

Project Update

Sodom Dam Fish Passage Improvement and Flow Management Project

Technical Team Meeting Comments

May 13, 2009 10 am to noon

Pioneer Villa, Halsey, OR

Prepared by: Denise Hoffert-Hay, Project Manager

Prepared for: Project area landowners and Tech Team members, May 2009

Questions? Please call or email Denise at: (541) 619-5896 or hofferthay@peak.org

In attendance:

Bud Baumgartner, Calapooia Watershed Council	Tara Putney, Calapooia Watershed Council
Denise Hoffert-Hay, Calapooia Watershed Council	Scott Wright, River Design Group
Troy Brandt, River Design Group	Jared Rubin, OR Dept Env Quality
Kerry Griffin, NOAA Restoration Center	Steve Mamoyac, OR Dept Fish and Wildlife
Michael Lambert, OR Dept Fish and Wildlife	Greg Apke, OR Dept Fish and Wildlife
Dennis Wiley, OR Parks and Recreation Dept	Darin Wilson, OR Parks and Recreation Dept
Jim Morgan, OR Parks and Recreation Dept	Jan Houck, OR Parks and Recreation Dept
Wendy Hudson, OR Watershed Enhancement Board	Shelly Hanson, US Army Corps of Engineers
Kate Groth, US Army Corps of Engineers	Michael Mattick, OR Water Resources Dept
Peter Jensen, Landowner	Telly Wirth, Landowner
Tim Otis, Landowner	Dave Goracke, Landowner
Theresa Buckley, Landowner	George Pugh, Landowner
Ann Gray, US Fish and Wildlife Service	Janine Castro, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Meeting began at 10 am with introductions.

Presentation from Scott Wright, River Design Group (RDG). Scott's PowerPoint presentation is available to view on the Council's website: <http://www.calapooia.org>

RDG's presentation focused on the results of the geomorphic study of the Calapooia River and briefly discussed conditions in the Sodom channel. Scott provided an overview of the conditions in each of the four Calapooia River reaches. He also provided an overview of the 5 management alternatives for the system.

Data collected for this project phase included:

Field Data

- Extend control point network (survey)
- Survey typical cross-sections and key features

Hydraulic Modeling Tasks

- Prepare at-a-section hydraulic models
- Determine channel capacities/overtopping

Remote Sensing

- Map, photo and GIS information

RDG conclusions for this phase:

- River environment has had extensive alterations
- Historical river processes have been interrupted and are no longer acting as they once did
- Management of the bifurcation area has a significant impact on river dynamics
- Fish passage at Sodom Dam does not meet current state and federal fish passage criteria

The five management alternatives presented at the meeting include:

1. Interim Action

- a. Implement fish passage (interim) improvements at all dams
- b. Develop plan for replacement of deteriorated structures
- c. Maintain bifurcation point with annual sediment and large wood removal
- d. Invoke flow management policy (as developed by Tech Team in 2003-04)

(Background on this option: In 2003-04, Inter-fluve worked with the Council and the Tech Team on site alternatives. During this process, they identified some interim actions that could be undertaken by the property owner to improve fish passage conditions at the Sodom Dam and at the Mill in the interim while a longer term management plan was under development. This Option 1 is to remind the group of these interim actions and to bring them forward for implementation since construction of a preferred long-term solution is likely several years away. The typical project would also examine the “Do Nothing” alternative, however with this project, doing “nothing” is not an option. FERC, ESA, sediment and water management issues have all reached critical mass. Continuing with status quo is not an option with this project. In addition, this site is not a “do nothing” site, even if the project were to attempt to maintain status quo, doing so requires some action from the dam/Mills owner (State Parks).

2. Fish Passage

- a. Install new fish ladders that meet current criteria.
- b. Develop specific flow regime and adaptive management plan.
- c. Increase capacity of Calapooia to ensure water delivery for fish passage and water rights holders.

