WATERSHED RESTORATION GRANT APPLICATION

Revised
August 2006

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please read the "Instructions for Completing Restoration Grant Applications" before beginning your application.
2. Use 8½″ x 11″ single-sided, unstapled pages. Avoid color and detail that will not photocopy clearly.
3. Complete Sections I and II in the space provided.
4. Answer all the questions in Section III on separate 8½″ x 11″ single-sided, single-spaced, unstapled pages. Complete the required forms and attachments.
5. Read, complete, and sign the Application Checklist at the back of this document.

A down-loadable electronic application form and instructions can be obtained from **www.oregon.gov/OWEB**

SUBMISSION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS

Grant applications may be submitted to OWEB at any time by hard copy via mail or delivery to our Salem office. No faxes or emails will be accepted. To learn about the next deadline and review date, visit our website at the address shown above.

OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD
775 Summer St. NE, Suite 360
Salem OR 97301-1290
Phone: (503) 986-0178

Section I
APPLICANT INFORMATION

Type the information for Sections I and II **USING ONLY the pages provided** (or reproduce the pages on your computer **using the spacing and layout shown, NOT TO EXCEED 2 PAGES**)

Sections I and II must accompany your application
THE FIRST 2 PAGES ARE NOT THE PLACE TO DESCRIBE YOUR PROJECT IN DETAIL

Name of project: 2008 Deer Creek Culvert Replacement

OWEB dollars requested: $116,683 **Total cost of project**: $241,866

Project location:

This project occurs at (check one): ☒ **A single site** ☐ **Multiple sites**

Lower Wallowa River
Watershed(s)

Wallowa
County or counties

T01S R42E Sec 18
Township, Range, Section(s)

Longitude, Latitude (if available)

Applicant: Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program (GRMWP)

Official Contact (if different): Jeff Oveson

Email: jeff@grmw.org Phone: (541) 663-0570 Fax: (541) 962-1585

Street: 1114 J Avenue City: La Grande Zip: 97850

Technical Contact (if different): Coby Menton
Email: coby@grmw.org Phone: (541) 663-0570 Fax: (541) 962-1585

Landowner (see Instructions): USFS

Fiscal Officer (if different): Mary Estes **Affiliation:** GRMWP

Email: mary@grmw.org Phone: (541) 663-0570 Fax: (541) 962-1585

Street: 1114 J Avenue City: La Grande Zip: 97850

Section II
PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Abstract. In the space provided, and in 150 words or fewer, state 1) the problem, 2) the proposed solution, 3) other partners involved, and 4) how OWEB funds will be used.

An existing 8.4'x5' open-bottom arch at RM 11.7 on Deer Creek, a tributary to the Wallowa River, is undersized and a barrier to fish passage. Additionally, a 3-foot high waterfall over a log weir 15 feet downstream of the culvert outlet ensures only large fish get past this point. Replacing the arch and removing the log weir will open 2.5 miles of habitat for juvenile steelhead trout and 5.0 miles of habitat for juvenile and sub-adult bull trout. The proposed solution is to replace this arch with a 23'(span) x 7'(rise) x 40' bottomless concrete box with wing walls set at stream grade and remove the downstream log weir to restore up- and down-stream connectivity for all aquatic organisms. Partners include the GRMWP, BPA, USFS, and OWEB. USFS engineering designs for this project are complete. OWEB funds will be used to pay for project management, labor, and equipment rental.

2. Was this application submitted previously? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**
If yes, what was the application number?

3. Is this project a continuation of a previously OWEB-funded project(s)? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**
If yes, what was the application(s) number?

4. Project Partners. In the table below, show all anticipated funding sources (do not include OWEB) and indicate by checking in the appropriate box the nature of their contribution. Be sure to provide a dollar amount or value for each funding source. If participation is in-kind, briefly describe the nature of the contribution in the first Column.

Funding Source (if in-kind, briefly describe the nature of the contribution)	Cash (X)	In-Kind (X)	Secured (X)	Pending (X)	Amount/Value
Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program - *request for proposals (RFPs) and contract preparation, pre-bid site tours with contractors, contractor selection, interim reporting, contract management, Picies completion reporting.*		**X**	**X**		**$2,349**
US Forest Service – *survey project area,* ***NEPA, ESA, SHPO compliance, project designs,*** *assist with RFPs and contract preparation, pre-bid site tours with contractors, contractor selection, project oversight, direction for streambed excavation and rebuilding, completion reporting and monitoring activities.*		**X**	**X**		**$38,475**
Bonneville Power Administration	**X**			**X**	**$84,359**
Total Estimated Funds (add all amounts in the far-right Column):					**$125,183**

5. Have any conditions been placed on other funds that may affect project completion?
☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**

Attachments — Complete and attach to the back of your application:

☒ *Project Maps: 1) Provide a vicinity map showing township, range, and section (TRS), and the project location. 2) On a USGS 7.5 min. topo quad map, or on an aerial photo showing TRS, locate the extent of your project and site-specific activities. **Provide maps on 8½″ x 11″** pages and include a legend.

