized that \$411,560 was still a very significant amount.

During the meeting discussions, the reviewers noted that most of the large wood placement work was planned for areas of mature forest, and although they understood that trees would naturally recruit to the stream, they recognized that would take time and they wondered why this project aimed for 40 key pieces of wood per mile, rather than the NOAA recommended 80 pieces. They noted the previous wood project in the basin also aimed low in the number of key pieces per mile and they would have preferred a more aggressive approach in this project so there would not be need to return at a later date to again supplement the work. All that said, the reviewers believed the large wood component in its entirety could be delayed for a short time without too significant a negative effect to the basin. That segued the discussion back to which project components were the most important to do as soon as possible, and the reviewers decided the road decommissioning and the campsite modifications were the most timely project components and moved their focus that direction.

They considered the Porter Creek road decommissioning and first wondered if "decommissioning" was the same as "obliteration". To be truly permanent restoration work, they strongly favored obliteration, meaning the road bed would be totally eliminated and the hill slope restored to its original form prior to any road construction. The reviewers dug through the planned road activities and came to the conclusion that this would be obliteration; that the fills would be removed, the road bed removed and the slopes re-contoured. But, they also noted the original budget had the total costs of that work to be \$300,000, with OWEB's portion set at \$100,000. They then noted the December 15th response letter, while lowering the total cost for the road work to \$100,000, continued to have OWEB's portion at \$100,000. They found that confusing. They wondered if there was a mistake in the numbers or the portions for which the different parties involved were responsible, and they also wondered what elements of the work had been eliminated to achieve the reduction. They found no answers to those questions. The reviewers remarked that the project budget provided little detail for the different activities, listing some significant activities only as lump sums; a practice that made implementation of the project difficult to understand and virtually impossible to rework when trying to modify an activity.

Having already come to the conclusion that the large wood component could be delayed for a short time, and with their questions on the Porter Creek road unanswered, only the dispersed campsite component remained. The reviewers decided that component was simply too small a part of the original project to consider on its own and as a result they decided to not recommend the total application for funding, a strange decision when all the reviewers agreed that the restoration values of the overall project were both excellent and important. They want to strongly recommend the applicant address their concerns with this application and resubmit the project with the necessary adjustments and budget detail. They also recommend the future submission

provide a budget with the different activity components easily broken out should it be necessary for the review team to modify or select between them in the future. They noted that a prioritization of the different activities and sites would be useful as well for that same possibility.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

**October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle
North Coast Review Team (Region 1)**

Application No.:	212-1032	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Yager Riparian Enhancement		
Applicant:	Siuslaw SWCD		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$68,187.00	Total Cost:	\$125,918.00

Application Description

Withdrawn by applicant prior to review

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1034	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	SF Lousignont Creek Watershed Restoration Project		
Applicant:	Upper Nehalem WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$35,686.00	Total Cost:	\$58,221.00

Application Description

Lousignont Creek joins the upper Nehalem River at RM 107.5, about a half mile south of the junction of Hwy 26 and Timber Road, and roughly 11 miles south of Vernonia. Lousignont is the last significant trib to the Nehalem before the Nehalem's headwaters at RM 120. The Lousignont basin drains 18,356 acres and supports populations of coho, fall Chinook, steelhead, cutthroat trout and lamprey. The creek provides miles of low gradient habitat with braided channels and good gravels and the majority of the basin is managed by ODF. The entire ODF owned portion of Lousignont Creek is managed as Aquatic/Terrestrial Anchor Habitat, a strategy that requires additional stream protection rules than required under the Forest Practices Act, and the surrounding forest is managed for older forest structure. Large wood projects have previously been implemented in several reaches of Lousignont Creek over the years; in 1996 (private), 2000 (ODF), 2008 (private) and 2009 (ODF).