3. Restore Calapooia as Mainstem

- a. Excavate or initiate natural river processes to reclaim channel
- b. Relocate existing homes or realign mainstem
- c. Upgrade bridges

4. Sodom Ditch as Mainstem

- a. Remove dam and establish grade control – natural channel
- b. Add habitat features to Sodom Ditch, upgrade bridges

5. Variable Flow Management

- a. Incrementally transition Sodom Ditch flows to Calapooia
- b. Install fish passage facilities at Shear and Spillway Dams

Meeting participants were then asked to have one representative from each state/federal agency to participate in a round table discussion on the project. Two landowner representatives

participated in the discussion. Denise Hoffert-Hay, Council Project Manager provided facilitation.

Representatives at the round table discussion included:

Steve Mamoyac, ODFW
Michael Mattick, WRD
Bud Baumgartner, CWC
Peter Jensen, Landowner
Shelly Hanson, USACE
Jared Rubin, DEQ
Janine Castro, USFWS
Kelly Griffin, NOAA
Dennis Wiley, OPRD
Wendy Hudson, OWEB
Telly Wirth, Landowner

Comments on Alternative 1: Interim Action

ODFW – Sodom Dam must be addressed. Alt 1 does not change the status quo and should not be carried further.

WRD – Under Alt 1, Calapooia eventually fills in with sediment and brush. Long-term non-starter, River goes away by accident not intention.

CWC – Improving fish passage is the Council's goal. Sodom Dam is identified in the Council's watershed assessment as the number one priority for restoration. We know the dam violates the law; it is failing. Do not pursue further. How could fish passage be improved in the interim with the complex funding and permitting environment?

Landowner – Disappointed to hear the Interim Action discarded. These issues are so complex, there is not a one-shot solution and interim action may be needed. When Parks purchased the property, fish needed to be considered and management of the existing system was required.

USACE – Regulatory/permitting role, not helping choose an alternative. Corps will examine the effects of the project on aquatic environment. Anticipate a long timeframe for receiving project permits. Need to envision how we want the system to look in 10-20 years and how to achieve that vision.

DEQ – No to status quo. It is good to think Big at the beginning of the project, but keep funding availability in mind. Have this option as the fall-back option if other actions are cost-prohibitive.

USFWS – Not supportive of Alt 1.

NOAA – Not viable or sustainable under current operating conditions. Not supportive of moving this alternative forward. Some of the actions identified in this option (excavation of the Calapooia, check boards on the Sodom) are included in other, more viable options.

OPRD – This alternative does not resolve issues with silting, flooding, fish passage or low flow conditions.

OWEB – Alt 1 does not address larger issues. Money should not be the primary concern at this point in the project.

Landowner – This is the least favorable option. However, may need a 5-10 year interim plan and this could be the transition process.

Comments on Alternative 3: Calapooia Channel Restored (discussed next, saved Alt 2 for the end)

WRD – Water rights issues fewer since there are fewer impacted water rights holders.

CWC – Pass.

Landowner – Pass.

DEQ: Significant excavation would be required to implement this alternative, what are the disposal options for the excavated sediment? Testing of the sediment definitely required under 401 program. ODOT and Linn County should be included in the discussions since their infrastructure (bridges) is being discussed. Can we increase the sinuosity of the Calapooia to create more storage (rather than just excavate the existing channel?) What about creating alcoves? Can we increase floodplain storage?

USFWS – Most supportive of this option. Maintain a longer channel with more complex habitat and keep Sodom as the flood control channel. Keep in mind, once Calapooia is abandoned, it is a one-way process and we permanently lose this channel. The number of homes and other infrastructure would likely be increased on the Calapooia's abandoned riverbanks making future re-capture of the channel impossible.

NOAA – This alternative provides long-term restoration of the Calapooia which has the best habitat and 2-3 more miles of habitat than the Sodom. Choosing this alternative means we are working with a more natural system. However, to move 1.5 million cubic yards of sediment requires 100 trucks a day hauling 10 yards each for 4 years. Are there other creative ways to achieve moving this amount of sediment?

