

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 8 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$60,000 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$60,000 with conditions. Staff eliminated non-capital education and outreach costs due to very limited non-capital funds. The grant agreement will 1) require the grantee to work with the landowner and OWRD to check the feasibility of enrolling in the conserved water allocation program or some other water leasing program for the water saved with this system installation; and 2) require the final project completion report to explain whether the property will be enrolled in the conserved water allocation program or a water leasing program, and if not, explain the reasons; and 3) the final project completion report, and annual post-implementation status reports for two years after the final report, must include information on how much water was saved, what crops were grown and their respective yields.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6001	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Sherman County Area Watersheds Upland Erosion Control		
APPLICANT:	Sherman SWCD		
BASIN:	JOHN DAY	COUNTY:	Sherman
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$88,887	TOTAL COST:	\$119,549

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The project sites are all located in Sherman County within Oregon's major wheat producing area, which includes the highest percentage of tillable acres in any county in the state. Such cropland can be vulnerable to sheet and rill erosion, beginning in the headlands, gaining momentum and topsoil, draining lower elevations into natural draws or swales and creating concentrated flow erosion and sedimentation. This project works to reduce this major limiting condition of ecological function by installing 54 cropland water and sediment control basins (WASCB), 4 rangeland WASCBs, 99,336 feet of terraces, one acre grassed waterway, and implementing 519 acres of direct-seed practices. Partners include the Sherman County SWCD, NRCS and 12 participating landowners. OWEB funds will be used for project management, in-house personnel, contracted services, travel, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team held a discussion on direct seed/no-till practices and the differences between terraces built now and in the past. The terrace and WASCB construction standards have improved so more ecological benefits are now realized ~ less erosion, more water infiltration. Landowners cannot afford to treat entire property at once, so fields and slopes are analyzed and sites are then prioritized for improvements. So what looks shotgun is, in fact, systematic. It was confirmed that the landowners maintain the terraces and WASCBs for their design life and that many of these had exceeded their design life of 10 years. This project is not for maintenance costs.

The team felt these projects produce good examples, enough to compel neighbors to initiate similar practices on their fields. Direct-seed practices are slowly being accepted in this area mostly in the north end of the county. This application will assist one traditional farm and one new producer to give direct seed a try. Keeping soil where it lies and allowing water to infiltrate where it falls are the key components of this application.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By installing WASCBs, terraces, grassed waterways and using direct-seed practices, this project will reduce erosion, trap sediment and increase infiltration, slow sediment transport to streams and improve water quality.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 9 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$88,887 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6002	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Weinke Ranch Off-stream Water Developments		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$18,346	TOTAL COST:	\$23,496

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project proposes to develop three upland springs located on 1,500 acres of steep terrain in the East Birch Creek Watershed of Umatilla County. Currently the landowner's livestock waters out of E. Birch Creek on the extreme west end of the pasture, or out of undeveloped seeps in two other pasture units. This causes increased sedimentation, degraded riparian vegetation and potential nitrate inputs into the stream. Also, forage is under-utilized in parts of the three pastures because the livestock tend to congregate close to any water sources they find. The three springs proposed for development are strategically located to reduce pressure on the East Birch Creek water gap. The ranch follows a grazing management plan and with these improved water sources, upland forage can be better managed. Cross fencing is already in place to aid in controlling cattle movement. Birch Creek is a focal area of restoration in Umatilla County with many partners working on various projects, both in-stream and uplands. Project partners include the landowner and NRCS. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, travel, supplies/materials, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team noted that much of East Birch Creek was fenced off 20 years ago and because of the geography of the landscape and lack of other available water in the uplands, the water gap and corresponding riparian area is getting overused. There was some concern about the springs really not being effective in keeping cattle away from the water gap. But those review team members on the site visit clarified that the landscape would aid in that; steep slopes with bluffs that would act somewhat as a deterrent to livestock readily traveling back and forth, especially if they didn't have to go for water. Conversation was also held on the amount of money being asked for project management ~ seemed like 80 hours was high. Same with the amount of time required for an NRCS engineer to design the spring developments, although it was noted the NRCS contribution served as a match. From the site visit, the locations of the springs did not appear to be difficult to access so the estimate for developing the springs also seemed high. Some of the review team felt the application could have been stronger with a more direct link to the watershed benefits.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

Developing upland water sources will help reduce livestock impacts on riparian areas, reducing sedimentation and potential nitrate/bacteria contamination to East Birch Creek. It will also aid grazing management practices to improve ecological function of upland grasslands.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund reducing project management to 40 hours.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 13 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$17,026 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at the reduced level of \$17,026, reducing project management to 40 hours.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6003	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Broken Spur Ranch Watershed Enhancement		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$31,923	TOTAL COST:	\$43,423

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project, encompassing over 5,000 acres in Umatilla County, is located in the headwaters of two watersheds: Stewart Creek, a tributary of Birch Creek; and North Fork McKay Creek. Stewart Creek is listed as critical habitat for summer steelhead spawning, rearing and migration and the North Fork McKay Creek watershed supports rainbow and redband trout populations. Due to the lack of developed water sources in the uplands, livestock and large elk herds water in these creeks, causing sedimentation and potential bacteria inputs. The solutions proposed include developing five springs in the uplands of four separate pasture units. This would facilitate improved pasture management and the reduction of livestock in the riparian areas. The ranch pastures 200 pairs and currently, because water in several of the upland pastures dries up in late summer/ early fall, the landowner has to relocate his herd off the ranch to a pasture along Birch Creek where they water out of the creek. Development of these springs would eliminate the need to move the herd. The project would be designed by an NRCS engineer. Project partners include the landowner and NRCS. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, travel, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This ranch was, up to three years ago, a historic family ranch with an excellent reputation for land management. The new owners are interested in continuing that legacy of a healthy natural environment. There was discussion about the change in management and whether shifting from spring/summer rotation to year-round grazing could be an improvement or a detriment. The new owners did reduce their herd size by half and while on the site visit indicated that their goal was to be able to better manage the uplands and riparian areas on the ranch. The application didn't make it clear if there is an existing grazing plan and if so, will rotation on upland pastures be the same every year or if it is possible to rotate first pastures to allow for maximum recovery. Discussion also was held on the location of two of the springs. The map made it look like they were located right in the stream channel and the question was asked if the riparian area would need to be fenced to assure cattle would stay out of the creek. This was clarified by those who were either familiar with the property or who were on the site visit that the location of the trough was up on the side of the hill and access to the riparian area was difficult. Cattle would be more likely to use the easily accessible trough rather than fight the brush and steep banks of the riparian area. There was also an indication that the grantee had discussed the potential of riparian fencing with the landowner but it hadn't advanced far enough to include in this application. The team noted that the higher costs of two of the spring developments were justified by the steepness and difficulty of the terrain. The review team did feel that 80 hours of project management was excessive and requested it be dropped to 40 hours.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

