

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6000	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Mountain Creek Watershed Restoration Project		
Applicant:	Grant SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Wheeler
OWEB Request:	\$216,500.00	Total Cost:	\$357,000.00

Application Description

This project, located in southeast corner of Wheeler County, includes the Mountain Creek and Rock Creek watersheds, both which flow into the John Day River. The condition of streams, and ultimately the John Day River, are influenced by the condition of the range and forest upland drainage. Current conditions in these uplands include significant overcrowding of pine and encroachment of Western juniper, when historically a regular fire regime kept those species in check. The project proposed to work with six landowners to pre-commercial thin 660 acres from forest, meadows and rangeland areas.

Partners on this project are landowners and Jerome Natural Resource Consultants. OWEB funds were requested for project management (5%), contracted services (92%), fiscal administration (2%), and post implementation status reports (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team noted that in this timbered corner of Wheeler County, there are extremely dense, overcrowded stands of pine and juniper, especially concentrated in the high elevation, desirable meadow areas. If left untreated, the potential for catastrophic wildfire increases and such a fire would damage both upland and downslope habitat, including steelhead and redband trout streams. That being said, the review team felt there was not enough detail to review the project proposal and evaluate the ecological benefits and risks. Some reviewers perceived there could be a high cost and low environmental benefit with this project and more details in the application would help them evaluate that. If the application is resubmitted it needs to include more detail and site descriptions including: 1) treatment descriptions for each site; 2) why those sites were selected; 3) how treated areas fit together for a basin impact; 4) once treated, what the resultant ecological benefits of the selected sites are; 5) details on how meadows and riparian areas will be treated; 6) in riparian sites, an explanation of size of trees left, size of stream impacted, and size and number of trees dropped as large woody debris instream; 7) density metrics for each site; 8) details on the slope and aspect of sites; 9) the phases of juniper in selected sites; and 10) more detail in maps, such as access roads and staging areas. There was high confidence about the experience of the consultant who put the application together. She has developed good working relations with the local landowners and will see that the work is done correctly and on schedule.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6001	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	ODFW Phillip Schneider WA John Day River Instream Habitat Project		
Applicant:	Grant SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$91,692.00	Total Cost:	\$160,859.00

Application Description

This project is for instream habitat enhancements and bank erosion treatment on two sites along the upper John Day River on the ODFW Phillip Schneider Wildlife Area near the town of Dayville in Grant County. The lower site will offer protection for a relatively new bridge using a combination of large wood structures, bendaway weirs, and live plantings. The upper site will provide protection for a critical wildlife food plot. High water and stream erosion has completely eliminated existing riparian buffer vegetation on these two sites. The proposed structures will be designed to provide additional instream habitat function for fish, as well as stabilizing the channel.

Partners on the project are the Bureau of Reclamation, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Funds were requested from OWEB for project management (8%), contracted services (76%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (11%), and fiscal administration (4%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the melding of bank stabilization with instream habitat structures. This section of the upper John Day is known as an overwintering area for smolts. This project will address the instability of stream channels, a limiting factor for both steelhead and Chinook. There was much discussion amongst the team about the differences of the two sites when viewed on the tour. The upper site, where the river is eroding into the ODFW wildlife food plots on the floodplain, seems to be stabilizing with meander and point bars beginning to form. The downstream site, where flood events have taken out the riparian buffer vegetation and dumped debris on the neighboring private landowner's hay field, presents a challenge because of the channel constriction caused by the bridge located right after a wide bend in the river. There was discussion, both on the tour and during the meeting, about creating a high-water overflow channel with an engineered, roughened re-entry into the river to inhibit down-cutting; and wood structures placed along the bank where high flows enter to catch debris but let water continue to access the floodplain and overflow channel. There was some concern that the riparian buffers were not wide enough to project the banks but it was noted that once there was significant vegetation but the last three recent flood events took it out. The project manager has a good record of successful implementation of complicated restoration projects, with two engineers on staff, the review team has confidence the project will be successful. The application would have been stronger if there had been a hydrologic analysis of the entire reach where stream instability is occurring. After scrutiny, the review team felt this application was ready for funding at this time, but reduced to only fund restoration on the lower site. The team did not recommend funding for the upper site, noting that it should be allowed to move and create the meander to where the channel should be. Design should incorporate woody bank structures that catch debris, an overflow channel with rock crossing for road and roughed entry where overflow re-enters the river.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will provide instream habitat for overwintering steelhead and Chinook, increase stream channel stability, reduce sediment loading and increase riparian vegetation.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Conditions include treating only lower site and incorporating a roughened channel re-entry for overflow.

Regional Review Team Priority

3 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$69,847.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced with Conditions. The grant agreement will reflect that funding is provided only for the lower site, and grantee will incorporate a roughened channel re-entry for overflow to inhibit downcutting.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$69,847.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 69,847.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6002	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Tutuilla and Patawa Creek Re-Vegetation Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$60,156.00	Total Cost:	\$112,356.00

Application Description

This project will be implemented on the mid to upper sections of the Tutuilla and Patawa creeks, tributaries of the Umatilla River in Umatilla County. Agricultural and rural residential properties along these two creeks have been invaded by weeds that are crowding out the sparse native riparian plant communities. The applicant held pre-application meetings with the landowners who showed a high level of interest in controlling the weeds and bringing the riparian areas back to health. Targeted weeds to be treated include Russian knapweed, Garlic mustard, Scotch thistle, Rush skeletonweed, Yellow starthistle and Whitetop. The project components include a weed survey of the two streams to prioritize sites for treatment and determine planting plans; spraying the selected sites with three herbicide treatments (spring/fall/spring); releasing biological controls where appropriate; working with volunteers and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) to plant native riparian vegetation; follow-up meetings with landowners to encourage project success; distributing landowner education and information via newspaper article, brochures for the public, booths at community events and a presentation at the Watersheds Pilot Education project; and monitoring vegetation for four years after initial plantings to determine treatment success, where follow-up treatment is needed, and native plant survival.