In this application, the Upper Nehalem Watershed Council (Council) is partnering with ODF and ODFW to place 65 key pieces (24" by 50 ft long, with attached root wads) and 130 other pieces of large wood into instream structures at 15 different sites; decommission 1.5 miles of road currently running up the stream valley bottom; and remove one 14 ft diameter culvert (mainstem) and one 3 ft diameter culvert (tributary). OWEB funds are requested for the acquisition and placement of the large wood, road decommissioning work, and a small amount of GIS mapping work.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers found this application brief and to the point and appreciated the clarity and simplicity. They liked that the three project activities of large wood placement, road obliteration, and culvert removal all addressed known limiting factors of stream complexity; excessive sediment; connectivity; and passage. They also appreciated the detail on the road obliteration component provided by ODF staff as a result of the early December site visit, and they commented on the comparative low cost of that work component. They understood some of the reason for the relative low cost was due to the contractor bidding the job in conjunction with a timber sale nearby. The application indicated, and the site visit confirmed, that the stream was low gradient and gravel rich and while previous large wood work had been conducted over the last 15 years, stream habitat would clearly benefit from additional structures. They learned through discussion that even in the bad times for coho in the 1990s, Lousignont remained a core area for coho in the upper Nehalem. The reviewers appreciated the designation of Lousignont as Aquatic Anchor Habitat, with ODF's accompanying 120-year harvest management strategy and felt the longer time period between harvests would help with stream habitat recovery.

The reviewer's only issue with the application was the amount of administration requested; noting it far exceeded the 10 percent maximum. They wanted to make certain the amount was brought into compliance.

Ecosystem Process and Function

The addition of large wood instream will help slow flows, sort and store gravels, encourage creation of off channel habitat, encourage floodplain connectivity, provide increased stream complexity, and provide additional protection and cover for fish. Road obliteration will eliminate the road as a source of sediment and allow the stream to fully access its floodplain again. Removal of the two culverts will restore unrestricted passage for all aquatic life forms and allow the stream freedom to fully utilize its natural valley bottom.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. The amount of administration originally requested was \$6,877. The maximum allowed administration should have been \$2,790 (10% of the sub totals). Correcting the administration figure will reduce the overall project costs requested from OWEB to \$31,599.

Regional Review Team Priority

#1 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$31,599.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$31,599.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$31,599.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1035	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Walker Creek Phase II-Riparian Enhancement Project		
Applicant:	Upper Nehalem WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Clatsop
OWEB Request:	\$65,365.00	Total Cost:	\$88,265.00

Application Description

The 7,600 acre Walker Creek sub-basin is the major tributary of Beneke Creek in the upper Nehalem River watershed. Beneke Creek joins the Nehalem at RM 47, in the community of Jewell. Walker Creek joins Beneke 5.25 miles upstream of Beneke's confluence with the Nehalem. The Beneke and Walker Creek sub-basins flow south from the hillslopes north of Jewell. Walker Creek provides roughly 13.5 miles of low gradient habitat after dropping from the headwalls of the sub-basin. It supports populations of Chinook, coho, steelhead and cutthroat trout and recent ODFW spawner surveys (post 2000) have shown peak counts of 25 adult coho/mile. Industrial timber companies own much of the valley bottom and lower hillslopes. Intermixed with the private ownership in the lowlands are parcels of Clatsop State Forest. The upper hillslopes and ridgelines of the Walker Creek sub-basin are within the Clatsop State Forest.

The Upper Nehalem Watershed Council (Council) completed their original watershed assessment in 2000 and supplemented that document with a riparian conditions analysis, various water quality monitoring projects, an aquatic habitat inventory (2007) and other field studies. Excessive stream temperature and lack of instream large wood are identified as priority limiting factors. In 2010, the Council implemented a significant large wood and riparian planting project along the lower reaches of Walker Creek.

In this application the Council is partnering with the landowner (Hampton Affiliates), BLM and local area students to conduct a riparian planting project along 6.4 miles of stream, focusing on areas of alder domination. 6,000 trees native conifers will be planted and some girdling of alders will occur to open the existing canopy for sunlight to the newly planted trees. OWEB funds would be used for planting materials and labor, purchase and installation of tree protective devices, project management and administration.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized Walker Creek from the previous LWD and planting project, 210-1010, and were pleased to see the planned follow-up work. They understood Walker Creek to be designated as High Intrinsic Potential (HIP) habitat, with potential for significant increases in its salmonid populations once the habitat is restored and they appreciated that riparian planting would address two of the identified factors limiting salmonid production in the basin: excessive stream temperature and lack of stream complexity. They appreciated that this project would build on previous restoration projects in both Beneke Creek and Walker Creek, and they understood that the project managers were learning through experience on other projects how to best under-plant conifers in an alder dominated system. The reviewers also recognized the need for follow-up tree release for new plantings and were pleased to see this activity included in the project.