☒ *Preliminary Project Designs: Provide sufficient detail to allow a reasonable evaluation of the proposal and of the effect of the project on the site. The preliminary design should include reference to appropriate standards and guidelines.

☒ *Photographs: Provide photographs to aid in understanding the situation. If color photos are necessary to convey information important for application review, supply 25 copies of each photo. **Note: If your project is funded, pre-project photos will be required in the final report.**

☒ Letters of Support from project partners or others, as appropriate.

*** IMPORTANT:** Avoid color and detail that will not photocopy clearly. Otherwise, provide 25 color copies of any maps, photos, or project designs that you want OWEB reviewers to see in color. Multiple copies must be collated and stapled into separate packets for distribution to the reviewers. This is the only exception for the use of staples.

Section III
SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT ACTIVITY

These essay questions and their answers are designed to step you and reviewers through a logical process from understanding and identifying the problem to "fixing" the problem and measuring for success.

Answer the questions in 12-pt type size, single spaced, on single-sided pages. Use bullets where appropriate. Use **bold face** and *italics* for emphasis only. If the project involves multiple sites, be specific for each. **Refer to the Instructions for clarification and helpful examples.**

R1. Contextual Overview

Provide a brief contextual overview of where the project will be implemented. Describe the key watershed issues. Describe the key water quality, water quantity, species, habitat, and resource management issues (physical or social) that are limiting conditions. Also briefly describe the process used to identify and prioritize restoration issues. DO NOT describe the project here; you will do so in question #R3.

Deer Creek is a 20 mile-long creek located in the Lower Wallowa Watershed of the Wallowa River Subbasin of the Grande Ronde Basin (see vicinity map). From its confluence with the Wallowa River to approximately RM 10, Deer Creek is on private land. The upper 10 miles are on USFS land, with 6 miles of that in the Eagle Cap Wilderness. The culvert proposed for replacement is at RM 11.7 on USFS land. Deer Creek contains spawning and rearing habitat for Snake River steelhead trout and bull trout, both of which are listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

One of the key limiting factors to bull trout and steelhead distribution in the Lower Wallowa River Watershed are fish passage barriers such as the arch/log weir combination addressed in this proposal. Replacing this arch will restore passage to 2.5 miles of juvenile steelhead habitat and 5.0 miles of juvenile/sub-adult bull trout habitat. Replacing this arch will also eliminate the current risk of headcutting under the arch should the log weir downstream fail.

The Deer Creek arch was rated "very high" for replacement in the 2001 Culvert Fish Passage Rating and Prioritization Report by the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest (W-WNF) staff based on Region 6 fish passage evaluation criteria. The Nez Perce Tribe also ranked the Deer Creek arch and downstream log weir as high replacement priorities in Wallowa County (Barrier Prioritization, Wallowa County, 2007, www.nezperce.org/~dfrm/Watershed/). USFS aquatics personnel worked with local private, state, and tribal counterparts in identifying the need to replace this culvert, and determined that replacing this arch was the number one priority over all other culverts in the county. The Deer Creek arch is also the W-WNF's highest priority for replacement in 2008. Replacement of this culvert is considered a key recovery action for bull trout while also benefiting steelhead.

R2. Problems to Be Addressed

Use a table similar to the example below to provide site-specific information for the project: a) The specific problem(s) you are addressing; and b) the *root* cause(s) of the problem(s). DO NOT describe the project here; you will do so in question #R3.

Specific Problem(s)	Root Cause(s) of the Problem
Barrier to juvenile fish passage	Passage barriers are one of the key limiting factors for steelhead and bull trout distribution in this watershed. The bankfull width of Deer Creek at this culvert is 18 feet, while the current structure is undersized at an 8.4' wide x 5' high open bottom arch set at a 5% grade with a trash rack at the inlet. The gradient of the streambed is very steep at the inlet as well: 13.8% from the inlet extending eight feet upstream, probably from the influence of the trash rack. Additionally, there is a 3-foot drop over a log weir just fifteen feet downstream of the arch outlet that prohibits upstream passage of juvenile steelhead and juvenile/sub-adult bull trout which are listed as "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act.
At risk for failure	The log weir downstream of the culvert outlet is the last remaining log step in a series of 3 or more log steps that were installed in the past to attempt to provide fish passage past the culvert. The remains of 2 more log weirs are evident downstream of the current weir. Failure of this last log weir would result in a quick-moving headcut that would undermine the arch and would result in deleterious impacts to 12 miles of aquatic habitat downstream.

