

Appendix A

Washington County Policy Summary

Washington County Comprehensive Plan

Volume II: Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area (CFPUA)

Nov. 26, 1993 This element addresses growth and development inside UGB

Definitions (from glossary unless otherwise noted):

“buildable” = undeveloped lands outside 100-year floodplain with slope 20 % or less

“critical services” = water, sewer, fire protection, drainage, local and minor collector roads
(p. ix).

“essential services” = schools, arterials, transit, police, pedestrian walkways (p. III.3)

“desirable services” = public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle paths, parks (p. III.4)

“natural hazards” = flood plain areas; slopes greater than 20 % (p. II.6)

“policy” = a generalized statement of a county need or goal which provides general direction for specific plan elements, regulations, budgets.

“strategy” = a specific mechanism, action or program designed to implement policy.

Strategies are subject to County fiscal, resource, and work program constraints.

“significant natural areas” = areas which in their existing condition are especially important for their uniqueness, scientific value, educational opportunities, or general ecological role relative to other natural areas of Washington County or the surrounding region.

Overview:

Development of land can not proceed until “critical” services are provided (p. ix).

Water supply is not seen as a constraint; increasing impervious surface area and lack of county-wide plan are viewed as problems in drainage management (p. xiii).

Flood prone areas provide unique opportunities for open space, wildlife habitat & seasonal recreational uses. Open space, fish and wildlife habitat, natural areas, scenic views and vistas, and water areas and wetlands are considered urban area resources (p. xv).

Specific policies supportive of Tualatin River Watershed:

Monitoring

Establish procedures for monitoring demographic, economic, public facility, land use, and environmental changes to “insure” responsiveness of CFPUA to current conditions (p. I.1)

Air quality

Support efforts to control emissions of air pollutants in the County and region, and attempt to limit the adverse impacts of air pollution resulting from development (p. II.1). Strategies are simply to enforce rules of EPA, DEQ, etc.

Water resources

Preserve and improve the quality of water resources (p. II.3). This includes:

- Limit the removal of natural vegetation along river and stream banks.

- Regulate construction practices and stream channel improvements in accord with Drainage management program (Policy 27).
- Develop standards for connection to public drainway to reduce volume of chemicals and sediments reaching stream systems.
- Control soil erosion.

Land resources

[Addresses mineral and aggregate extraction.] Prohibits extraction from urban streambeds (p. II.4).

Energy resources

Conserve existing identified energy resources while encouraging development of renewable and alternative resources and implementation of new energy producing systems—solar and wind power (p. II.8).

Biological resources and natural areas

Protect and enhance significant natural areas (p. II.9) including:

- Identify significant natural areas to assure that unique values of significant natural resources can be examined and all reasonable methods for their preservation can be pursued prior to development.
- Preferential taxation.
- Tree conservation studies to regulate removal of or damage to trees and vegetation in significant natural areas.

Scenic resources

Protect and enhance outstanding scenic views, routes, and features (p. II.12).

Growth (urbanization)

Growth management policies are listed that include (p. III.1):

- Development compatible with existing land uses.
- Development in concert with adopted community plans.

Coordination

Coordination between County, all cities, and private companies must address drainage management, water distribution and storage, and parks and recreation (p. III.6).

Land use conservation

Promote high density and residences near workplaces (p. IX.6).

Recreation

Provide adequate open space and park facilities and services, located to implement County policies and community plans (p. VIII.1 & 2).

Specific policies which may threaten Tualatin River Watershed:

Growth (urbanization)

Growth is viewed as synonymous with prosperity (p. III.2). Growth management policies are listed that include (p. III.1):

- Parcelization of land so that future development at urban densities can take place.
- Agricultural use of agricultural land until services are available to allow development.

Community plans accommodate the projected need for new housing units and jobs (p. III.14). County projections are based on trends over time in past census data (p. v).

Rural/Natural Resource Plan (RNRP)

Apr. 30, 1991 -- oversize maps with ordinances

This element “guides resource conservation and development lands” outside UGB.

Overview:

Lands designated rural residential (AF-5, Af-10, RR-5), commercial (R-COM), or industrial (R-IND, MA-E) have been granted an exception to Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission’s (LCDC’s) Goals 3 and 4 (these goals require the County to determine the location and extent of agricultural and forestlands for the purpose of preserving and conserving them.

Only lands designated Exclusive Farm Use (EFU), Exclusive Forest and Conservation (EFC), and Agricultural and Forest-20 (AF-20), compose the Natural Resource Area.

