GA0014 09

OREGON WATER RESOURCE DEPARTMENT
WATER CONSERVATON, REUSE AND STORAGE GRANT PROGRAM

RECEIVED
SEP 02 2008
WATER RESOURCES DEPT
SALEM, OREGON

I. Grant Information

Project Name: *Water & Stream Health Feasibility Study - Tasks 1, 2, 3*

Type of Grant Requested: ☐ Water Conservation ☐ Reuse ☒ Above Ground Storage
☐ Storage Other Than Above-Ground [Including Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)]

Program Funding Dollars Requested: $ $500,000 Total cost of planning study: $ $500,000
Note: Request may not exceed $500,000

II. Applicant Information

Applicant Name: *Baker County*	**Co- Applicant Name:**
Organization: *Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee*	Organization:
Address *1995 3rd Street*	Address:
Baker City, Oregon 97814	
Phone *541.523.8200*	Phone:
Fax: *541.523.8201*	Fax:
Email: *hmartin@bakercounty.org*	Email:

Fiscal Officer Name: *Heidi Martin*	**Principle Contact: *Peggy S. Browne***
Organization: *Baker County*	Organization: *Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee*
Address: *1995 3rd Street*	Address: *50809 Ellis Rd.*
Baker City, OR 97814	*North Powder, OR 97867*
Phone: *541.523.8200*	Phone: *541.519.4908*
Fax: *541.523.8201*	Fax: *541.523.5170*
Email: *hmartin@bakercounty.org*	Email: *pegbrowne@eoni.com*

Certification:

I certify that this application is a true and accurate representation of the proposed work for a project planning study and that I am authorized to sign as the Applicant or Co-Applicant. By the following signature, the Applicant certifies that they are aware of the requirements of an Oregon Water Resources Department grant and are prepared to implement the project if awarded.

Applicant Signature: Fred Warner Jr. Date: *8/28/2008*

Print Name: *Fred Warner Jr.* Title: *Chairman, Baker County Commissioners*

III. Planning Study Summary

Please give a brief summary of the planning study using no more than 150 words.

The Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee (WASH) in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation are planning a feasibility study of a specific storage site (yet to be determined). The feasibility study process consists of the partners (Reclamation and WASH) who will refine the identified alternatives, collect missing data, and develop engineering solutions in detail. Studies will be needed to support the development of alternatives including: hydrology, water rights, hydraulics, geotechnical investigations, engineering, and design analysis. The alternatives once refined will go through an evaluation and assessment process. The evaluation will include technical development and cost estimate, environmental impact and economic viability evaluation, and identify political, legal, and administrative issues.

IV. Grant Specifics

Section A. Common Criteria

Instructions: Answer all questions in this section by typing the answer below the question. It is anticipated that completed applications will result in additional pages.

1. Describe how the planning study will be performed. Include:
   a. A description of the planning schedule/timeline, which includes identifying all key tasks. (Section VI provides an opportunity for a "graphical" representation of the schedule.)

   We are requesting funding for three tasks out of six outlined for a feasibility study for additional water storage in the Powder Basin. The three tasks are: Task 1. Data Collection, Task 2. Alternative Development, and Task 3. NEPA/Public Involvment. Due to budgetary constraints combined with Federal Planning requirements that include following the NEPA process, a logical phased approach (provided below the Task 3. description in this section), has been used for the overall effort where the project has been broken into three distinct phases. At present we have finished Phase I, and are currently working on Step 4 of Phase II- the Hydrologic Analysis.

   Task 1. - Data Collection will take about 6-18 months, will commence in June 2009, and consists of the following key study components:

   a) Water Quality - A water quality assessment will be made to evaluate baseline water quality conditions and effect of project alternatives on water quality. Water quality components may include sediment and contaminant loadings, temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity,urban and vegetative trash/debris, depth, and water movement criteria. A reservoir water quality model may be developed if necessary. The purpose of this modeling effort is to predict near-term water quality associated with inundation as well as long-term conditions.

   b) Hydrology - The team will develop a detailed hydraulic analysis on the selected site. Development of hydrologic data will include compiling limnology data, stream flow data, and water rights data. A hydrologic model, named "Hydrologic Modeling System," will be developed for the contributing basin. Unit hydrographs, flood hydrographs, and routing will be developed. A sedimentation analysis will be performed on the reservoir to determine reservoir sedimentation and the potential for aggradation/degradation.

   c) Economic Analysis - For the array of alternatives, the team will compute national economic development (NED) benefits, regional benefits that do not add to national benefit categories (recreation, regional development, transportation, etc.), and environmental benefits (riparian, fish, and wildlife). The team will conduct an economic screening of alternatives; cost analyses for alternatives including life cycle OMRR&R, interest during construction, other direct or associated costs of alternatives, induced damages, total annual cost for project implementation; determine net benefits for each alternative; and compute benefit/cost ratios for comparison of alternatives. The team will also prepare an incremental analysis of separable features of the preferred alternative.

   d) Cultural Resources - All cultural resources associated with the selected alternative will be evaluated. Any necessary Section 106 compliance for all activities involving ground disturbance or building/structure/feature alteration will be completed.

   e) Real Estate/Land Ownership - Real estate cost estimates for proposed project scenarios will be developed. The real estate estimates include a value estimate of the project's real property

requirement and an estimate of any relocation required. Any private property involved will be secured by the Sponsor via perpetual easements or purchase.

f)Fish & Wildlife - Affected fish and wildlife species will be surveyed throughout the affected area. USFWS and ODF&W will be closely consulted throughout the process.

g) Recreation - A study will be conducted to ascertain what the economic potential gained would be from recreation opportunites resulting from a multi-purpose water storage facility.

h) Geology/Geotechnical - Reclamation will contract qualified Geology/Geotechnical service providers to conduct core sampling at the site and submit a geology report.

Task 2. - Alternative Development will take approximately 12 months, and will commence January 2, 2010, and consists of the following:

a) Alternative Plan Refinement and Plan Formulation - The team will develop a more detailed design and development concept for the alternatives brought forward from the appraisal study. Inundation areas determined, dam type, and elevations will be developed. Construction consideration, operational performance considerations, interface with existing infrastructure, water delivery and conveyance considerations, and O&M considerations will be described.

b) Cost estimates - A more detailed cost estimate will be performed for the site. This estimate will be used in the economic analysis to determine cost to benefit ratio.

Task 3. - NEPA/Public Involvement will take approximately 12-18 months and will commence January 2011 and consists of the following tasks:

a) Scoping - Conduct public meetings to identify potential concerns, interests and issues.

b) Alternative Analysis & Screening - Reclamation is mandated by law to allow for specific time periods when conducting public meetings and comment periods. This process will employ those time periods.

c) Draft F/EIS Report Review - The draft report will be made available for public review and comment.

d) Comments - Comments are received and considered in the document.

e) Plan Selection - A plan is selected. A record of decision explaining the rational for the decision is based on substantial evidence will be published.

In reference to the above schedule and strategic approach...Reclamation will be responsible for all contracting and contractors. Prior to contracting the team will develop conceptual plans for each study and then further refine them with the designated contractor.