R3. Project Description

Use a table similar to the example below to describe the proposed action. The degree of detail should match the project complexity and technical difficulty to allow for full evaluation of the technical viability. For projects involving multiple sites, be sure to identify them separately, as appropriate. See the Application Instructions for definitions of "measurable objectives" and "practices," and as well as for helpful examples.

Specific Problem(s) (Repeat from #R2)	Measurable Objectives	Proposed Practices, Detailed Descriptions, and Root Causes
• Barrier to juvenile fish passage • At risk for failure	• Increased fish passage • Decrease failure risk	Proposed practice: remove log weir and replace undersized arch with concrete box (see attached photos and engineering designs). Detailed description: An existing 8.4'(span) x 5'(rise) x 61'arch will be removed and replaced with a 23'(span) x 7'(rise) x 40' concrete bottomless box with wingwalls. The box is designed to pass the 100-year peak flow event. The log weir downstream will be removed, and 248 total feet of stream channel (extending 116 feet upstream and 68 feet downstream of concrete box and wingwalls) will be reconstructed to its natural gradient of 5% with a bankfull width of 18' using stream simulation design. Thirteen

		rock steps will be constructed approximately 20 feet apart throughout the reconstructed channel to provide grade control and imitate natural steps in the channel upstream of project area. These actions will restore access to 2.5 miles of upstream habitat for juvenile Snake River steelhead and 5.0 miles of upstream habitat for juvenile/sub-adult bull trout.

R4. Other Related Plans/Efforts

a) Explain how the project complements other efforts under way or completed in the watershed; b) Explain how the project implements a local area plan (e.g., watershed assessment/action plan, TMDL, agricultural water quality plan). Provide the name and date of the plan(s), and where and how the plan(s) identifies as a priority the problem(s), which the project proposes to address; and c) Explain whether the project implements a regional plan (e.g., ESA Recovery Plan, Coastal Coho Assessment, OWEB Basin Priority Plan, NWPCC Subbasin Plan, Groundwater Management Area). Provide the name and where and how the plan identifies as a priority the problem(s), which the project proposes to address. (See the Application Instructions for helpful links to various regional plans).

The Grande Ronde Subbasin Plan identified the Wallowa Steelhead population as a habitat priority for Grande Ronde steelhead (pg 4). Key habitat quantity and sediment loads highly impacted steelhead survival in the greatest proportion of steelhead Geographic Areas (pg. 12). The Grande Ronde Subbasin Plan Supplement (2004) Table 3-2 pg. 16 identifies key habitat quantity and sediment as key limiting factors for steelhead populations in the Lower Wallowa. Table 3-3 pg. 17 recommends identification and reduction of largest tributary sediment sources resulting in moderate improvements to steelhead abundance, productivity and diversity. Table 5-4 pg. 40 summarizes priority attributes for the Wallowa-Lostine River and includes key habitat quantity, habitat diversity, and sediment all attributes improved by this project.

The Lower Wallowa River Watershed is one of the five highest-priority Geographic Areas for the Grande Ronde Subbasin Steelhead Population (pg 16) and is a Geographic Area priority for multiple fish populations (pg 17). The EDT analysis of restoration scenarios showed that that largest potential increase in both steelhead and spring Chinook production occurs in the Wallowa River watershed. Based on this finding, priority should be given to improving fish passage in the Wallowa River watershed (pg 37).

Key issues impacting bull trout populations are increasing stream temperatures from water withdrawals and changes in riparian function, fish passage barriers, and competition with non-native species (pg 37). Bull trout strategy is to address fish passage barriers to ensure connectivity between local populations. The Subbasin Plan recommends fixing passage barriers due to low flows, diversions and culverts to restore fish passage into habitat (pg 46). Restoring watershed connectivity by restoring fish passage to good habitats has been identified as one of the methods to prioritize projects in the Grande Ronde Subbasin.

R5. Project Design

a) Identify who will do the project design and include their qualifications and experience; b) Describe how project planning and design take into consideration extreme events (e.g., floods, fire, drought, etc.) known to be of concern in the area that have the potential to impact your project; and c) provide a brief description of design alternatives considered and the reasons for choosing the one(s) proposed.

The design for this project was completed in October 2007 by Kim Johansen, P.E. He is a USFS engineer at the Willamette/Siuslaw/Hood National Forest Supervisor's Office in Corvallis, Oregon. The concrete bottomless box with wingwalls as designed will pass the 100-year peak flow event. A bridge was briefly considered for this project, but the sharp switchback nature of the road crossing at this site required a fairly wide road base and a culvert, arch or concrete box design. A multi-plate ellipse and bottomless arch were more seriously considered for this project, but the concrete box design was chosen because it is inherently more stable and less likely to fail than an ellipse, and it would take the shortest amount of time to install.