Specific policies supportive of Tualatin River Watershed:

Monitoring (Policy 1, the Planning Process)

Establish procedures for monitoring demographic, economic, public facility, land use, resource management, and environmental changes to “insure” responsiveness of the Comprehensive Plan to current conditions [all except resource management are monitored under CFPUA] (p. 1).

Air Quality (Policy 4)

Maintain or improve existing air quality (p. 2).

Noise (Policy 5)

Support efforts to control noise and attempt to limit its adverse impacts (p. 3).

Water Resources (Policy 6)

Maintain or improve surface and ground water quality and quantity (p. 3.). To this end the County will:

- Encourage water conservation programs.
- Cooperate with Dept. of Forestry to implement effective methods of controlling non-point sources of water pollution in agricultural areas.
- Ensure that septic tanks will not adversely affect ground water quality.
- Protect and maintain natural stream channels, emphasizing non-structural controls when modifications are necessary.
- Limit the alteration of natural vegetation in riparian zones and “significant water areas and wetlands,” to control soil erosion.
- Support conservation of vegetation in watersheds as a means of controlling the release of water to downstream farm lands and urban areas.

Mineral and Aggregate Resources (Policy 7)

Minimize potential impacts of resource extraction on adjacent uses (p. 3). County will:

- Require new or expanded mineral and aggregate extraction operations to develop programs based on ...environmental and energy consequences analysis that will minimize any negative effects of activities.

- Prohibit extraction from stream beds when necessary to protect fish and wildlife habitats, prevent soil erosion or prevent water pollution.
- Ensure that all excavated sites will be reclaimed for future use.

Natural Hazards (Policy 8)

Protect life and property from floods and other hazards. County will discourage new development in flood plains, and alterations of flood plains, partly to prevent enlargement of flood plain (p. 3).

Energy Resources (Policy 9)

Encourage solar and wind power and other alternative energy sources (p. 3).

Fish and Wildlife Habitat (Policy 10)

Protect and enhance significant F & W habitat (p. 3). The County will:

- Establish standards to assure conservation of habitat.
- Limit alteration of natural vegetation in riparian zones, and in “significant water areas and wetlands” to preserve habitat.

Significant Natural Areas (Policy 11)

Protect and enhance SNAs (p. 3).

- Review development proposed in SNAs to reduce its impact on an Area’s unique or fragile character or features.
- Limit development and alteration of natural vegetation in riparian zones, and in “significant water areas and wetlands” to protect SNAs from degradation.

Scenic Resources (Policy 13)

Protect and enhance outstanding scenic views, routes and features (p. 3).

Exclusive Farm Land (Policy 15)

Conserve and maintain agricultural lands for farm use, consistent with existing and future needs for ...and open space (p. 3).

Exclusive Forest Lands (Policy 16)

Conserve and maintain forest lands for forest uses, consistent with existing and future needs for ...and open space (p. 3).

Transportation (Policy 23)

Regulate the existing transportation system and provide for future transportation needs through development of a County-wide Transportation Plan that will have precedence over community plans (p. 3).

Recreation (Policy 24)

Ensure that open space and recreational facilities are provided which reflect needs of County residents (p. 4). Strategies include:

- Encourage acquisition of use easements for recreation areas or sites.
- Work to improve public access to Tualatin River.

Energy Conservation (Policy 25)

Reduce energy consumption in RNRA and encourage use of alternative energy sources (p. 4).

Specific policies which may threaten Tualatin River Watershed:

Fish and Wildlife Habitat (Policy 10)

The County will allow activities customarily conducted in conjunction with commercial farm and forest practices in areas designated as F & W habitat.

Washington County Community Development Code

Definition:

“Significant natural areas” = sites of special importance, in their natural condition, for their ecologic, scientific, and educational value. 422-2.4

Code supportive of Tualatin River Watershed:

Landscape design—407, 11/24/95

[At least] 25 % of buildable land shall be used for landscaping in residential districts. 407-1.3

Landscaping must be compatible with preserved native vegetation. 407-2.3

Tree removal cannot be done without approval. Site plans must show trees > 6” diameter at breast height (DBH). After approved cutting on a site, same species proportions must remain. No clearcutting is allowed; more than 50 trees > 11” DBH per acre must remain. 407-3

Slopes and Grading—410, 11/26/93

Topsoil to 12” depth must be saved.