PHASED STUDY APPROACH:

PHASE I : Development Phase

STEP 1

Task 1. -Identify Goals

Task 2. -Identify Needs/Issues

Task 3. -Identify Decision Makers

PHASE II : Assessment Phase

STEP 1

Task 1. -Data Collection

STEP 2

Task 1. -Literature Review

Task 2. -Hydrologic Analysis

STEP 3

Task 1. -Hydrologic Analysis/Appraisal Study

Task 2. -Water Needs Assessment

Task 3. -Hydrologic Assessment

Task 4. -Develop Options and Alternatives with Stakeholder Working Group

STEP 4

~Feasibility Study/NEPA Process

Task 1. -Data Collection

Task 2. -Alternative Development

Task 3. -NEPA/Public Involvment

Task 4. -Effects Analysis

Task 5. -Report Preparation

Task 6. -ESA Consultation

PHASE III : IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

STEP 1

Task 1. -Pre-Implementation

Task 2. -Select an Option

b. When the planning study could begin.

The planning study is scheduled to begin June 1, 2009. The schedule for each of the three tasks for which funding is being requested as delineated above.

2. Provide a description of the relevant professional qualifications and/or experience of the person(s) that will play key roles in performing the planning study. If the personnel have not been decided upon, include a description of the professional qualifications and/or experience of the person(s) you anticipate will play key roles in performing the planning study.

The Bureau of Reclamation and Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee will put together a team of experienced professionals to perform various tasks in the study. It is anticipated that some of the team professionals conducting the Hydrologic Analysis will also be working on the two phases being presented in this grant application. Team members are as follows: Lesa Stark (BOR), Darrell Dyke (BOR), Christina Caswell (BOR), Peggy S. Browne (Browne Consulting), Jill

Myatt (Browne Consulting), Sheri Anderson (Browne Consulting), Janae Trindle (Browne Consulting).

Lesa Stark - Bachelor of Science Landscape Architecture, Washington State University. Over 14 years project management experience in the pacific northwest in land and water resource management and recreation design and stream restoration projects. 6 years experience in program management for water resource planning and ESA programs in the snake river basin. Past projects include: Emigrant lake resource management plan, pilgrim creek stream evaluation study, snake river resources review recreation evaluation, Boise/Payett storage study appraisal study, upper snake BA/BO section 7 consultation, Lewiston Orchards BA/BO section 7 consultationChristina Caswell -

Darrell Dyke - BS in Engineering Oregon State University, Professional Hydraulic Engineer, 10 years of hydrology analysis experience, 8 years experience with civil design and cost analysis, all with the Bureau of Reclamation. Past projects include San Juan Basin Hydrology Study, Upper Colorado Hydrology Study, Lower Colorado Water Accounting Study, Boise Valley Water Use Study and FCRPS Water Enhancement Projects.

Christina Caswell - BBA in Marketing, minors in Economics and International Business; MS in Human Performance Technology in progress (May 2009 graduation date), Boise State University, Project Manager, 15 years program and project management experience, seven years in natural resources planning. Past projects include: Corps of Engineers AK - Kake Dam Water Supply Study, Eyak Flood Control Project, Basset Army Hospital Military Construction Project, Dillingham West Bank Stabilization Project, Savoonga Breakwater Protection Project; Bureau of Land Management OR - Western Oregon Land Use Plan Revisions, Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan; Bureau of Reclamation - Upper Snake Basin ESA Consultation Project and Powder Basin Water Supply Study.

Peggy S. Browne - BS in Rangeland Ecology, Oregon State University with a minor in Crops and Soils Sciences. Professional Certificate in River Restoration Physical Processes and Ecological Processes, Portland State University, OR. 12 years as rangeland manager for local ranch. Owner of Browne Consulting, LLC in Baker City, Oregon. Past projects include: Powder Basin Watershed Council Education and Outreach Program, Project management and development Eagle Creek Restoration Project, Coordinator Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Project, numerous conservation projects.

Jill Myatt - BS Natural Resource Management, Northland College, WI. MA in Ecology and Natural Resources, St. Cloud State University, MN. Past projects include: Oregon statewide wetland delineations, Camp Ripley Noxious Weed Management Plan, Minnesota Dept. of Agriculture, developed monitoring program for invasive plant biological control, Cover and Frequency monitoring for Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, Browne Consulting - Kleinhoff Land Use and Water Rights Development, Dunning Land Use and Development.

Sheri Anderson - BS in Agriculture Business Management, Oregon State University with minors in Crops and Soils Sciences and Rangeland Ecology. Project Manager for Browne Consulting. Past projects include: OSU Extension Service, Water and Energy scheduling technician, Browne Consulting - Lead researcher and author of "North Powder Cost/Benefit Analysis", Lead Researcher and author of "Literature Review of the Powder Basin, Oregon", Project planner and manager Bingham Conservation Program in North Powder, OR.

Janae Trindle - BS in Business Administration from Eastern Oregon University with an emphasis in marketing. Office manager and Inside Sales 10 years at Moe Country Cupboards. Officer Manager of Browne Consulting, LLC. Past projects include: Interior marketing to McNary Dam, interior marketing to Orchard Homes (Housing Authority), and interior marketing to Pine Valley Ranches.

3. What local, state or federal project permitting requirements/issues do you anticipate in order for the planning study to be conducted?

There are no permitting requirements associated with Data Collection and Alternative Development Analysis. Permitting will come into play in the ESA Consultation identified as Task 6 of the Feasibility Study.

4. Are permits/governmental approvals required for the planning study? If yes, indicate whether you have obtained the necessary permits/governmental approval. If you have not obtained the necessary permits/governmental approval, describe the steps you have taken to obtain them.

No

5. Describe your goal (which must be based on evaluating the feasibility of developing a water conservation, reuse or storage project) and how this study helps to achieve the goal.

Powder Basin Water & Stream Committee's goal is to "enhance water quantity and quality in the Powder Basin". Taking into consideration the very low precipiation of the area (10-14"annual precipitation), high elevation topography with deep snowpack, water storage is expected to be an effective solution to a chronic problem. The Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation and numerous other partners have completed a "Whitepaper" which backgrounds the basin and the need for the project, a literature review which is a compilation of all known information pertaining to stream health and water storage within the Powder Basin, and a Cost/Benefit Analysis of the proposed North Powder Reservoir. We are scheduled to finish a Hydrologic Analysis of the entire basin by May 2009. Thus, we are at a critical step in the process of developing water storage. Feasibility is one of the last steps on the long path to building a multi-purpose water storage facility. The studies will dictate if the selected site will be environmentally viable and cost effective to construct.

Feasibility studies are an extremely expensive portion of the project. Total estimated cost for Powder Basin Feasibility Study is $1,385,000.00. At this time we have $500,000 secured/pending and thus are requesting the same. Therefore, we have broken the Feasibility Study into six tasks and at this time would like to proceed with Tasks 1-3.

6. Describe the technical aspects of the planning study and why your approaches are appropriate for accomplishing the goal of the planning study.

The Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee realized early in the process that guidance would be needed pertaining to the process and technical aspects of the processes of constructing an above-ground water storage project. Hence, an excellent partnership has been established with the Pacific Northwest Bureau of Reclamation in Boise, Idaho. Once the partnership was established the partners and stakeholders put together a phased approach for constructing a multi-purpose reservoir. The phased approach is described in Section IV.A.1. of this form above.

The project is currently mid-way through the Hydrologic Analysis which will specifically delineate and rank 3-4 above-ground water storage sites within the Powder Basin. The site ranked the highest will automoatically be selected for the feasibility study. If we are successful in obtaining this grant we will begin Tasks 1-3 of in Phase II of our project, which is the Feasibility Study. Notice that the Feasibility Study is broken down into six different tasks. Due to the time and cost of conducting an entire feasibility study we are proposing to only embark upon Tasks 1-3 at this time. In light of the

above facts, either the team members or professionals that meet Bureau of Reclamation standards will be employed to conduct the studies spelled out in question.