Parks – Meets OPRD goals.

Landowner – Cost is a concern. More landowners will be happy. Moving the channel may decrease flooding. Protects more water rights and maintains the historic river. Currently, Calapooia channel a wetland that does not flow, this alternative would address that.

OWEB – Are landowner easements an option? Can we let the River move more freely?

ODFW - Ideal for fish, wildlife. Protects the historic river channel. Temperature benefits since Calapooia provides more shade to the River than the Sodom. However, Sodom is providing some habitat and is currently the primary fish migration corridor.

Comments on Alternative 4: Restore Sodom Channel

CWC – Loss of habitat in Calapooia, loss of water for Thompson's Mills, Sodom is a good overflow channel, not necessarily a good river channel.

Landowner – Courtney Creek and other tributaries feed into the Calapooia, can't lose it entirely.

USACE – Have to balance the human and aquatic system needs. Corps would have a difficult time giving up such a significant reach of the Calapooia.

DEQ – Variability of the Sodom channel not great enough, lacks base flows, hyporheic flows and other functions the natural Calapooia channel provides. Calapooia needs repair rather than starting from scratch with the Sodom. Think of how difficult it is to create new wetlands rather than to enhance existing wetlands. Similar situation with creating the River in the Sodom channel.

USFWS – This alternative abandons the historic channel and disrupts the longitudinal gradient. On-going stability issues will likely occur and require grade control. In long-term, this option may prove to be more expensive.

NOAA – Alternative 4 may be less expensive, but have more problems later.

Parks – Concur with others on issues raised. *Parks* is examining a closed system for demonstration milling (rather than continuing to manage flows to the Mills).

OWEB – Not viable. What happens in 100+ years if the system still operates as a ditch? More water rights impacted.

Landowner – Continued flooding/erosion in this channel is a major concern for ag producers.

ODFW – Does fix fish passage. Would want to see grade control structures in place of the Sodom Dam. Do we entirely lose the Calapooia or in the short-term will there still be water/habitat available in this channel?

WRD – Surprised how little support this option received from group. Yes, more water rights impacted under this scenario, but that is likely a non-issue since the water rights could be met with other options. No homes on this channel. Sodom is not uplands – it is all a floodplain. If there were 150-foot easement in place, CRP program, could let the Sodom channel meander and form a natural channel. How long will it take to recover the Calapooia channel after all the excavation work takes place? How much of the natural riparian buffer would still be in place?

Comments on Alternative 5: Variable Flow Control

Landowner – Ultimately, where we end up without management is a dried up Calapooia. Sodom Ditch will be the main channel soon if action not taken. This solution is likely best.

USACE – Council could implement this project in phases, use adaptive management to make adjustments down the road.

DEQ – This option should be kept on the table. Concerns with this option: highly regulated and with a lot of maintenance requirements, not clear who will be responsible for it long-term.

USFWS – This alternative is a modification to alternative 3. Would like to see this alternative move forward with alternative 3, both have similar goals.

NOAA – Can Shear/Spillway dams be removed entirely under this alternative not be replaced with grade control structures? Reminder that if dam removal is not the preferred alternative, ORI funding is not available for the project (over \$300,000).

Parks – Sees this as intensive management of the system for decades. *Parks* could have an off-line system for the Mills, but then still have to manage the River.

OWEB – Sees the option looking at the whole system, management of that system and bifurcation for years to come. This alternative raises more questions than it answers.

Landowner – This is not as favorable as 3, but perhaps as a compromise to get there. Homes between the bifurcation and Shear dams will flood if excavation or management not performed soon as flows increase on the Calapooia side.

ODFW – Management concerns over long-term life of the structure. More realistic for implementing a change-over to the flows being in the Calapooia.

WRD – This alternative doesn't discuss moving homes or re-aligning the channel. What happens to excess flows that get sent down this channel? Management of the system required for a long time.