Erosion control plan required for any site left unfinished during Oct. 1 through May 1, unstable areas, areas of > 6,000 square feet of development, and within 50’ of drainage hazard area or floodplain. Erosion, stream sedimentation, or other adverse off-site effects or hazards are not allowed. 410-1.6

Drainage—412, 11/26/93

Drainage plan must be submitted with or as part of Site Plan, Grading Plan or Grading Permit.

Protect and preserve existing natural drainage channels except for permitted piping and culverting. 412-3.1

Preserve the functioning of offsite drainage courses or bodies of water, and do not cause erosion. 412-3.2

Significant Natural Resources (SNR)—422, 11/26/93

SNR are classified into 4 categories: water areas and wetlands, water areas and wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat, wildlife habitat, and significant natural areas.

Code which may threaten Tualatin River Watershed:

Landscape design—11/24/95

No landscaping is required for detached dwellings or duplexes. 407-1.3

Only 15 % of area of Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Districts need to be landscaped (Industrial sites are 30 acres minimum). 407-1.3

Of required landscaped areas, up to 25 % can be (impervious) brick, ...other decorative material; landscaping materials include (impervious) fountains, pools, artwork, and walls. 407-2.1

Drainage—412, 11/26/93

Roof drains discharge to curb, storm drain or natural drainage. 412-3.2

Forestry activities are exempt from 412 if in compliance with Forest Practices Act and OAR.

Flood Plain and Drainage Hazard Area Development—421, 11/26/93

Construction of dwellings in flood plain is permitted if lowest habitat floor is 1' above flood surface elevation, and if new dwellings are constructed on pilings or on fill. 421-8

Parking is allowed in the flood plain. 421-13

Land Use Districts (zoning):

EFC	Exclusive forest and conservation
EFU	Exclusive farm use
AF-20	Agriculture and Forest—20 acres
AF-10	Agriculture and Forest—10 acres
AF-5	Agriculture and Forest—5 acres
RR-5	Rural residential—5 acres
R-COM	Rural commercial
MA-E	Land extensive industrial
R-IND	Rural industrial

Note: Rural residential comprises AF-10, AF-5, and RR-5.

Appendix B

Summaries of Existing Plans and Programs in the Tualatin Basin

City Plans:

City of Lake Oswego Nonpoint Source Watershed Management Plan- preliminary draft. Kramer, Chin & Mayo, Inc. URS Consultants. January 1990.

As a Designated Management Agency (DMA) for the reduction of phosphorus loading in the Tualatin River, the City of Lake Oswego was required to prepare a nonpoint source pollution control plan. The purpose of this plan is to meet DMA requirements and propose additional strategies for dealing with other water quality problems in urban areas. Therefore, the plan addresses stormwater management issues such as hazardous substance spills, runoff from small dump sites, waste disposal practice, illegal stormwater connections, urbanization impacts, and landuse runoff. Specific sources are identified and solutions are proposed for minimizing the impacts of the sources.

City of West Linn Storm Drainage Master Plan. Woodward-Clyde Consultants, and Psomas & Associates. September 1995.

This plan proposes specific engineering projects for the City of West Linn to implement. The projects are designed to help the City of West Linn meet its responsibilities defined in the TMDL load allocations and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The report ranks Capital Improvement Projects based on projected improvements in hydraulics, water quality, and natural resources.

Fanno Creek and Tributaries Wetlands and Riparian Areas Conservation Plan- Volume One. City of Portland, Oregon, Bureau of Planning. April 4, 1992.

The City of Portland prepared this plan for the following purposes: to bring the City's zoning code and zoning maps into compliance with the State Wide Planning Goals and the Portland Comprehensive Plan; to reduce risks associated with erosion, land slides and flooding; and, to aid in the permitting processes for public works projects designed to enhance Fanno Creek. The plan identifies resource areas in the Fanno Creek basin and describes the potential uses for these sites. Consequences to economic, social, energy, and environmental systems are then explored.

Lake Oswego Surface Water Management Master. Otak. July 1992.

This plan deals with flooding and water quality issues in the major drainages of Lake Oswego's Urban Services Boundary, portions of Rivergrove, and portions of unincorporated Clackamas County. Four major elements are covered: (1) Public Awareness Plan; (2) Flood Control Plan, (3) Water Quality Management Plan, and (4) Implementation Plan. The Public Awareness Plan describes education and volunteer programs which deal with watershed issues. The Flood Control Plan and Water Quality Plan recommend management and capital improvements based on computer models of the watershed. Formation of a Surface Water Management Utility is recommended in the Implementation Plan. This Surface Water Management Utility's responsibilities would include implementing the programs described in the report and managing the Utility's billing and expenditures.