This project would reduce livestock impact on riparian areas and improve riparian vegetation, reducing sedimentation and potential bacteria contamination to the streams.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund reduced with conditions: a grazing management plan be submitted with final report.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 10 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$30,603 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$30,603 with conditions. Reduce project management to 40 hours. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include a grazing plan.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6004	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Hermiston Irrigation District LA Conversion Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$143,106	TOTAL COST:	\$219,906

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

Located four miles east of Hermiston and one mile NW of the Cold Spring Reservoir, this project is within the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area and the Stage Gulch Critical Groundwater Area (LUGMA). The LA-line is an open earthen ditch in poor condition. This project would convert 7,600 feet of open ditch to pipe and install trash screens. By piping the LA-line, 335 acres of flood irrigation will be converted from flood to sprinkler systems. One benefit would be the reduction of groundwater contamination in an area where shallow wells for residential use are threatened. Improving the efficiency of individual irrigators will reduce the amount of water diverted annually from the Umatilla River by the Hermiston Irrigation District. Partners on this project include the Bureau of Reclamation and NRCS. OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation, project management, in-house personnel, contracted services, travel, supplies/materials, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team discussed that this is a 100-year-old delivery ditch through which it is estimated 35-40% of the irrigation water is lost. However, it appeared that any water savings would be utilized by the users, which meant that watershed benefits would need to be improvements in surface water or groundwater quality. It was pointed out that the Groundwater Management Area Action Plan has a goal of conversion from flood irrigation to sprinkler for groundwater quality protection. Reviewers thought that by improving the delivery system, some groundwater quality benefits would be realized, even though they seemed small for the amount of dollars requested. The application could have been stronger if water savings from the Umatilla River could be quantified or better explained, and if it had contained more information about expected pollution reduction benefits rather than talking about “potential” reduction in pollution. In similar applications from this same area, OWEB funds were requested for supplies/materials and the match was the irrigation district’s project management and labor. This application could have fared better if the applicant had found or listed more partners and if they hadn’t asked for funds to pay irrigation district staff in addition to paying for supplies and equipment. In the end, some reviewers wanted to fund at a reduced level, but on a 6-4 vote, reviewers recommended that the project not be funded.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Fund

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Do not fund

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6005	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Stanfield Irrigation District C-line Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$46,089	TOTAL COST:	\$88,739

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The Umatilla Soil & Water Conservation District partnered with the Stanfield Irrigation District and NRCS to propose piping the last mile of the C-line irrigation ditch that serves eight landowners. The project site is located four miles east of Stanfield, in an area of mostly rural residential and agriculture. In order to become as efficient as possible with their use of irrigation water, the Stanfield Irrigation District has converted 97% of their patrons from flood to metered piped and sprinkler systems; this project would bring them to 100%.

The existing system, built in the early 50s, has degraded to the point of minimal functionality, requiring more water to be put through the system to cover water rights on this stretch. Flood irrigation potentially can increase ground water contamination, especially in the soils identified in this area. And, because the old line leaks so much and creates pools of water, mosquitoes and related control has become an issue. The project would pipe 5,200 feet of the C-line, install a rotating trash screen and three irrigation pumps. By piping the C-line and converting to efficient irrigation systems, water loss, potential groundwater contamination and health risk will all be reduced. Project partners are the Stanfield Irrigation District and NRCS. OWEB dollars will be used to pay for in-house personnel, contracted services, supplies/materials, travel, and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This is the second time this project has been submitted and the review team did feel the application had improved. However, there was still discussion on exactly what the ecological benefits were resulting from this project. The application explained this water comes from the Furnish Ditch, but it would have been helpful to know where that water comes from. It would help to have a quantifiable explanation of how much less is pulled from the river or from the reservoir. The application could also have been improved by noting the landowner contribution to their irrigation upgrades. The review team acknowledged that flood irrigation is a pollution issue in an area identified as having high nitrate levels in their groundwater. The application notes that three sites will switch from flood irrigation to sprinkler, which is positive. It was noted that the open water currently goes into the Stainfield Drain, which is high in bacteria and drains directly into the Umatilla River.

Some reviewers noted that the irrigation district must know the old pipes are failing and wondered if the district has tried to save money to cost share and address this issue. It was noted that the Bureau of Reclamation used to help fund maintenance and repair but no longer does so.

Overall, the review team struggled with this application and the other irrigation efficiency projects submitted by this applicant. They felt that the application needed to do a better job articulating the watershed problems and how those problems are addressed by the project. For example, the application notes that the project will reduce “potential” pollution. What can the irrigation district or the applicant tell

reviewers and OWEB about documented pollution problems and how the piping projects have or will reduced those pollution problems? Reviewers noted that with many applications they see a more direct watershed benefit, making it difficult to rank highly those with more indirect or vague watershed benefits. They also found the application unclear and thought it could be improved to be easier to read and provide better information.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

This project would potentially reduce the contamination of groundwater and surface water.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund with condition that final report include a description of the opportunities and barriers to permanent conservation of water instream or in-reservoir as a result of the irrigation efficiencies gained by the irrigation district's conversion of irrigation system to piping or sprinkler.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 17 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$46,089 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund with conditions. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include a description of the opportunities and barriers to permanent conservation of water instream or in-reservoir as a result of the irrigation efficiencies gained by the irrigation district's conversion of irrigation system to piping and sprinkler.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6006	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Hasenbank Ranch Watershed Improvements		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$44,946	TOTAL COST:	\$56,657

