

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6024	Project Type:	Education
Project Name:	STELLAR		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$23,496.00	Total Cost:	\$41,550.00

Application Description

STELLAR, a valuable education and outreach program started in 1996, proposes to continue providing activities and services to 2,000 Milton Freewater and 225 Weston students related to water resources and watershed health. The program incorporates over 14 different facets including: the Leidall outdoor learning lab; Grove School 4th grade River Studies; the W3 (Wonderful World of Water) K-8th grade curriculum; "In the Footsteps of Explorers" field sessions; Ferndale 4th and 5th grade science classes; the Watershed Field day for Ferndale 1st and 4th graders; a district-wide 5th grade ecosystem habitat field day, SOLV/Public Lands Day; Watershed Calendar contest for Weston-Athena and home schooled students; Arbor Poster Contest; 5th grade Wildlife Field Day; Summer Science Camp; Grove and Ferndale Weather Stations; and the Fish Egg to Fry STEP classroom project. Partners include Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council, agency and community volunteers and various grants.

OWEB requested for project management (87%), travel (2%), supplies/materials (1%), equipment (1%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team acknowledged the good track record of this long standing educational effort in the Milton-Freewater area. The amount of money requested is a very good value based on the number of students served and the diversity of programs offered. Education to youth relating to natural resources and ecological health is a good investment and especially when experienced out in the field and in the area where those youth live. Teaching kids is a good way to reach residents, with kids taking home information learned. This is especially beneficial in the Hispanic community. The application would have been stronger by summarizing the results of previous projects and how the projects have made a difference, as well as providing letters of support from school administrators, teachers, the community and/or other involved participants. There was concern that the pending match could impact the success of program if not awarded. The Review Team felt this proposal was ready for funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

3 of 5

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$23,496.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount

EM Portion

PE Portion

Non-Capital Amount
\$23,496.00

Total Recommended Board Award

\$23,496.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.: 211-6026	Project Type: Education
Project Name: Eastern Oregon Natural Resources Camp 2011	
Applicant: The Grant County 4-H Leaders Assoc	
Basin: LAKES	County: Grant
OWEB Request: \$6,000.00	Total Cost: \$32,590.00

Application Description

The Natural Resource Camp brings 100 urban and rural youth from across the region ranging from 6th to 9th grades to a 3½ day camp in Logan Valley, located in Grant County. The camp format focuses on the students working and interacting in the field with professionals from fisheries, riparian habitat, hydrology, forestry, range, alternative energy and many other careers relating to natural resource management. Two restoration projects are incorporated into the camp agenda so students can experience on-the-ground and hands-on natural resource activities. Over 14 agencies were identified as partners and volunteer instructors.

OWEB funds were requested for contracted services (68%), supplies/materials (17%), and equipment (15%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the regional approach targeting both urban and rural youth. This was the second time this group came to OWEB for funding. Several of the review team knew of this venture and felt it was very successful. The team, as a whole, felt there was great partnership effort with over 14 agencies and volunteers identified. There was some concern about ownership of the equipment purchased, but it was clarified that the 4-H Leaders Association, as the applicant, would be responsible for keeping inventory up-to-date. The team felt this was a good investment for the requested amount and recommended it for funding.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 5

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount \$6,000.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6031	Project Type:	Education
Project Name:	Adventure Days		
Applicant:	Umatilla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$36,242.00	Total Cost:	\$79,652.00

Application Description

This new program targets 100 thirteen to twenty-year old students from the Umatilla Basin by hosting six events focused on natural resource issues and watershed health in the basin. There are several existing opportunities for younger students but nothing that provides outreach to engage teenagers. The six proposed events include: 1) field trip tours and sessions at the Umatilla Fish Hatchery and the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers Pacific Salmon Visitor Center; 2) students working with natural resource professionals on hands-on activities at the Meacham Creek Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) restoration projects; 3) field trip and sessions relating to consumptive use of water vs. conservation and the methods of groundwater recharge and irrigation efficiency in the basin; 4) field trip and session relating to the City of Pendleton's Wastewater Treatment Plant; 5) participation in the SOLV Riverside Clean-up event; and 6) two-day Natural Resource Elements event with learning stations set up in the Pendleton Community Park covering water quality, erosion, geology, soils, wildlife, rangeland, fires, ecology, botany and native/non-native plants. Partnerships on all these events include CTUIR, SOLV, Umatilla Soil and Water Conservation District, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW), IRZ, Inc, and the City of Pendleton.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (78%), travel (8%), supplies/materials (3%), production (2%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team thought this was a great program that will build on existing watershed and natural resource programs already being implemented in the watershed. The review team appreciated the many diverse letters of support from partners and thought this was an appropriate program for outreach and engagement of teenagers in the watershed. There were questions on how those 100 students would ultimately be selected. The team also had some concerns that the fund request was high for only reaching 100 students. Reviewers would have liked to see the application break out the staffing costs in the budget, including the number of hours and rate of payment. This is a new venture for this watershed council and the review team felt that it was ready for funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

5 of 5

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$36,242.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6037	Project Type:	Education
Project Name:	Promoting Stewardship of Umatilla's Natural Resources		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$45,250.00	Total Cost:	\$76,589.00

Application Description

This application proposes to increase community stewardship and engage residents in restoring and protecting healthy watersheds in the Umatilla Basin. The goal of the proposal is to provide the best tools, resources and information to encourage individuals to adopt best management practices through workshops, tours, events and presentations. This would be accomplished by two programs: 1) the Clean Water Neighborhood (CWN) that would be responsible for a booth at the Umatilla County Fair, the Oregon Association Conservation District poster contest for local school children, two water quality workshops, and neighborhood meetings; and 2) Preserving Umatilla's Resource through Education (PURE) that would be responsible for hosting the Sustainable Ag Seminar, assisting at the Confederated Tribes UIR Native Plant Sale, partner at the CTUIR Salmon Walk, and hosting two workshops for landowners focusing on "Best Management Practices" and "Naturescaping for Water Resources." Partners included Umatilla County SWCD and community volunteers.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (82%), travel (1%), production (8%) and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team acknowledged this group has a strong track record in administering these two programs, producing good landowner contacts with resultant restoration projects and an increased awareness of ground and surface water issues in rural neighborhoods. The team appreciated getting best management information to hobby farmers can be difficult and the process the CWN uses seems to be successful.

The team spent time discussing whether the approach outlined in the application is an effective way to address the serious groundwater problems in the area. Some reviewers did not think the activities in the application would result in actions that will address the problem. Other reviewers thought that reaching out to landowners will have a positive influence over time by raising awareness on how their activities affect the environment, and encouraging actions to improve management practices.

The team also discussed concerns about the cost of staffing the county fair booth and whether the poster contest really held educational benefits for the price. Specifically, the team questioned whether it really takes 110 hours for a one-week fair and 80 hours for a poster contest. They then wondered whether a booth at a fair and a poster contest are really effective ways to engage landowners. The team would have liked the application to provide specific information about past efforts, such as how many people visited the fair booth, how many brochures were handed out and how many future contacts were initiated from the booth. A letter of support from teachers involved with the poster contest, attesting to the knowledge gained by this activity, would have strengthened the application. There was also some debate on whether landscaping workshops improved groundwater issues. The application would have been stronger with better match and more partnerships.

After lengthy discussion, reviewers noted that the local groundwater committee has identified numerous sources of groundwater pollution, and concluded it was not clear that these issues would be addressed by the

application's proposal. The team felt this application was not ready for funding at this time and encouraged the applicant to resubmit.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6043	Project Type:	Education
Project Name:	NFJDWC Landowner and Community Outreach Program		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$42,405.00	Total Cost:	\$93,395.00

Application Description

This program will target 120 income-producing ranches within the North and Middle Fork John Day Watersheds, where 95 percent of the land is used for livestock production, whether in public (40 percent) or private (60 percent) ownership. Scheduled to occur during the review of the North and Middle Forks Agricultural Water Quality Management Plan and the implementation of the John Day Basin TMDL, four workshops will be offered and expanded to include not only the ranchers but all 1,200 rural residents. The objective is to motivate landowners to consider different management practices by discovering both the ecological and economic benefits of different techniques and management options available. Community members will learn about general watershed health and what is going on right in their basin. Deliverables include four workshops, each focusing on a different aspect of ranch and farm management; an electronic Landowner Toolbox with information about each workshop topic available on the watershed council's website; updated landowner database; four one-hour community and club presentations; and newspaper and newsletter informational articles. Partners include Monument SWCD, community and presenter volunteers and a DEQ 319 grant (pending).