7. Describe the level of involvement, interest and/or commitment of different entities associated with the planning study (attach letters of support). Describe how these entities will benefit or be impacted by the planning study.

Eastern Oregon's most limiting resource is water. The vast majority comes in the form of snowpack in the mountains and quickly leaves the Powder Basin in the spring during runoff leaving streams hot and dry often starting in June and not ending until snowfall. That is why the Powder Basin Water & Stream Health project has the vast support it does. Notice on the attached spreadsheet that all the irrigation districts and all the Soil and Water Conservation Districts as well as two counties and USDA Rural Development have contributed to the project. It has been a goal of the steering committee that any project will take into consideration all beneficial uses: stream health, recreation, agriculture, fish, wildlife, hydro-power (if feasible), flood prevention, water quality, and tourism. Rather than ask who would benefit from an above-ground water storage project in Eastern Oregon a better question would be who or what would not benefit from additional water storage.

Irrigation Districts, Water Control Districts, and Soil and Water Conservation Districts would greatly benefit from the ability to irrigate land later into the season thus extending the growing season and increasing annual yeild. Additionally, late season instream low flows would be enhanced by increased subsurface flows and additional water left in-stream from the above-ground storage project. With the potential ability to capture spring run-off, much erosion can be prevented on very delicate soils and ecosystems. Finally, water quality will be enhanced through releasing cool water into warm streams in the summer season and decreasing turbidity during runoff.

Communities such as the Pine Valley/Halfway area support such a project with the hopes of keeping their community alive with increased recreation potential and tourism as well as hydro-power should a site be selected in that area. With an ongoing fight to keep their local school open as well as businesses, residents see the East Pine Reservoir as a potential solution to critical economic concerns.

Senator Smith, Senator Wyden, and Representative Walden are in support due to the fact that the difficult issues they address everyday such as, more water for fish and stream health, increased water quality, drought and energy costs would be mitigated.

If addressed correctly, and all beneficial uses considered, multi-purpose water storage in the Powder Basin is a win win for all basin residents.

☒ Above-Ground Storage

Please answer the following three questions **BEFORE** proceeding:

Will the project divert greater than 500 acre-feet of surface water annually?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Will the project impound surface water on a perennial stream?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Will the project divert water from a stream that supports sensitive, threatened or endangered species?	☒ Yes ☐ No

If you answered "Yes" to any one of these questions, by signature on this application, you are committing to include the following elements in your planning study:

- **Analyses of by-pass, optimum peak, flushing and other ecological flows of the affected stream and the impact of the storage project on those flows;**
- **Comparative analyses of alternative means of supplying water, including but not limited to the costs and benefits of water conservation and efficiency alternatives and the extent to which long-term water supply needs may be met using those alternatives;**
- **Analyses of environmental harm or impacts from the proposed storage project;**
- **Evaluation of the need for and feasibility of using stored water to augment in-stream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life and any other ecological values; and**
- **For a proposed storage project that is for municipal use, analysis of local and regional water demand and the proposed storage project's relationship to existing and planned water supply projects.**

Proceed in answering the following questions:

1. Describe when and to what extent the project associated with the planning study includes provisions for using stored water to augment instream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life or other ecological values.

   In addition to the environmental considerations required by NEPA that would occur as part of the feasibility study process, we would like to point out that since the inception of the project in 2005, all beneficial uses have been taken into consideration and will continue to be, including but not limited to: aquatic species and ecosystems, wildlife and terrestrial ecosystems, and instream and riparian health. All stakeholders, partners, and contributors are very well aware and supportive of this fact. In order to ensure that these interests are addressed we have participation or have requested participation from the following entities: US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, US Environmental Protection Agency, Oregon Trout, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Powder Basin Watershed Council, Hells Canyon Preservation Council, WaterWatch, and Nature Conservancy (this is not an all inclusive list of participants or those invited to participate.)

2. Describe the water supply need(s) that the project associated with the planning study in intended to meet. Applicant should reference supporting documentation that would be available upon request.

   The streams on the Powder Basin have been over-appropriated since the 1960's. Historically, streams have gone completely dry by as early as mid-June with no water storage available. Low summer flows are a well recognized contributor of poor riparian area and stream health conditions as well as a critical factore for the health of aquatic species. Water supply needs are identified in the following categories: streamflow, stream temperature, water use,

projected water use, irrigation, water rights, recreation, economy, and biology. No less than 58 documents have been written pertaining to one or more of the above topics regarding the Powder Basin. All of these are available upon request and have been included in a comprehensive literature review which addressed "stream systems, water storage, and stream health as they petain to the basin and water science". Water supply need has been thoroughly documented in the basin and is extremely extensive. Please reference "Literature Review of the Powder Basin, Oregon", May 2008.

A task associated with the Hydrologic Analysis is the Water Needs Assessment. The Water Needs Assessment quantifies current available water versus current unment water rights and thus delineates the amount of water needed. This is assessed for irrigation, in-stream rights/health, recreation, hydro-power, municipal, and flood control.

3. Explain how the project associated with the planning study will meet the water supply need(s), and indicate what percentage of that need will be met. (For example: If your water supply need is 20,000 acre-feet of additional water and the project will supply 10,000 additional acre-feet, 50% of your need will be met).

   As will be explained in question 5 of this section, we are currently in the process of developing criteria with which to select and rank water storage projects. One criteria may be related to the current water supply need not being fulfilled. For example, if a site has not met 70-80% of the current water supply need, then that site will not be considered. The water storage project would not be feasible if a large percentage of the water supply need is not fulfilled.

4. Present convincing argument that there are no other reasonably achievable alternatives that would be able to meet the water supply need(s). Applicant may reference supporting documentation that would be available upon request.

   Generally speaking the benefit of the NEPA process is that all feasible alternatives are identifed. Of those identified, some alternatives may not be further considered once identified, howerver those reasons will be provided and documented. The alternatives considered would be further analyzed in the NEPA process where ultimately a final alternative would be recommended. The benefit of the NEPA process is that it documents alternative sites considered and reasons why they were not selected as well as the justification for the final site that is selected.

   Specifically in Task 3. Public Involvement (NEPA) of the Feasibility Study process for this project, there is a specific line item of study for 'Alternative Analysis and Screening' which has $150,000 allocated to it to address this very question.

   Already known is that a water source is the limiting factor for the Powder Basin when considering reasonably achievable alternatives to above-ground water storage. Our source of water is the snow pack in the mountains. Therefore, we must capture, store, and have available for safe release the water that flows from the mountains during snowmelt.

   Also known is that the potential for below ground storage is limited at best due to numerous faults which run through the Powder Basin.

5. Provide data and information on the associated project and the project's sources of water supply:
   a. The location of the associated project. (Include the basin, county, township, range and section.)

The following explanation is intended to answer parts (a) and (b) of question 5. The Powder Basin has 74 potential water storage sites that would store more than 200 acre feet. Five

of those sites are existing storage sites that could be enlarged to increase water holding capacity. Throughout the process, these five sites have continuously received much support from residents throughout the basin. However, a justifiable and transparent process must be employed to prioritize and rank water storage sites. To accomplish this, the Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Committee and Reclamation are currently conducting a Hydrologic Analysis. When the study is complete 2-4 sites will be ranked as top priority and a feasiblity study will begin on site #1.

There are three main tasks associated with the Hydrologic Analysis: a Water Needs Assessment, a Hydrologic Assessment, and stakeholder involvement through a Stakeholder Working Group. The Water Needs Assessment quantifies current available water versus current unment water rights and thus delineates the amount of water needed. This is assessed for irrigation, in-stream rights/health, recreation, hydro-power, municipal, and flood control.