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

Located in the Umatilla County foothills of the Blue Mountains on East Fork Spring Hollow Creek, a tributary of Wildhorse Creek, this project would develop four upland water sources, install 5,000 feet of riparian fence, build one water gap to facilitate moving livestock, thin Hawthorne monoculture and plant more diverse riparian vegetation. Spring Hollow Creek is 303(d) listed for nitrate and temperature and Wildhorse Creek is considered spawning and rearing habitat for summer steelhead. The landowner has a history of restoration activities on this ranch. They have installed cross fencing, enrolled 50 acres into CRP and 1.5 acres into CREP just below the project site. They did attempt to enroll the project site into CREP but that section of the site didn't qualify because the CREP technician determined there was adequate existing vegetation. The livestock currently water on portions of the creek, from a pond, from undeveloped seeps and two upland water troughs. Most of these sites contribute to decreased water quality through degraded riparian areas, sedimentation, bacteria, fecal and nitrate inputs, which affects downstream anadromous fish habitat. This project would eliminate livestock access to the riparian area, develop additional upland watering sites and increase riparian vegetation diversity. Springs, fencing and water gap would be installed following NRCS specifications. Partners include the landowner and the NRCS. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, travel, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team liked the landowner's commitment to fencing off the riparian areas and implementing management practices to alleviate contamination of East Fork Spring Hollow Creek. The project site is located in a higher rainfall, shallow soil and high gradient zone so vegetation cover, both in the riparian areas and in the uplands, is crucial to reducing erosion. The team was concerned about the thinning component of the Hawthorne and wondered at what level it would be thinned. They noted that Hawthorne currently provides streamside woody vegetation and shading and wondered if it was thinned, if whether the Hawthorne would just take over again since the site potential may be Hawthorne. Reviewers would have liked to have seen a more detailed planting and site preparation plan with more justification for the thinning and/or research on appropriate densities of native Hawthorne on these sites. In the Blue Mountain ecosystem, Hawthorne is a dominant component in high-gradient systems and the team wondered if Hawthorne was in fact, the appropriate species for the site. The lower end of the project site, below the Hawthorne, has high potential for recovery once fencing is installed. The review team recommended for funding but eliminated funding for the Hawthorne thinning component.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By fencing off the creek and developing upland water sources, this project will decrease sedimentation, nutrient run-off, fecal and bacteria contamination. It will also improve the condition of the riparian area, improving water quality.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund at \$41,771 reducing the amount of site preparation to eliminate thinning component of the Hawthorne site.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 12 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$41,771 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$41,771 reducing the amount of site preparation to eliminate thinning component of the Hawthorne site.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team

Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6007	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Francis Water Quality Enhancement Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$41,565	TOTAL COST:	\$52,327

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located east of Stanfield in the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area (LUBGMA) which deals with contamination of the groundwater. The Francis farm is 63 acres of flat hay ground, pasture and corrals used for livestock production. Currently, an open ditch flows through the corral areas, that are used as to house three bulls and for weaning calves, and into the Stanfield Drain. The ditch collects spring flows as well as neighboring irrigation tailwater and runoff from the adjacent county road. Water quality in this area, east of Stanfield, is seriously degraded due to high inputs of fecal matter, bacteria, nitrates, mainly from livestock access and wallowing. The landowner wants to pipe 350 feet (the last section of open drain on this ditch), reseed any ground disturbed and rebuild fence removed for installation of the pipe. Umatilla SWCD is partnering with the landowner on this project. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, travel, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

A revised design and budget were provided to the review team because of late-breaking information from the irrigation district manager. The team felt this was a good project but thought that the goal of reducing pollution from runoff during rain events, when runoff would carry livestock manure and other pollution, would be better accomplished by covering the gravel with soil and seed. The application talks about reseeded but the team wondered if this would be successful if the area is used as the bull holding pen for 11 months of the year. If livestock are continually in the area, the grass will not survive and will not filter the pollution. There was some confusion about whether the rebuilt fence would exclude the ditch area which would resolve the issue of seeding viability and successful filtering mechanisms. It was decided from additional review of the application that the fence was designed to be rebuilt where it was originally located. This caused some concern with some of the reviewers, they wondered if the bull holding pen could be relocated or if the fence line could simply exclude the ditch. Because of the revision to the design, the other item the reviewers weren't clear about was if there would be dirt placed over the gravel swale and if then, that would be seeded.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By piping and seeding the drain ditch and excluding livestock, water quality will be improved by reducing the levels of sediment, bacteria, fecal matter and nitrates from entering the Stanfield Drain, and ultimately the Umatilla River.

Staff follow-up: After the review team meeting, staff called and spoke with both the applicant and the landowner to clarify the questions and concerns of the review team. The landowner said that fill over pipe will be approximately five feet of dirt that incorporates a gravel swale but will have a dirt layer on top to serve as a seed bed. They will exclude livestock from the pipe area until sod becomes established. They

also clarified that each of the three separate pens along this ditch will only contain one bull and only for 8 months. Staff provided this information to the reviewers, and they agreed it should be funded even if livestock are not permanently excluded.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund at \$42,565 increased with conditions. The grant agreement will require the piping to be overlaid with soil and seeded, and fenced to keep livestock away from it. Increase budget by \$1,000 to pay for additional required fencing.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 15 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$42,565 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at the increased level of \$42,565 with conditions. The grant agreement will require the piping to be overlaid with approximately five feet of soil and seeded, and temporarily fenced until sod is well established. If at two years after project implementation, the area over the swale is without the grass filtering layer, additional measures to protect that area will be implemented. Increase budget by \$1,000 to pay for additional required fencing.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6009	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Westland Irrigation District Conversion Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$261,254	TOTAL COST:	\$329,529