Partners on this project include 31 landowners, the Umatilla County Weed Department, CTUIR, Oregon Department of Transportation, CTUIR Tribal Native Plant Nursery, 200 volunteers for planting, and the Umatilla Basin Watershed Council. OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation/travel/outreach (3%), project management (17%), contracted services (50%), supplies/materials (22%), fiscal administration (6%), and post implementation status reports (2%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team was very impressed with the council outreach coordinator's efforts at pre-application coordination and landowner contact. She knew what each landowner's concerns and wishes were relating to the proposed project. This council also has a good track record with organizing and using volunteers. There is a definite need for weed control in this area, especially the rural residential section. From the site visit, there is some regeneration of willow but it is spotty. There is also a lot of the area that has been exclusion fenced but the weed communities are dominant. The council is working with good partners; the tribes have both the experience and the expertise in native species selection and planting technique. The review team would like to see sedges and rushes incorporated into the planting list. ODFW has seen tagged steelhead in the perennial Patawa stream. Reviewers felt that the outreach and follow-up activities were key to the success of this project. There was concern about how the council would make sure the plantings were taken care of and would succeed in getting to the "free to grow" stage. If successful, it could be a great tool for landowner outreach on weed control and riparian function. The review team requested that staff follow-up with applicant to clarify they had enough funding to handle follow-up and plant establishment activities necessary to assure success of the project. After deliberation, the review team felt this project was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will improve riparian conditions, providing a more effective riparian filter for sediment and other pollution as well as provide stream shade and a food source for insects, fish and wildlife. It will also reduce invasive weed communities and increase native riparian plant diversity.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund. OWEB should check with the applicant to determine whether increased funding is needed to provide follow-up plan for plant establishment, explaining timing and duration of landowner follow-up, potential activities for assuring planting success.

Regional Review Team Priority

9 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$60,156.00		\$3,500.00

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

Staff discussed the plant establishment component and whether additional funding was needed. Applicant submitted plans for follow-up after planting was accomplished and the budget was revised. Plant establishment dollars (\$3,500) were included as a line item in revised restoration budget.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Increased.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$60,513.00		\$3,500.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 60,513.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6003	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Hermiston Irrigation District T Line Project 2011		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$115,990.00	Total Cost:	\$232,523.00

Application Description

The T-Line project is located within the Lower Umatilla Basin Ground Water Management Area (LUGMA), north of Hermiston, east of the Umatilla River and south of the Columbia River in Umatilla County. Irrigation water is diverted from the Umatilla River through the Maxwell Canal and the M-Line and on into the T-Line which serves 18 patrons. This project addresses water quantity and groundwater and surface water quality. The T-Line ditch was built in the early 1900s, operating today in the original, open concrete lined canal, using a siphoning system and requiring an overflow pond. The current system wastes water and creates a potential for groundwater and surface water contamination through seepage, breakouts, and the excess draining from the pond out to the Columbia River. The overflow pond is the result of having to keep open canal charged with water so users have access to their water rights. The other issue of water quality results from toxins entering the irrigation canal from chemical weed control along the canal, currently necessary due to the eroded and uneven bank structures and broken concrete which prevents mowing the canal berms. Overspray from those chemicals, as well as adjacent field crop spraying, all enter the irrigation open canal. Once the system is converted to a 7,500' closed, piped system, it is estimated that 5-7 cfs less water will need to be diverted to fulfill the rights of the 18 patrons; herbicides from weed treatments will no longer be polluting the canal water; and chemical treatment for mosquitos will be reduced once pond is eliminated.

Partners on the project include the Hermiston Irrigation District and the Bureau of Reclamation. OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation (<1%), in-house personnel (1%), supplies/materials (90%), fiscal administration (9%) and post implementation status reports (<1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team noted the major benefit from this project is water quality. Runoff to the Columbia River can be very polluted, running through corrals and other areas. By closing the system and piping the open canal, herbicides, pesticides and other pollutants will no longer have contact with open water. The review team noted that there are incremental benefits to water quantity, because a lot of water has to keep flowing to keep the system going, so the main benefits of piping are weed management and pollution reduction. However there will be a more efficient system for water delivery, and that is positive. The review team wanted staff to make sure there would be water measuring devices installed. They also requested that the completion report include documentation on the amount of water used for the system, before and after project implementation. After much discussion, the review team felt this application was ready for funding with conditions as stated.

Ecosystem Process and Function

By piping the open canal, water quality will be improved and with the overflow pond eliminated; polluted water going into the Columbia from this source will be stopped.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. All turnouts will be required to have water meters installed, and the effect of the project on water use should be estimated to the best ability.