CWC – This alternative provides a transition process, maintains flows in the Sodom for awhile. In past years' discussions, it seemed agency staff were opposed to variable flow structures and that these structures don't function well.

Comments on Alternative 2: Fish Passage

Landowner – Pass

OWEB – Not a long-term solution, full or partial removal required to receive existing *OWEB* grant funding.

OPRD – Pass

NOAA – Potential regulatory actions looming. Alternative 2 would be held up for FERC and other permitting authorities to weigh in on and all ESA issues must be addressed. This alternative not feasible.

USFWS – This alternative meets minimum requirements for fish passage. Not supportive of this option. Likely on-going dredging operations will not receive permits in the future.

DEQ – This scenario still leaves a fish passage obstruction and all the other issues unresolved.

Landowner – Who is on the line for taking care of/managing the structure?

CWC – Permits/funding for this alternative would be mission impossible.

ODFW – Sodom Dam must be addressed, preferably with grade control. Fish ladder is on its last leg.

At the end of the meeting, it seemed most representatives at the table were most in favor of Alternatives 3 and 5, to let the River be the River and to work to restore the more natural part of the system with the greatest potential to be high-quality habitat. However, in discussions following the meeting and the written comments that were provided seem to lean back toward examining Alternative 4 more closely.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05

WRITTEN COMMENTS

The following comments were provided in writing. They are organized by Alternative. When different agency folks submitted comments that were different in vision, I separated the entries. Where the vision/direction was similar, I lumped them. Some people provided more general, overall comments and those are included at the end as a separate section.

Written Comments on Alternative 1: Interim Action

Landowner - Need to re-define goals. Many goals were discussed – fish passage, landowner rights, preservation, erosion control, water quality, etc. With these goals in mind, not necessarily prioritized, several actions from each alternative may provide the best answer to reach these goals.

Landowner – One comment made by an agency staff person was, “whatever the cost” meaning forge ahead regardless. This seems like it was spoken by someone who does not own much if any land in the area.

Landowner – Not likely acceptable to any one.

Landowner – If other options take years to decades to implement, interim measures may need to be considered. However, putting money into temporary solutions seems inadvisable.

USFWS – Meets minimum requirements for fish passage, but does not move toward recovery and represents a lost opportunity. Not supported.

ODFW - What are the annual/yearly costs associated with this option and who is responsible for these funds (who will pay)?

Written Comments on Alternative 2: Fish Passage

Landowner – Very costly and does not address all of the flooding and erosion problems on Sodom or the sedimentation on the Calapooia.

Landowner – Okay from my perspective as a landowner, but may be a difficult proposal from a maintenance standpoint.

USFWS – Meets minimum requirements for fish passage, but does not move toward recovery. Lost opportunity. On-going dredging not viable and will be a future permitting challenge. Alternative 2 also would require additional costs to upgrade the Sodom Dam, which could be done as part of the fish passage structure, but likely at a greater cost than a fish ladder alone. Not supported.

DEQ – Does “increase conveyance capacity of Calapooia” mean dredging? If so, what would the frequency be projected to be given the apparent depositional regime under current conditions? What is the current authorization for dredging to remove debris? When is it scheduled to expire? What are the “larger scale stability” issues?

ODFW - This alternative is a viable alternative given the context of the Oregon Fish Passage Statutes and Administrative Fish Passage Rules, yet this does not address the larger context and more holistic approach.

Written Comments on Alternative 3: Restore Calapooia River

Landowner – This alternative will likely not go through, but a combination of re-establishing the Calapooia flows and maintaining stabilization of Sodom may be more feasible.

Landowner – Think this is a good option for habitat, probably better from an erosion and flooding standpoint, but the channel re-alignment could be a tough sell.

Landowner – My preferred alternative. Allows most flows down the historic channel and allows Sodom to be maintained as flood relief. Sodom channel has best opportunity to provide high flows without damage to infrastructure. All flows could be down the historic channel in summer low-flow period. Need to address fish stranding in Sodom Channel.