While the reviewers believed the project was worthy of funding, they noted they would have appreciated more detail on the maps included in the application, as well as in the text. The detail they found missing included information on the previous plantings in Walker Creek; their location and survival rates, and specifics on exactly where this new planting effort would concentrate in comparison. They noted that the entire 6.4 miles of stream would not be treated since in some reaches the number of conifers in the riparian zone was more than sufficient. They would have appreciated more detail on the location and numbers of the alders to be girdled and specifics of what species of conifers would be planted in the different locations. There was also some concern noted about recent research indicating that alder dominated stream channels

were a natural condition in some stream systems in the region, and on the early December site visit the reviewers noted a significant number of Big-Leaf Maples in the reach visited.

The issue of alder dominated stream bottoms being a “natural” condition sparked a lengthy discussion on “natural” versus “disturbed” conditions. The reviewers were familiar with the current prevalence of alder dominated riparian areas throughout the region and the amount of effort and funding being spent to return conifers to those stream bottoms, and they noted that the science of how to proceed in addressing the issue, in theory and in practice, was still developing. They discussed whether this project might offer a good opportunity for monitoring, with its different facets of tree girdling; planting different conifer species in different conditions; spot planting; and different types and approaches to tree protection. They noted that the application did not include any significant monitoring component and while some reviewers thought this to be a lost opportunity, the group agreed that adding funds and providing protocols and schedules for a useful monitoring program for this project was not a good approach for them to take at this time. They also understood from several of their fellow reviewers that a lot of research on alder dominated systems had already been conducted and more was in process currently.

The reviewers agreed to recommend the application for funding but wanted to be sure the applicant understood their desire that the existing Big-Leaf Maples not be girdled or otherwise removed in the conifer planting.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Planting native conifers in the riparian area of alder dominated stream bottoms addresses the twin issues of shade for alleviating excessive water temperature and providing a source of future large wood. After a significant disturbance to the NW landscape, such as logging or severe flooding, alder seeds aggressively, grows quickly, and provides summertime shading to streams. But alders have a relatively short life span and since often in disturbed environments the alders are all similarly aged, when they senesce and begin to die, they do so en mass, thereby leaving the riparian area open to brush domination with little shading of the creek. In addition, when the alders fall into creeks, while they do provide a source of large wood, the wood lasts for only a comparative short time (10 years versus 50 or more for a large conifer log). Under-planting alders with conifers keeps some alders and provides stream shade as a result, while allowing the conifers to take root and begin growing. The practice allows the conifers to grow before the remaining alders die and gets the conifers to a free-to-grow stage before brush would otherwise limit them.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. The existing Big-Leaf Maples not be girdled or otherwise removed.

Regional Review Team Priority

#7 of 7

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$65,365.00		\$15,230.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1036	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Fish Log Bank Renewal		
Applicant:	MidCoast WC		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lincoln
OWEB Request:	\$48,960.00	Total Cost:	\$68,960.00

Application Description

The region covered by the MidCoast Watershed Council lies between Heceta Head in the south and Cascade Head in the north. It includes the basins of five major rivers (Yachats, Alsea, Yaquina, Siletz and Salmon Rivers, south to north) and numerous direct to ocean tributaries (22 of which sustain anadromous fish runs). All six species of anadromous salmonids native to Oregon inhabit the rivers and streams of the region to varying degrees. The crest of the coast range defines the eastern boundary and the region includes all or portions of six counties (Lincoln, Lane, Benton, Polk, Yamhill and Tillamook). The roughly 48,000 people who live in the 977,000-acre region are distributed between seven incorporated towns and numerous unincorporated rural communities. The region's historic economic engines were timber, fishing, tourism and some limited agriculture. As the historic timber, fishing and agricultural industries have scaled down in the last few decades; the demographics of the region have changed with the outward migration of those industries' workers passing an influx of newcomers comprised of retirees, people seeking vacation homes and staff for the businesses to service this new demographic and increasing tourism.