Regional Review Team Priority

7 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$115,990.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The application states that the project will reduce the total amount of water required from 18-20 cfs to 13 cfs. The final project completion report and the post implementation status reports (PISR) will include descriptions of whether the system was constructed as designed and is functioning and performing as predicted, including installation (e.g., was it installed as designed, or were there changes that may affect the water savings), number of acres converted to a more efficient irrigation delivery system as a result of the project, and other factors considered in the original estimate of the water savings. The reports should also include any calculations done by the Hermiston Irrigation District regarding water savings as a result of this project. The report may also include, if applicable, whether there have been any changes in irrigation practices including the timing and duration of irrigation. In addition, include water quality monitoring data collected – if any – in the PISR.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$115,990.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 115,990.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6004	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Mulvaney Upland Improvement Project		
Applicant:	Mid John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Wheeler
OWEB Request:	\$40,700.00	Total Cost:	\$54,120.00

Application Description

The Mulvaney Upland Improvement project is located in the Lower John Day/Kahler Creek basin that flows into the John Day River in Wheeler County. Western juniper has encroached into the watershed, affecting the watershed conditions and invading Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir forests on the northern boundary. The project proposes to cut and pile 245 acres of juniper, develop two springs as upland water sources for wildlife and livestock; treat 32 acres of medusahead, reseed 42 acres of disturbed ground within the juniper removal area. A grazing management plan and long term juniper maintenance plan will also be completed.

Partner on this project is the landowner. OWEB funds were requested for project management (2%), contracted services (66%), supplies/materials (22%), fiscal administration (9%) and post implementation status report (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

This resubmitted application focused treatment on higher elevation sites at the north end of the property. On the site visit, reviewers saw the sites selected were indeed heavily stocked with encroaching juniper and that the brush component and perennial grass understory was beginning to show signs of stress from moisture and nutrient competition. The sites had deep soils and once juniper is removed, the historic communities of aspen, mountain mahogany, bitterbrush and other beneficial native species can expand. The review team noted that this landowner has a good track record of getting projects done through NRCS and felt this proposal had a high likelihood of success. Even though the sites were above steelhead distribution, these drainages flow into Kahler Creek which does offer steelhead spawning and rearing habitat. The spring development will help keep both wildlife and livestock in the uplands and away from the riparian areas. The review team questioned the seed mix varieties and the cost estimate for native seed. They recommended a special condition be added that requires NRCS consultation on the seed mix prior to purchase. After much discussion, the review team felt this proposal was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This proposal will improve the ecosystem process and function by increasing the upland potential for infiltration of rainfall; maintain and expanding the diverse native plant species that are threatened by the juniper encroachment, providing benefit to wildlife habitat; and reducing potential for erosion and sediment loading of downslope streams.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Require NRCS consultation on seed mix prior to purchase.

Regional Review Team Priority

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount
\$40,700.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will require the grantee to submit to OWEB confirmation of NRCS consultation on the seed mix as a condition to OWEB funding for seed purchase. The final project completion report must include a grazing plan and long-term juniper management plan.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$40,700.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 40,700.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6007	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Gable Creek Water Quality Project		
Applicant:	Wheeler SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Wheeler
OWEB Request:	\$130,523.00	Total Cost:	\$232,553.00

Application Description

The project is located at the headwaters of Weddle Creek, a tributary to Gable Creek in the Bridge Creek watershed of Wheeler County. Currently, the landowner flood irrigates 150 acres with a water right of 3.7 cfs diverted from Thompson Creek, another tributary of Gable Creek. Due to the steep topography of the fields, concentrated run-off and subsequent erosion of the fields by irrigation often occurs. This sediment, as well as other agricultural by-products, flows to a concentrated point at the lower end of the field where Weddle Creek begins. The project proposes to convert the flood irrigation to sprinklers by installing a pivot at the center of the field and create a buffer of three acres at the lower end of the field to act as an additional filter should any run-off occur.

Wheeler SWCD partners with the landowner on the project. OWEB funds were requested for project management (9%), contracted services (37%), supplies/materials (46%), fiscal administration and post implementation status reporting (8%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

There was a lot of discussion amongst the review team about benefit vs. cost on this project. The two tributaries, Weddle Creek and Thompson Creek, are not salmonid streams but they do flow into Gable Creek and on into Bridge Creek which is a priority stream in the Mid-Columbia Steelhead Recovery Plan. Water quality was determined to be the primary ecological benefit resulting from converting from flood to a piped sprinkler system. Creating the three acre wetland type buffer at the headwaters of Weddle Creek helped sway the team. However, they recommended not funding the installation costs of the pivot or k-lines. The review team requested that staff determine if a water measuring device exists on the system or else be required and the completion report include information on how much water savings were realized after installation of this system. After much discussion the team recommended reduced funding for this proposal with conditions.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will reduce sediment and overland erosion into Weddle Creek and ultimately to Gable Creek and Bridge Creek, by converting flood irrigation to sprinkler system. Creation of a three acre buffer at headwaters of Weddle Creek will provide some wildlife and wetland habitat.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Do not fund installation costs for pivot or K-line. Require a water measuring device be installed somewhere on the system. Require reporting on how the project has affected water use.

Regional Review Team Priority

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount
\$121,466.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

After talking to project engineer and OWRD, staff found out there is already an existing water measuring device at the point of diversion.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Do not fund installation costs for pivot or K-line. Reduce fiscal administration to \$8,000. Do not fund electric hook-up or partial equipment use cost. Add \$1,000 for irrigation management plan. The final project completion report must describe efforts by the grantee and landowner to explore potential water leases on water saved from irrigation efficiencies realized from this project, and must include an irrigation management plan showing irrigation efficiencies and the estimated amount of water saved.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$107,941.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 107,941.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6008	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Mountain Creek Restoration Project Phase II		
Applicant:	Wheeler SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Wheeler
OWEB Request:	\$152,850.00	Total Cost:	\$318,275.00

