

GRMW Project site tour for BiOp funding

Site Visit Report

Project: Dark Canyon Culvert Replacement & Watershed Restoration

Present: GRMW staff: Jeff Oveson, Lyle Kuchenbecker; BPA: Timmie Mandish, Rosy Mazaika, Kathy Fisher, Don Rose; FS: Joe Platz, Kurt Wiedenmann; ODFW: Tim Bailey; CTUIR: Allen Childs; NMFS: Christian Jilek, **Renee *****

Date of site visit: 10/28/09

Background:

Prospectus initial rating by expert panel: Medium

Species benefitted: steelhead

Habitat metric: 1.5 miles of improved passage, .5 mi enclosure fence on .25 mi Little Dark Canyon Creek (trib to Dark Canyon)

Restoration activities: Culvert replacement, prevention of dispersed rec site use, enclosure fence

Limiting Factors Addressed: Recovery Plan (UCG4): a) excess fine sediment; b) fish passage; c) degraded riparian

Funding: 245K prospectus/191,700 field

Technical Committee (TC) Comments: Support to move forward with proposal.

The project proposes to replace a partial barrier culvert on Dark Canyon creek to gain unhindered passage to 1.5 miles of habitat, restrict access to a dispersed campsite and fence from cattle use .25 miles of Little Dark Canyon creek.

Dark Canyon Creek, tributary to Meadow Creek is spawning and rearing habitat for listed SR steelhead trout. Little Dark Canyon Creek is rearing habitat for these listed steelhead. The planned restoration activities will address limiting factors identified for this stream system. Culvert replacement designs were initially prepared by the FS and are in draft form, they may have been completed, but that is not confirmed at this time. Fencing and dispersed rec site restoration are conceptual but will follow standard protocols. In general, design methods outlined in the field are supported by the TC, however \$191,700.00 project costs are high for the benefit that can be gained by addressing a partial fish passage barrier and improved habitat associated with tributary fencing and rec site rehabilitation. The TC supports this project for a reduced cost. If the project can be accomplished through cost share or reduction of project costs the TC can support the project for a maximum of \$125,000 in BiOp funding. As discussed previously, NEPA costs should be picked up by the FS (if their agency is unable to accept BPA NEPA clearance procedures).

Areas of interest from site visit /Additional information needs to include with proposal:

- When submitting proposal please include;
 - updated culvert design,
 - fencing specs with regard to distance from water body fence will be placed,
 - and further describe plan for how you will be addressing the dispersed recreation site.
- Separate out relative costs for different activities. For example, culvert provides direct benefit to listed fish species, fencing a nearby tributary provides watershed health benefits and is worthwhile provided costs for this activity are small in relation to total project cost.

Please work with the GRMW to submit a project proposal.