OWEB funds were requested for project management (6%), in-house personnel (66%), contracted services (8%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (7%), production (2%), equipment (1%) and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Reviewers noted this is an important time for outreach to landowners, to engage them in taking action to address issues identified in the John Day Basin TMDL Implementation Plan. The team appreciated that this council is working hard to build council credibility and gain landowner and resident trust. However, the review team wondered whether workshops were a fairly simple approach to outreach and perhaps not as well directed or as good a cost/benefit ratio. They would have liked to have seen more detail on just how the watershed council plans on getting those 1,200 residents and 120 ranching families to attend the four workshops. The application did include some information about the previous workshop the council co-hosted, but the reviewers thought it would have been helpful to have more detail on how much that workshop actually cost to put on, how many attended and how many projects resulted. More detail would have been helpful on exactly what the landowner and community toolboxes would contain. The review team felt this proposal was ready to fund for one year with a progress report showing program accomplishments at that time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Fund for one year at reduced rate of \$21,225.00. The final Project Completion Report should include workshop attendance numbers and topics.

Regional Review Team Priority

4 of 5

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$21,225.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget. At that time, staff would recommend fund for one year at reduced rate of \$21,225.00 with conditions that the final Project Completion Report include workshop attendance numbers and topics; number of landowners indicating interest in projects; and number of resultant restoration projects implemented.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6045	Project Type:	Education
Project Name:	Monument Student Watershed Enhancement Team (SWET) Program		
Applicant:	Monument SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$16,677.00	Total Cost:	\$27,527.00

Application Description

This application would reinstate a previously successful program in Monument Schools, located in Grant County. Originally created in 1993 by Mr. Ron Gaither, the Student Watershed Enhancement Team (SWET) program ceased to exist when Mr. Gaither passed on in 2000. There is strong support by both teachers and schools to bring this program back. The program will train approximately twenty 7th to 12th grade students to perform macro invertebrate surveys and monitor temperature, fecal coliform and water quality. The students will write data reports of their findings, contributing to a better understanding of whole watershed health conditions. Cooperation with the BLM, DEQ and NOAA ensures that the monitoring data will be useful and done using quality assurance standards. The students will participate in experiential learning within natural resource and science curriculums and gain a valuable understanding of watershed health conditions. The project deliverables include professional reports of monitoring, a video of the summer program and three presentations to the community and various agencies. Partners include Monument teachers, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and Oregon State University Extension.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (23%), travel (3%), supplies/materials (10%), production (20%), equipment (35%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team acknowledged that this program had strong support both within the school system and the community. The current SWCD district manager has a strong work ethic and a good relationship with the schools so there is a high likelihood of the program's success. The dollars requested were perceived to be a good value for the extent of what was proposed both in program deliverables and learning objectives for the students. By having students do the monitoring, some landowners are more likely to allow access and even be more receptive to hearing about enhancement opportunities available for resource concerns on their own ranch. Kids will also communicate natural resource information to their families at home. The team thought this was a great program to get students involved in the natural resource industry and they appreciated the numerous letters of support. Also, the team liked that the majority of funds requested went to supplies, equipment and production rather than simply paying for staff. The team felt this proposal was ready for funding.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

2 of 5

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$16,677.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6049	Project Type:	Monitoring
Project Name:	Walla Walla River Bed Stability and Flow Monitoring		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$44,620.00	Total Cost:	\$96,620.00

Application Description

This monitoring project would supplement existing data of high sediment load, streambed instability, low flow and high water temperatures with additional data analysis of changing river bed conditions and underlying alluvial aquifer of the Walla Walla River near Milton-Freewater in Umatilla County. Recent channel downcutting and degradation of the streambed seems to be increasing on this specific reach of the Walla Walla River. Additionally, higher seepage losses have been observed in the lower section of this same reach. The proposal components include doing 16 cross-sectionals; a longitudinal survey of the streambed and pebble counts within the municipal levee reach of the Walla Walla River; performing cross-sectionals and installing four bed scour chains at six locations upstream of the municipal levee; installing six water level recording devices in wells within the nearby shallow alluvial aquifer; installing two devices that continuously record specific conductance, temperature and flow in the mainstem Walla Walla River and the eastern branch of the Big Spring complex. The data collected will be utilized to refine the groundwater/surface water interaction model, aid in the municipal levee assessment, and contribute accurate baseline conditions for any future restoration projects. Partners included BPA, The Freshwater Trust and Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council (WWBWC).

OWEB funds requested would be used for project management (7%), in-house personnel (61%), travel (1%), supplies/materials (9%), Equipment (13%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team felt this was a good project that will add to the existing monitoring program managed by the WWBWC. There were several questions: 1) how the data will be analyzed; 2) how often the scour chains would be monitored; and 3) how this information would be applied to future projects in that area. There was some discussion about doing a more holistic approach to find out the why this degradation and downcutting is happening rather than just identifying how much is occurring on this specific reach. The review team would like to have an annual progress report as a condition to assess how the project is proceeding and if any preliminary results are available. However, there is high confidence this proposal will be done well and will provide valuable data. The review team felt this proposal was ready for funding at this time.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Annual progress report will be required.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 1

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$44,620.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Because OWEB lacks sufficient available 2009-2011 non-capital funding to meet the Board's non-capital funding target in March, staff recommends the Board award funds at its June Board meeting dependent on OWEB's 2011-2013 budget. At that time, staff would recommend Fund with Conditions. Annual progress report will be required.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6025	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Fruitvale Water Management Phase 2		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$15,607.00	Total Cost:	\$47,565.00

Application Description

This application is a resubmit from the Fruitvale Water Users Association (FWUA) located in Milton-Freewater in Umatilla County. Phase two funding would increase irrigation efficiency and improve water management by installing four turn-out weirs, a grade control structure and correct erosion and improve water quality by armoring a section of the irrigation ditch. The FUWA ditch is interspersed with natural sections of Middle Mud Creek, a tributary of the Walla Walla River and many spring-fed ponds. This proposal is the result of a five-year plan and design previously funded by an OWEB technical support grant. Phase one was completed last year. Many farmers on this ditch have been enrolled in an Agricultural Water Efficiency Program (AWEP) through Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to bring irrigation efficiency onto their farm operations. Partners on the project include BPA and FUWA.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (4%), contracted services (87%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The team acknowledged that irrigation users in this valley are expected to maintain operations using less water since the 2000 Walla Walla River instream flow agreement. This project does not have direct benefit to fish, as there is a fish screen at the Little Walla Walla diversion on the Walla Walla River. But even though Middle Mud Creek is not salmonid habitat there is amphibian and waterfowl habitat that will realize some improvement through reduction of sediment and improved water quality as a result of this project implementation. The review team appreciated that this small request will contribute to the efficiency realized by the improvements accomplished through the NRCS Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP) proposal. The team noted that the application answered some, but not all, of the questions posed by the last evaluation. Specifically, the team would like to know how reducing sediment restores watershed process and function in this system and what the future phases of improvements involve. After a lengthy conversation, the majority of reviewers concluded that it warranted funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project reduces sediment and improves water quality entering into Middle Mud Creek from irrigation ditch systems.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund. The review team requested that staff follow up to assure that water measuring devices will be installed at the four turnouts.