Application Description

This project is located along Mountain Creek in the southeastern corner of Wheeler County and is a part of five year plan to return Mountain Creek to its historic meadow channel. Due to flooding in the 1950s, Mountain Creek was routed into a by-pass channel along the north side of the meadow, offering little to no quality habitat. Also, there is significant subsurface flow from the by-pass channel back toward the historic channel, leaving the by-pass often dry from June to October. The landowner has agreed to work with the applicant on a 3-5 year, phased project to move Mountain Creek back to the historic meadow channel, leaving the by-pass to handle extreme high flows and protect the ranch headquarters located mid-meadow. Phase 1 of the proposed 2.5 mile restoration of Mountain Creek has been completed. This Phase 2 proposal will replace three failing field tiles with 3,500' of perforated pipe that will return cool, subsurface flow into ½ mile fenced CREP (pending) riparian area; replace two culverts, currently fish passage barriers, with one bridge and one bottomless pipe culvert; reconstruct historic channel back to dimensions capable of handling the normal Mountain Creek flows; and install juniper rootwads and rock clusters to create additional instream habitat complexity. The applicant also proposes effectiveness monitoring to assess the cooling effect of subsurface flows, quantify the release rate from newly installed return flow cooling systems, assess the temperature effects of flow through the restored channel, and provide peak flow estimations for Mountain Creek using acquired flow data.

Partners on this project include the landowner, Bonneville Power Administration, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and Wheeler SWCD. OWEB funds were requested for project management (27%), contracted services (32%), supplies/materials (22%), fiscal administration/post implementation status reporting (7%) and effectiveness monitoring (12%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the reach approach restoration on Mountain Creek, an important salmonid stream. This project complements significant habitat work done both up and downstream on Mountain Creek. ODFW reported that juvenile steelhead densities upstream have steadily improved over the last ten years. Moving the by-pass flow back into the historic meadow channel will provide significant ecological benefit to both hydrologic function of the stream and the aquatic habitat. The review team liked this innovative approach to collect and bring that cooler, subflow back into a wetland buffer alongside the creek, as well as removing the fish passage barriers created by the two undersized culverts. One reviewer, experienced with return flow cooling systems, suggested the engineer not go below 6" pipe size, because smaller diameter pipe has proved problematic. The review team also liked the effectiveness monitoring component of the application. Since this is a "new" approach to return flow cooling, gathering temperature and flow data to determine if this system is successfully meeting the objectives is a good idea. There was some concern with the high cost of project management and engineering. However, with the significant match, the review team felt this innovative scope of the project was positive and was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will increase instream habitat complexity, lower stream temperatures, increase stream flow, improve riparian vegetation, restore natural hydrologic function of the floodplain, stabilize stream channel and reduce sedimentation to the stream.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$152,850.00	\$18,435.00	

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will require grantee to submit to the Board’s Project Manager a detailed work plan and timeline for effectiveness monitoring activities before releasing any funds for reimbursement of effectiveness monitoring activities.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$152,850.00	\$18,435.00	

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 152,850.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6009	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	WEID Lateral 17 Piping		
Applicant:	Morrow SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Morrow
OWEB Request:	\$187,701.00	Total Cost:	\$302,567.00

Application Description

This project is located west of Boardman, south of I-84 along the Columbia River in Morrow County and is in the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area (LUBGWMA). This project proposes to improve water and soil quality in this area by eliminating flood irrigation to the uneven crop and pastureland. Other problems resolved by the implementation of this project include reducing nutrients from agricultural lands leaching into groundwater, eliminating irrigation tailwater from entering the Columbia River and stopping flooding on the adjacent county road. The project will combine laterals 17 and 18 to save an estimated 372 acre-feet of water by converting 8,300' of open, earthen ditch to pipe and replacing 16 individual pumps with one variable speed pump to serve the 16 patrons. Once implemented, irrigators will be required to switch from flood to sprinkler to improve efficiency and management.

Partners on this project include the West Extension Irrigation District (WEID) and the Bureau of Reclamation. OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation (15%), contracted services (8%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (71%), fiscal administration and post implementation status reporting (6%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated that this proposal requires conversion from flood to sprinkler systems and will improve water quality by reducing sediment and nutrients. It was questioned where the 372 acre feet of saved water would show up. On the site visit reviewers saw where the issue of nutrient inputs, pastures converting to reeds (because of pooled irrigation water) and surplus water at end of the ditch was a problem. They also could see that the ditch was at a higher elevation than the county road and posed a safety hazard. It was thought that the water was diverted from the Umatilla River three miles from the mouth; hence there would be a limited benefit from any increase in flows. There was discussion of the costs of the project relative to the ecological benefits and whether the watershed benefits were significant. The review team wondered why the irrigation district was not providing for project engineering and design and recommended dropping those budget items from the OWEB request. The application would have been better if a good map had been provided that showed where these laterals were located in the entire WEID system; also if there had been some information about the level of pollution at the end of the line in the overflow pond area; as well as information about the nitrate levels of the wells in the vicinity of this project. Another helpful addition would have been some discussion of WEID's long term system goals, how those upgrades would impact the ecological benefits of the general area and the flows of the Umatilla River. After much discussion, the review team recommended this project be funded, but reduced by dropping engineering and design costs.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will improve ecological process and function by reducing nutrient input resulting from irrigation tailwater and improved water and energy conservation.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Take out engineering and design costs.