Portland's Tualatin Basin Water Quality Management Plan. City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (Brown and Caldwell Consultants). March 1990.

The report describes the City of Portland's nonpoint source pollution control plan for meeting the TMDL's set for phosphorus in the Tualatin Basin. The plan evaluates pollution control options in the basin and the issues surrounding the City's ability to implement the plan. Control options include phosphorus pollution prevention and removal facilities. Recommendations for implementing the plan involve closer evaluation of the Load Allocation (LA) value, clarification of how the LA relates to the different drainages in the City of Portland's jurisdiction and throughout the basin, and further investigation of the effectiveness and suitability of pollution reduction facilities.

County plans:

Clackamas County Nonpoint Source Watershed Management Plan- preliminary draft. Kramer, Chin & Mayo, Inc. URS Consultants. January 1990.

This plan was prepared to meet DEQ requirements of "Nonpoint Source Watershed Management Plans" for the phosphorus TMDL's. The authors also propose strategies for mitigating non-phosphorus based water quality problems. The plan addresses the following specific sources: on-site waste systems; construction; landuse runoff; long-term impacts of urbanization; hazardous substance spills; illicit stormwater connections; runoff from small dumps; excessive waterfowl populations; transportation; agriculture. The problems associated with each of these sources are explained and management options to reduce the problems are proposed.

Multnomah County Tualatin River Basin Nonpoint Source Control Watershed Management Plan. Multnomah County (Brown and Caldwell). January 1992.

This plan was written to bring Multnomah County into compliance with the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) rules requiring jurisdictions to develop management plans for the control of nonpoint sources of phosphorus in the Tualatin. The plan covers urban and agricultural sections of the Tualatin basin in Multnomah County not within the jurisdiction of the Oregon Department of Forestry or the Unified Sewerage Agency. Three phases of action are recommended. Phase I lists urban and agricultural Best Management Practices designed to reduce phosphorus loading. Phase II consists of a monitoring program to determine the effectiveness of the BMP's. If Phase II monitoring finds that additional pollution reduction is need, then Phase III is recommended. Phase III outlines a program for construction of regional pollution reduction facilities.

Metropolitan Service District:

2040 Framework and Functional Plans

Title 3: Stream and Floodplain Protection Plan. Furfey, R. 1997. Title 3 adopted by Metro Council in June, 1998

This plan sets policies for water quality and floodplain management within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Utility Plans:

Unified Sewerage Agency urban watershed plans, Stormwater Master plan, Facilities plans, Recycled Wastewater Master plan

Summary of Hydrologic and Hydraulic Modeling Upper Rock, Bronson & Willow Creeks Subbasin Strategy Plans. Unified Sewerage Agency. August 1995.

The report describes the results from HEC-1 and HEC-2 modeling of Upper Rock, Bronson, and Willow Creeks. The impact of development on flow characteristics of the streams is addressed, including the impact of Metro's 2040 Plan on runoff. The plan also recommends specific structural alternatives for mitigating the impacts of development. The impacts of these structures are then predicted with the models.

Surface Water Management Plan. Unified Sewerage Agency (KCM, URS Consulting, & Richard Horner). February 1990.

This plan is the first in a series of reports which define USA's strategy for dealing with stormwater from urban areas in Washington County. A framework for managing urban non-point source pollution of surface water is presented. Non-urban uses are not addressed in this plan. Management approaches described by the Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District and Oregon Department of Forestry will be applied by USA for agricultural and forestry activities.

The plan identifies the following sources as having a negative impact on urban streams: increased runoff, landuse washoff, transportation, construction, septic tanks, and hazardous substance spills. For each source, the plan provides a description of how the source impacts stormwater quality or quantity; and presents management options. A "workbook" section is presented to help guide managers through the planning and implementation of an urban watershed management program. This plan emphasizes the maintenance functions of USA.

The Basinwide Report and Technical Guidelines presents specific methods and criteria for preparing plans for the seven subbasins—Fanno Cr., Butternut Cr., Rock Cr. McKay Cr., Dairy Cr., Gales Cr., and Scoggins Cr.—and the lands draining directly into the Tualatin River. Individual plans have been prepared for Fanno, Butternut, Hedges, and Upper Rock, Bronson, and Willow Creek subbasins. The subbasin plans evaluate the storm drainage and water quality conditions and prescribe alternatives for controlling stormwater and pollution sources.