R6. Proposed Project Schedule

Use a table similar to the example below to show the anticipated schedule for the project. See the Application Instructions for clarification and an example.

Project Stage and Phases	Date	Description
Pre-Implementation		
Phase 1	Spring 2006	Meet with local counterparts. Determine Deer Creek priority for replacement.
Phase 2	Summer 2006	USFS survey project area.
Phase 3	Summer 2007	USFS complete design for arch replacement.
Implementation		
Phase 1	July-Aug 2008	Remove and replace arch with bottomless concrete box; remove log weir.
Phase 2	October 2008	USFS spreads native seed on disturbed soil.
Project Completion	July 2009	Site will be inspected by project hydrologist and photos taken to show replacement achieving fish passage

R7. Project Monitoring

YOU DO NOT NEED TO FILL OUT THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE NOT PLANNING ON DOING MONITORING ABOVE AND BEYOND WHAT IS REQUIRED BY OWEB GRANT AGREEMETNS (See R9).

If requesting funding to perform monitoring of this project above and beyond what is required as a part of OWEB grant agreements (See R9) use the table similar to the example below to show: a) measurable objectives (repeat from #R3) b) type of monitoring (see instructions for definitions); c) what will be monitored; d) the frequency and duration of monitoring; e) protocols to be used; and f) who will monitor (name, affiliation, phone number). Relate each monitoring activity to the objectives shown in #R3. Also provide a brief statement as to why it is important to monitor this restoration project above and beyond what is required in the OWEB project completion report and post- implementation status report (see R9).

Measurable Objectives (Repeat from #R3)	Monitor for What?	Frequency and Duration of Monitoring	Who Will Monitor? (name, affiliation, phone)
Increased fish passage	Visual inspection of box substrates and inlet and outlet conditions.	1x in the year following project completion	Dana Nave USFS hydrologist 541-426-5690

Decrease failure risk	Visual inspection of conditions in and around concrete box to identify hydraulic jumps that may pose a failure risk.	1x in the year following project completion	Dana Nave USFS hydrologist 541-426-5690

R8. Educational/Public Awareness Opportunities

Explain whether and how you will educate and raise public awareness about the project (e.g., install a project partner sign, write an article for the local paper, lead a site tour for local citizens). See the Application Instructions for clarification of eligible education and outreach costs.

This project will be highlighted in Ripples in the Grande Ronde newsletter a quarterly publication focusing on natural resources in the Grande Ronde Basin.

R9. Project Completion and Post-Implementation Status Reports

Use a table similar to the example below to indicate who will inspect and sign off on the completed project, as well as submit the Project Completion Report (Exhibit C) and required Post-Implementation Status Reports (Schedule D). Identify that person's affiliation and provide contact information for that person.

Name of Person Who Will….	Agency/Organization and Address	Telephone Number	Email Address
Inspect and sign off on the project: Jeff Stein, engineer	USFS, 88401 Hwy 82, Enterprise, OR 97828	541-426-5656	jwstein@fs.fed.us
Submit the *Project Completion Report:* Dana Nave, hydrologist	USFS, 88401 Hwy 82, Enterprise, OR 97828	541-426-5690	dorrick@fs.fed.us
Submit the *Post-Implementation Status Report:* Dana Nave, hydrologist	USFS, 88401 Hwy 82, Enterprise, OR 97828	541-426-5690	dorrick@fs.fed.us

R10. Project Maintenance

Use a table similar to the example below to document how the project will be maintained over time. State who will maintain the project. Identify their affiliation and provide contact information.

Name of Person Agency/Organization and Addresses	Telephone Number Email Address	What will be done and for how long?
Jeff Stein, USFS, 88401 Hwy 82, Enterprise, OR 97828	541-426-5656 jwstein@fs.fed.us	Yearly visual inspections of the concrete box condition and potential blockage threats will be conducted indefinitely. Maintenance needs are anticipated to be minimal.

S Section IV

WATERSHED RESTORATION BUDGET

IMPORTANT: Read the application instructions. Attach additional lines, if necessary