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

Located six miles SW of Hermiston, bordered by Butter Creek and the Umatilla River, this project would pipe 10,500 feet of existing open, unlined ditch; build and install a new pumping station; and install 300 feet of pipe under Interstate I-84. The old ditch services 12 patrons and provides water for 451 acres. Due to seepage, evaporation and flowing through a pasture, keeping the flow to the end of the line has proved problematic. There is also danger of potential contamination of bacteria and nitrates to both Butter Creek and the Umatilla River from irrigation tailwater. All 12 patrons serviced by this line would be required to convert from flood to an efficient sprinkler irrigation system. There are many planning and guidance documents (Umatilla Subbasin 2050 Management Plan, Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area Action Plan, Umatilla Agricultural Water Quality Management Plan, Umatilla Willow Subbasin Plan, the Critical Groundwater Areas, Umatilla Basin Irrigation Program and others) that focus on this area's water quality and quantity issues and they all identify irrigation efficiency as a priority action. The Umatilla SWCD is partnering with the Westland Irrigation District on this project. OWEB funds were asked for pre-implementation, project management, contracted services, in-house personnel, travel, supplies/materials, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This application could have been improved by focusing more on the ecological benefits realized by this project. For instance, there is mention of "possible" contamination from tailwater entering Butter Creek and the Umatilla River or reports of wells in the area showing a rise in nitrates or e. coli. More detail about the pollution problems and how this project would solve them, photos showing polluted tailwater entering those systems, or data reflecting water quality issues in wells in this area would have been more compelling. It appeared that the main goal of the project is to get water to the smaller irrigation district users. Some reviewers didn't see how individual water users would be monitored and wanted to see that measuring devices would be part of the project. The application talked about the computer system but it could have better explained how that translates to each place of use (POU.) There was concern there weren't more partners in the project and that the budget requested significant funding for irrigation district salaries and for the use of the irrigation district equipment, and the fiscal administration request of \$23,000 was too high.

This was one of ten similar projects submitted by the same applicant. The reviewers discussed again the difficulties these projects present when they don't make a strong case for ecological benefits; the benefits seem weak; and the application's budget and narrative are poor quality.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Fund

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Do not fund

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6010	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Upper Walla Walla River Irrigation Efficiency Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$81,487	TOTAL COST:	\$108,857

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The project area is located on the South Fork of the Upper Walla Walla River near the convergence of the North Fork Walla Walla, southeast of Milton Freewater in Umatilla County. The project would pipe 3,000 feet of an unlined and leaking ditch, install flow meters and two culverts. The Dorothy Ditch was built in 1942 to serve 6 irrigators. This unlined ditch leaks, flooding a nearby neighbor's basement; creating sinkholes in the county road; and swamping portions of the local orchards. However, if the system was piped, less water would be required to serve the six water rights, and it was stated that approximately 1.5 cfs would remain instream. Better water management would be facilitated by the installation of both individual flow meters and by the size of delivery pipe. Partners include landowners, the NRCS and the Umatilla County Road Department. OWEB funds would pay for project management, contracted services, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The reviewers noted that this irrigation efficiency proposal provided an estimate of how many cfs would be saved, although the application used different numbers (1 cfs and 1.5 cfs) in different places. But there were unanswered questions on whether downstream users would take the saved water or if it would be left instream to provide benefits to water quality and fish. The stream supports bull trout, summer steelhead and spring Chinook, so if the 1 cfs stays instream, reviewers saw it as a benefit. However, this application should have provided information on how far downstream the water would stay instream. For example, if the water stays instream for 200 yards, probably not a good project; on the other hand if it stayed in to the state line, it would be positive. The application also would have been improved by giving more detail on the limiting factors on this reach of the Upper Walla Walla, like flow regime, temperature or any other concerns. The review team also felt because the county road department would benefit from having to do fewer road repairs because of the sink, the county should pay for the work done relating to the road. The review team wanted staff to find out where the next withdrawal point was on the system and they wanted to condition funding on having the grantee work with OWRD on the possibility of permanent water savings as a result of this project and submit an interim progress report on such feasibility by December 2011.

Staff follow up: Staff researched the OWRD website map to locate the points of diversion on this stream system and found the first one 800 feet below project site with .38 cfs right; next diversion is 1.3 miles downstream with a water right of .39; and two miles from project site is a point of diversion with over 5 cfs. Regarding ESA-listed species benefit, conversations with ODFW staff noted that North Fork Walla Walla River is both flow and temperature challenged; the South Fork Walla Walla somewhat less. After hearing this information, reviewers still supported their funding recommendation.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By piping an unlined and leaking irrigation ditch, this project could increase instream flows and improve fish habitat.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund reduced with conditions at \$73,038. The county should cover installation of the county road improvements and have grantee and landowner consult with OWRD on the feasibility of permanent instream protection of the water saved as a result of this project.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 14 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$73,038 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$73,038 with conditions. No OWEB funds will be used for work on the county roads and infrastructures or landowner culvert improvements. The grant agreement will require the grantee to consult with OWRD on the feasibility of permanent instream protection of the water saved as a result of this project and submit an interim progress report to OWEB's Project Manager by December 2011. The final project completion report must include data showing the amount of water savings resulting from the project.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6011	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Hermiston Irrigation District B4 Ditch Conversion Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$33,602	TOTAL COST:	\$85,552

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located in the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area (LUBGMA), eight miles northeast of Hermiston in Umatilla County. The project would convert 4,000 feet of open ditch to pipe, reconnecting the B-line with the B4 line. Currently the unlined ditch follows a 1907 easement adjacent to a permitted feedlot. The feedlot owner is concerned about potential overland flows entering the irrigation ditch and neighbor's fields from his feedlot. And, at the end of the ditch, the excess irrigation water inundates a low-lying, high basalt pasture, creating a breeding ground for mosquitoes and unproductive pastureland. By piping this last section, the watershed benefits realized include reducing sediment and potential nutrient runoff, improving ground water quality and increasing conveyance efficiency. Partners on the project are the Hermiston Irrigation District. OWEB funds will be used for materials/supplies, project management, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This is the third submission of this project. The last cycle, this project was recommended but fell below the funding line. The review team recognizes there is some benefit to water quality and groundwater. Reviewers did not think the application explained measurable water savings other than more was available to irrigators. It was discussed that the cumulative effects of irrigation efficiencies can result in less water needing to be drawn from the river. However, the water is diverted from the Umatilla River during high flows in winter, so the limiting factor of summer/fall low flows isn't improved. It was mentioned that water from the McKay Reservoir has, in the past, been released to supplement low flows in the river. This application could have been stronger by explaining these factors, if they are relevant to this irrigation district. Several on the review team questioned why upgrades are not funded by irrigation district water users. It was noted that the mosquito population in this area has been identified as a subspecies that transmits both West Nile and malaria.