Regional Review Team Priority

10 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$144,427.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund; falls below staff-recommended funding line. If the applicant resubmits this application, it needs to include information in response to the review team’s comments about the need for a good map showing where these laterals were located in the entire WEID system; information about the level of pollution at the end of the line in the overflow pond area; information about the nitrate levels of the wells in the vicinity of this project; explanation of WEID’s long term system goals and why this section of their system is a priority; future plans; and how those upgrades would impact the ecological benefits of the general area and the flows of the Umatilla River.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6010	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	John Day River Bank Stabilization and Restoration		
Applicant:	Monument SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$122,112.00	Total Cost:	\$154,129.00

Application Description

This project occurs on two different properties: one site on the lower North Fork John Day River and six sites on the mainstem of the John Day River, both located in Grant County. High water events of the past several years have eroded banks and are threatening wetlands, pasturelands, agricultural production lands and the state highway. The continuing erosion is depositing enormous amounts of soil into the river every year, contributing to heightened level of poor water quality standards for turbidity and sediment. The proposed objective of this project is to improve fish habitat while increasing protection to the adjacent property. To achieve this goal, banks will be stabilized by installing juniper root wads, rock barbs and weirs, planting riparian vegetation, and rebuilding eroded banks. At one location, a berm, that protects overflow into an agricultural field, would be extended.

Partners on the project include two landowners, NRCS and Monument SWCD. OWEB funds were requested for project management (18%), travel & outreach (<1%), supplies/materials (75%), fiscal administration and post implementation status report (7%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team understood this application had potential for good habitat restoration work at these locations however, without more detail or designs, the application left too many questions unanswered and made it difficult to review. There was also concern, on the mainstem sites, that individual site solutions were identified without a more thorough analysis of what was actually causing the problems on a reach scale. Many of the proposed solutions also seemed more like bank stabilization to control the river rather than working to install something that would survive future large events. This is a big river at flood stage, and the review team questioned whether rootwad and boulder channel stabilization would work without causing unintended consequences on other areas of the river. The team felt that more analysis of what was causing the erosion problems would have made this a stronger application.

On one of the sites, the review team didn't think that extending the protective berm was an applicable OWEB expense. They also would like to see more landowner cost-share included in the match. The review team suggested the applicant submit a technical assistance grant to fund a reach scale hydrologic assessment. After much deliberation, the review team felt this project was not ready for funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6011	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Bansen Irrigation Efficiency		
Applicant:	Monument SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$198,789.00	Total Cost:	\$264,439.00

Application Description

This project is located outside the town of Monument alongside the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. The current irrigation system is inefficient and uses more water than necessary. The overflow tailwater has potential to carry sediment directly into the North Fork. The proposed solution is to install a subsurface drip irrigation system on 70 acres of organic crops; cutting water use by 50 percent and allowing unused water to stay in the North Fork John Day River.

Partners on this project include the property leasee, NRCS and the Monument SWCD. OWEB funds were requested for project management (4%), contracted services (43%), supplies/materials (44%), educational/outreach & post implementation status report (<1%), fiscal administration (9%)

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Last grant cycle a similar proposal was submitted by this same organic farmer. The review team recommended it but with the caveat that results of the project, including any quantifiable water savings, would be reported and that some water would potentially be leased instream. That project is still in the implementation stage and it is too early to get any results. The current proposal is almost four times larger than the first one and the cost significantly more. The review team felt strongly that this proposal was premature and that they wanted to see quantifiable results from the first project before funding a similar project. They recommended not funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund. Staff noted that the amount requested for fiscal administration was very high (\$18,000) for a project where there is one landowner, one project site and minimal contracting. The applicant is encouraged to review OWEB's fiscal administration costs guidance.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6012	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Final Rudio Creek Irrigation Efficiency Project		
Applicant:	Monument SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$144,369.00	Total Cost:	\$228,354.00

Application Description

This project is located on Rudio Creek, a significant tributary to the North Fork John Day River, downstream from the town of Monument in Grant County. In January 2010, landowners, land managers, public agencies and local groups established the Rudio Creek Restoration Partnership (Partnership) with the intent of taking a strategic, landscape approach to restoration in the Rudio Creek basin. The Partnership recently was awarded a three-year NRCS Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI) that would offset some of the cost of implementing the basin's planned restoration. This OWEB request seeks to replace a dysfunctional, hand-dug open ditch that has an estimated ditch loss of over 50 percent and replace a rock and dirt push up diversion dam that blocks juvenile salmonid and other aquatic species passage to valuable, upstream cool water refugia. This proposal would replace the rock push-up dam with a fish friendly driven sheet steel diversion, install a headgate and water measuring device, upgrade existing fish screen and convert 7,200 feet of open ditch to pipe.

Partners include the landowner, Monument SWCD and NRCS. OWEB funds were requested for project management (3%), contracted services (39%), supplies/materials (49%), travel, education/outreach and post implementation status reports (<1%), fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the basin scale and strategic planning process the Rudio Creek Basin Partnership has accomplished. However, this application was confusing and difficult to review. The project proposed to install a sheet steel diversion, headgate, water measuring device and an upgrade to the fish screen but none of those items were included in the budget. The application also talked about the pipe being sized to the water right servicing the fields; however the ditch empties into a reservoir. Also, it wasn't clear how critical, late season flows would be impacted by the project, since the application explained this diversion can only be used in the early season, dictated by the instream flow agreement with Freshwater Trust to leave 2 cfs instream. Reviewers wanted an explanation of the instream water benefits from this project – how is instream flow increased, by how much? The review team wanted to see conceptual designs for the diversion and headgate and a more detailed explanation of why the more expensive HDPE pipe was required. The review team thought that project management costs seemed high and needed to be explained. Reviewers would have liked to have seen more landowner contribution. The budget did not delineate what was NRCS funding and if there was any landowner cash match. The review team felt this application was not ready for funding at this time and noted that if the application is resubmitted it needs to address their comments.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6013	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	MNF Aspen and Fen Wetland Restoration		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$58,877.00	Total Cost:	\$106,479.00