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Itemize projected costs under each of the following categories.	**Unit Number** (e.g., # of hours)	**Unit Cost** (e.g., hourly rate)	**In-Kind Match**	**Cash Match Funds**	**OWEB Funds**	**Total Costs** (add columns C, D, E)
PRE-IMPLEMENTATION. Must occur *after* the OWEB grant agreement has been fully executed, unless it is a city or county charge for processing the Land Use form. OWEB funds will be disbursed only upon receipt of all required permits and licenses.						
GRMW Project Manager	100 hours	$45/hour	$2,250		$2,250	$4,500
USFS Hydrologist	120 hours	$30/hour	$3,600			$3,600
PROJECT MANAGEMENT. Includes *staff or contractors* who coordinate project implementation. Line items should identify who will be responsible for project management and their affiliation.						
USFS Engineer	160	$35/hour	$5,600			$5,600
USFS Hydrologist	80	$30/hour	$2,400			$2,400
IN-HOUSE PERSONNEL. Includes *only* applicant employee costs and the portion of their time devoted to this project.						
CONTRACTED SERVICES. Labor, supplies, and materials to be provided by non-*staff* for project implementation.						
Deer Creek Culvert Replacement Design (K. Johansen)	25 days	$275/day	$6,875			$6,875
Excavation & Installation:						
Mobilization	Lump sum	$27,000			$27,000	$27,000
Construction survey and staking	Lump sum	$1,500		$1,500		$1,500
Soil erosion and pollution control	Lump sum	$16,000		$16,000		$16,000
Clearing and grubbing	Lump sum	$2,000		$2,000		$2,000
Removal of existing culvert	Each	$3,450		$3,450		$3,450
Excavation and embankment (1696)	CY	$25		$42,400		$42,400
Streambed channel excavation and rebuilding (191)	CY	$50		$9,550		$9,550
Aggregate base, grading D, compaction method A (36)	CY	$45		$1,620		$1,620
Bottomless box 23'x7'x40' purchase and installation with all foundations, wingwalls and curbs	Lump sum	$76,825			$76,825	$76,825
Streambed simulation rock, class 12 (116)	CY	$50		$5,800		$5,800
Stream Channel rocks, 16-24 inches (375)	Each	$50		$18,750		$18,750
TRAVEL. Mileage, per diem, lodging, etc. Must use current State of Oregon rate.						
GRMW project manager (2 trips)	200	0.4875/ml	$99			$99
		SUBTOTALS	$20,824.00	$101,070	$106,075	$227,969
FISCAL ADMINISTRATION. Not to exceed 10% of Subtotal of OWEB Funds. Costs associated with accounting; auditing (fiscal management); contract management (complying with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement); and fiscal reporting expenses for the OWEB project, including final report expenses (Exhibit C) for the grant.						
GRMW Indirect Expenses	10%				$10,608	$10,608
USFS Indirect Expenses	17.8%		$3,289			$3,289
		TOTALS	$24,113	$101,070	$116,683	$241,866

MATCH FUNDING FORM

Document here the match funding shown on the budget page of your grant application

OWEB accepts all non-OWEB funds as match. An applicant may not use *another OWEB grant* to match an OWEB grant. However, an applicant who benefits from a pass-through OWEB agreement with another state agency, by receiving either staff expertise or a grant from that state agency, may use those benefits as match for an OWEB grant. (Example: A grantee may use as match the effort provided by ODFW restoration biologists because OWEB funding for those positions is the result of a pass-through agreement).

At the time of application, match funding does not have to be *secured*, but you must show that at least 25% of match funding has been *sought*. On this form, you do not necessarily need to show authorized signatures ("secured match"), but the more match that is secured, the stronger the application. Identify the type of match (cash or in-kind), the status of the match (secured or pending), and either a dollar amount or a dollar value (based on local market rates) of the in-kind contribution.

If you have questions about whether your proposed match is eligible or not, visit our website at http://www.oregon.gov/OWEB/GRANTS/grant_app_materials.shtml, or contact your local OWEB regional program representative (contact information available in the instructions to this application).

Project Name: 2008 Deer Creek Culvert Replacement Applicant: Grande Ronde Model Watershed

Match Funding Source	Type (√ one)	Status (√ one)*	Dollar Value	Match Funding Source Signature/Date*
Grande Ronde Model Watershed	☐ cash x in kind	x secured ☐ pending	$2,349	Jeff Oveson
Bonneville Power Administration	X cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured X pending	$84,359	Jeff Oveson
US Forest Service	X cash X in kind	☐ secured X pending	$38,475	
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ pending	$_____	
	☐ cash ☐ in kind	☐ secured ☐ pending	$_____	

*** IMPORTANT:** If you checked the "Secured" box in the status Column for any match funding source, you must provide either the signature of an authorized representative of the match source in the final Column, or attach a letter of support from the match funding source that specifically mentions the dollar amount you show in the Dollar Value Column.

LAND USE INFORMATION FORM

This information is needed to determine if the proposed project complies with statewide planning goals and is compatible with local comprehensive plans (ORS 197.180). The form must be submitted before OWEB releases project funds. OWEB will release project funds only if the project either is not regulated by, or is compatible with, the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. If a project is regulated by the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance, OWEB will void grant agreements for projects the county determines to be incompatible with the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. If the county requires additional local approvals for a project regulated by the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance, OWEB will not release project funds until these conditions are satisfied.