Overall, the review team struggled with this application and the other irrigation efficiency projects submitted by this applicant. They felt that the application needed to do a better job articulating the watershed problems and how those problems are addressed by the project. For example, the application notes that the project will reduce "potential" groundwater pollution. What can the irrigation district or the applicant tell reviewers and OWEB about how the piping projects have or will reduce those pollution problems? Is there a way to quantify those results? Reviewers noted that with many applications they see a more direct watershed benefit, making it difficult to rank highly those with more indirect or vague watershed benefits.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By piping 4,000 feet of an unlined irrigation ditch, this project will reduce the risk of groundwater contamination from the feedlot.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund with condition that final report include a description of the opportunities and barriers to permanent conservation of water instream or in-reservoir as a result of the irrigation efficiencies gained by the irrigation district's conversion of irrigation system to piping or sprinkler.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 16 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$33,602 **NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT:** \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund with condition. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include a description of the opportunities and barriers to permanent conservation of water instream or in-reservoir as a result of the irrigation efficiencies gained by the irrigation district's conversion of irrigation system to piping and sprinkler.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6012	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Rudio Creek Ranch Habitat Restoration Project		
APPLICANT:	The Freshwater Trust		
BASIN:	JOHN DAY	COUNTY:	Grant
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$383,854	TOTAL COST:	\$1,073,278

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located on the Rudio Creek, an ecologically significant tributary of the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. During the early and mid-1900s, Rudio Creek was straightened and channelized in order to drain wet meadow floodplain habitat for livestock pasture and hay fields. Beaver dam complexes and riparian hardwoods were lost as a result. This has resulted in higher stream energy and corresponding erosive tendencies, reduced habitat diversity and cold-water storage. This project will increase stream length and complexity, restore floodplain function and riparian habitat by reconnecting two miles of stream channel to historic location; creating riffles and 58 pools by installing large wood structures; plant 4,300 cuttings and 330 hardwood clumps in the restored riparian zone. Plant establishment activities include watering and weed suppression. Partners include the landowner, Ecotrust Whole Watershed Restoration Initiative, Bella Vista Foundation, NOAA-NACO, CTWS, and USFS Title II. OWEB funds were requested for portions of pre-implementation, project management, in-house personnel, contracted services, travel, supplies/materials, riparian plant establishment, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This application was a resubmit and the applicant met all requests from the previous evaluation. The main issue was the inclusion of a comprehensive set of designs along with the application. This is a good project that has a strong match from an array of partnerships. The consulting engineers are well respected and have done similar and successful projects in the Middle Fork John Day River. There was some discussion involving the permitting and consultation on the project. But with NOAA being one of the secured funders, it was felt that any potential issues relating to compliance could be resolved. The review team appreciated the landowner's commitment to improving the ecological function on his ranch by giving up productive acres as an exclusion and leaving water in-stream. This section of Rudio Creek has high potential for being cold, clear and productive ~ the hyporrheic storage capacity would be huge.

The team discussed the riparian planting information in the application and noted that it will be vegetated using onsite materials of large salvaged clumps, which reviewers believed would be successful. Because there are beaver in the area, reviewers thought that Question R17 should have included discussion of beaver protection considerations; however, reviewers noted that there is a lot of vegetation in the area for beavers and they are not a high risk to the plantings, though some protection will be needed.

There was a lot of scrutiny of the budget and it was felt some of the estimates of project management hours required were higher than warranted for a project of this scope. They did not think that staff costs for water rights work were justified by the application. The team also questioned why a fish biologist was needed for 80 hours of planting project management. The extremely high fiscal administration cost was not justified in the application. The review team liked the project and recommended it for funding but at a reduced level and a revised budget.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By reconnecting to historic floodplain, lengthening and increasing stream channel complexity and increasing riparian vegetation, this project will serve to improve spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead and Chinook by increasing stream gravel, slowing stream velocity, improving cold water refugia and floodplain storage; and it also increases habitat for beaver and other wildlife and avian populations

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund reduced at \$300,000

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 4 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$300,000 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$300,000, with conditions. OWEB's project manager will work with the applicant to determine the appropriate amount of the fiscal administration costs to be paid by OWEB (4%-10%) based on the complexity and number of fiscal administration tasks and hours needed for this project.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team

Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6014	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Rudio Creek Upland Watershed Restoration		
APPLICANT:	North Fork John Day WSC		
BASIN:	JOHN DAY	COUNTY:	Grant
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$41,084	TOTAL COST:	\$170,152

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located in Grant County, on lands draining into Rudio Creek, an important steelhead habitat tributary of the North Fork John Day River. The eastern side of this ranch is an arid landscape with little or no water available in the uplands. This is contributed to both the natural geology of the area and the encroachment of Western juniper. Pre-treatment inventories were conducted on the two selected sites for juniper removal and all sites were found to be phase two moving into phase three, showing skeletonized shrub components and loss of vegetation between trees. The landowners have fenced livestock off of Rudio Creek and are involved in extensive riparian restoration. Because this is a working ranch, the upland water sources on the east side are critical to implementing best managed grazing practices. A grazing plan was created that reverses the historic pasture rotation, effectively benefiting the grassland resources, improving overall plant health and reducing noxious weed impacts. But without eastside water availability, the improved grazing rotation doesn't work. The OWEB portion of the project would remove 240 acres of phase two/three juniper, reseed the 240 acres disturbed by juniper eradication, and develop an upland spring and purchase troughs and seed. Partners and landowner will be paying for installing a well, improving and adding solar well systems and infrastructure, and paying for and installing two wildlife guzzlers. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, travel, supplies/materials, status reporting and fiscal administration. This project has a high landowner match and a host of partners, including the USDA Rural Development Fund, the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla and the Freshwater Trust.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This is the third submission for this project and the review team felt this application had better detail and explanation of ecological benefits. They also liked the increased partnership match and the explanation of the ranch's grazing strategy to improve upland forage and health. The review team noted that the landowners are involved in many environmental improvements on their ranch. They have participated and have hosted several meetings of the Rudio Basin Collaborative group that is exploring a basin-wide approach to restoration. It was also discussed that OWEB has funded several projects for neighboring ranches, previous landowners and the current landowner in this basin already, and this project builds on those previous investments. Because the juniper removal is more than 120 acres, before treatment is initiated a notice of operation will need to be submitted to the local Oregon Department of Forestry. The review team questioned the seed mix and suggested that the grantee work with NRCS range tech or some other range technician to improve the selection.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