Application Description

This project, designed to rejuvenate aspen stands and protect a unique fen wetland site, is located in the Middle Fork and Upper John Day River watersheds, within the Long Creek, Camp Creek and Beech Creek subbasins. Changes in land management, such as fire suppression and reduced timber harvests, have led to conifer encroachment to aspen stands. This encroachment, coupled with heavy grazing by wild and domestic ungulates, has led to declining aspen communities across the landscape. This proposal will thin competing shrubs and conifers; under-burn select sites and buck and pole fence to protect eleven aspen stands and one fen wetland site; and construct two off-channel water developments for wildlife and livestock. Several of the sites are directly adjacent to streams that provide critical spawning habitat for ESA listed summer steelhead. The remaining sites are located in meadow systems at the headwaters of critical habitat streams. The fen wetland site provides year-round cool water inputs to Long Creek, as well as habitat for the Columbia spotted frog and two rare and imperiled moss species: *Meesia uliginosa* and *Helodium blandowii*.

Project partners include the Malheur National Forest Service, North Fork John Day Watershed Council and the allotment permittee. OWEB funds were requested for project management (6%), contracted services (79%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (3%), fiscal administration (9%), post implementation status report (2%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team thought this was a good project, by protecting declining aspen stands and the unique fen wetland, wildlife and avian habitat will be improved, as well as improving water quality and increasing cool water inputs to adjacent or downslope streams. The fence exclusions will not only protect the aspen from grazing ungulates, it will also protect the sites from ATV pressure during hunting season. The team appreciated the collaboration with the USFS, and felt this kind of project was needed in this area. The off-channel water developments will provide much needed benefits of keeping livestock out of the riparian and wetland areas. The review team did feel that certain parts of the budget were inflated. They did not understand how this project would require both 160 hours of project management from the watershed council and 26 days of technical oversight by the USFS, in addition to another 12 days of pre-implementation site inspections. The team thought that the project management by the council could be lowered to 40 hours and that the 14 days of implementation oversight by the USFS should be contributed as match. They also thought fiscal administration was too high and suggested it be cut in half. The project was recommended but with reduced funding.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will protect and restore sensitive aspen clone and fen wetland communities, which provide improved habitat for wildlife, avian, amphibian and rare plant and moss species; as well as, reduce sediment and increase cool water subsurface inputs to adjacent fish bearing streams.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. The review team recommended reducing the amount OWEB would pay for project management hours to 40 hours or \$1,200; shift the USFS Implementation oversight of 14 days or \$3,500 to serve as match; and reduce fiscal administration to half of what was requested or \$2,622, noting this lower amount would be sufficient if there was only one contract for the project.

Regional Review Team Priority

4 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$50,356.00		

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

The review team recommended reductions to project management costs, cutting the USFS oversight; and fiscal administration line items in the budget. After discussions with the applicant, staff determined that the USFS implementation oversight is needed and funding is needed due to USFS budget constraints; that project management costs should be reduced to \$1,200; and fiscal administration costs should be 10 percent because the applicant had mistakenly included fiscal administration tasks as part of its project management.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. Reduce project management costs to \$1,200.00

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$56,234.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 56,234.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6015	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Rudio Creek Restoration Partnership Phase I		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$50,251.00	Total Cost:	\$135,051.00

Application Description

This project is proposed for the Rudio Creek Basin, which drains into the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. In January, 2010, the landowners, land managers, public agencies and local groups established the Rudio Creek Restoration Partnership (Partnership), with the intent to take on a strategic, basin-scale approach to restoration. Through a series of meetings, the Partnership has identified a series of resource concerns and an implementation timeline for 2011-2013. Starting in 2011-2012, the focus is on rangeland improvements including removing 600 acres of juniper and installing six spring developments. In June, 2010 the basin was awarded a three-year NRCS Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI) grant. This proposal would work in collaboration with the CCPI funding to achieve maximum landscape objectives.

Partners on this project include the landowners, NRCS, North Fork John Day Watershed Council and the Monument SWCD. OWEB funds were requested for project management (13%), in-house personnel (4%), contracted services (70%), travel (<1%), supplies/materials (2%) fiscal administration (9%), and post-implementation status reports (2%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team liked the approach the Partnership took with the excellent collaboration and strategic landscape scale planning process. They are developing a watershed strategy for the whole basin. Reviewers noted that other projects should take this approach, including regular landowner meetings to discuss restoration. There is excellent landowner leadership and cooperation through the Partnership. The landowners in this basin have a good track record of implementing projects successfully, including treating each site for ground disturbance and reseeded, which is very important to reduce noxious weed establishment. The review team has a high level of confidence this project will be done well.

Even though the application could have provided more detail on how sites were selected, reviewers on the site tour had a better idea of the selection process. Discussion included the juniper growth phase, site aspect, soils and potential for increasing spring flow. Most of the sites pointed out during the tour bordered timber, were on the moist westside of Rudio Creek, and were up high on the slope where numerous springs originate. The landowner explained that by removing juniper on these locations, he hopes more rainfall can infiltrate and potentially increase subsurface flows into the creek systems; native perennial grass and shrub species could proliferate; by reducing the fuel load, wildfires could be more easily managed; and habitat would be improved for wildlife. Even though Rudio Creek is fenced off from livestock, elk continue to access the bottom for water and wallows. By developing springs high up on the slope, the landowner's goal is to help keep both cattle and elk up away from Rudio Creek.