The Hydrologic Assessment is being conducted by Reclamation personel out of the Denver, Colorado office. It will justifiably show natural flows at key areas on streams in the basin versus the amount of water actually being used at these same key locations. The result will be truly how much water is available at a specific location in the basin at specific times throughout the year for storage.

The third piece of the study is the Stakeholder Working Group which consists of a diverse group of people all with an interest in water. HDR Engineering has been contracted to facilitate the meetings with assistance from Reclamation and Browne Consulting. The group is charged with identifying selection criteria which will 'weed out' some of the 74 potential water storage sites. The group is expected to come up with a list of 10-20 sites at which time the Hydrologic Assessment data and the Water Needs Assessment data will be overlaid with the short list of sites and the top 2-4 will be easily identified and ranked in order of priority.

As stated earlier, throughout the process five sites have had the most support. Those five sites in no particular order are: East Pine Reservoir, North Powder Reservoir, Hardman Dam, Ricco Dam, and enlarging the capacity of Thief Valley Reservoir. Interestingly enough, these sites represent five main rivers and three subbasins. East Pine Reservoir would divert water from East Pine Creek and Clear Creek. The North Powder Reservoir would store water from the North Powder River and is a tributary to the Powder River. The Hardman Dam would store water from the South Fork Burnt River which is a tributary to the Burnt River. The Ricco Dam would store water from the North Fork Burnt River which is a tributary to the Burnt River. Thief Valley Reservoir is already in existence and stores water from the Powder River and is a tributary to Brownlee Reservoir on the Snake River.

b. The name(s) and river mile(s) of the source water and what they are tributary to, if applicable.
see answer in (a) above

c. Whether the project will be off-channel or on-channel.
All but one potential project is proposed to be on-channel.

d. Water availability to meet project storage. (Typically, the Department evaluates new storage projects using a 50 percent water availability analysis.)

Reclamation has worked with OWRD utilizing the WARS model to determine water availability at specific sites within the Basin. Currently Reclamation is adding site specific data and information from the WARS model to have a more accurate evaluation of water availability at specific sites by incorporating natural streamflow.

e. Proposed purposes and uses of stored water.

Stored water will be used for multiple beneficial uses. Uses that will be considered at each site include: Recreation, stream health, agriculture, fish, wildlife, hydro-power, flood prevention, & water quality. If a beneficial use is not applicable to the storage site that is selected it will be eliminated from consideration. For example, not all sites will have the potential for hydroelectric power development.

f. Environmental flow needs and water quality requirements of supply source water bodies.

These concerns will be addressed throughout the Feasibility Study and its associated tasks. During Task 1 data will be collected which will then be analyzed to ascertain what flow needs are of the river. Water quality and stream flow will again be addressed during Scoping, Alternative analysis and screening and in the Draft F/EIS Report that will be written during the NEPA/Public Involvement steps. They will again be scutinized during the Effects Analysis and finally numbers will be scrutinized during Report Preparation. The NEPA process ensures that environmental issues are thoroughly and critically addressed.

6. Provide a review of the local, state, and/or federal permitting requirements and issues posed by the implementation of the project associated with the planning study.

   No local, state, or federal permits are required at this Step in the Phased Approach. However, once a site is selected as the priority we will file for Water Storage Rights and Water Usage Rights with the OWRD.

V. Match Funding Information

Applicants must demonstrate a minimum dollar-for-dollar match based on the total funding request. The match may include a) secured resources, b) previously expended resources, and/or c) pending resources. For secured funding, you must attach a letter of support from the match funding source that specially mentions the dollar amount shown in the "Amount/Dollar Value" column. For pending resources, documentation showing a request for the matching funds must accompany the application. For resources that have been previously expended, the expenditure must have occurred on or after July 1, 2005. Resources expended prior to July 1, 2005 are not eligible for match purposes.

The Type of matching funds may include:	The Status of matching funds may include:
• The value of in-kind labor, equipment rental and materials essential to the planning study provided by the applicant or partner*.	• Secured funding commitments from other sources.
• Cash is direct expenditures made in support of the planning study by the applicant.	• Associated and documented expenditures for the planning study from non-program sources incurred on or after July 1, 2005.
	• Pending commitments of funding from other sources. In such instances, Department funding will not be released prior to securing a commitment of the funds from other sources. Pending commitments of the funding must be secured within 12 months from the date of the award.

*"Partner" means a non-governmental or governmental person or entity that has committed funding, expertise, materials, labor, or other assistance to a proposed planning study. OAR 690-600-0010.

Match Funding Source (if in-kind, briefly describe the nature of the contribution)	**Type** (✓ One)	**Status** (✓ One)	**Amount/ Dollar Value**	**Date Match Funds Available** *(Month/Year)*
Baker County	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$14,000*	
Baker County	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☒ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending	*$7,000*	*September 08*
Baker County SWCD	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$1500*	
Burnt River Irrigation District	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$5,000*	
Eagle Valley SWCD	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$1,502*	
Keating SWCD	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$1,501*	
Lower Powder Irrigation District	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$2,000*	
ODA	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$3,000*	
OWRD	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☒ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending	*$20,000*	*July 08*
Powder Valley Irrigation District	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$5,000*	

V. Match Funding Information

Applicants must demonstrate a minimum dollar-for-dollar match based on the total funding request. The match may include a) secured resources, b) previously expended resources, and/or c) pending resources. For secured funding, you must attach a letter of support from the match funding source that specially mentions the dollar amount shown in the "Amount/Dollar Value" column. For pending resources, documentation showing a request for the matching funds must accompany the application. For resources that have been previously expended, the expenditure must have occurred on or after July 1, 2005. Resources expended prior to July 1, 2005 are not eligible for match purposes.

The Type of matching funds may include:	The Status of matching funds may include:
• The value of in-kind labor, equipment rental and materials essential to the planning study provided by the applicant or partner*.	• Secured funding commitments from other sources.
• Cash is direct expenditures made in support of the planning study by the applicant.	• Associated and documented expenditures for the planning study from non-program sources incurred on or after July 1, 2005.
	• Pending commitments of funding from other sources. In such instances, Department funding will not be released prior to securing a commitment of the funds from other sources. Pending commitments of the funding must be secured within 12 months from the date of the award.

*"Partner" means a non-governmental or governmental person or entity that has committed funding, expertise, materials, labor, or other assistance to a proposed planning study. OAR 690-600-0010.

Match Funding Source (if in-kind, briefly describe the nature of the contribution)	**Type** (✓ **One**)	**Status** (✓ **One**)	**Amount/ Dollar Value**	**Date Match Funds Available** *(Month/Year)*
RBEG Grant	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$5,031*	
Union County	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$1,500*	
USDA Rural Development	☒ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$2,969*	
Bureau of Reclamation	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☒ expended ☐ pending	*$251,907*	
Bureau of Reclamation	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☒ pending	*$300,000*	
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending		
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending		
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending		
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending		
ADDITIONAL PAGE ADDED WHEREAS TABLE COULD NOT BE UNLOCKED	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ expended ☐ pending		

VI. Project Planning Study Schedule

Estimated Project Duration: June 1, 2009 to July 1, 2012

Place an "X" in the appropriate column to indicate when each element (key task) of the project will take place.