Removing juniper and developing upland water sources will increase plant community diversity, resilience and abundance, increase avian and wildlife habitat, increase infiltration of precipitation, potential increase of groundwater, and reduce potential of catastrophic stand-replacing wildfire.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund with conditions: 1) to consult with NRCS, BLM, USFS or state related agency on a better seed mix; and 2) provide a grazing management and long-term juniper management plan with completion report.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 6 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$40,584 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$40,584 with conditions. Staff eliminated non-capital education and outreach costs due to very limited non-capital funds. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include a grazing plan and long-term juniper management plan, and documentation that the seed mix was determined appropriate by BLM, NRCS or other appropriate agency.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6016	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Ramsey/Rock Creek Riparian		
APPLICANT:	Gilliam SWCD		
BASIN:	JOHN DAY	COUNTY:	Gilliam
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$94,950	TOTAL COST:	\$146,290

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project does work on two sites located on Rock Creek, at river mile (RM) 5 and river mile 7.5, in northwest Gilliam County. Rock Creek is an important tributary of the John Day River for summer steelhead spawning and rearing, providing over 140 miles of streams that drain a 314,551 acre basin. Two irrigation diversions are currently blocking adult and juvenile passage very low in the stream system, prohibiting migration to headwater areas where cool water is essential to their survival. After initial consultation and site visits with the engineering firm hired to do this project, NOAA and ODFW, it was decided the best solution was to build a ramp/pool project at the RM five diversion; and add an additional compartment to the existing but degraded and out of compliance fish ladder at RM seven. The partner on the project is the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs. OWEB funds were requested for project management, contracted services, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

There have been numerous other uplands and fish passage projects in Rock Creek, and this project ties in well, builds on the results of previous work. The team expects good results. The quantifiable immediate improvements are huge, opening up 140 miles of habitat. All other dams on Rock Creek pass adult steelhead; this is the last adult barrier on the creek., Correcting these two low-in-the-system barriers will have a huge effect on salmonid survival and abundance. The review team appreciated the information regarding negotiations with the landowner about alternatives to correcting these barriers and also the information on all the other riparian and upland projects being implemented on the Rock Creek watershed. The cumulative effect on habitat and native fish species is expected to have good, quantifiable results. The application would have been easier to review if it had included better designs and initial survey information; however the site visit with the engineer clarified many questions and left the team with a high level of confidence on this project. Some of the budget amounts seemed a bit high but in discussion on the site visit with the engineer, it was deemed appropriate due to the need for some possible adaptive design. There was some confusion about why the upper degraded fish ladder was just not being replaced, but it was clarified that this design was the most cost effective and will achieve the same passage results as a complete rebuild. The team appreciated that NOAA, ODFW Fish Passage team, BPA and the tribes had been on site and provided input. Final designs will still have to pass compliance review by these same agencies but those agencies having on-the-ground knowledge of the project could help it through the process. The team felt this was a very good project.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By fixing both of these diversions, connectivity to approximately 140 miles of upstream habitat will be restored to all life-stages of salmonid and native fish species.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION Fund

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 1 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$94,950 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund

There was some discussion whether the project could be adversely affected if future park management decisions result in removing Bates Pond. Reviewers wondered whether sediment backed up from the pond might destroy the work done from this application. After discussions, reviewers concluded that the impact would depend on how any sediment load removal was dealt with and if it is done the right way, a damaging sediment dump would be prevented.

Staff follow up: Under the Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers requirements, OPRD will have to file a notice of intent for the project and request comment from other agencies and tribal governments (ODFW, CTWS, etc). Most of those agencies have already written letters of support for the restoration project, so it wasn't thought to be a problem. Irrigation rights were also researched and the Bates property was found to have multiple water rights including rights for irrigation. However, the process to assure availability for this project's riparian planting has not been finalized.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

By re-establishing connection with the natural floodplain and re-vegetating stream banks of both Bridge Creek and a stretch of the Middle Fork John Day River, floodwaters will be absorbed, sediment can be dropped out and habitat for both aquatic and terrestrial species will improve. Riparian vegetation will increase shading of both streams; rushes and sedges will serve to catch sediment transport; and with banks pulled back, stream will have the ability to naturally introduce meander and begin to form instream complexity of pools and riffles.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund at \$119,108 with conditions. Reduce fiscal administration to \$1,800 and eliminate portable irrigation equipment costs. Consult with OWRD about water rights needed for irrigation and follow up with OPRD on whether there are scenic waterway issues.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 11 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$119,108 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$119,108 with conditions. Reduce fiscal administration to \$1,800 and eliminate portable irrigation equipment costs. The grant agreement will require OWEB project manager approval of the following information before any funds are released to the grantee: 1) copies of the Wild and Scenic River notice of intent from OPRD and comment letters from agencies consulted; 2) confirmation that water rights are available to be used on the project's riparian planting and, if not, an explanation of how OPRD will water the plantings to ensure they survive and thrive.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund reduced with conditions. Do not fund the kiosk; shift seed collection costs to in-kind and provide OWEB funds for range seeding. Provide a grazing management plan with the final project completion report.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 5 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$24,970 NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund at a reduced level of \$24,970 with conditions. Do not fund the kiosk. Reduce fiscal administration costs. Shift seed collection costs to in-kind and provide OWEB funds for range seeding. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include a grazing plan and long-term juniper management plan. If OWEB funds go for seed collection to be used off-site, the final project completion report must include documentation showing how the seeds were used for restoration projects, including a list of landowner names, amount seed was sold for and maps of sites.