The MidCoast Watershed Council (Council) has completed their watershed assessment and supplemented it with several years of juvenile salmonid abundance and distribution snorkel surveys and miles of new aquatic habitat inventory surveys. The combination of this data has allowed the group to develop a comprehensive and strategic action plan. The information clearly indicates that one of the chief factors limiting salmonid production in the region is the lack of low-velocity winter habitat for juveniles. Although there are several causes for that limiting factor, it is primarily driven by the lack of large wood in the stream systems. When planning restoration activities addressing this factor, it's necessary to find a source of large logs and trees to use for in-stream log structure projects.

This proposal would continue and expand upon a project that has been successful in the region over the course of the last twelve years. The project entails taking advantage of opportunities to collect whole trees, logs and other materials for restoration activities, free of charge from public and private properties, made available through storm events and land management activities (road building and/or land clearing). In addition, the project includes the ability to use a portion of the funds for the purchase of large logs from the region's timber companies, logs that the timber companies would otherwise chip for pulp material instead of use as lumber. The price of the purchased logs is comparatively low due to their size and condition (species, number of branches/knots, size and age) and the fact that the companies do not have the normal transport costs involved in logs of this type.

The expenses of this style of log salvage project come from either the purchase of the logs from the timber companies or the need to collect donated materials in a timely manner and transport them either to a restoration project site or to a storage site for use at another time, when additional transport costs are accrued. Partners in the project include ODFW, ODF, Plum Creek Timber, Forest Capital Partners Inc, and private landowners.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized this as a continuation of a project that has been successful over the course of the twelve years of its previous three iterations. They were familiar with the workings of this project, as well as the other log salvage projects in the region, and appreciated both the opportunities and the challenges involved in implementation and they were supportive of continuing to fund the project type.

But, the reviewers found this application weak in the detail provided on the previous iteration, project #208-1051. They found no information on the logs acquired, either through donation or purchase. The application supplied nothing on the number; size; species; method of acquisition; restoration sites where the logs were used; or the same information on the logs remaining at the different storage sites. They understood that the previous project had been in play for three years and wondered why it had taken so long to spend the award. They understood the 208-1051 project was still active but did not have detail of the funding remaining in order to determine the immediacy of this request. The lack of detail offered them no ability to determine the success of the previous grant in order to project the likelihood of success of this new proposal.

While the reviewers continue to support log salvage projects, they could not recommend this application for funding due to the lack of detail provided. Besides the detail desired on the logs noted above, they also would have appreciated more discussion on the activities and costs associated with acquiring the logs and determining the suitability of all the material expected to be offered during the course of the project. Several reviewers were familiar with problems encountered on the north coast after the 2007 windstorm when many logs and trees were offered for donation, many of which turned out to not be suitable for the purpose of the project. They would have appreciated some discussion on how this project deals with that issue.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 17, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle North Coast Review Team (Region 1)

Application No.:	212-1038	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Big Creek Restoration Design		
Applicant:	The Nature Conservancy		
Basin:	NORTH COAST	County:	Lane
OWEB Request:	\$39,686.00	Total Cost:	\$52,852.00

Application Description

In Oregon, Big Creeks are ubiquitous. The unimaginative name has been assigned to a multitude of creeks across the state, often in close proximity to one another, making things even more confusing to all. The Big Creek in this application is a significant direct-to-ocean tributary located on the central Oregon coast roughly 10 miles south of Yachats and 13 miles north of Florence. Big Creek has roughly 10 miles of mainstem, several significant tributaries and supports populations of Chinook, coho, steelhead and cutthroat trout. Its headwaters fall from the western side of the ridge that also forms the west wall of the North Fork Siuslaw River. The vast majority of the basin lies within the Siuslaw National Forest, but there are a few small private holdings scattered in the Big Creek valley bottom.