Regional Review Team Priority

12 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$15,607.00			

Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review

Staff confirmed that as a condition of the NRCS funding, water measuring devices are required and will be installed at all turnouts.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$15,607.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$15,607.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6027	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Oxbow Tailings Restoration Phase 1		
Applicant:	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$97,600.00	Total Cost:	\$239,739.00

Application Description

This project, located on the Middle Fork John Day River in Grant County, is the first phase of a large restoration effort that will ultimately construct 7,500 feet of new stream channel and improve habitat of existing channels. Phase one project components include removing dredge tailings, increasing riparian and floodplain vegetation and installing instream wood to add complexity and critical habitat for summer steelhead and spring Chinook. This area, historically a wet meadow, has been mined, overgrazed and logged, removing such habitat for juvenile steelhead and Chinook. The property is now owned by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs (CTWS), with their obtainable goal to allow the river to naturally move and gain back meander and floodplain connectivity. Phase one focuses on instream, riparian and floodplain habitat improvements; phase two will reconnect Big Boulder Creek to the Middle Fork thus aiding in decreased stream temperatures and improving tributary access for spawning; phase three focuses on the downstream section where river will be reintroduced into historic channel (pre-dredging), and reconnect with the floodplain. Partners on this project include the CTWS, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF) and Bureau of Reclamation (BOR.)

OWEB funds are requested for contracted services (90%), fiscal administration (9%), and PISR (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

ODFW believes this section should be more productive for salmonids but with the split channel on the upstream end, the resultant low flows and high stream temperatures limit survival of juvenile salmonids. Another limiting factor for salmon in this reach is the lack of pools and cover to escape predation. A future phase of the project will create a low gradient meander channel to improve habitat and fish populations. The Middle Fork is one of five tributaries of the John Day and is the tributary where spring Chinook populations are most threatened due to the loss of wet meadows as a result of past practices. Reviewers noted that connecting to Granite Creek will make a big immediate difference in cooling the water.

The review team liked the comprehensive, phased planning approach on this project. They also appreciated having a good set of understandable designs to review. It was clarified that work within the CREP area had approval from FSA. The team also questioned whether large wood was a natural factor in this meadow system. Research done around this issue, using charcoal and pollen data, showed that although most riparian vegetation in this section was historically willow and shrub dominated, large wood did migrate downstream during high water and lodged in the meadow. The review team appreciated the expertise of the technical team and felt this project was ready for funding.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will improve instream habitat complexity, increase riparian and floodplain vegetation; improve floodplain connectivity, water quality, decrease stream temperatures, and increase numbers of refugia pools and cover for salmonids.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

2 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$97,600.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$97,600.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$97,600.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6028	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Kirkpatrick Pasture Enhancement		
Applicant:	Morrow SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Morrow
OWEB Request:	\$95,613.00	Total Cost:	\$128,123.00

Application Description

The project site is located in the Blue Mountains of southern Morrow County. The 10,000 acre property encompasses the headwaters of Rock Creek, an important summer steelhead tributary of the lower John Day River in Gilliam County; and Johnson Creek, Little Round Creek and Harrington Creeks, all tributaries of the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. The uplands, interspersed with both Aspen groves and Yew thickets, are important summer and winter range for mule deer and elk. Because of prior logging activities, the forest is predominately an early successional, young multi-storied stand. The landowner has enrolled 95 acres of Rock Creek into CREP and a second CREP contract of 30 riparian acres is pending. There are also plans to fence sensitive Aspen and Yew communities to protect from grazing pressure of livestock, deer and elk. The rest of the riparian areas on the ranch do not qualify for CREP given forest soil types. This proposal would divide the existing large pasture unit into four smaller, manageable pastures, each with multiple upland water developments. This division would allow for a deferred-rest/rotation grazing plan to be implemented, increasing plant health and vigor; and encouraging livestock to stay out of the sensitive riparian areas. Project components include 27,500 feet of wildlife-friendly cross fence and nine springs that will be developed into off-channel water facilities. The landowner is the partner on this project.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (4%), contracted services (20%), supplies/materials (69%), fiscal administration (6%) and PISR (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated this comprehensive application including the grazing management plan, good maps and photos. Those familiar with the site shared that this was a productive site with a good stand of perennial grasses. ODFW does redd surveys right below the property in Rock Creek and the review team thought that this project would contribute to improved water quality of that system. This project adds to the cumulative impact from the many projects done along the entire Rock Creek system. There was some discussion about fencing along the intermittent streams but those familiar with the terrain said it was not feasible or economical – that this design was a good solution. The review team felt this application was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

By installing cross fencing and developing extensive upland water sources in conjunction with grazing management, this project will improve water quality, reduce erosion and shearing of stream banks, improve riparian vegetation and protect fish bearing streams.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

8 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$95,613.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$95,613.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$95,613.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6029	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Upper John Day Streambank Stabilization Projects		
Applicant:	Grant SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$31,044.00	Total Cost:	\$556,871.00

Application Description

Four properties, along sections of the upper mainstem John Day River in Grant County, would be treated using a combination of large wood, bendaway weir structures and live plantings to stabilize severe erosion. Landowners came to the Grant SWCD with concerns of eroding property and the amount of sediment entering the river during recent high and flashy flows. With the implementation of the John Day River TMDLs and the existing Ag Water Quality Management Plan, their concerns elevated. From initial surveys done at one location last year, after a June rain event, over 3,500 tons of sediment was estimated to have been lost into the John Day River. The construction costs will be covered by landowners or by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs (CTWS). Engineering and project oversight would be cost shared between Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and OWEB. Partners include BOR, Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), CTWS and landowners.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (84%), travel (2%), fiscal administration (8%), and PISR (6%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team liked that this project not only stabilized the banks but increased channel and habitat complexity. The treatment area between John Day and Prairie City provides habitat year round; the lower sites have salmonids nine months of the year. All the sites would help provide refugia for salmonids during high flows in winter and the spring. It was noted that lots of salmonids use this area for 9-12 months out of the year, and they need more pools and more habitat features as well as riparian vegetation that will help with shade and temperature. The riparian planting will eventually add stabilization to the banks, increasing shade and aiding in decreasing stream temperatures.

The review team would have liked to see a wider buffer allowed so river could dissipate energy in a meander rather than just depending on instream structures. There was discussion that the proposal does not account for the normal channel morphology, and the channel is trying to move to sinuosity and the proposed structures try to stop the channel natural movement. This led to a discussion about natural process and function, and what landowners are willing to do. In this case, landowners are concerned about loss of agricultural land. There was discussion of the need to balance between landowners' needs and the river's natural dynamics.

The review team questioned the longevity of the bendaway weirs and if hardened points would last and not result in changes downstream. ODFW did major stabilization using similar structures in the 80's as a part of their corridor fencing and most sites have survived major flows and floods. The district has completed six or seven similar treatments and some have been in place for over ten years. It was felt that using wood and instream weirs are a better solution than bank armoring and that establishing vegetation was the long term

solution to stabilizing the banks. After lengthy discussion, the review team felt this application was ready for funding due to the importance of improved habitat and water quality for the fish that are using this area.

Ecosystem Process and Function

By stabilizing the banks and increasing riparian vegetation, this project will significantly decrease mass sediment loading to the John Day River; decrease temperatures once riparian vegetation is established; create refugia pools for summer steelhead and spring Chinook; and improve water quality.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

10 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$31,044.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$31,044.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$31,044.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.: 211-6030 **Project Type:** Restoration
Project Name: Bear Valley Riparian Improvements
Applicant: Grant SWCD
Basin: LAKES **County:** Grant
OWEB Request: \$48,083.00 **Total Cost:** \$101,055.00

Application Description

This project is located in Bear Valley in the Upper Silvies Valley of Grant County. Four off-channel water sources will be developed in three pastures to relieve livestock grazing pressure along the Silvies River. Project objectives are to improve riparian conditions by increasing riparian vegetation, decreasing sediment inputs and decreasing stream temperatures. The landowner is the sole partner on this project.