	2009				2010				2011
Project Planning Study Element (Key Tasks)	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	& Beyond
DATA COLLECTION: Water quality		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Hydrology		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Economic		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Cultural		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Real Estate/Land Owership		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Geology/Geotech		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Fish & Wildlife		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT: Design					X	X	X	X	
Cost Estimate					X	X	X	X	
NEPA/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Scoping									X
Alternative Analysis and Screening									X
Draft F/EIS Report Review									X
Comments									X
Plan Selection									X

VII. Project Planning Study Budget

Section A

Please provide an estimated line item budget for the project planning study. An example would include: labor, materials, equipment, contractual services and administrative costs.

Line Items *Note: Administrative costs may not exceed 10% of the total funding requested by the Department.*	**Unit Number** *(e.g. # of hours)*	**Unit Cost** *(e.g. hourly rate)*	**In-Kind Match**	**Cash Match Funds**	**OWRD Grant Funds**	**Total Cost**
Please Note: 1. We are unable to expand table so are combining multiple key tasks into single rows to accommodate issue and ensure capture of data. 2. The range in unit cost runs between $35/hr. to $120/hr. for various levels of expertise in the various disciplines throughout the study process. Given limited ability for cost break-down in this table, a unit cost average of $50 will be used for each discipline for this table. *DATA COLLECTION: Water Quality*	*1400*	*$50.00*		*$35,000*	*$35,000*	*70,000*
Hydrology, Economics	*4000*	*$50.00*		*$100,000*	*$100,000*	*$200,000*
Cultural, Real Estate/Land Ownership	*600*	*$50.00*		*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$30,000*
Geology/Geotech, Fish & Wildlife	*3400*	*$50.00*		*$85,000*	*$85,000*	*$170,000*
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT: Design,Cost Estimates	*5900*	*$50.00*		*$147,500*	*$147,500*	*$295,000*
NEPA/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Scoping	*800*	*$50.00*		*$20,000*	*$20,000*	*$40,000*
Alternatives Analysis and Screening	*3000*	*$50.00*		*$75,000*	*$75,000*	*$150,000*
DraftF/EIS Report Review, Comments, Plan Selection	*480*	*$50.00*		*$12,000*	*$12,000*	*$24,000*
Administrative Costs	*1800*	*$50.00*		*$45,000*	*$45,000*	*$90,000*
Total for Section A				*$500,000*	*$500,000*	*$1,000,000*
Percentage for Section A				***50***	***50***	***100%***

Section B

If Grant amount requested is $50,000 or greater, you <u>MUST</u> complete Section B. Elements (key tasks) in Section B should be the same as the elements (key tasks) in Section VI (Project Planning Study Schedule).

Project Planning Study Element (Key Tasks)	**In-Kind Match**	**Cash Match Funds**	**OWRD Grant Funds**	**Total Cost**
DATA COLLECTION: Water Quality		*$35,000*	*$35,000*	*$70,000*
Hydrology		*$65,000*	*$65,000*	*$130,000*
Economic		*$20,000*	*$20,000*	*$40,000*
Cultural		*$10,000*	*$10,000*	*$20,000*
Real Estate/Land Ownership		*$5,000*	*$5,000*	*$10,000*
Geology/Geotech		*$70,000*	*$70,000*	*$140,000*
Fish & Wildlife		*$15,000*	*$15,000*	*$30,000*
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT: Design		*$110,000*	*$110,000*	*$220,000*
Cost Estimates		*$27,500*	*$27,500*	*$55,000*
NEPA/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Scoping		*$20,000*	*$20,000*	*$40,000*
Altnernative Analysis and Screening		*$75,000*	*$75,000*	*$150,000*
Draft F/EIS Report Review		*$5,000*	*$5,000*	*$10,000*
Comments		*$5,000*	*$5,000*	*$10,000*
Plan Selection		*$2,500*	*$2,500*	*$5,000*
Administrative Costs		*$45,000*	*$45,000*	*$90,000*
Total for Section B		*$500,000*	*$500,000*	*$1,000,000*

Totals in Section B must match the totals in Section A

Request to be added to the Oregon Water Resources Department's

Inventory of Potential Conservation Opportunities

The purpose of this inventory is to catalogue potential conservation projects that water users themselves have identified but not yet pursued because of financial, institutional, or other barriers. For the purpose of this application, water storage other than above-ground are included as conservation opportunities and are most likely capital conservation projects.

As a water provider or user, you know your water demands and water conservation opportunities better than anyone. We would appreciate your assistance with this important data collection effort by completing this survey. Your participation will help provide the building blocks we need to begin to identify and achieve potential future water supplies. Please answer the questions as completely as possible, to the best of your ability. We appreciate your help with this important effort.

This inventory of already-identified, potential conservation projects includes both capital and programmatic projects. Capital projects are defined as one-time, large investments resulting in water savings. Examples include reclaimed water plants, reservoir covering, transmission line upgrades reducing leaks, or industrial engineering modifications to re-use process water. Programmatic projects are defined as ongoing investments resulting in water savings. Examples include facilitating upgrades to more efficient water using devices (e.g., distributing free showerheads, toilet rebates) and distribution system leak detection programs. The conservation inventory is primarily intended to include "planned" projects rather than projects that are currently being implemented. However, currently active programmatic projects may be listed if they will continue or expand in future years. The inventory of projects submitted will be compiled by county or basin.

Examples are provided below.

	Example **Capital Conservation Project**	**Example** **Programmatic Conservation Project**
Project Description Provide brief sentence	Line 3 miles of unlined ditch.	Toilet rebate program for residential customers
Estimated Future Savings Provide brief sentence, including information regarding savings seasonality.	20 acre feet of water per year	If we spend our full budget each year, we estimate 50,000 gallons of water save per year
Seasonality Indicate what part of the year savings are generated (e.g. year-round; summer only; etc.).	Peak (irrigation) season savings.	Savings should occur throughout the year.
Estimated Future Costs Provide brief sentence.	$500,000 total project costs.	$40,000 a year.
Implementation Schedule Provide brief sentence.	Not set. Have conducted cost and savings estimate, but still seeking funding.	We started the program in 2005 and plan to implement until 2015.
Project Funded? Designate either "yes", "no", or provide brief sentence if necessary	No. Pursuing grant funding.	Yes. IN our CIP through the next 5 years.

To add a project to the inventory of potential conservation opportunities, please provide the following information for each conservation project.

This is a ☐ Capital Conservation Project ☐ Programmatic Conservation Project	
Project #/Name	
Project Description	
Estimated Future Savings	
Seasonality	
Estimated Future Costs	
Implementation Schedule	
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	
This is a ☐ Capital Conservation Project ☐ Programmatic Conservation Project	
Project #/Name	
Project Description	
Estimated Future Savings	
Seasonality	
Estimated Future Costs	
Implementation Schedule	
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	

- Include this form with your application -

Short list of projects submitted to HDR Engineering & OWRD for inclusion in OWSCI.