Roughly a year ago, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), using OWEB funds as part of the funding package, purchased a 193 acre property which includes 0.6 miles of stream at the mouth of Big Creek. The property begins on the immediate eastern side of Hwy 101 and includes the small estuary and head-of-tide transition zone. TNC has identified 3 issues on the property it believes limit production of salmonids in the basin: 1) the property includes an ODOT in-holding (~0.5 acre) located in the estuarine floodplain. ODOT uses the in-holding as a stockpile site for landslide debris collected from the local reach of Hwy 101. The fill curtails the creek's ability to meander or otherwise utilize its floodplain; 2) This reach of Big Creek is deficient in key pieces of large wood, with just 0.44 pieces per 100 meters compared to the ODFW benchmark of at least 3 pieces per 100 meters; 3) There's a roughly 4 acre patch of giant knotweed (*Polygonum sachalinense*) at the mouth of the creek. The knotweed has displaced all the native vegetation and offers little of the natural benefits to the resources of Big Creek that native vegetation would otherwise provide.

In this TA application, TNC is requesting funding to hire a consultant to design a restoration project to address these limiting factors. Deliverables would include bid-ready engineering drawings and a companion report outlining project goals, methods, analysis, implementation elements, and a cost estimate. Partners include Oregon Parks & Recreation Department, ODFW, ODOT, USFS, USFWS, Audubon and the MidCoast Watershed Council.

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers recognized the resource values of the Big Creek basin and were pleased to see the newly acquired site getting the attention necessary to restore it to full natural function. But, for a number of reasons they found this application confusing. They understood the bulk of the grant award was to fund a consultant, but they felt the application did not provide sufficient detail for them to understand the consultant's expected role in the three activities of large wood placement, knotweed eradication and removal of the ODOT spoils.

The reviewers understood the bulk of the basin was in federal ownership and in comparatively good shape. They understood the stream reach at this site was short on large wood, but they also expected wood to recruit to the site naturally over time due to the federal ownership and the attendant mature forest. Because of the size of the system and the dynamic nature of the stream reach involved at this site, they recognized that any

wood added to the site would need to be large; so large that an excavator could not be used for placement and a helicopter would be required instead. The reviewers also understood that ODFW staff was more than capable of designing and managing such a wood project and although a grant would have to be written to fund the action, writing the grant would not be expected to be particularly difficult or time consuming. They didn't see much use for a consultant for this component.

The knotweed issue was discussed at length and again the reviewers were uncertain of the role a consultant would fill. They were aware that knotweed was a significant issue in the basin and that the original infestation appeared to be located several miles upstream of this site. They understood that much of the upstream infestation was being treated, and they understood the method of treatment being utilized was herbicide. They were also aware that considerable research on knotweed control has been accomplished, that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) had extensive experience with the issue, and that herbicide use was generally acknowledged as the only method successful in gaining control of large infestations relatively quickly. The reviewers couldn't understand this proposal's intent to study the use of mechanical equipment to remove the knotweed by excavating. They understood this method had already been attempted in multiple locations with little success and resulting in unexpected problems. Because this site is at the bottom of the watershed and, until all upstream sources of knotweed are eliminated, susceptible to ever continuing knotweed repopulation, the reviewers were skeptical about the chances for success achieving even the application's conservative goals of 30 percent eradication.

The reviewers discussed the problem of the ODOT in-holding and the resulting pile of spoils in the Big Creek floodplain and agreed that this issue needed resolution if restoring the creek to full function were to occur. But, they didn't see where a consultant would fit into this scenario either. They understood that both TNC and State Parks were looking for alternate spoil sites for ODOT, on this property, on a nearby State Park property, and elsewhere along highway 101 locally. But, they understood that until an acceptable alternative spoil site was determined, ODOT would continue to use their in-holding for their spoils disposal site. The reviewers understood that this issue needed to be resolved before any floodplain restoration work could begin and ultimately this was ODOT's decision to make and State Parks and TNC staff were the ones necessary to be involved. They didn't see a role for a consultant in this part of the process either.

The reviewers recommend this application not be funded and the ODOT spoil site issue resolved before proceeding on restoration work. The reviewers further recommend the applicant, once the ODOT spoil site issue is resolved, work with ODFW staff to submit a restoration grant for a large wood project and include a design component within that application. The knotweed problem could also be included in the restoration application if desired.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.