OWEB funds are requested for project management (2%), travel (1%), in-house personnel (7%), supplies/materials (83%), fiscal administration (5%), and PISR (2%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated that by installing these four water developments, livestock can be excluded from Silvies River for all but a few weeks of the year. The budget had a \$4,000 error that the applicant caught and then provided a revised, decreased budget for the review team perusal. The review team appreciated having a grazing management plan included. Overall the review team agreed this project was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project by reducing livestock access to riparian area will result in improved riparian vegetation, decreased sediment inputs and resultant temperature reduction on Silvies River.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. Revised budget submitted by applicant to correct error.

Regional Review Team Priority

9 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$44,083.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. Revised budget submitted by applicant to correct error.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount
\$44,083.00

EM Portion

PE Portion

Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$44,083.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6032	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	English Irrigation Efficiency Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$59,538.00	Total Cost:	\$87,229.00

Application Description

This project is within the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area and located 4.6 miles east of Hermiston in Umatilla County. The landowner flood irrigates 22 acres. Tailwater runoff contributes sediment and contaminants to the Cold Spring Drain and ultimately flows into the Columbia River at Hat Rock. The landowner has applied to the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) for EQIP funding to help fund the project. The project would replace 4,074 feet of mainline, install sprinklers and a pivot. Partners include the landowner and NRCS.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (2%), contracted services (6%), supplies/materials (83%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The application requested OWEB funds to pay for portable sprinklers and pivots, and these components of the application are ineligible for OWEB funding. Much of the match funding is planned to come from NRCS, and they do not fund sprinkler or pivots either. Discussion ensued about the likelihood of success of the proposed project if there is no funding to pay for the sprinklers and pivots. The team did not know whether the landowner had the means to purchase and install the pivot and sprinklers. The review team talked about the potential for this acreage being included in a future AWEP proposal where irrigation delivery systems can be paid for. But at the time of application review, it was not known whether an AWEP proposal had been submitted. The review team noted that the estimated water savings calculation was incorrect. There was discussion about requiring a water measuring device. It was brought out during the discussion that any irrigation efficiency project using NRCS funds is required to install a water measuring device. The review team recommended that the landowner apply for all eligible funds from NRCS. After much debate, they opted to recommend reduced funding (eliminating cost of pivot and sprinklers).

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project would improve water quality by reducing pollution from sediment and contaminants in tailwater.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Do not fund the pivot or sprinkler components. Require installation include water measuring device.

Regional Review Team Priority

14 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$26,870.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund. After considering the RRT recommendation and the many unanswered questions regarding the project, staff conclude that there are too many unknowns to recommend funding at this time. Without identified funding for the pivot and sprinklers, the goals of the project cannot be met. It would be better to see this application resubmitted in the future as a part of an AWEPP proposal or with other match secured to pay for the OWEB ineligible, above-ground irrigation delivery system.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6034	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Morrow/Grant County OHV Park WS Improvements Phase III		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$102,792.00	Total Cost:	\$133,006.00

Application Description

This project is located on lands draining into Wilson and Wall Creeks and ultimately into the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. The property is a premier Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Park (OHV.) Prior to the purchase of this park, logging road developments had greatly reduced the hydrological connectivity between the upland water sources and creeks downstream. Phases one and two have contributed to correcting over 28 inventoried springs and water issues on the park. This third phase of restoration on the OHV Park focuses on excluding livestock from 2 miles and 157 acres of Wilson Creek; protecting springs and sensitive wetland areas from grazing and recreational impacts; restore hydrological connectivity between inventoried springs and downstream swales; and correct road drainage issues and provide four off-stream livestock and wildlife water developments. This section of riparian fence along Wilson Creek will add to existing fence line that protects riparian zones both up and downstream on OHV and USFS property. The OHV Park has done a good job at providing educational kiosks relating to the restoration activities in the park. The partner on this project is the Morrow County Public Works.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (2%), in-house personnel & travel (1%), contracted services (84%), supplies/materials (3%), fiscal administration (9%), and PISR (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Those review team members on the site visit were impressed with how the park is a model for thoughtful restoration and resource management. Focus is on protecting the natural features of the park, while at the same time incorporating recreational activities. The park management utilizes educational kiosks to help explain resource management and natural resource function and processes. This is a great opportunity to help inform and educate both rural and urban park users. The review team appreciated the basin approach to protecting Wilson Creek and how the park management is working to reconnect the natural hydrologic function of upland springs. With these riparian areas protected, ODFW believes the creek should show strong improvement in steelhead numbers. There is livestock grazing in the park and neighboring USFS but it is managed by a well-respected permittee, following a grazing management plan refined with help from the OSU range department. The review team liked this project and felt it was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will increase riparian vegetation, improve hydrologic function of riparian and upland spring inputs, decrease sediment, and improve both water quality and habitat.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced. Revised budget submitted by applicant to correct error

Regional Review Team Priority

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$88,085.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced. Revised budget submitted by applicant to correct error

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$88,085.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$88,085.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6035	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Red Boy Mine Restoration Project		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$41,181.00	Total Cost:	\$72,525.00

Application Description

The Red Boy Mine Restoration Project would install a short-term correction of surface flow discharging from the Red Boy Mine into Congo Gulch, and into Clear Creek, an important salmonid tributary to the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. Clear Creek is a significant spawning/rearing stream for spring Chinook and summer steelhead. This project would replace an undersized, existing 6" PVC drain pipe with 8" HDPE pipeline equipped with adequate air vents and cleanouts. Routine maintenance of the pipe is complicated by the build up of precipitates of iron oxide around the grate and inside the pipe. The Red Boy Mine, categorized by Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in 2000 as an orphan site, has been identified as having significant contamination of soil and surface water, specifically arsenic and iron. Water tested from the discharge of the mine portal had a pH of 3.9 to 4.0. Partners include Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), DEQ 319 grant (pending) and Cascade Earth Sciences.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (5%), in-house personnel (2%), contracted services (71%), supplies/materials (11%), PISR (2%) and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The reviewers discussed the existing pipe system, which directs water draining from the abandoned mine to settlement ponds as a treatment mechanism to keep acid mine drainage from going directly into the river. Because the pipe becomes clogged over time, when the amount of water overwhelms the grating and the size of the pipe, some of the drainage overflows into Congo Gulch and on into Clear Creek. The review team noted that when these overflows occur, those discharges into Clear Creek are extremely damaging to fish populations. Clear Creek and Granite Creek are two of the best-used salmon streams and ODFW feels they should support a higher population of spring Chinook. This is a high-priority area for the US Forest Service (USFS), and a lot of investment is being made up and downstream. ODFW stated the abundance of juvenile Chinook and steelhead is relatively low in this area because of the toxic water quality. There have been three fish kills over the last 20 years directly below this site. During ODFW fish surveys, gill burns and damage in adult salmon have been verified.

It was acknowledged that the drainage from this site probably cannot be stopped, and will likely require a permanent pollution treatment system that needs routine maintenance. Technical Assistance application 211-6033 seeks OWEB funding for a feasibility study to find the best option for addressing the problem. The eight-inch pipe is likely a short-term fix. The proposed pipe was sized based on flow measurements throughout the year, and is estimated to last for at least five years without blowout or failure, and perhaps longer with regular maintenance. The application indicated this pipe replacement would be rolled into future design solutions so investment would be lasting. USFS is very supportive of this project because of the work already completed on mines located on USFS property on either side of this toxic discharge site. Plugging the mine portal was discussed, however it was revealed that the groundwater flow exiting the mine portal can be of such high levels that any plug simply blows out, creating an even larger scope of disaster.

OWEB staff noted potential policy issues for OWEB around funding contaminated sites regulated by state and federal cleanup laws, and advised the review team that staff will be looking into policy issues. It was noted that DEQ declared the Red Boy mine an orphan site eligible for state cleanup funds, but due to other, higher-priority human health orphan site needs, there is little to no funding available from DEQ to address Red Boy.