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6019	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Mulvaney Upland Improvement Project		
APPLICANT:	Mid John Day WSC		
BASIN:	JOHN DAY	COUNTY:	Wheeler
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$29,160	TOTAL COST:	\$38,900

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located in Wheeler County in the Lower John Day/Kahler Creek basin. Many south flowing tributaries drain this area into the John Day River. This historic ranch site was recently sold to a new, absentee owner who is interested in making improvements to the overall health of the land. Western juniper has expanded from historic communities and encroached into Ponderosa pine and sagebrush steppe systems. This was caused by both fire suppression and historic grazing practices. Components of this project include cutting and piling 180 acres of juniper, developing one upland spring site, treating and reseeding 64 acres of Medusahead and reseeding an additional 16 acres of ground disturbed by juniper treatments. A grazing plan and long-term juniper maintenance plan will also be completed. The landowner partnered on this project. OWEB funds were requested for project management, some contracted services, supplies/materials, and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team felt this application would have been stronger if it had included more research, planning and detail. From the site visit, there seemed to be good potential for restoration on the land but it wasn't made clear why the sites were selected over others. The application would have been stronger with a more comprehensive plan that included rehabilitation of old fields to eradicate extensive annual grass communities in combination with a more thorough analysis of juniper site restoration potential. The review team would like to see a ranch plan, showing all projects completed and future potential identified, perhaps done with assistance from NRCS. The team didn't want to discourage this new landowner from doing restoration but would encourage a more comprehensive and detailed approach to treatments. It didn't appear the landowner owned cattle himself, but did lease the grazing. The review team would like to see a grazing plan that includes how upland water developments would keep cattle out of riparian areas, where are cross fences located, where are the old fields located. The team wondered if there is potential interest in fencing out riparian zone or if that practice is even necessary basis the topography of the land. The team also would like to know more detail on the seeding – what is the mix, how and when the sites would be seeded. Overall, the review team thought that the application seemed to be “rushed together” and wanted any future application to include a comprehensive plan showing strategic treatments, more detail on seeding component, and a ranch and grazing management plan.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Do not fund

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Do not fund

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications

APPLICATION NO.: 211-6020	PROJECT TYPE: Restoration
PROJECT NAME: Richmond Upland Improvement Project	
APPLICANT: Bridge Creek WSC	
BASIN: JOHN DAY	COUNTY: Wheeler
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED: \$29,700	TOTAL COST: \$39,324

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The Richmond Upland Improvement project is located in the headwater area of Girds Creek, in the Lower John Day/Service Creek watershed of central Wheeler County. Western juniper has encroached into Ponderosa pine and sage steppe ecosystems affecting watershed hydrology and overall ecosystem health. Juniper encroachment is associated with soil loss, impaired water quality, reduced infiltration rates, the loss of native plant communities and the avian and wildlife species that rely on them. This project proposes to pull and pile 180 acres of phase one and two juniper; develop two springs to provide upland water for both wildlife and livestock; and apply herbicide and reseed 32 acres of Medusahead. A grazing plan and juniper maintenance plan will also be completed. The landowner is partnering with the Mid John Day Watershed Council on this project. OWEB funds would be used for project management, a portion of the cost of removing the juniper and spring developments, status reporting and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team first questioned why this site was selected for treatment. Those who were on the site visit or who knew this area explained it was a highly productive site where the juniper encroachment hadn't progressed so far as to have destroyed the potential for re-establishment of existing perennial native grass and shrub component. Also, the landowner, who is recognized as a good steward of the land, wants to remove the intense juniper fuel load bordering their pine forest acreage so burning can safely be used as a future juniper maintenance tool. Conversation was held about fire not being a good tool in areas where Medusahead monocultures existed, but it was then determined that the 32 acres of Medusahead treatment was to shrink satellite communities of this invasive weed and also serve as an educational tool for landowners to see the potential of herbicide and reseeding treatments. The team wanted to make sure the resultant slash is piled and burned, as noted in the application. And, that those burned pile areas would be monitored for two years and would be sprayed and reseeded if weeds become an issue. Those experienced with the project site noted that the juniper treatment piles from the EQIP project were burned in winter on frozen ground helping reduce sterilization of the soil and encroachment of opportunistic weeds. Some team members wished that the grazing management and long term juniper management plan would have been included in the application. There was also a question about no funds being requested for fencing for the spring developments. The team asked to condition funds making sure the spring developments would be installed according to NRCS specifications, including fencing the spring box.

HOW THE APPLICATION ADDRESSES WATERSHED AND ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND PROCESSES:

Removing juniper on this site will increase plant community diversity, resilience and abundance, increase avian and wildlife habitat, increase infiltration of precipitation and potential increase of groundwater, and reduces potential of catastrophic stand-replacing wildfire.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund with the conditions that 1) grazing management and long-term juniper maintenance plans are submitted with final report; 2) that spring developments are installed according to NRCS specifications, including fencing the spring box; 3) consult with the BLM, NRCS or other appropriate agency regarding the appropriate seed mix; and 3) reseed and treat slash piles for one to 2 years after burning if weeds are present.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 7 of 17

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$29,700 **NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT:** \$ 0

EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING AMOUNT: \$ 0

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund with conditions. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report to include 1) a grazing management plan and long-term juniper management plan; 2) documentation that spring developments were installed according to NRCS specifications, including fencing the spring box; and 3) documentation that the seed mix was determined appropriate by NRCS or other appropriate agency. The grant agreement will also require the grantee's post-implementation status reports to include a description and photographs showing that slash piles were treated and reseeded for one to two years after burning, or that no weeds were present.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6021	PROJECT TYPE:	Restoration
PROJECT NAME:	Fruitvale Water Management Phase 2		
APPLICANT:	Walla Walla Basin WSC		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$75,372	TOTAL COST:	\$126,700