Overall, the review team liked the project; however they felt that 320 hours of project management was inflated for the size and scope of the project as described and suggested that 120 hours seemed more appropriate. The team requested staff find out how many sites and landowners this project will include and

then adjust project management and fiscal administration accordingly. The application also didn't elaborate on what the monitoring technician would be doing for 80 hours, so they suggested that amount be dropped. But overall, the review team recommended this project for funding with a reduction in the amount requested.

Ecosystem Process and Function

By removing encroaching junipers, this project will increase infiltration of rainfall thus increasing subsurface flows; reduce erosion and increase the native perennial grass and shrub component; and by developing the six upland springs as water sources, livestock and elk will be encouraged to stay high and away from Rudio Creek and its tributaries.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. After staff follow-up with applicant, adjust project management accordingly, review team suggest 120 hours; and eliminate funding for 80 hours for monitoring technician since the application did not explain what monitoring would be done for \$2,000 and there is \$1,200 of post implementation status report funds.

Regional Review Team Priority

2 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$44,751.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Cut monitoring costs of \$2,000 and reduce project management to 120 hours. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include long term juniper management plans and grazing management plans from each participating landowner.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$44,751.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 44,751.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6016	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Blakeslee Push Up Dam Elimination		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$30,696.00	Total Cost:	\$39,961.00

Application Description

This project is proposing to eliminate the need of a gravel push-up dam at approximately river mile 6.94 of the North Fork John Day River, downstream of Monument in Grant County. Push-up dams on the lower North Fork John Day River can impede upstream passage of migrating adult summer steelhead and spring Chinook during low flows, as well as restricting juvenile steelhead from reaching overwintering sites, thermal refugia, and important tributary rearing habitat. This project is a part of a larger, collaborative effort to improve fish passage and habitat connectivity for spring Chinook and summer steelhead on the lower North Fork and adjoining tributaries. Project components include moving the point of diversion upstream to an existing diversion site out of a historic scour pool; install 1,640 feet of new 6" pipeline to connect to existing mainline; install a flow meter; and install a Pump-Rite intake fish screen on the suction hose.

Partners include the landowner, ODFW and the North Fork John Day Watershed Council. OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation (40%), project management (12%), in-house personnel (3%), contracted services (3%), supplies/materials (30%), fiscal administration (9%), and post implementation status report (3%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated that this project eliminates one of the last major push-up dams on the lower North Fork John Day River. They liked that the application included installing both a fish screen and a water measuring device. There was discussion about whether conditions needed to be included that would prohibit the water user from going back to old point of diversion but it was determined that by moving the point of diversion, no rights would exist at the old site. There was also concern that the timeline relating to the actual point of diversion transfer was optimistic. From the aerial map provided with the application, it wasn't clear if the water user was irrigating the entire place of use. Discussion that followed explained that the project is using the same horsepower pump as previously used; the pipe is sized to fit the water right; and aerial photos are not always current. The one submitted could be two years old, or six years old. Also, when the point of diversion is transferred, Water Resources will be checking on all those details. The review team thought that based on the size and scope of this project and with 120 hours of project management dollars, the project implementation dollars should be dropped from the budget. The review team recommended this project for funding but reduced by dropping the \$1,000 from in-house personnel.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will reduce sediment entering the river; eliminate instream disturbance from annual construction of a gravel push-up dam; eliminate potential pollution from construction equipment fluids, and prevent entrapment of salmonids during irrigation.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. Reduce \$1,000 by eliminating line item in budget for in-house personnel.

Regional Review Team Priority

5 of 10

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$29,596.00		

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. Reduce OWEB funds by \$1,000; cut in-house personnel line item.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion
\$29,596.00		

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 29,596.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6017	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	North Fork John Day Juniper Removal Project		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$114,444.00	Total Cost:	\$229,094.00

Application Description

The North Fork John Day Watershed Council (NFJDWC) and the Monument SWCD propose to conduct juniper removal on 1,400 acres of private lands throughout the North Fork John Day Watershed in Grant County. This project represents a joint effort between the two organizations to utilize OWEB, USFS Title II and other funding to cost-share juniper removal projects on phase I & II sites. Juniper encroachment is a significant resource problem throughout the North Fork basin. The goal of this project is to be more strategic and focused on juniper treatments.

Partners on this project include landowners, USFS Title II funding, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Monument SWCD & NFJDWC. OWEB funds were requested for project management (11%), in-house personnel (3%), contracted services (67%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (9%), fiscal administration (8%), and post implementation status reports (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated this project was a good step toward collaboration between the council and the district. However, the application was written more as a “block grant” with no information on specific sites to be restored. As a result, reviewers were unable to evaluate the watershed benefits and the appropriateness of the sites to be treated and whether they are strategic. There was concern that there wasn’t enough detail on how sites would be selected; how prioritization process would be instituted; or how many landowners the process would include. There was also concern that \$12,000 for project management and \$4,200 for monitoring was high. The review team commented that rather than this approach, they would rather see a landowner recruitment technical assistance application if that is needed to accomplish the preliminary landowner involvement, education and site selection screening. If a restoration application is resubmitted, it needs to identify landowners, identify sites and the priority criteria used to select sites, and discuss the overall strategy. The review team felt this application was not ready for funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6005	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Bolen Kelly Habitat Walla Walla River		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$49,296.00	Total Cost:	\$181,831.00

Application Description

This technical assistance application will fund the survey and design alternatives for habitat improvement along a half-mile reach of the Walla Walla River, upstream of the town of Milton-Freewater in Umatilla County. The design will be used for permitting needs and for costing out the resultant restoration project. Landowners on both sides of this river reach are interested in a project that will create better instream habitat, improve the riparian area, and increase bank stability. This reach is utilized by ESA listed bull trout and steelhead and also reintroduced spring Chinook.