USFWS – Restores Calapooia River and maximizes habitat, retains greatest channel length, retains future restoration potential. The Calapooia River has more potential fish habitat now relative to the Sodom Ditch, particularly if additional flows were to enter the Calapooia River. Riverine habitats (including fish habitats) will be functioning at a much greater capacity in a shorter amount of time in the Calapooia (and the River will require less maintenance in the future than Sodom Ditch if Sodom Ditch became the primary channel) than if all or most flows were to continue down the Sodom Ditch. The higher functioning of the habitat in a shorter amount of time is important to the recovery of ESA-listed salmon and steelhead.

Most strongly supported.

DEQ – What is the linear area of channel alteration? What are the disposal options for 1.5 mc of sediment? Testing will be required. Is ODOT and the County involved in the potential I-5 and other bridges changes? Are you aware of NRCS and FEMA funding for moving development out of floodplains?

ODFW - This alternative is supported as a long term goal/vision as the most preferred outcome, yet this can not be accomplished without “interim” steps as outlined in alternative #5.

Written Comments on Alternative 4: Restore Sodom Ditch

Landowner – I feel this option is not viable. It does not create natural fish passage, although fish are smarter than we are. The Sodom is not designed to handle 100% of the flow. Historically, it was the overflow. Making it the primary channel would increase erosion of this channel and silt in the Calapooia over the long term.

Landowner – This may be the simpler alternative, also cheaper, but there is more potential for damage caused by erosion and flooding, also much less habitat than in alternative 3.

NOAA – I amend my objection to this alternative. A comprehensive land purchase and easement program, couple with channel improvements (build oxbows, etc) could result in the Ditch becoming a functional channel.

USFWS – Disrupts longitudinal continuity (sediment transport, etc) of the Calapooia River . On-going channel stability issues. Abandons historic channel. FWS is not supportive of this alternative and believes that it will not pass regulatory processes (ESA, Corps 404). Some statements made by other agencies indicated that most upstream migrating fish use the Sodom Ditch, and that Sodom Ditch provides spawning and rearing habitat. However, the FWS believes these statements were not fairly conditioned in the amount of time speakers were allowed. While these statements are reflective of current fish use, this greater use is by and large a fish response to current flow conditions, where the majority of river flow is flowing down Sodom Ditch. Upstream migrating fish will typically follow the largest stream flow when given a choice. With the restoration of flow to the Calapooia River, fish will readily use the river over Sodom Ditch. Similarly, the Calapooia River has more potential fish habitat now relative to the Sodom Ditch, particularly if additional flows were to enter the Calapooia River, and that riverine habitat (including fish habitats) will be functioning at a much greater capacity in a shorter amount of time than if all or most flows were to continue down the Sodom Ditch. The higher functioning of the habitat in a shorter amount of time is important to the recovery of ESA-listed salmon and steelhead. This alternative not supported.

DEQ – Does the ditch have enough variability for habitat creation? As with creating wetlands rather than restoring them, it is often impossible to create the correct assemblage of components to get the system to function. Rewatering an old natural channel typically has much more chance of success than designing a system to occur from a channelized ditch dug through uplands. This takes into account existing pathways for hyporheism to support baseflows and historic riparian zones which can be rejuvenated much more quickly than trying to establish them from nothing. Water quality benefits will be long in the lag time, if ever realized at the ditch, whereas the Calapooia already has function and is likely easier to repair where impaired rather than trying to create it from scratch. USFWS and NRCS have a new reference for successful stream restoration which should be examined. Would groundwater withdrawals be able to satisfy the water rights holders? Who would be impacted if the flow went to Sodom? Also, Sodom has different soil types.