The review team discussed the potential for increased demands on OWEB funding because there are a number of abandoned mines with pollution issues across the state, and cleanup is very costly. Reviewers commented that this project is not essentially different than other pollution treatment projects funded by OWEB to protect and improve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat, and hoped that policy issues would not preclude funding.

Ecosystem Process and Function

By reducing direct toxic discharges to the creek, this project would improve Granite Creek water quality, reduce the chemical barrier to fish passage, and improve fish health and juvenile salmonid abundance.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

5 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$41,181.00			

Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review

Staff conducted research on potential liability under state and federal cleanup laws, the number of Orphan Sites and abandoned mines in the state, and DEQ’s involvement and fiscal responsibility in the clean up or mitigation process. Staff identified legal and policy issues including:

- OWEB does not fund maintenance of restoration projects; since the treatment system will be permanent, OWEB will need assurance that some entity will continue to fund operation and maintenance of the treatment system.
- The Department of Justice has indicated that one of the following will be needed to meet permitting requirements for the treatment system:
 - An NPDES permit issued for the site, or
 - DEQ’s officially documented approval of the contemplated grant activity as a removal or remediation activity.
- Because of the strict liability for cleanup sites imposed by federal and state law, OWEB had concerns about risk of liability to OWEB for providing grant funding. The Department of Justice (DOJ) has indicated OWEB would probably not incur liability since OWEB’s role would be strictly to provide grant funds and not provide any oversight or regulation of work on the site. OWEB also had concerns about whether the watershed council might have risk of liability. DOJ informal response indicates there is a risk to the council as an “operator” or “arranger.” OWEB understands the council has discussed this issue with DEQ; however, DEQ cannot shield an owner or operator from potential liability to a third party who might seek to enforce cleanup or damages under cleanup laws.

- Should OWEB provide funding for cleanup activities where federal and state law make “responsible parties” strictly liable, and where the federal Superfund and state Orphan Site Account were created to fund cleanup at sites where responsible parties are unknown, unwilling or unable to fund cleanup?
 - a. Does it matter if federal and state cleanup funds are insufficient?
- If OWEB should provide funding, what funding sideboards are appropriate, if any? E.g.,
 - a. No OWEB funding for federal Superfund sites.
 - b. No funding for work on federal lands, federal landowners are responsible and should fund the work.
 - c. Funding for private land only where landowners are contributing significant cash or in-kind to the cleanup.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Defer funding decision until June to allow follow up discussions regarding policy issues and potential funding sideboards.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6036	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Hermiston Irrigation District T Line Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$116,089.00	Total Cost:	\$244,722.00

Application Description

This irrigation efficiency project is within the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater Management Area in Umatilla County, and located five miles north of Hermiston. The T-line is 7,500 feet of open, lined and unlined canal that delivers 18-20 cfs of irrigation water to 18 producers over 600 acres. Currently, at the end of the T-line, the tailwater drains into a holding pond and contributes sediment, fecal matter, fertilizers and pesticides into the Hat Rock drain and ultimately into the Columbia River. By piping this canal, the T-line will not only eliminate significant pollution, it will save 5-7 cfs of water required for irrigation. Partners include BOR and the Hermiston Irrigation District.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel, travel and PISR (1%), supplies/materials (90%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team appreciated the benefits of eliminating the tailwater pond and the contamination inputs into Hat Rock Drain and the Columbia River. They also realized that these were commercial agricultural producers interested in conserving water and reducing contamination. Most, if not all, of the users are on sprinkler systems.

Reviewers had a lengthy discussion on the water savings potential of the project. The application states that 5 to 7 cfs would be saved by piping the canal. The water comes from the Maxwell Ditch, which is fed from the Umatilla River in summer. Reviewers wondered whether water savings could be left in the river. This led to questions whether the irrigation district can show water savings from the other piped canals in this system, previously funded by OWEB. The review team would like to know if there is any possibility for providing more water instream.

Reviewers appreciated that this round of irrigation efficiency applications from this applicant are better written and more clear. There was a lot of discussion at the review team meeting on whether to fund with conditions or request a resubmit. After much discussion, reviewers thought that since the T-Line takes water directly from the Umatilla River, the reviewers wanted more information before they could recommend funding. Reviewers encouraged the applicant to resubmit with more information on: 1) how much water has been saved with previous piping projects, 2) how much water has been saved collectively within the entire irrigation system, 3) how and where would that water would be used and 4) if there was possibility for any permanent instream transfers to the Umatilla River resulting from all the improvements made on the delivery system and better water management. They noted that a map should be included, showing the Umatilla River and where would water savings be, and how far it is to the next point of diversion on the river. Reviewers also want to see flow meters installed or an explanation of how water use is measured.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6038	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Columbia Lane Irrigation Efficiency Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$41,131.00	Total Cost:	\$126,247.00

Application Description

This project is located northeast of Hermiston in Umatilla County and also lies within the Lower Umatilla Basin Groundwater and the Stage Gulch Critical Groundwater Management Areas. The project would convert 2,800 feet of open ditch to pipe and install seven turnouts for rural residential landowners. The grantee estimates saving 80% irrigation water with the improved delivery system and will reduce the tailwater runoff into the Cold Springs Drain, Hat Creek and ultimately the Columbia River. Project partners include the seven landowners and the Hermiston Irrigation District.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (2%), supplies/materials (88%), fiscal administration (9%), and PISR (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Reviewers spent time discussing the watershed benefits of this project. Water is from the Cold Springs Reservoir, filled in the winter from the Umatilla River. Increased efficiency allows the irrigation district to better manage water use, which is the right thing to do, but raised the question about how the project supports watershed benefits – is there a benefit beyond that realized by the water users? It was noted that it is hard to assign an ecological benefit to each small project individually, but with the number of systems now piped and sprinklers in use, can the irrigation district start looking at conservation and the cumulative impacts of better irrigation. Reviewers concluded it would be important for the project to measure how much water they are saving.

The review team noted these landowners did not qualify for NRCS EQIP or AWEP programs and the landowners were paying for their portion of the improvements out of their own pockets. This project will require all users on this ditch to convert to sprinklers, which will help conserve and manage water resources more efficiently. It was not clear in the application if water measuring devices would be required at each of the seven turnouts. The review team did appreciate by doing rural residential irrigation efficiency projects there is significant education benefit, both from neighbor over the fence conversations, as well as irrigation management education with the installation of sprinklers and pivots. The review team would like to see record of actual water savings gained from these irrigation efficiency projects in the basin and information on ODFW's target Umatilla River instream flows. After much discussion, the review team voted to fund with the condition that measuring devices be installed at each turnout.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will improve both surface and ground water quality.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Calculate and report quantitatively the water savings realized by this project, also require water measuring devices to be installed at each turnout.

Regional Review Team Priority

13 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$41,131.00			

Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review

Staff researched water measuring devices for this type of system in the Hermiston area. Because of problems with clogging from moss and sand impairing the propellers in the devices, it was determined a more cost-effective solution to the water measurement requirement would be to install one measuring device at the junction where feed line goes to the seven landowners and have each landowner provide an irrigation management plan showing water use for each location.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Increased with Conditions. The grant agreement will require the final Project Completion Report to include a calculation and reporting of the water savings realized by this project, and will require a water measuring device to be installed at junction where the delivery line feeds the seven properties. \$2,000 was added to the recommended award to fund the required water meter. The grant agreement will also require that each of the seven landowner/water users on this system will need to complete an irrigation management plan. These plans would be submitted with the project completion report, and include information on the number of acres watered; what type crops are grown; and a schedule and the rate of water applied. The Post-Implementation Status Report will include follow-up information on water use by those seven irrigators showing water savings and lessons learned.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$43,131.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$43,131.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6042	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Meacham Creek Habitat Restoration Project		
Applicant:	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$500,000.00	Total Cost:	\$3,510,559.00

Application Description

The Meacham Creek project is one component of a holistic approach to watershed restoration on a 176- square mile basin 23 miles east of Pendleton in Umatilla County. There have been a several similar projects implemented up and downstream of this site. In the early 1900s, the Union Pacific Railroad built extensive levees, dikes and relocated the channel to constrain Meacham Creek. These activities have resulted in a lack of channel habitat complexity, limited floodplain connectivity and alteration of riparian plant communities. The goal of this project is to restore, enhance and protect 70 acres of floodplain habitat; restore stream morphology while at the same time enhance habitat for summer steelhead and bull trout. Project components include remove or modify spur dikes in the floodplain; excavate a new main channel and several side channels putting Meacham Creek back into historic channel alignment; incorporate in-stream habitat features like log and rock structures to create pool habitat; remove the confining 2,800 foot levee; treat invasive weeds; and revegetate disturbed construction sites with native plants. Partners include US Forest Service (USFS), Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) CTUIR Accords, Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF) grant (pending) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) grant (pending).