POWDER BASIN - INVENTORY OF PROJECTS FOR OWSCI

Project Name	East Pine Reservoir
Project Description	18,000 af impounded for multiple beneficial uses including hydropower
Project Location	Melhorn Mill outside of Halfway, OR, Baker County
Estimated Future Savings	18,000 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$40M
Implementation Schedule	7 years until construction
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding, ESA -bull trout

Project Name	North Powder Reservoir
Project Description	16,650 af impoundment instream N. Powder River - multiple beneficial uses including hydropower
Project Location	T7S R43E S10 Baker County, OR
Estimated Future Savings	16,650 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$40-65M
Implementation Schedule	7 years until construction
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding, possibly ESA, possibly land acquisition

Project Name	Rock Creek Dam
Project Description	4,000 af impoundment instream Rock Creek for multiple beneficial uses including hydropower
Project Location	T8S R38E S18 Baker County, OR site AKA Eilertsons Meadows
Estimated Future Savings	4000 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$400,000
Implementation Schedule	10 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding, possibly ESA

Project Name	Muddy Ck Dam
Project Description	4,900 af off-stream impoundment of Muddy Ck for multiple beneficial use
Project Location	T7S R 39E S 21
Estimated Future Savings	4,900 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$500,000
Implementation Schedule	10 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding

Project Name	Ricco Dam
Project Description	6,500 af impoundment, instream channel of N. Fork Burnt River for multiple beneficial use, possibly hydropower
Project Location	T10S R36E S30 NW1/4
Estimated Future Savings	6,500 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	1,000,000
Implementation Schedule	9 years, a Fatal Flaw Analysis has been conducted
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding, possibly ESA, possibly wetland mitigation

Project Description	17,800 af impoundment, instream channel of S. Fork Burnt River for multiple beneficial uses, possibly hydropower
Project Location	T13S R36E S23 SW1/4
Estimated Future Savings	17,800 af per year
Seasonality	stored fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	20,000,000
Implementation Schedule	11 years, a Fatal Flaw Analysis has been conducted
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding, possibly ESA

Project Name	Bert's Reservoir
Project Description	721 af impoundment in-channel of Alder Ck. For irrigation and instream during low flows
Project Location	T11S R42E S12 Alder Creek
Estimated Future Savings	unknown
Seasonality	fall, winter, spring
Estimated Cost of Construction	$750,000
Implementation Schedule	3 years, water right permits have been applied for
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	fish passage, funding

Project Name	Thief Valley Reservoir - new dam
Project Description	Build a new dam w/ fish passage downstream of the existing dam
Project Location	T6S R04E S26
Estimated Future Savings	an additional 10,000 af per year
Seasonality	same as current -storage fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$20M
Implementation Schedule	5 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	Funding

Project Name	Sugar Loaf Reservoir Expansion Project
Project Description	Increase ht of dam, current capacity 260af enlarge another 200af
Project Location	T6S R46E S5
Estimated Future Savings	460 af per year
Seasonality	store fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$500,000
Implementation Schedule	5 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding

Project Name	Melhorn Reservoir Expansion
Project Description	Increase reservoir capacity by adding onto dam. Current capacity is 165 af want to increase another 200 af
Project Location	T 6S R46E Sec 7
Estimated Future Savings	365 af per year
Seasonality	store fall, winter, spring; safe release summer
Estimated Cost of Construction	$400,000
Implementation Schedule	8 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding

Project Name	Pilcher Creek Reservoir Expansion Project
Project Description	Increase ht. Of dam or dredge project
Project Location	T 6S/R38E/Sec 16
Estimated Future Savings	unknown at this time, will save water and electricity
Seasonality	during fall, winter, and spring runoff

Estimated Cost of Construction	unknown until site feasibility study
Implementation Schedule	Not set, must conduct site feasibility study
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	funding

Project Name	Wolf Creek Water Conservation Project
Project Description	Pipe approximately 3 miles of irrigation delivery ditches to reduce seepage, evaporation, and increase subsurface returns, riparian area health, and late season flows
Project Location	T 6S/R38E/Sec 11
Estimated Future Savings	7,079 af of water per year
Seasonality	irrigation season
Estimated Cost of Construction	10,800,000
Implementation Schedule	2 years
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	Funding

Project Name	Wolf Creek Reservoir Expansion Project
Project Description	Enlarge storage capacity of reservoir by either increasing dam ht or dredging existing reservoir.
Project Location	T 6S/R38E/Sec 11
Estimated Future Savings	unknown at current time will conserve power and water
Seasonality	storage of fall, winter, and spring runoff; safe release during summer months
Estimated Cost of Construction	unknown until site feasibility study can be conducted
Implementation Schedule	Not set, must conduct site feasibility study
What are the barriers to implementation, e.g. funding?	Funding, fish passage, diversion replacement laws

POWDER VALLEY WATER CONTROL DISTRICT

P.O. Box 189-690 E Street, North Powder, OR 97867 Tele: (541) 898-2366
Fax: (541) 898-2548 Email: pvwater@ucinet.com
Hearing Impaired – Call 711

February 28, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

The Powder Valley Water Control District would like to voice strong support of the Powder Basin Water and Stream Health Committee. To date the Committee has made several important accomplishments toward better water stewardship within the basin. One recent undertaking that the District is specifically interested in is the Hydraulic Analysis for the entire basin which is currently underway.

In the near future the District hopes that more support can be raised throughout local, state and federal levels to accomplish the next steps needed to continue, an example would be the Feasibility Studies for several potential water storage sites, including the North Powder Reservoir.

The District is pleased to be a local sponsor of the Water and Stream Health Committee, and would encourage organizations and other interested parties to join in the support effort for a project advocating the beneficial storage and use of our precious natural resource. Finding new water storage facilities must be a high priority or water issues and shortages will continue to become more widespread; which, in effect, will cause the solution to be more difficult and cost prohibitive to pursue.

Sincerely,

Aaron Umpleby

Aaron Umpleby
Manager, PVWCD

August 27, 2008
Halfway, OR

To Whom It May Concern:

We the elected officers of the Pine Valley Community Watershed Project would like to show our support the for grant application presented by Peggy Browne of the Water and Stream Health group to the Water Resources Board for the completion of the study of a possible East Pine Dam and others in this area.

Our group has set priorities for the use of the stored water and believe it could have a large positive impact on this community. This community struggles to offer living wage jobs and we feel it would certainly offer some opportunities for employment which could bring or keep families in the area and the benefits would be widespread.

Some of the priorities we set are as follows: Recreation, hydroelectric, increased stream flow, employment, agriculture, economic development, flood control and fire suppression.

Please give serious consideration to funding this project.

KELLY ROWEN, President

KERRY GULICK, Vice President

JOANN POLLOCK, Secretary

GORDON H. SMITH
OREGON

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
INDIAN AFFAIRS
CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510–3704

June 15, 2006

Ms. Peggy S. Browne
Coordinator
Powder Basin Water and Stream Health Committee
50809 Ellis Road
North Powder, OR 97867

Dear Ms. Browne:

I am writing to commend your efforts with the Powder Basin Water and Stream Health Project. Your work in reaching out to partners and stakeholder groups regarding the future of Baker County's water supply is a great example of a locally-developed solution using innovative approaches for the good of the entire community.

As you note, the population of Baker County is increasing and the water needs for agriculture, recreation, the environment and wildlife are increasing as well. There is a need to explore all options to make certain that various water needs are met. I am a firm believer that farmers and ranchers are protectors of the environment, since they recognize that healthy land is productive land. An abundant and predictable water supply will ensure that Baker County maintains a healthy environment, and remains a viable long-term community for farmers and ranchers.

Throughout my years in the United States Senate, I have pledged to use my position to support the rural communities of Oregon. Coming from a rural community myself, I understand first hand the challenges rural Oregon faces today. I am in full support of your efforts to enhance the water quality and quantity in the Powder Basin and I will do all that I can to help you in your efforts. I have submitted the Powder Basin Water and Stream Health Committee's 2007 request to the Senate Appropriations Energy and Water Subcommittee for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin an appraisal study for the basin. While we all need to recognize that funds will be limited next fiscal year, I will continue to work with the Oregon congressional delegation and the Senate Appropriations Committee as we move forward with the 2007 appropriations process.