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT/GRANTEE

Applicant/Grantee Name: Grande Ronde Model Watershed

Project Name: 2008 Deer Creek Culvert Replacement

2. TO BE COMPLETED BY CITY/COUNTY OR TRIBAL PLANNING OFFICIAL

Complete this section only after section 1, above, has been completed. Check the box below that applies:

☐ This project is not regulated by the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.

☐ This project has been reviewed and is compatible with the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.

☐ This project has been reviewed and is not compatible with the local comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.

☐ Compatibility of this project with the local planning ordinance cannot be determined until the following local approvals are obtained:

_____ Conditional Use Permit
_____ Development Permit
_____ Plan Amendment
_____ Zone Change
_____ Other

An application has ___ has not ___ been made for the local approvals checked above.

_____ _____

* Signature of Local Official Date

Print Name:_____ Phone:_____

Title: _____ Email:_____

Must be an authorized signature from your local City/County or Tribal Planning Department, regardless of which box is checked above.

LANDOWNER/APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

Monitoring Information from Participating Private Lands is Public Record

OAR 695-005-0030 (4) states that "All applications that involve physical changes or monitoring on private land must include a landowner signature signifying their approval and understanding that all monitoring information obtained on their property is public record. An explanation must accompany the application if any of the information required on the application cannot be provided. The landowner's signature will be required prior to the release of the grant agreement if the application is approved for funding."

Therefore, EITHER the applicant must sign and date in the "For the Applicant" section below, OR all private landowners participating in the project must complete this form at the application stage (use additional pages, if necessary) by signing in the "For the Landowner(s)" section below.

The project will occur on (check one):

X Public land only (STOP: No need to complete the rest of the form)

☐ Private land only ☐ Public & private land (If you check either of these boxes, complete either of the boxes below)

EITHER

For the Applicant: I am unable to secure all landowner signatures at this time as not all landowners have been identified at the time of application. I understand that should OWEB fund this project, that OAR 695-005-0030 (4) requires me to secure all participating landowner signatures prior to the release of an OWEB grant agreement for this project.

Applicant Signature _____ Date _____

OR

For the Landowner(s): By my signature below, I certify my understanding and approval that should the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board fund part, or all, of this proposal, that all monitoring information obtained on my property as a result of this project is public record. I understand that if I refuse to comply with the terms of this form, I will jeopardize my ability to receive OWEB compensation for my participation in this project.

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

Landowner Signature _____ Date _____

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FORM

AGREEMENTS:

I/we, Grande Ronde Model Watershed

of La Grande, Oregon, hereby make application for financial assistance under the terms and conditions of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board in the amount of $116,683. The total cost of the project is $241,866, as shown in Section I of the application and on the budget page.

I/we understand that if this proposal is funded, I/we will in most cases be required to:

- Sign a Grant Agreement containing the terms and conditions upon which funds will be released (work on the grant may not begin until all parties have signed the Grant Agreement);
- Submit a Cooperative Agreement between the Project Sponsor (Grantee) and the Landowner(s) addressing issues of site access, monitoring, and maintenance;
- Certify that the project complies with state, federal, and local regulations;
- Submit copies of all applicable permits and licenses from local, state, or federal agencies or governing bodies, or written evidence that permits and licenses are not needed;
- Submit a report at the completion of the project, and subsequent periodic reports as required in the Grant Agreement, on the project's performance;
- Resolve any and all outstanding issues from previous grants with OWEB.
- Agree that educational products and monitoring information resulting from projects are public domain;
- Complete the Oregon Watershed Restoration Reporting form; and
- Certify that the work to be accomplished will comply with the *Oregon Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Guidelines*.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Print Name: Jeff Oveson

Title: Executive Director

RESTORATION METRICS FORM

OWEB receives a portion of its funds from the federal government and is required to report how its grantees have used those funds. Complete both sections of the form below as they apply to your project. The information you provide is used for federal reporting purposes.

Section 1 Project Overview

Answer all six questions below, even if you have answered a similar question in a previous section in the grant application.

1. Land Use Setting: CHECK ONE BOX ONLY.

☐ **Urban/Suburban/Exurban** *(Projects located within urban growth boundaries or rural residential areas)*	***X*** **Rural** *(Projects located outside urban growth boundaries or rural residential areas.)*

2. Dominant Watershed Setting: CHECK ONE BOX ONLY. Example: Your project involves managing erosion in the upland area with some erosion control extended to the riparian area. Because most of the work is to occur in the upland area, you would check only the Upland box below.