OWEB funds were requested for contracted services (100%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team acknowledged Meacham Creek as an important tributary that provides habitat for steelhead, spring Chinook and bull trout in the Umatilla basin. They discussed what the relationship is with the railroad and whether the railroad administration is on board with the levee and dike removals. That relationship has been ongoing for years and is getting better. Railroad engineers have reviewed and approved the recent designs so this project can proceed. Projects involving the removal of levees and the placement of large wood, occurring both up and downstream proved to be a valuable example to the railroad during flood events ~ they saw where the floodwaters were able to re-enter the stream channel and not get trapped, causing problems behind the levees. The team discussed simply removing the levee and letting Mother Nature make the adjustments, but it was explained that part of the project would be to lift the channel bed back to historic levels and add roughness in the floodplain to help dissipate energy during high water events.

The review team liked the project but wondered whether the large request for funds could potentially impact other good projects ranking below this one. Discussions included phasing funding or funding at a lower level. Reviewers asked the question whether OWEB has considered capping the amount of funding that can be requested by an individual grant application. It was discussed that OWEB does consider the ability to phase or stage a project when staff develops funding recommendations for the OWEB Board.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project would serve to decrease stream velocities, increase salmonid habitat complexity, increase large wood instream, reconnect the floodplain resulting in longer, later and cooler groundwater inputs to Meacham Creek, and increase riparian and floodplain vegetation.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

6 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$500,000.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$500,000.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$500,000.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6044	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Upper Middle Fork Allotment Improvements - Phase II		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$47,704.00	Total Cost:	\$82,992.00

Application Description

This fencing project will be implemented at two locations in the Malheur National Forest located on the Middle Fork John Day River in Grant County. Project components include construction of 1.5 miles of livestock exclusion fence protecting 93 acres along Mosquito Creek and 3.5 miles of riparian pasture fence creating a 1,200 acre intensively managed riparian pasture protecting portions of Tin Cup, Windlass Creek and Hunt Gulch. All three streams impacted by this project are known spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead and refugia for juvenile Chinook. Partners include the US Forest Service (USFS) and allotment permittees.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (5%), contracted services (69%), supplies/materials (15%), fiscal administration (9%) and PISR (2%)

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

It was noted this project is the second phase of an earlier OWEB-funded fencing project that will enhance and improve management on USFS allotments on the Middle Fork. Adult steelhead have been found in all three streams, and the streams are important summer streams for juvenile steelhead and spring Chinook to be able to get into the tributaries away from warmer water. The permittee on this allotment has been very proactive in improvements and a good manager of the resource. There was a discussion on the merits of riparian exclusion fencing versus riparian pasture fencing. Members of the review team, familiar with these practices, explained that riparian pastures, when managed intensively, many times are the better alternative for wildlife, natural landscape function and ease of fence maintenance. Terrain also factors in when determining which type of pasture or fence is selected. Because this is a Forest Service Allotment and the permittee is a well-respected manager, it was felt the standards expected would be adhered to. The review team felt this application was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will eliminate bank alterations from livestock, reduce sediment inputs, and improve water quality, riparian vegetation and habitat on Mosquito Creek. The riparian pasture encompassing Tin Cup Creek, Windlass Creek and Hunt Gulch will improve riparian vegetation health and cover, reduce sediment inputs and improve water quality.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

4 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$47,704.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$47,704.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$47,704.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6046	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Birch Creek Watershed Restoration		
Applicant:	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Wheeler
OWEB Request:	\$35,024.00	Total Cost:	\$82,179.00

Application Description

The Birch Creek watershed is located in the southeastern part of Wheeler County. The project site is threatened by juniper encroachment that is crowding out significant bitterbrush communities important to wintering mule deer, elk and antelope herds. This project will remove a targeted 398 acres of invasive juniper resulting in restored upland shrub communities, perennial grasslands and riparian vegetation. The landowner is partnering with Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs (CTWS) on this project.

OWEB funds were requested for contracted services (91%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Those review team members on the site visit noted that the forage management on this working ranch was excellent. The goal of the landowner is to treat this drainage and then repeat similar treatments drainage by drainage until fire can be safely be reintroduced to the system as an effective way to control the juniper. While on the site visit, over 250 antelope were seen moving through the area. It was clarified that Birch Creek had a natural barrier so steelhead could not access the headwater region. However, there is redband trout in the basin and with increased flows, juveniles could get flushed out and add to the steelhead population downstream.

The question was raised that because of the encroachment by juniper in many areas around the state, will this project make a difference. The team debated the question of “why fund this here and why now?” After discussion the team concluded that this is an area where juniper was not historically present and has deep soil, north slopes and existing perennial grass stands, and it’s important to treat it “before it ecologically tips over.” The team appreciated that the application included information on plant densities, species and soil information. Because of the benefits to wildlife habitat, the potential to increase water to a fish-bearing stream and the potential good return on investment the review team concluded this project was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

The results of this project will include the release of sequestered upland water supply, restore upland and riparian conditions, increase stream flows and reduce sediment inputs.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund. Require that a juniper management plan and a grazing management plan be included in the completion report.

Regional Review Team Priority

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$35,024.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund with Conditions. The grant agreement will require the grantee to submit a long-term juniper management plan and grazing management plan with the final Project Completion Report.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$35,024.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$35,024.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6047	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Berry Creek Culvert Replacements		
Applicant:	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$87,363.00	Total Cost:	\$113,903.00

Application Description

The two culverts identified for replacement are located on Berry Creek, a tributary to Canyon Creek in Grant County, which provides critical spawning and rearing habitat for summer steelhead. The existing culverts impede fish passage and sediment transport and are undersized and prone to failure. By correcting these two culverts, over 3.75 miles of habitat will be opened up for all life stages of salmonids. At the 3.75 stream mile, there is an existing irrigation diversion that blocks fish passage but this barrier is on the Grant SWCD list to replace. Once that is done over 5 miles of stream connectivity to the wilderness area headwater reaches will be achieved. Partners include landowners, BPA, submitted grants to Oregon Governor's Fund for the Environment and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

OWEB funds were requested for pre-implementation (2%), project management (2%), contracted services (55%), supplies/materials (26%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Reviewers noted that the culverts are perched and very few steelhead get through. More adults could get upstream if the culverts are fixed, and juveniles would be able to use the creek as a thermal and high-water refuge. The intrinsic value of opening up Berry Creek for salmonids was clear; however, the review team felt they could not fairly evaluate the project without some preliminary designs. It was noted that bottomless arches and stream simulated bottom will be needed because of the stream gradient as well as high velocity water that occurs annually. It was not clear whether engineering had begun; however, it seemed likely since the budget incorporated specifics relating to final engineering costs, construction, supplies/materials and fill/removal yardage. There were also concerns that the match amount seemed inflated, especially in the expenses related to the annual report and a conference. There was also a lack of agency letters of support, such as from ODFW and USFWS. There was no landowner match, even though this was on a private road. The review team thought the project is important, but felt this application was not ready for funding at this time. If an application is resubmitted, the application should include more information on design (ideally preliminary engineering designs) and provide more information about the culvert replacements including looking at bridges as alternatives. Reviewers also would appreciate some match from the landowner.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6048	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Cottonwood and Cavender Juniper Removal		
Applicant:	Monument SWCD		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$45,032.00	Total Cost:	\$60,986.00

Application Description

The project sites are located near the town of Monument within the North Fork John Day watershed in Grant County. The southern site is located on uplands draining into Cottonwood Creek, an important tributary that provides spawning and rearing habitat for summer steelhead and spring Chinook. The northern site is on the drainage of Franklin Mountain and Pine Creek. The project components include removing 281 acres of encroaching juniper and reseeding ground disturbed by treatment implementation. Landowner will incorporate prescribed burning to control future juniper seedlings from taking over landscape again. Partners include three landowners, Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS.)