Please keep me informed of your progress and let me know how I can help as you move forward with the Water and Stream Health Project.

Sincerely,

Gordon H. Smith
United States Senator

Water for Life, Inc.

A Non-Profit Organization

April 26, 2006

Peggy Browne
Powder Basin Water and Stream Health
50809 Ellis Road
North Powder, OR 97867

Dear Peggy:

Thank you so much for making the trip to Sisters to do the presentation about the Powder Basin water storage project. The Water for Life Board of Directors enjoyed the presentation and are excited to hear about the work your Committee is doing to develop new water storage in the Powder Basin.

Water for Life endorses your project and we would be happy to support your efforts to move this project forward.

I'll look forward to working with you on water related issues in the future.

Sincerely,

Helen

Helen Moore
Executive Director

P.O. Box 12248
Salem, Oregon
97309-0248

Office:
(503) 375-6003

Fax:
(503) 375-9017

E-Mail:
info@waterforlife.net

Web Site:
www.waterforlife.net

Burnt River Irrigation District

19498 Hwy 245
Hereford, Oregon 97837
Phone (541) 446-3313
E-Mail: briver@ortelco.net

February 6, 2008

Oregon Water Resources Department
North Mall Office Building
725 Summer St. NE, Suite A
Salem, OR 97301-1271

Reference: Baker County Water and Stream Health

To Whom it May Concern

The Burnt River Irrigation District (BRID) is a member of and gives it's total support to the Baker County Water and Stream Health (WASH) committee.

As a member of the WASH committee, we agree with the goals and objectives of the committee and actively support their efforts to enhance stream health by all means possible. This includes but is not limited to increased storage for late season flows, riparian restoration, and encouraging increased water use efficiency.

Sincerely;

Jerry Franke

Jerry Franke, Manager

Peggy S. Browne

From: Rachel Birr [rbirr@pn.usbr.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2008 10:07 AM
To: Christina Caswell; Lesa Stark
Subject: Study Costs

Attachments: FY09 Burnt, Malheur, Powder.doc

FY09 Burnt, lalheur, Powder.do

Lesa, I think the easiest thing to do is give you a combined capability statement that reflects all costs. I am attaching the capability statement. The Allocations through FY 2007 are the actuals for all years of the study and is based on EXPENDITURES.

In FY 2006 Powder Burnt River Basins obligated a total $37K. Your expenditures were $59,934 (actuals)

In FY 2007 Powder Burnt River Basins obligated a total $21K. Your expenditures were $43,973 (actuals)

In FY 2008 Powder Burnt River Basins obligated a total $36K. Your expenditures through July 31, 2008 are $0.00

The capability statement is from a point in time around February/March 2008 so the costs are a bit different since a few more months have gone by since then.

Call me if you have questions. Rachel

Project Name in Hill Request: Powder Basin Water & Stream Health Project (143, 154, and 20557)

Bureau Project: Malheur, Owyhee, Powder, Burnt River Basins Feasibility Study (OR)

Appropriation: Water and Related Resources

Authorization: P.L. 107-237, The Burnt, Malheur, Owyhee, and Powder River Basin Water Optimization Feasibility Study Act of 2001.

Summarized Financial Data	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Total Estimated Cost	$574,250	$575,750	$1,150,000
Allocations through FY 2007 1/	126,250	126,250	252,500
Approved by Congress FY 2008	148,000	148,000	296,000
Budget Request for FY 2009	0	0	0
Balance to Complete after FY 2009	300,000	301,500	601,500
Amount Requested by Member (H)	300,000	0	300,000
Amount Requested by Member (S)	300,000	0	300,000
Additional Capability for FY 2009	300,000	0	300,000

1/ Allocations through FY 2007 were included in the Oregon Investigations Program.

Location/Description: The Baker County Water and Stream Health project addresses water supply issues in the Powder basin. The Powder basin includes three watersheds, The Powder River, Burnt River and Pine Creek. The Powder basin is located in Baker and Union counties in southeast Oregon and drains into the Snake River. In the Powder River watershed, Reclamation owns the Baker Project, which includes Philips reservoir and Thief Valley reservoir, operated by the Baker Irrigation District. In the Burnt River watershed, Reclamation owns the Burnt River project, which includes Unity reservoir, operated by the Burnt River Irrigation District.

Project Status: The Baker County Water and Stream Health (BCWASH) committee is in the initial stages of this study. Primary activities since 2005 have been to develop a well-organized and diverse partnership, develop a well-defined problem statement and scope of work to address watershed health and water supply problems and search for funding sources and grant opportunities. In 2007, Reclamation participated in the partnership through the Oregon Investigations Program and completed literature review. Reclamation funded $20,000 and the BCWASH matched the $20,000.

Additional Capability for FY 2009: Reclamation has the capability to spend up to $300,000 in FY 2009 on this project. The first year of this study in 2007 completed a literature review, identification of existing data and data gaps, further definition of objectives and development of options and alternatives to be evaluated. The second year 2008 would require a thorough analysis of the water supply, evaluation of demands and potential new or existing sources available to meet the demands. The third and fourth years (2009 - 2010) would focus on the analysis of the options and determine feasibility of the proposed project. This phase includes the incorporation of NEPA compliance to understand impact to the environment, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act activities, preliminary cost estimates and economic viability analysis.

The additional capability shown was not included in the President's budget and is not a priority of the Department.

Submission of this capability statement does not reflect departmental support. The Department does not support the addition of funds for any project, which would result in the reduction of funding for other projects included in the budget.

Problem Areas: It is the policy of Reclamation to require 50 percent cost-share for appraisal and feasibility studies. Non-Federal contributions have met or exceeded the required 50 percent cost-share to date; however, capability by non-Federal partners to continue this level of commitment in FY 2009 is not assured at this time.

Congressional Location and Representation:
State of Oregon
2nd Congressional District – Greg Walden (R)
Senators: Ron Wyden (D)
Gordon Smith (R)

Congressional Members Requesting Additional Funding:
Senators: Wyden (D)
Smith (R)