☐ **Estuary** *(where freshwater meets and mixes with saltwater of ocean tides.)*	☐ **Riparian** *(adjacent to a water body, within the active floodplain.)*
x **Instream** *(below the ordinary high-water mark or within the active channel — includes fish passage.)*	☐ **Upland** *(above the floodplain.)*
	☐ **Groundwater** *(Projects that recharge groundwater or primarily affect the subsurface water table.)*
☐ **Wetland** *(areas inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated conditions.*	

3. Total Acres Treated: 1 **Total Stream Miles Treated:**<1

4. Project Priority Identification: Name the primary watershed/subbasin plan or assessment in which this project type is identified as a priority. **See Application Section III, question #R4.**

Grande Ronde Subbasin Plan

5. Project Limiting Factor(s): Watershed and/or habitat limiting factor(s) identified in the above plan addressed by the project. Check as many boxes as apply. **See Application Section III, question #R1.**

☐ Bank stability	☐ Nutrients	☐ Stream complexity
x Channel morphology	☐ Off-channel habitat	☐ Substrate conditions
☐ Estuarine habitat	☐ Over-wintering habitat	☐ Summer habitat
x Excessive sediment/erosion	☐ Rearing habitat	☐ Unscreened water diversions
☐ Exotic species	☐ Reduced habitat capacity	☐ Upland habitat diversity
x Fish passage	☐ Riparian habitat	☐ Water quantity
☐ Floodplain connectivity	☐ Shade	☐ Water quality
☐ Large wood	☐ Spawning habitat	☐ Water temperature
☐ Other (explain):		☐ Wetland habitat

6. Project Monitoring: Identify the type of monitoring. Check as many boxes as apply. **See Application Section III, question #R7.**

☐ Fish presence/absence/abundance/distribution survey(s)	☐ Riparian vegetation (Presence/Absence)
☐ Instream Habitat surveys	☐ Spawning surveys
☐ Macroinvertebrates	☐ Upland vegetation (Presence/Absence)
☐ Noxious weed (Presence/Absence)	☐ Water quality
X Photo points	☐ Water quantity
☐ Other (explain):	

Section 2 Project Activities

Provide values for each Project Activity applicable to your application. Leave blank any Project Activity or metric line that is not appropriate to your application. All data are pre-project and are therefore proposed, not completed.

Fish Passage Improvement Projects: *Projects that affect or provide fish migration. For partial barriers, include total miles made accessible by the project.*

☐ Install fish passage structure *(e.g., fish ladder, fishway, etc.)*	☐ Removal of stream crossings
x Remove/replace culverts	☐ Removal of irrigation/push up dams
☐ Other (explain):	

1 Number of fish passage blockages removed or improved

_____ Estimated miles of stream made accessible by removal of barriers *other* than culverts

2.5 Estimated miles of stream made accessible by the improvement or removal of culverts (i.e., record the miles of stream to the next barrier or the extent of fish use)

Water Quality Projects: *Projects that result in an improvement of water quality parameters.* Check all boxes that apply:

☐ Bacteria	☐ Nutrients (name):	☐ Temperature
☐ Dissolved Oxygen	☐ Pesticides	☐ Toxics
☐ Heavy Metals (name):	☐ pH	☐ Turbidity
☐ Nitrates	☐ Phosphorus	
☐ Other (explain):		

Instream Habitat Projects: *Projects that increase or improve the physical conditions within the stream environment to provide needed habitat conditions.* Check all proposed activities.

☐ Bank stabilization	☐ Channel reconfiguration	☐ Large wood placement
☐ Boulder placement	☐ Deflectors/barbs	☐ Off-channel habitat
☐ Carcass placement	☐ Floodplain connectivity	☐ Spawning gravel placement
☐ Other (explain):		☐ Weirs/grade control

_____ Pieces of wood per mile.

_____ Estimated number of miles of streambank to be stabilized (i.e., to be bioengineered or engineered to resist the erosive forces of flowing water). Add the length treated on both sides when both sides are to be stabilized; add one side when just one side is to be treated.

_____ Estimated number of miles of stream to be treated that **are not** bank stabilization. Count one side of the stream only.

Riparian Habitat Projects: *Projects above the ordinary high-water mark of the stream and within the floodplain of the stream.* Check all proposed activities for the riparian area.

☐ Beaver management	☐ Manage nutrient inputs	☐ Riparian habitat protected
☐ Conservation grazing management	☐ Manage sediment inputs	☐ Vegetation management (specify):
☐ Exclusion fencing	☐ Non-native/noxious plant control	☐ Voluntary tree retention
☐ Floodplain nurse log placement	☐ Planting riparian species	☐ Water gap development
☐ Off-stream livestock water development		
☐ Other (explain):		

_____ Estimated total acres of streambank to be treated.
_____ Estimated total acres to be planted.
_____ Estimated total acres of streambank to be treated for non-native/noxious plant species.
_____ Miles of streambank to be treated. Add the length treated on both sides when both sides are to be treated; add one side when just one side is to be treated.