Parks - Include "Alternative 4: Maintain Sodom Ditch as primary channel" in the feasibility study. The straw poll opinion was 7:3 in yesterday's meeting in favor of not including this option. Given the very brief time to discuss this option and the fact it is a reversal is earlier popular opinion, this should be kept as a viable option worthy of study. Keeping this as a viable option of study is a marginal cost since modeling work for Alternative 5: Variable Flow Management requires conducting similar tasks. Alternative 4 should include maintaining the

former Calapooia channel as a side-channel of the main river (Sodom Ditch). The Calapooia channel will not be abandoned, but will serve as a vital high-overflow channel for considerable time. Maintaining grade control at the current Sodom dam site will allow the side-channel to function for many years. Considerable funds are being invested throughout Oregon to create such channels. The Calapooia does and will continue to serve for many years the same functions so many river restorationists seek.

ODFW - As I read it, Alternative 4 would involve exchanging the Sodom dam/fishway with a series of grade control structures. In essence, the existing crest elevation would remain unchanged, just relocated. The bifurcation elevation would not change. "Management" (dredging/debris removal) of the bifurcation and Calapooia branch would cease, presumably resulting in the Calapooia branch gradually becoming increasingly isolated over time. I actually view this alternative as having some appealing aspects (sans the isolation component). It permanently addresses Sodom dam passage and adopts a "hands-off" approach at the bifurcation and in the Calapooia branch. While I generally support "hands-off" I'd still want to retain the ability to perform minimal "maintenance" at the bifurcation and/or elsewhere (i.e. Calapooia branch) to meet surface flow objectives throughout the year. While I am not supportive of Alternative 4's long term flow "abandonment" of the Calapooia branch, I could envision supporting an interim scenario whereby Alternative 4 was initially implemented as proposed and the system response carefully monitored over time. If it was ultimately determined that a VES was required at the bifurcation then appropriate action would be initiated. It might turn out, however, that the Calapooia branch might retain sufficient connectivity with the River and that installation of a VES would never be needed.

Written Comments on Alternative 5: Variable Flow Management

Landowner – This seems most viable because of the options that it provides as far as water management. It also addresses the fish passage problem. It will definitely require more management which, if left up to the Parks is a non-alternative. Parks' unwillingness to manage their own flood gates at the Mills is currently forcing water down alternative channels on my property. This is a side line problem, but I would like the opportunity visit more about this problem if possible. Bottom line, this alternative will most likely meet everyone's needs, but who will manage the diversion structure?

Landowner – Not long term, difficult because of management concerns.

Landowner – My second choice alternative. It allows adaptive management and 20 or more years to implement restoration projects.

NOAA – This option does not necessarily have to lead to the Calapooia becoming the primary channel.

USFWS – Meets restoration goals but has less certainty than alternative 3. Alternative 3 and 5 seem to be on the same spectrum, just different implementation. Management is a concern. Supported as a modification to alternative 3.

DEQ – Have they considered increasing Calapooia capacity by adding sinuosity and complexity (alcoves, side-channels, backwaters), rather than excavating? How about reconnecting floodplain? Establishing wetlands for storage? Shooting more water down a straight channel gets nothing for water quality, indeed it increases scour potential and erosion and sedimentation.

Not clear how implementation of this alternative leads to water rights issues for irrigators on the Calapooia River in the short-term?

Parks - It is not clear how Alternative 5: Variable Flow Management differs significantly from Alternative 3 except in complicated uncertainties. Until the former river channel attains historical carrying capacity for base flows, the channel will have to be excavated either with machinery or high river flows. We would have marginal control on the latter, using the river flows to excavate sediments deposited since the construction of the Sodom Ditch is uncertain in time and costs. I think there is a visceral attraction to "let the river do its work" in terms of sediment movement. Therein lies the appeal of acquiring through easement or fee-simple acquisition a buffer along the Sodom Ditch to allow natural process to occur using the Sodom Ditch as the main channel, with a little restoration effort to accelerate the process. Please consider all costs associated with the options, including soil disposal costs, bridge replacements, cultural resource protection, bank stabilization and re-vegetation after excavation. With the construction of recirculation (offline) system for Thompson Mill, OPRD has no operational interest in flow management of this reach of the Sodom Ditch/Sodom Dam/Calapooia River. Our interest is and will remain supportive of the collective effort to restore fish habitat and natural riverine functions.

