

Project Manager Report Review Protocol
Post-Implementation Status, Interim Progress, and Quarterly Reports

Purpose of Reports- Document public dollar investment to protect and restore healthy watersheds and natural habitats that support thriving communities and strong economies.

6/9/2016

Date

Grant No. 212-2016

Project Manager Mark

Type:

Progress/Quarterly PISR Other:

CHECK LIST	If No, Explain
<p>1. Review Special Conditions (Exhibit B) to identify additional or different reporting requirements. Did Grantee meet these requirements?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Progress report indicates grantee will not be able to meet project objectives described in grant application (e.g. landowner no longer allowing access). <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Explain:</p>
<p>2. Review PISR requirements (Exhibit D). Did Grantee fulfill these requirements?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PISR does not provide sufficient documentation to determine status of OWEB investment. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Explain:</p>
<p>3. Photos: Did Grantee fulfill the requirements for photo point monitoring described in the grant agreement (i.e. before and after photos located at consistent photo points and includes a current photo)?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Photo points do not include all major project components. <input type="checkbox"/> Photo points do not include project locations on each landowner site. <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee is unable to locate photo point(s). <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee is unable to access photo point (e.g. not safe or no landowner approval). <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Explain:</p>
<p>4. Other requirement:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Explain:</p>

REPORT APPROVAL

- Progress report demonstrates a trajectory for success in meeting project objectives. If not, report sufficiently indicates Grantee is taking action to increase likelihood for project success.
 - PISR sufficiently describes project status to determine OWEB investment is in place and functioning as intended. If not, report sufficiently documents why to inform future OWEB decisions.
-

Justification if needed (briefly explain how you resolved issues documented in the checklist table and/or attach relevant communications):



Report Approved By: Project Manager Signature

6/9/2016

Date

If you are unable to complete this form and sign for report approval, meet with a Program Manager to determine how to move forward.

Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers



1758 NE Airport Road
Roseburg, OR 97470
(541) 673-5756

*Report Approved
M 6/9/2019*

Big and Sagabeard Creeks Fish Passage

OWEB Project # 212-2016

Project Monitoring Report – Year Two

Exhibit D

Ap
ril
12,
20
16

B
ac
k
gr
o
u
n
d
Tw
o



undersized culverts on Lutsinger Road, one at the Sagabeard Creek crossing and one at the Big Creek crossing, both tributaries to the Umpqua River, were barriers to fish passage and were causing significant erosion around the sites. The Umpqua Basin Fish Access Team (UBFAT) had identified both of these crossings as high priority for replacement. Big Creek Culvert was rusted out and was a complete barrier to all fish passage with an eight foot outfall

and little to no jump pool. The Sagabeard Creek culvert had a significant gradient (5%) that drains a 2,200 acre watershed, resulting in a velocity barrier to fish at high flows. In addition, there was concern that both culverts would fail and deliver a large amount of sediment into the mainstem Umpqua River.

Project Description

Work began on the Big Creek culvert in July of 2012. The old culvert had nearly 30 feet of fill above it, so several weeks were spent excavating this fill and moving it to an upland area well outside of the Umpqua River floodplain. In addition, a temporary road was created just above the old culvert to allow access to local residents above the work site. The old culvert was then removed and replaced with a 117 in. x 79 in. x 107 ft. arch pipe. New fill was brought in and packed on top of the new culvert to ensure stability. Finally, the road surface was re-rocked, and the bare dirt surfaces were rip-rapped and/or mulched and seeded. Work was completed in mid-August 2012

Work began on the Sagabeard Creek culvert in August of 2013. The first undertaking was to reroute Lutsinger Creek road upstream on Sagabeard Creek by 600 feet. When this was complete, concrete forms were placed, concrete was poured and the new culvert was placed. This culvert is a 19 ft. x 9.5 ft. x 84 ft. open bottom arch culvert. After the new culvert was installed the old one was removed, riprap was placed, and the entire site was seeded and mulched.

Changes to original proposal

There were no changes to the original proposal.

Lessons Learned

This project required coordination among Roseburg Resources Co. (RRCo.) and PUR staff members. The most important lesson learned was the importance of working together to ensure that the goals of both organizations were met.

Meeting Goals

This project has been highly successful.

Sagabeard Creek:

Fish passage for all anadromous fish has been restored and the integrity of the culvert is much more secure, ensuring that a failure and resulting sediment input into the river will not occur.

Sagabeard Creek was the subject of an instream restoration project in 2014. We placed, with a helicopter, 100 whole trees, including 50 with rootwads, throughout 1 mile above the new culvert. Fish response has been excellent and this was a nice compliment to the fish passage project.

Big Creek:

This culvert was also replaced as designed. While there was a lot of fill that was removed and then replaced, the contractor did a good job of backfilling the culvert and very little settling has occurred.

Fish response to this culvert replacement has been good as well. Salmonids were spotted above the culvert during the first winter following replacement.