Baker County Water and Stream Health Steering Committee
Financial Review

Description	Date of Transaction	Revenue	Expenditure	Balance
Beginning Fund		$3,500.00		$3,500.00
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	10/17/2005		$855.00	$2,645.00
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	11/14/2005		$930.00	$1,715.00
Copy, Ship and Mail	11/30/2005		$79.85	$1,635.15
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	12/19/2005		$912.98	$722.17
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	1/16/2006		$1,080.00	-$357.83
Burnt River Irrigation District	1/17/2006	$1,500.00		$1,142.17
Powder Valley Water Control District	1/19/2006	$1,500.00		$2,642.17
Hudson Printing Co.	1/16/2006		$56.81	$2,585.36
Oregon Dept. of Ag.	2/10/2006	$3,000.00		$5,585.36
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	2/16/2006		$1,845.00	$3,740.36
Burnt River SWCD	2/22/2006	$1,500.00		$5,240.36
Copy, Ship and Mail	3/3/2006		$36.85	$5,203.51
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	4/7/2006		$3,980.82	$1,222.69
Hudson Printing Co.	4/27/2006		$115.00	$1,107.69
Hudson Printing Co.	6/20/2006		$38.04	$1,069.65
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	7/3/2006		$4,937.50	-$3,867.85
2006-07 Budget	7/1/2006	$3,500.00		-$367.85
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	8/11/2006		$3,316.25	-$3,684.10
Baker Valley SWCD	9/29/2006	$1,500.00		-$2,184.10
Keating SWCD	10/17/2006	$1,501.00		-$683.10
Eagle Valley SWCD	10/17/2006	$1,502.00		$818.90
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	12/11/2006		$818.90	$0.00
Powder Valley Water Control District	2/8/2007	$2,000.00		$2,000.00
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	2/19/2007		$776.42	$1,223.58
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	2/19/2007		$899.49	$324.09
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	2/26/2007		$242.67	$81.42
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	3/26/2007		$352.92	-$271.50
2007-08 Budget	7/1/2007	$7,000.00		$6,728.50
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	8/13/2007		$5,468.73	$1,259.77
Union County	6/14/2007	$1,500.00		$2,759.77
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	11/12/2007		$2,649.74	$110.03
RBEG Grant	1/17/2008	$779.00		$889.03
Lower Powder Irrigation Dist.	2/13/2008	$2,000.00		$2,889.03
Coordinator, Peggy Browne	2/20/2008		$2,170.01	$719.02
Keating SWCD	2/20/2008	$2,008.00		$2,727.02
RBEG Grant	3/4/2008	$4,252.00		$6,979.02
Peggy Browne, inv#1237,1239,1240	3/11/2008		$4,366.26	$2,612.76
Burnt River SWCD	4/23/2008	$2,000.00		$4,612.76
Peggy Browne, inv#1252	4/23/2008		$2,059.17	$2,553.59
Peggy Browne, Inv # 1257	4/23/2008		$2,683.34	-$129.75
USDA Rural Development	5/9/2008	$2,969.00		$2,839.25
Peggy Browne, Inv # 1272	5/16/2008		$1,122.91	$1,716.34
Peggy Browne, Inv # 1273	5/16/2008		$1,872.49	-$156.15
Powder Valley Water Control District	6/18/2008	$1,500.00		$1,343.85
Browne Consulting # 1288	6/18/2008		$621.25	$722.60
Browne Consulting #1289 $977.09(254.49)	6/18/2008		$722.60	$0.00
State of Oregon Water Resources Dept.	7/8/2008	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
Browne Consulting #1224, 1225, 1226	1/31/2008		$1,919.15	$8,080.85
Browne Consulting #1310,1311 & bal. from #1289	6/30/2008		$2,080.33	$6,000.52
Browne Consulting #1315 & 1316	8/1/2008		$983.03	$5,017.49

Peggy S. Browne

From: Vaillancourt, Jason (Gordon Smith) [Jason_Vaillancourt@gsmith.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2008 11:17 AM
To: pegbrowne@eoni.com
Subject: FW: Smith, Wyden Announce Funds for Oregon Energy and Water Projects

Here you go

From: Scales, Sally-Shannon (Gordon Smith) **On Behalf Of** Press Office (Gordon Smith)
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2008 11:13 AM
Subject: Smith, Wyden Announce Funds for Oregon Energy and Water Projects

News Release . . .

United States Senate

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
July 18, 2008

CONTACT: Gordon Smith Press Office
(202) 224-8329
Tom Fazzini (Wyden)
(202) 224-3789

Smith, Wyden Announce Funds for Oregon Energy and Water Projects

Washington, D.C. – Oregon Senators Gordon Smith and Ron Wyden announced today that they are one step closer to securing critical federal funding for Oregon energy and water projects. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved these projects last week as part of the Fiscal 2009 Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, which now heads for the Senate floor.

"The management and protection of Oregon's abundant natural resources are vital to our state's economy and way of life," said Smith. "These funds will also strengthen our ability to research and develop initiatives for renewable energy and conservation."

"These funds will help restore ecosystems and will make OIT the only campus in the world to be completely geothermally powered," said Wyden. "With these resources, Oregon will break new ground in the areas of energy and environmental technology."

The funding bill provides $1.6 million for the Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) to construct a geothermal power plant on its campus that, once completed, will make OIT the only campus in the world to satisfy all of its energy needs from a geothermal energy source.

The Klamath Project is slated to receive $25.008 million; and $36 million was allocated for the Columbia River Channel deepening.

Other projects approved for funding include:

- Savage Rapids Dam Removal -- $3 million
- Burnt, Malheur, Owyhee and Powder River Basin Water Optimization Feasibility Study -- $300,000
- Crooked River Project -- $851,000
- Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project -- $300,000
- Deschutes Project -- $1.166 million
- Eastern Oregon Projects -- $828,000
- Oregon Investigations Program -- $444,000
- Rogue River Basin Project, Talent Division -- $902,000
- Tualatin Basin Water Supply Project -- $400,000
- Tualatin Project Title Transfer and Facility Assessment Study -- $106,000
- Tualatin Project -- $381,000
- Umatilla Project -- $3.932 million
- Christmas Valley Renewable Energy Development, Oregon Department of Energy -- $400,000
- Oregon Solar Highway, Oregon Department of Transportation -- $1 million
- Columbia River Treaty Access Sites, OR & WA -- $2.455 million
- Elk Creek Lake -- $3.12 million
- Willamette Temperature Control -- $3.331 million
- Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration, OR & WA -- $1.5 million
- Columbia River Fish Mitigation, OR & WA -- $92 million
- Applegate Lake -- $904,000
- Blue River Lake -- $427,000
- Bonneville Lock and Dam -- $9.691 million
- Chetco River -- $574,000
- Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers Below Vancouver -- $18.052 million
- Columbia River at the Mouth -- $15.125 million
- Columbia River at Baker Bay -- $500,000
- Columbia River between Vancouver and the Dalles --$640,000
- Columbia River and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project -- $18 million
- The Dalles Lock and Dam -- $7.696 million
- Coos Bay -- $4.769 million
- Coquille River -- $307,000
- Cottage Grove Lake -- $991,000
- Cougar Lake -- $5.380 million
- Depoe Bay -- $124,000
- Detroit Lake -- $ 2.564 million
- Dorena Lake -- $831,000
- Fall Creek Lake -- $1.418 million
- Fern Ridge Lake -- $1.433 million
- Green Peter-Foster Lakes -- $2.323 million
- Hills Creek Lake -- $1.292 million
- Inspection of Completed Environmental Projects -- $33,000
- Inspection of Completed Works -- $413,000
- John Day Lock and Dam -- $7.049 million
- Lookout Point Lake -- $2.761 million
- Lost Creek Lake -- $3.560 million
- McNary Lock and Dam -- $5.183 million
- Port Orford -- $7,000

- Project Condition Surveys -- $220,000
- Rogue River at Gold Beach -- $587,000
- Scheduling Reservoir Operations -- $82,000
- Siuslaw River -- $583,000
- Skipanon Channel -- $ 5,000
- Tillamook Bay and Bar -- $2.2 million
- Umpqua River -- $635,000
- Willamette River at Willamette Falls -- $210,000
- Willamette River Bank Protection -- $62,000
- Willow Lake Creek -- $610,000
- Yaquina Bay and Harbor -- $1.482 million
- Yaquina River -- $300,000
- Amazon Creek – FEAS -- $350,000
- Walla Walla River Watershed – PED -- $500,000
- Willamette River Floodplain Restoration – FEAS -- $240,000

The committee also expressed support for Arrowhead Creek, Beaver Creek, Eugene Delta Ponds, Camp Creek-Zumwalt Prairie, and the Springfield Millrace – all ecosystem restoration projects – as well as the Port of Arlington's dock removal project and the City of Portland's Columbia Slough Section 1135 restoration project. Those projects are all eligible for federal funding, to be determined at a later date by the Army Corps of Engineers.

###