ODFW - I believe this is the logical next step as an interim solution, while focusing on Alternative #3 as the long term goal and vision.

ODFW - Alternative 5 is the only design providing what I've felt all along was likely a necessary (albeit, undesirable) structural component for the Sodom/Calapooia's unique situation: some means of managing flow between the two channels (the "variable elevation structure" - VES). As desirable as it clearly is from a resource standpoint I do have doubts about our being able to return the Calapooia channel/floodplain to any real semblance of its historical self. Given the challenges and complexities inherent in such an endeavor it seems to me that the "phased-in" approach set forth in Alternative 5 represents the only potentially realistic means of pursuing such a vision. (Not surprisingly then, I really have a hard time envisioning implementation of Alternative 3 as proposed.) And even if the desired "flow emphasis transfer" is never fully implemented via Alternative 5 the VES, as troublesome as it is bound to be, will provide that essential element of flow control that will provide managers the ability to provide minimum flows in the respective channels for migrating adult salmonids as well as optimize the ecological potential of the available water during low flow periods.

General Comments

USFWS - Regarding Shear Dam as the process continues to move forward: If all alternatives that are selected to move forward include the removal of Shear Dam and maintain the Calapooia channel as the primary channel, it may be advantageous to remove Shear Dam as early as possible. It was stated at the May 13th meeting that Shear Dam has a backwater effect on the river that extends quite a distance upstream. If this were removed, some of the aggradation in the Calapooia River may start to move out on its own (especially if the bifurcation were dredged for a couple of years to allow more flow down the river), and ultimately result in reduced physical removal/dredging of sediment for restoration.

ODFW –

1. What are the future land use planning goals in the area, particularly given the projected population growth in the Willamette Valley?
2. What is the habitat potential for wildlife, fish, migratory birds, aquatic insects, etc. in both the Calapooia and the Sodom Ditch? This comparison is critical to the discussion and is paramount to the decision of which alternatives should be pursued?
3. I believe the solution lies with Alternative 5 as an interim short term solution, with the long term goal being Alternative #3. The target goal of #3, and the associated time lines, needs to be defined as a state of Oregon approach and ultimately would be set by the amount of financial resources available and the willingness of the stakeholders?
4. Where and how does the Calapooia River fit into the larger Endangered Species Act (ESA) context and subsequent recovery planning efforts and goals in Oregon? If the Calapooia River gets restored, what are the societal and natural resource “net benefits”?

ODFW - My primary concern with the current situation is that the Technical Committee’s preferred alternatives (3&5) now embrace a much broader vision(s) than that initially defined. While I fully support exploring the full range of conceptual possibilities I think we still need to be carefully consider each one’s implementation potential. While I never viewed abandonment of the Calapooia branch as an acceptable arrangement (and I’m still not convinced that will happen under Alternative 4), I don’t know that embracing the other extreme, however appealing it may be, works either.

NEXT STEPS

It is clear from reading/reviewing the agency and landowner comments that we will need to have another Technical Team meeting this summer to re-examine project goals in light of the changing project objectives. With Parks willing to seek an off-line water delivery system to meet their needs at the Mills, it changes the project landscape considerably. Also, it is apparent that conversations with SHPO, ODOT and Linn County need to take place in order to gain some perspective on challenges to implementing Alternative 3.

I will work to put together a summer meeting that combines the Technical Team and landowner groups to have another conversation about these alternatives and agency goals/project objectives. I want to make clear that this is not a Council project. This is a watershed team project. The Council’s role is to provide support for a collaborative process to take place where partners come together to reach a mutually agreeable solution to a complex, historic fish passage/water management dilemma. Thank you for your continued support of and participation in this process.

Submitted by: Denise Hoffert-Hay, Project Manager, Calapooia Watershed Council