

Hebo Stewardship Group Meeting Minutes

October 4th, 2012

Cape Kiawanda, Pacific City

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Ron Hudson	USFS		
David Skelton	USFS	Paul Katen	SDCWC
Alex Sifford	NNWC	Chuck Fisher	USFS
Catherine Pruet	SDCWC	Guy Sievert	NNWC
Lisa Phillips	TEP	Jane Barth	Facilitator

September minutes were approved by consensus.

Chuck Fisher, Technical Review Team leader

Chuck explained the review process for stewardship proposals:

- total of 11 applications.
- 6 different reviewers for the projects, including fish biologist, wildlife biologist, hydrologist, watershed person, OWEB reviewer, 1 non FS person. Scores ranged from 97.7 - 83.8. Only 1 of the 11 projects will have a challenge addressing the technical issues identified by the review team.
- Review is to help the applicant think the project through and help the roundtable decide what projects they want to put through. Final approval for the projects is given at the Regional Office level. The RO will scrutinize the technical aspects of the project to be sure the designs meet FS requirements. The Technical Review helps applicants make sure their project will pass at the RO level.
- If it is not a technical problem, then responses do not need to be reviewed by the technical review team again. Roundtable representatives will share that applicants are responding to concerns to ensure to the Roundtable that each project is ready to be moved forward. Applicants will integrate their responses into a revised proposal submitted to CPRCD. That way a "clean" proposal moves up to the SNF Board of Directors and RO. [Note: Applicants express a desire to not revise the entire application, and instead answer the questions raised by the responses as an addendum. Pros and cons of this can be explored in future funding cycles.]

Chuck then discussed details of the review of each of the HSG project proposals. The objective was to answer any questions the applicants had and to offer guidance for how they could respond to issues raised by the technical review team when they submit a revised proposal.

1. Butte Creek (NNWC) – Responses to reviews will be sent to Chuck.
 - a. R2 Tide gate – unclear to reviewers what is being proposed so need to explain more about situation with landowner. Fish are passing the tidegate even though it is not optimal. This is not likely to be a significant problem and will not need to

Approved

be reviewed by the technical team. The group agrees the project is worth investing in because fish passage is occurring.

- b. R3. Question about approaches to the bridge and disconnecting ditch from the stream. No drainage ditches are on the sides of the road; water flows off the sides to a meadow.
 - c. R4. Bankfull = Active channel width in application
 - d. R5 who is responsible for maintaining the bridge? The county owns the road and the bridge.
 - e. R9. Visual inspection of the project, by NNWC & Till. Co. for 3yrs after the project
 - f. R10. Cost of project is a quote from the company supplying the bridge.
- Guy motioned to for the group to support the project, Lisa seconded the motion and the group agreed by consensus.

2. Lower Schooner Creek (SDCWC)

- a. Riparian planting portion will be removed from the project. The site has enough shade and doesn't warrant riparian planting. Catherine will update the project budget. Total project cost will be \$33,907 including match.
 - b. R1. How will it benefit fish? Will explain in more detail in the update.
 - i. Downstream neighbor sees coho reaching the culvert but not passing.
 - ii. John Sanchez did a habitat assessment report.
 - iii. Habitat will be increased by 0.5 miles
 - c. R3. Excavator Bobcat from Hancock as In-Kind.
 - i. Bankfull width = 6-7ft, John Sanchez recommended the culvert size.
 - ii. Longitudinal profile has not been done.
 - iii. Design is a preliminary; FS needs more complete a design, including long profile for this type of project. Ideally the proposal would include engineering drawings and surveys, would show meets 100-year event, etc. Catherine assured Chuck the design will meet NOAA & ODFW fish passage requirements. She will get a letter from the engineer stating that his plan will meet all requirements. The design is being provided as match from Hancock, a new stewardship collaborator. [Note: The group would like more information on what type of designs is needed in proposals for different types of projects. Last year the log placement project proposal was OK with preliminary designs, but culverts require final designs.]
 - iv. Boulders in the scour pool, large rocks will be used to create 4 bands in the culvert to allow passage.
- Guy motioned to support the project, Alex seconded the motion, and the group agreed by consensus without the caveat to approve final design.
 - The group also was in consensus to move the 2 projects forward at top priority rather than ranking them. They anticipate both being funded so no need to rank.

- Jane explained that there are approximately \$50,000 more retained receipts than initially projected. The Roundtable will decide how to allocate those additional funds. Ideas discussed in other stewardship groups include 1) giving some of the funds to the FS to fund their projects since their project total is higher than their 60% of the retained receipts, 2) to allow project applicants to scale up their projects, and 3) to allow new projects proposals to be made. The group had concerns about leaving this allocation to the Roundtable and voiced a strong preference for each group to be allowed to propose new projects and then compete for the additional stewardship dollars. Both applicants will, however, look for ways they might scale up their projects in case that is the method chosen by the Roundtable.

Forest Service Stewardship Updates

Ron Hudson shared that the FS has added a project for FS roads for Road Storm Mitigation.

Ron shared that the USFS had a Stewardship sale on Hebo RD that sold for \$1.9 million.

Announcements

- Future meetings:
 - Lincoln City on Nov 8th – main topic will be Roundtable debrief; let Jane know if you have any special topics you would like to have of upcoming agendas
 - Joint meeting in December- Date TBD

Meeting adjourned around 5pm.