OWEB funds were requested for project management (4%), contracted services (87%), fiscal administration (8%), and travel & PISR (1%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team could see the benefit of the juniper treatment on the locations up Cottonwood Creek, where identified treatment sites will build on previous juniper projects for a more landscape scale benefit, with better existing grass stands and more species diversity. Reviewers were concerned about recommending funding for the Cavender site. They noted it appeared this is an area that should be low priority for juniper treatment unless some pretreatment of the was included, since in photos of the sites the vegetation seemed to consist primarily of cheatgrass, thistle and medusahead.

There was some discussion on treating phase three juniper sites, as they might be too far gone for restoration. Reviewers thought that investing funds in these areas is not a good choice; funding should be put into phase 2 or phase 1 areas where there can be a bigger bang for the buck and more chance of long term success. The review team concluded it was appropriate to recommend funding for the Cottonwood sites at this time but did not recommend funding the Cavender site. If the applicant chooses to resubmit the Cavender site in a future application reviewers will need to see 1) more analysis of site potential and alternative methods considered for treatment, 2) landscape approach design, 3) incorporate pre-removal treatments of weeds, and 4) a reseed component and management plan to alter the annual grass regime.

Ecosystem Process and Function

This project will increase infiltration of rainfall into the ground, reduce overland flow and resulting erosion, improve water quality and potentially decrease Cottonwood Creek temperatures with higher groundwater lateral inputs into the stream.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Fund only components of treatments in the Cottonwood Creek area. Require long-term juniper management plan and grazing management plan to be submitted with the final Project Completion Report.

Regional Review Team Priority

11 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$39,460.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund Reduced with Conditions. Fund only components of treatments in the Cottonwood Creek area. Require long-term juniper management plan and grazing management plan to be submitted with the final Project Completion Report.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$39,460.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$39,460.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6050	Project Type:	Restoration
Project Name:	Lampson Levee Setback and Habitat Restoration		
Applicant:	Walla Walla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$97,985.00	Total Cost:	\$813,534.00

Application Description

This project was resubmitted from the last grant application cycle. The project would remove portions of 3/8 of a mile of private levee and restore riparian/wetland vegetation on a 22-acre conservation easement upstream from Milton-Freewater on the Walla Walla River in Umatilla County. The old levee constricts the Walla Walla River's ability to meander, limits fish habitat complexity for summer steelhead, spring Chinook and bull trout, and limits riparian vegetation. Project components include connecting floodplain by pulling back portions of the levee; revegetate riparian area and floodplain; install a secondary backwater channel; re-align and reconnect a channelized spring creek. The river, where the levee will be removed, will be redesigned for stability and fish habitat by installing j-hooks, root wads and rock structures to create pools and spawning gravels. Partners include landowners and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR.)

OWEB funds were requested for project management (5%), contracted services (57%), supplies/materials (29%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

Reviewers noted that a good population of steelhead and bulltrout and recovering spring Chinook use the reach in the fall and winter, and there is good water quality but limited fish habitat. The review team recognized the good relationship with landowner and, based on both partners' track records, felt there was a high likelihood of project success. There was discussion that a downstream neighbor is concerned about flooding, and the watershed council has been talking with the neighbor about the project design and leaving the lower end of the levee in place as an additional buffer to the flood plain for the neighbor.

A final set of comprehensive designs was provided and the budget was revised to reflect those final changes. It was clarified that the riparian planting would be contracted out to the Umatilla Tribes Plant Nursery. The unit cost of planting does include predator controls and mulch mats where warranted. The review team noted that in this area of levees (Walla Walla River basin) projects like this will be watched by those all along the river and if successful, will serve as a great education and project procurement tool. The review team felt this project was ready for funding at this time.

Ecosystem Process and Function

Implementation of this project will reconnect the river to its flood plain, decrease flow velocity, diversify in-stream complexity, add high-velocity refugia, and enhance spawning habitat and complexity.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

3 of 14

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$97,985.00			

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
\$97,985.00			

Total Recommended Board Award

\$97,985.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6033	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Red Boy Mine Assessment		
Applicant:	North Fork John Day WC		
Basin:	JOHN DAY	County:	Grant
OWEB Request:	\$41,201.00	Total Cost:	\$58,588.00

Application Description

The Red Boy Mine Assessment, a technical assistance application, would fund an engineering evaluation for the surface water discharged from the Red Boy Mine, located along Clear Creek, a tributary to the North Fork John Day River in Grant County. The goal of the assessment would be to select a preferred design alternative to minimize or eliminate any release of hazardous and toxic substances into Clear Creek. The Red Boy Mine, categorized by DEQ in 2000 as an orphan site, has been identified as having significant contamination of soil and surface water, specifically arsenic and iron. Water tested from the discharge of the mine portal had a pH of 3.9 to 4.0. There is an existing pipe that carries the discharge (gauged to be approximately 60 gpm) to the series of settling ponds alongside Clear Creek, critical habitat for spring Chinook and summer steelhead. Partners include DEQ and Cascade Earth Sciences.

OWEB funds were requested for project management (12%), contracted services (74%), travel (5%) and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team felt the Red Boy Mine was an important ecological issue that warranted attention. ODFW stated the abundance of juvenile Chinook and steelhead is relatively low in this area because of the toxic water quality. There have been three fish kills over 20 years directly below this site. During ODFW fish surveys, gill burns and damage in adult salmon have been verified. It was stated that when the acid drainage reaches the river, it kills everything for ¼ mile below Congo Gulch.

The team spent some time discussing the history of pollution treatment efforts at this site. The US Forest Service (USFS) started out by trenching the drainage into ponds, a pipe was then installed, not only at Red Boy but at two other adjacent mines on USFS owned land. Red Boy is on private land. Despite the efforts at treatment, there is still intermittent overflow of the pipe and there was a severe blowout in 2000. The team discussed that finding a better solution will be complicated but that there was a good chance for a design to respond to existing conditions. The current system needs to be assessed. It was recognized, however, that there will likely need to be a treatment system at this site “forever” and that whatever system is developed will need ongoing, long-term maintenance. The USFS is maintaining the Blue Bird and Blackjack treatment systems nearby.

Because the pipe becomes clogged over time with metal precipitate, when the amount of water becomes too much for the grate and the reduced interior diameter of the pipe, some of the drainage overflows into Congo Gulch and on into Clear Creek. The review team noted that when these overflows occur, those discharges into Clear Creek are extremely damaging to fish populations. Clear Creek and Granite Creek are one of the best-used salmon streams and ODFW feels it should support a higher population of spring Chinook. This is a high-priority area for the USFS, and a lot of investment is being made up and downstream. ODFW stated

the abundance of juvenile Chinook and steelhead is relatively low in this area because of the toxic water quality.

There was discussion of whether this is an appropriate OWEB request since there is a DEQ fund dedicated specifically for orphan sites. However, the orphan site account is severely under-funded. The issue, even though the Red Boy Mine is a high priority for DEQ, is that it does not rank as an orphan site priority because it does not impact human health as much as other orphan sites on the list. A comment was made that this site has been an issue for 20 years and DEQ has not had the regulatory or monetary ability to fund a fix. The applicant has submitted a DEQ 319 grant to offset some of the costs, however even if funded by DEQ, the DEQ 319 funding pool for the eastern region is fairly small and would need match to achieve the objectives of the assessment.