The Butternut Creek Subbasin and Hedges Creek Subbasin strategies are presented in similar formats. The plans recommend similar strategies for dealing with water quantity and control problems. The results of hydrologic and hydraulic studies of the basins are used to recommend drainage system improvements. Both plans recommend the enhancement of source control plans and the monitoring of source control and demonstration projects. Further implementation of water quality measures is to be based on the results of this monitoring.

The Upper Rock, Bronson and Willow Creeks Subbasin and the Fanno Creek Subbasin plans address water quantity and quality. In addition, these reports address biological issues or "Natural Resources". Drainage system improvements are based on model

results which evaluated current and future conditions. The Rock Creek report predicts pollution rates based on landuse and runoff predictions, and uses these results to recommend water quality improvement facilities. The Fanno Creek report bases its recommendations on existing data. Both reports identify specific sites for protection and restoration of Natural Resources including fish habitat and vegetation.

Tualatin River Basin Watershed-Wide Monitoring Plan. Unified Sewerage Agency, Montgomery/Watson. April 1994.

This report was prepared on behalf of the Designated Management Agencies (DMA) in the Tualatin Basin, pursuant to the Total Maximum Daily Load Compliance Schedule. The plan was developed to coordinate existing monitoring programs which had been developed independently by the separate DMA's. Two major goals of the plan are to improve the effectiveness of the individual monitoring programs in assessing water quality in the Tualatin Basin and to provide a mechanism for making data more accessible. Therefore, the plan defines a monitoring program with consistent site locations, sampling methodologies, parameters, scheduling, quality assurance protocols, and data reporting mechanisms. A brief summary and review of existing data collected by DMA's is also presented.

Soil and Water Conservation District:

Tualatin River Watershed Management Plan for Controlling Rural Non-Point Source Phosphorus Pollution. Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District. March 1991.

The Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) completed this report in response to requirements established by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality for pollution control plans to meet Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) limits in the Tualatin Basin. The plan identifies potential polluting sources in the basin. These include: (1) confined animal feeding operations; (2) container nurseries; (3) sewage treatment plant sludge and waste water application; (4) general agricultural runoff; (5) upland erosion; (6) streambank erosion; and (7) roadside erosion. The plan identifies control strategies for each of these potential polluting activities. Specific Best Management Practices (BMP's) are recommended for managing nutrients, runoff, manure, riparian areas, and erosion. Soil and Water Conservation District employees and USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service would prepare plans for implementing BMP's at each agricultural facility. Details of the BMP implementation plan would be based on an evaluation of existing resources, land use, and management practices at the facility.

State Agencies:

State of Oregon

**Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds
Healthy Streams Initiative**

Oregon Department of Agriculture

Agricultural Water Quality Management Program (Oregon Administrative Rules, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Chapter 603, Division 95).

These rules apply to landowners conducting agricultural activities in areas within the Tualatin River Watershed which do not fall under the jurisdiction of other Designated Management Agencies. The rules were developed to aid in the implementation of the *Tualatin River Subbasin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan, April 1996*. The rules establish standards for sheet and rill erosion, active channel erosion, near stream management areas, irrigation water discharges, and waste discharges. Agricultural facilities which do not meet these standards may complete Voluntary Water Quality Farm Plans, which must be approved by the Washington County SWCD. The required minimum content of the farm plans are described. Enforcement of the rules is the responsibility of the Oregon Dept. of Agriculture. These rules are often referred to as "Senate Bill 1010," after the legislation enabling them.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Water Quality Management Strategy (with Unified Sewerage Agency)

Oregon Department of Forestry

Nonpoint Source Water Quality Management Program Plan for the Tualatin River Basin-- Draft Revised. Oregon Department of Forestry, David A. Degenhardt. May 17, 1991. Oregon Forest Practices Act (ORS Chapter 527; OAR Division 600-665).

The plan was written pursuant to the Oregon Department of Forestry's (ODF) responsibilities as the Designated Management Agency for the forested lands in the Tualatin River Basin. The majority of these forested lands are parcels of large industrial forest ownership and state forests found in the upper reaches of the basin. The Nonpoint Source Water Quality Management Program Plan is based on the existing provisions of the Oregon Forest Practices Act administered by the ODF. The ODF and Department of Environmental Quality have agreed that no additional measures to protect water quality in the forested regions of the basin are required until it can be shown that the forested regions are exceeding their Total Maximum Daily Load allocations.