Upland Habitat Projects: *Projects implemented above the floodplain.* Check all proposed activities for the upland area:

☐ Conservation tillage	☐ Reduction of fuels	☐ Sediment control basins
☐ Grazing management	☐ Reduction of nutrient inputs	☐ Terracing
☐ Non-native/noxious plant control	☐ Restore historic natural habitats	☐ Upland erosion control; planting/seeding
☐ Protect natural habitats	☐ Upland livestock water development	
☐ Vegetation management (e.g., juniper control)		
☐ Other (explain):		

_____ Estimated total acres of upland habitat to be treated for non-native/noxious species.
_____ Estimated total acres of upland habitat to be treated.

Estuarine Habitat Projects: *Projects that result in improvement or increase in the availability of estuarine habitat.* Check all proposed activities for the estuary.

☐ Dike breaching/removal	☐ Estuarine habitat creation	☐ Removal of existing fill material
☐ Estuarine channel modification	☐ Non-native/noxious plant control	☐ Tide gate modification
☐ Protection of estuarine habitat	☐ Tide gate removal	
☐ Other (explain):		

_____ Estimated total estuarine acres to be treated for non-native/noxious plant species.
_____ Estimated total acres to be reconnected to the estuary.
_____ Estimated total estuarine acres to be treated.

Wetland Habitat Projects: *Projects designed to create or improve wetland areas.* Check all proposed activities in the wetlands.

☐ Manage nutrient inputs	☐ Vegetation planting	☐ Wetland habitat enhancement
☐ Manage sediment inputs	☐ Wetland creation (from upland)	☐ Wetland protection
☐ Non-native/noxious plant control	☐ Wetland restoration (reestablishment of hydrology)	
☐ Other (explain):		

_____ Estimated total wetland acres to be treated for non-native/noxious plant species
_____ Estimated total wetland acres created
_____ Estimated total wetland acres to be treated (improvement, enhancement, restoration and planting)

Road Projects: *Projects designed to improve road impacts to watersheds.* Check all proposed activities.

☐ Road drainage system improvements	☐ Road sediment and delivery control
☐ Road obliteration/decommissioning	☐ Road surface improvement
☐ Road reconstruction	☐ Other (explain):

_____ Estimated miles of road to be treated.

Water Management Projects: *Projects designed to improve water efficiency, quantity, and timing within the watershed.* Check all proposed activities.

☐ Convert gravity diversion to pumps or infiltration galleries	☐ Irrigation systems for improved water conservation	☐ Recharge groundwater/aquifer
☐ Create off-channel flood storage	☐ Irrigation systems for improved water quality	☐ Reduce water loss in irrigation delivery
☐ Install storm water runoff treatment	☐ Protect instream flow	☐ Other (explain):

_____ Estimated amount of water (cubic feet per second) returned during the critical water period, April-October.

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Instructions: Use this form as an important cross-check to ensure that your application is complete. An incomplete application will jeopardize your application's review. After you have checked all the boxes, return the checklist with your completed application.

General

- ❑ Only one copy of the application is included with the packet (other applications should be sent separately)
- ❑ The application and attachments are on 8 ½ x 11″ paper
- ❑ The application and attachments are single-sided and single-spaced
- ❑ The application and attachments are not stapled or bound (sets of color photos and color maps excepted; see check box immediately below)
- ❑ Where color photos or color maps are provided, I have included 25 copies of each, and if there are multiple sets, they are collated and stapled (no other documents or attachments are stapled).

Section I – Applicant Information

- ❑ All questions in this section have been answered
- ❑ The OWEB Dollars Requested and the Total Project Cost mirror the totals shown on the budget page
- ❑ The project location is complete
- ❑ All contact information — for the applicant and fiscal agent — is complete and current

Section II – Project Information

- ❑ All questions in this section have been answered

Section III – Specific Restoration Project Activity

- ❑ All questions in this section have been answered

Section IV - Budget Page

- ❑ I have read the application instructions for completing the budget page
- ❑ Columns A and B have been completed, where appropriate
- ❑ Fiscal Administration does not exceed 10% of the OWEB subtotal (subtotal row, Column E)
- ❑ The totals shown in the last row add up and are accurately reflected in Section I of the application

Required Forms

- ❑ Match Funding form – show that at least 25% match has been sought (authorized signatures are not required at the application stage, but are strongly encouraged)
- ❑ Land Use form (required only for applications involving on-the-ground activities to ensure compatibility with the local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances) — completed as relevant, signed, and dated by local official
- ❑ Landowner/Applicant Certification form – completed, signed, and dated by all participating landowners
- ❑ Legal Requirements form – completed, signed, and dated by the applicant
- ❑ Restoration Project/Activity Types form — completed, as relevant
- ❑ Restoration Metrics form — completed, as relevant

Attachments (see page 3 of the application for details)

- ❑ Project Maps
- ❑ Preliminary Project Designs
- ❑ Photographs
- ❑ Letters of Support from key project partners or others, as appropriate.