Partners include Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. OWEB funds were requested for project management (3%), in-house personnel (12%), contracted services (77%), and fiscal administration (8%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated that this section of the Walla Walla River has been identified as a priority reach by the numerous partners working on restoration within this watershed. The team liked that all the major landowners along this identified reach have been contacted and have expressed interest in some restoration activities, therefore allowing the design to encompass an entire reach. Landowners on this reach began to express interest about work on their property after watching the success of an upstream restoration project on the Lampson property, where work is being done to reconnect the floodplain, increase instream habitat and encourage re-establishment of floodplain vegetation. The goal of this technical assistance project will also be to reconnect the floodplain with the channel, increase complexity and instream habitat, with a goal of increasing and improving juvenile salmonid rearing habitat. The application demonstrated good collaboration and coordination with multiple landowners and partners. The team felt this technical assistance request would result in future restoration projects with high ecological benefits and recommended it for funding.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 2

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount
\$49,296.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$49,296.00

Total Recommended Board Award
\$ 49,296.00

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6006	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Accessing Industrial Impacts Upper Walla Walla Basin		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$14,703.00	Total Cost:	\$30,412.00

Application Description

This technical assistance application would identify sensitive, steep upland areas of the Blue Mountains directly above ESA listed bull trout and steelhead habitat in the South Fork and mainstem Walla Walla River and Couse Creek in Umatilla County. These areas are being considered for extensive industrial development in the form of wind farms. This technical assistance proposal would provide research, ground-truthing and mapping on those areas most vulnerable to erosion by incorporating information on slope, aspect, soil types and vegetation. The resultant document would be made available to Umatilla County, developers, landowners and other entities considering industrial development in the rural countryside above Milton-Freewater.

Partners in this endeavor include Umatilla County and the Blue Mountain Alliance. OWEB funds were requested for project management (19%), in-house personnel (40%), contracted services (28%), travel (1%), production (3%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the watershed council's attempt to head off potential ecological damage with this study. This country is extremely steep and already showing erosion which could affect sensitive salmon streams, resulting from water coming off the county road. With the development of wind farms, road density would significantly increase.

The team held quite an in-depth discussion about this application, the purpose of the study and how it would be used, what information was already available, and the impacts of wind farm development on highly erodible lands. However, the review team wasn't sure if OWEB was the correct source to fund such a study. Most technical assistance applications result in a restoration project and it didn't seem that would be the result of this study. It was questioned whether OWEB should fund a study to look at mitigation of development effects; if OWEB funded this study for wind towers, should it also fund such studies for other proposed developments. Reviewers noted that developers often have mitigation requirements as part of the regulatory process for approval of their proposed development. Some reviewers were concerned that the needed study would not be done if OWEB didn't fund it. On the other hand, there was also concern that by the time this funding was distributed, the permitting process will be too far advanced and the information would be irrelevant. There was also discussion that a lot of the information proposed to be gathered through the study already should be available in soil maps and gradients, as well as a lot of existing information about best practices for road building and maintenance that has been developed by the USFS, ODF and others.

After much discussion, a majority of the review team recommended that it was not a good fit for OWEB funding, and recommended a "do not fund." A minority of the team wanted to defer to the OWEB Board to decide whether such funding is appropriate. The reviewers concluded by wondering what statewide siting standards exist for wind development, and asked that other state agencies and the Governor's Office be made

aware of the reviewers' significant concerns about the effects the proposed project would have on endangered species and sage grouse.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

April 18, 2011 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	212-6014	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	MFJDR Weed Assessment and Landowner Coordination Phase I		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$34,497.00	Total Cost:	\$80,627.00

Application Description

This technical assistance proposal would provide funds for outreach, coordination and recruitment of private landowners to participate in a weed assessment within the upper Middle Fork John Day River Basin in Grant County. Community meetings, direct mail and follow-up phone calls will be made to obtain permission to access property for surveying of invasive/noxious weed communities. The data will then be compiled and mapped for future treatment coordination. There will also be an opportunity to discuss with the landowners the benefits of joining the existing NFJD Weed Management Area, as well as providing general weed education. Partners in this project include a potential DEQ 319 grant, The Nature Conservancy, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs and the NFJWC. OWEB funds were requested for project management (50%), in-house personnel (23%), contracted services (10%), travel (6%), supplies/materials (1%), production (1%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated that riparian corridors are natural vectors of weeds and if left unchecked, the weed invasion could negatively impact all the riparian restoration work already done in this basin. Weeds are a huge concern and continue to have a significant impact on water quality. The review team also liked that there was good partnership match already secured. From the application there seem to be approximately 70-80 landowners in the basin. There was some concern about weed issues and control in the neighboring national forests. It would be good to have some coordination with USFS, but the team realized that weed treatment is limited to only a few approved herbicides. The review team noted that this applicant has had good success with similar coordination done in Fox/Cottonwood basins. There was concern about the high number of project management hours and the team suggested that amount be dropped to half, unless the applicant could justify the time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Reduce project management hours

Regional Review Team Priority

2 of 2

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Recommended Amount
\$24,993.00

Staff Follow-up to Review Team Comment

At review team's request, staff talked with applicant about revisions to budget and justification for high project management hours. The applicant did not receive the DEQ 319 grant that would have offset \$9,720 of project management expense. Because of that and the applicants justification of hours required to accomplish objectives of the application, project management dollars were reduced to \$12,000.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. Reduce project management to \$12,000.

Staff Recommended Award

Recommended Amount
\$28,355.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 28,355.00