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

This project is located along Middle Mud Creek, a spring branch of the Walla Walla River. The Fruitvale Water Users Association (FWUA) serves water rights to over 1,300 acres of farmland in 45 ownerships northeast of Milton Freewater in Umatilla County. The water source is both the Walla Walla River via the West Little Walla Walla and the Middle Mud Creek headwater springs. This project is a continuation of an aggressive irrigation efficiency and water management program that began in 1999 to restore flows to the Walla Walla River for ESA listed bull trout and steelhead, reintroduced spring Chinook and to equitably manage water rights in the basin. Farms in this area used to be mostly orchards but now have converted to hay and pasture because of the reduction of available irrigation water. In this 2nd phase, the project proposed to upgrade four diversion weirs, install a grade control structure, armor a section of eroding bank, and enlarge two ponds. Partners on the project include the Fruitvale Water Users Association, the Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council, BPA and landowners. OWEB funds were requested for contracted services and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

The review team understood the goals of the applicant in working with the farming community affected by protecting instream flows. It is understood that if water is left instream and people's operations are damaged, people will oppose leaving water instream unless they get help to meet their needs. In this case, 25% of the flow in the Walla Walla has been protected instream and they need help to operate at 75%. While reviewers understood the goals and importance, they did not think the application made a clear or strong case for what they are doing and how all the pieces fit together. The application talks about lining the ditch with rock and expanding the ponds to store more water. Discussion followed on whether this was considered maintenance (dealing with sediment) or construction of ponds (potentially ineligible according to OWEB's rules). The other component that triggered some concern was the armoring of the ditch. The team wasn't clear on how armoring with rock increased irrigation efficiency, or how reducing sediment from those eroding banks impacted the ecological function of this particular system. If the application were to be resubmitted, reviewers wanted the application to explain all of the phases of this project and related projects, and what is proposed for future phases and how they all make up the big picture. The application would need to discuss how many phases there are, and provide better justification for proposed project work, including how the work protects and restores watershed process and function.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Fund

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Do not fund

**Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Region 6 (Mid Columbia) Review Team
Evaluation for April 19, 2010 Applications**

APPLICATION NO.:	211-6008	PROJECT TYPE:	Technical Assistance
PROJECT NAME:	Fish Passage & Stream Connectivity Restoration Project		
APPLICANT:	Umatilla SWCD		
BASIN:	UMATILLA	COUNTY:	Umatilla
OWEB FUNDS REQUESTED:	\$50,000	TOTAL COST:	\$214,910

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The Umatilla Soil & Water Conservation District, partnering with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, requested funds to provide engineering and design for removing two abandon concrete irrigation diversions, one of which also supports a bridge and a deteriorated and unusable fish ladder on Birch Creek, a significant steelhead spawning and rearing tributary of the Umatilla River. The project is located just upstream of the confluence of Birch Creek and the Umatilla River in Umatilla County. These man-made structures are fish passage barriers, limiting the upstream and downstream movement of native fish species including summer steelhead, redband trout, lamprey and suckers, all of which need upstream accessibility to high quality habitat in the headwaters of Birch Creek and its tributaries. Birch Creek is noted as one of the nine major steelhead spawning areas in the Recovery Plan for Oregon's Middle Columbia River Steelhead. BPA and ODFW funds will contribute match to the OWEB funds to contract engineering, surveying and design. OWEB funds will be used for contract services and fiscal administration.

REGIONAL TEAM REVIEW:

This application was originally submitted as a phase one restoration project at the direction of OWEB field staff. But upon submission, it was found to be ineligible as a restoration project as the components involved only design, surveying and engineering and did not have secured match for implementing the resulting restoration project. Thus, the application could only be funded with non-capital dollars. Since this mistake was done at the direction of OWEB staff, it was determined the application would still be accepted, but reviewed as a technical assistance application for engineering and design. The request for OWEB funds was reduced because of the \$50,000 cap on technical assistance applications.

The reviewers recognized that Birch Creek is one of the biggest steelhead producers in the basin, and realized the importance of removing these passage barriers so low in the Birch Creek system. This project is important to the comprehensive restoration work being done on Birch Creek. However, there was concern the original engineering estimates were high for the work considered (\$180,000.) The review team wondered whether, with the reduced amount the engineering could still be accomplished. After much discussion and review of the detail provided in the application the reviewers were satisfied that engineering and design could be completed for a lot less. The review team would have liked to have seen some engineering bids and estimates so they could evaluate what they were getting for the dollars requested. The team would have also liked the budget broken out by tasks/deliverables, rather than noted as a lump sum. The amount requested for fiscal also seemed high for the tasks and the number of entities involved.

Staff follow-up: OWEB field staff met with ODFW contact to discuss feasibility of obtaining estimate(s) before funding recommendation and to discuss review team's concerns. Engineering estimates were also provided and OWEB staff was satisfied that the recommended funding level was justified.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund up to \$50,000 with condition the applicants submit an engineering estimate(s) as a justification for funding at that level.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 1 of 2

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0 **NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT:** \$50,000

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund without conditions. Applicant has provided engineering estimates.

REGIONAL TEAM RECOMMENDATION: Fund with condition that the completion report include an action plan showing 1) potential areas for treatment both in uplands and riparian zones; 2) the number of priority acres identified; 3) number of acres enrolled in a NRCS program for juniper removal/treatment resulting from this project; 4) a list of landowners signed up for treatments; 5) the growth phases of targeted juniper (phase 1, 2 or 3), and 5) the degree and aspect of slopes identified in those priority acres.

REGIONAL TEAM PRIORITY: 2 of 2

CAPITAL AMOUNT: \$ 0 **NON-CAPITAL AMOUNT:** \$11,495

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD: Fund with conditions. The grant agreement will require the final project completion report include 1) the number and location (map) of priority acres identified, 2) number and location (map) of acres enrolled in an NRCS program for juniper removal/treatment resulting from this project, 3) a list of landowners signed up for treatments, 4) the growth phases of targeted juniper (phase 1, 2 or 3), and 5) the degree and aspect of slopes identified in those priority acres.