The road crossing has been improved for both culverts. This will allow access to continue for the residents above the culverts, helping build good will in the community and further our goals.

Maintenance and Modifications

Prior to the previous monitoring report, a small amount of new road gravel was required for the Sagabeard Creek culvert. This was due to a slight shifting of the culvert and was paid for and contracted by RRCO. Any future maintenance will be covered by RRCO.

PUR staff inspected the culverts when preparing this report. RRCO has added several truckloads of riprap along the Big Creek culvert to eliminate a small erosion problem that was occurring. No changes have been made to the Sagabeard Creek culvert. Vegetation has grown around both culverts and within the road prism, further strengthening the integrity of the new construction.

Costs

There were no maintenance costs for PUR or OWEB. The only costs incurred were for Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers (PUR) Staff to travel to the sites, do photo monitoring and create the monitoring report.

Category	Unit Number	Unit Cost	Total
Travel	45 miles	0.56/mile	\$ 25.20
Staff Time Monitoring	0.5 days	369/day	\$ 186.00
Staff Time Report	3 hours	30/hour	\$ 90.00
		Total:	\$ 285.20

Public Awareness

The project information is stored on the PUR database as well as at PUR's website which has been upgraded (www.umpquarivers.org). The project has also been featured on PUR's Facebook page, available at www.facebook.com/umpquarivers. The project area is highly visible from Lutsinger Creek Road. Many local residents stopped during construction and provided an excellent opportunity for education about fish passage projects, salmon habitat restoration and PUR's mission.

Photo Points



Description

Figure 1a. Looking upstream at the Big Creek Culvert.

Pre-project: 2/11/2011



Figure 1b. Looking upstream at the Big Creek Culvert following implementation.

Post-project: 05/07/2015

There is now no drop at the outfall and fish passage is improved.



Figure 1c. Looking upstream at the Big Creek Culvert.

Post Project: 3/23/2016

The main Umpqua River was experiencing high flows at the time this photo was taken. The outfall of the culvert is almost completely under water, allowing full fish passage.

Photo Points



Description

Figure 2a. Looking downstream at the Big Creek culvert.

Pre-project: 2/11/2011



Figure 2b. Looking downstream at the Big Creek culvert.

Post-project: 05/07/2015

Note the gravel and cobbles in the culvert that will facilitate fish passage.



Figure 2c. Looking downstream at the Big Creek culvert.

Post Project: 3/23/2016

Vegetation has grown around this culvert and there are no erosion issues.

Photo Points



Description

Figure 3a. Looking upstream at the culvert proposed for replacement on Sagabeard Creek.

Pre-project: 11/11/2011



Figure 3b. Looking upstream at the Sagabeard Creek culvert.

Post-project: 05/07/2015

The road re-routing has blended in with the landscape nicely.



Figure 3c. Looking upstream at the Sagabeard Creek culvert.

Post-project: 3/23/2016

Lutsinger Creek Road has a moderate amount of traffic, but has held up nicely since the culvert was replaced.

Photos



Description

Figure 4a. A close-up view of the Sagabeard Creek culvert.

Post project: 05/07/2015

Note the large size of the culvert. This is a significant watershed and the small original culvert produced a velocity barrier during higher flows. This is no longer an issue. Also note the natural stream bottom in the arch culvert.



Figure 4b. A close-up view of the Sagabeard Creek culvert.

Post Project: 3/23/2016

This culvert has an open bottom arch with a natural stream bottom. This photo shows the culvert at spring flow.

October 2015 Open Solicitation & Other GRANT AGREEMENTS 6/24/2016

<u>Being Held</u>	<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Outstanding Reports</u>	<u>RPR, PC, PM</u>
For OS Reports			
216-2063, 216-2064	Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers	208-2087, 212-2016	Mark <i>Br and Sage Deer Creek</i>
216-3038, 216-3032	Middle Fork Willamette WC	213-3006	Liz
216-4004	Ducks Unlimited	214-4025, 207-261, 210-2032	Greg
216-4022	OSU Office of Sponsored Programs	213-2055	Greg
216-4024	Crooked River WC	212-4016, 206-326	Greg
216-6061, 216-6048, 216-6047, 216-6059, 216-6060	Wheeler SWCD Wheeler SWCD	213-6015, 213-6035, 214-8100	Sue
216-8300-12534 216-039-11856	Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers Greater Yamhill WC	208-2087, 212-2016 207-086, 209-3011	Courtney Courtney
214-4999-11931 214-4999-12627	Crooked River WC Crooked River WC	212-4016, 206-326 212-4016, 206-326	Juniper/Jillian Juniper/Jillian
216-8203-12976 216-8203-12971	Malheur SWCD Malheur SWCD	211-5011, 211-5044, 211-5047	Karen

Not received from RPR yet

Region 2- 216-2036, 216-2045, 216-2069

Region 3- 216-3037

Budget Issues

216-5037 (missing Attach. F from App.; no review until it is received)

***All GAs received from RPRs are in tracking. Those still in the review process are not yet included in this list.**