OWEB staff stated they will need to research policy and legal issues. Some reviewers wondered whether funding this would result in increased demand for OWEB to fund other abandoned mines around the state. Others commented that the number of potential future application should not be the driver for funding recommendations; rather it should be considered based on benefits to the watershed.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund.

Regional Review Team Priority

2 of 3

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$41,201.00

Staff Follow-Up to the Regional Team Review

Staff conducted research on potential liability under state and federal cleanup laws, the number of Orphan Sites and abandoned mines in the state, and DEQ's involvement and fiscal responsibility in the clean up or mitigation process. Staff identified legal and policy issues including:

- OWEB does not fund maintenance of restoration projects; since the treatment system will be permanent, OWEB will need assurance that some entity will continue to fund operation and maintenance of the treatment system.
- The Department of Justice has indicated that one of the following will be needed to meet permitting requirements for the treatment system:
 - An NPDES permit issued for the site, or
 - DEQ's officially documented approval of the contemplated grant activity as a removal or remediation activity.
- Because of the strict liability for cleanup sites imposed by federal and state law, OWEB had concerns about risk of liability to OWEB for providing grant funding. The Department of Justice (DOJ) has indicated OWEB would probably not incur liability since OWEB's role would be strictly to provide grant funds and not provide any oversight or regulation of work on the site. OWEB also had concerns about whether the watershed council might have risk of liability. DOJ's informal response indicates there is a risk to the council as an "operator" or "arranger." OWEB understands the council has discussed this issue with DEQ; however, DEQ cannot shield an owner or operator from potential liability to a third party who might seek to enforce cleanup or damages under cleanup laws.

- Should OWEB provide funding for cleanup activities where federal and state law make “responsible parties” strictly liable, and where the federal Superfund and state Orphan Site Account were created to fund cleanup at sites where responsible parties are unknown, unwilling or unable to fund cleanup?
 - a. Does it matter if federal and state cleanup funds are insufficient?
- If OWEB should provide funding, what funding sideboards are appropriate, if any? E.g.,
 - a. No OWEB funding for federal Superfund sites.
 - b. No funding for work on federal lands, federal landowners are responsible and should fund the work.
 - c. Funding for private land only where landowners are contributing significant cash or in-kind to the cleanup.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Defer funding decision until June to allow follow up discussions regarding policy issues and potential funding sideboards.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount

Total Recommended Board Award

\$ 0.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6039	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Low Fish Passage Restoration Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$26,125.00	Total Cost:	\$35,605.00

Application Description

This technical assistance application was submitted for engineering design relating to the removal of a full channel spanning concrete irrigation diversion dam on West Birch Creek, a tributary of Birch Creek in Umatilla River watershed. Partners include ODFW, Freshwater Trust, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) and the BPA.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (7%), contracted services (84%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The review team acknowledged that this project, once implemented, will have high intrinsic value in salmonid connectivity – especially as it relates to juveniles. There is one existing barrier below this site and it was also submitted this cycle for technical assistance as 211-6040, Hamby Fish Migration Project.

Reviewers spent time discussing the proposed budget, noting that the costs seemed high for a design that should not be that complex, and asking if there had been bids. The application did not include any documentation to explain the costs. After some discussion, reviewers concluded that dollars could be saved if this and 211-6040 were bid together as a package. This site is three miles from the Hamby project so some design costs, such as basin hydrology, stream flow, travel etc., could be utilized for both sites. The review team felt this application was ready for funding with the condition that it would be bid together with the Hamby project as a package.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Staff to follow up on applicant requesting a minimum of three (3) bids, combining this proposal and 211-6040 to realize efficiencies and lower costs. Bid line item for this site not to exceed engineering costs stated in original budget.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 3

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount
			\$26,125.00

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund. Staff will recommend the applicant request a minimum of three (3) bids, combining this proposal and 211-6040 to realize efficiencies and lower costs.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount

EM Portion

PE Portion

Non-Capital Amount
\$26,125.00

Total Recommended Board Award
\$26,125.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6040	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Hamby Fish Migration Project		
Applicant:	Umatilla SWCD		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$32,725.00	Total Cost:	\$44,205.00

Application Description

This technical assistance application was submitted for engineering design relating to the removal of a full channel-spanning abandoned concrete irrigation diversion dam on West Birch Creek, a tributary of Birch Creek in Umatilla River watershed that is considered by ODFW as significant steelhead habitat. Partners include ODFW and the BPA.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (5%), contracted services (86%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

This project is very similar to the 211-6039 request also located on West Birch Creek. The funds requested would pay for research, surveying and engineering to remove an abandoned irrigation diversion and stabilize streambed and banks. The review team noted this project has high intrinsic value in salmonid connectivity – especially as it relates to juvenile passage. The engineering line item in the budget seemed high to the team, but it was acknowledged there were significant channel and streambank factors to incorporate in the design. However, the team wondered if dollars could be saved if this proposal and 211-6039 could be bid together as a package to cut costs. This site is three miles from the Low site so some costs, such as analysis of basin hydrology and stream flow, travel, etc., could be utilized for both sites, thus increasing efficiencies.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Fund with Conditions. Staff should follow up on having applicant request a minimum of three (3) bids combining this proposal and 211-6039 to realize efficiencies and hopefully result in lower costs. Each project cost not to exceed engineering costs stated in individual budget.

Regional Review Team Priority

1 of 3

Distribution of Recommended Award Amounts

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount \$32,725.00
-----------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Fund. Staff will recommend the applicant request a minimum of three (3) bids combining this proposal and 211-6039 to realize efficiencies and hopefully result in lower costs.

Staff Recommended Award

Capital Amount	EM Portion	PE Portion	Non-Capital Amount \$32,725.00
-----------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---

Total Recommended Board Award

\$32,725.00

October 18, 2010 OWEB Grant Cycle Mid Columbia Review Team (Region 6)

Application No.:	211-6041	Project Type:	Technical Assistance
Project Name:	Birch Creek Instream Flow and Fish Barrier Outreach		
Applicant:	Umatilla Basin WC		
Basin:	UMATILLA	County:	Umatilla
OWEB Request:	\$34,995.00	Total Cost:	\$60,650.00

Application Description

This landowner recruitment proposal would subsidize staff funding to assist in contacting landowners along Birch Creek, a priority stream in the Umatilla basin. The goal is to encourage landowners to participate in restoration projects removing fish passage barriers, improve irrigation efficiencies, explore instream flow/leases, and enroll in federal/state programs to offset funding of such improvements. Partners include the Freshwater Trust, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), ODFW, Blue Mountain RC&D, Umatilla SWCD and the USFWS.

OWEB funds were requested for in-house personnel (86%), travel (3%), supplies/materials and production (1%), equipment (1%), and fiscal administration (9%).

REVIEW PROCESS

Regional Review Team Evaluation

The team acknowledged that Birch Creek is an important salmonid habitat with limiting factors of barriers, flow and temperature. Building landowner trust is an important component of successful restoration on this stream system. That being said, the review team found the application confusing and unclear in its priorities and scope. They were not sure whether the focus was mainly on removal of the Broun Dam or more of a basin-scale approach. If it is for removal of Broun Dam, there are six landowners and all need to agree. If it also proposes to address other barriers in the system, that adds landowners. After much discussion, the reviewers found that they did not understand for what purposes the landowners would be contacted or what the applicant wants to accomplish. The application lacked clear deliverables such as number of landowners to be contacted and number of diversions to be included in the scope.

Overall, the concept is a good idea and reviewers struggled with their recommendation. In the end, the team concluded this proposal is not ready for funding at this time. The review team would like to see the application resubmitted with 1) clearer goals, 2) better detail and 3) more accountability in the budget. It would help if the application included an inventory of priority barriers that will be targeted vs. lower priority barriers; the application's focus should be clear, and it should explain how the work fits into the larger Birch Creek plans.

Regional Review Team Recommendation to Staff

Do Not Fund.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Do Not Fund.