The Oregon Forest Management Act consists of approved Best Management Practices (BMP's) designed to decrease the impact of forest practices on water quality. A Notification of Operation is submitted to the ODF prior to timber harvest. The operator supplying the Notification is then informed of appropriate BMP's and the facility is inspected by ODF personnel to assure the implementation of these practices. The Oregon Forest Practices Act gives ODF the authority to impose civil and criminal penalties on operators who do not meet the requirements of the Act.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Tualatin River Subbasin Fish Management Plan. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Tom Mertagh et.al. January 1992.

This plan was developed under the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Fish Management Policy that requires that management plans be prepared for each basin in the state. The Tualatin report expands on the Willamette Basin Fish Management Plan (ODFW,

1989). Priorities for management of habitat, angler access and fish species in the basin are defined. The fish species addressed are: winter steelhead, coho salmon, trout, warm water and miscellaneous species. Spring and fall chinook salmon are not considered important native species in the Tualatin River. Background information, policies, objectives, and recommended actions are presented. The plan identifies habitat constraints and presents actions to deal with fish passage, water quality and water quantity. Updated fish habitat and fish population inventories, increased angler access, and hatchery production plans are suggested.

Tualatin River, Willamette River Subbasin Salmon and Steelhead Production Plan.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. September 1, 1990.

This report was written in response to a request for long-term planning of salmon and steelhead production by the Northwest Power Planning Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. Winter steelhead, coho salmon, and spring and fall chinook populations in the Tualatin River are addressed. Objectives and actions presented in this plan parallel the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's 1992 Tualatin River Subbasin Fish Management Plan.

Oregon Water Resources Department

Tualatin Basin Plan

Tualatin Basin Multi-stakeholder plans:

Integrated Water Resources Management Strategy for the Tualatin River Watershed: in development

Tualatin River Basin Public Awareness Plan. Tualatin Basin Designated Management Agencies Public Awareness Committee. December 1993.

This report was written in response to the DEQ's Nonpoint Source Management Implementation and Compliance Schedule. All the Designated Management Agencies contributed to produce a single report for the basin. The plan lists all existing public awareness programs in an effort to identify " common programs, possible additional individual programs and opportunities for coordinated efforts or joint projects." Eight specific public awareness projects are proposed and implementation procedures are described.

Washington County Water Resources Management Strategy. Economic and Engineering Services, Inc. February 1988.

The plan develops a strategy for the County to implement a water resources management plan (WRMP) in the Tualatin Basin. The organizational structure needed to make management practices successful in the basin is described. A hierarchy is developed including joint operating agreements and advisory committees. Appropriate agencies are assigned the responsibilities of implementing water resources management components. The

components of the water resources management plan are: water supply management, water quality management, water resources management, and watershed and drainage basin management.

Appendix C

Funding Sources

Numerous sources of funding are available for organizations and individuals working to protect and improve the watershed. Many of these are listed in Table C-1, funding sources for private citizens, and Table C-2, sources for public and non-profit entities.

Table C-1 Potential Funding Sources for Private Recipients					
Agency	Program	Assistance	Recipients	Purpose	Comments
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (formerly SCS) (503) 648-3014	Agriculture Conservation Program	Direct payments Technical assistance	Private landowners	Land and water conservation	Up to \$30,000 per year produced; covers 75 % of out-of-pocket costs
NRCS Ken Hale, Lower Willamette Basin (503)623-5534	Conservation Reserve Program	Contracts	Private landowners	Plant permanent vegetation on highly erodable cropland	Economic incentives for 1-yr contracts; annual rental payment limited to \$50,000 per operator
	Water Quality Special Projects	Direct payments	Private landowners	Assist large water quality projects involving many participants	Emphasis on hot spots identified by Water Quality Board and national competition
NRCS Water Quality Program, Roger Borine (541) 385-5910	Wetland Reserve Program	Direct payments	Private landowners	Direct incentives for improvement measures; no cost share	Available in Oregon since 1994
Consolidated Farm Services Agency (formerly ASCS) (503)648-3174	Rural Clean Water Program	Direct payments	Private landowners	Solve water problems resulting from agricultural non-point surface pollution	May not be used as local cost share on federal projects
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (503)231-6214	Partners for Wildlife Program Wetlands Restoration	Grants and technical assistance	Private landowners	Restore and/or enhance wetlands	
Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board (GWEB) (503)378-3589 ext. 825	GWEB Program	Grants (from lottery funds) and technical assistance	Individuals or businesses (also public)	Watershed improvements, assessment, action plans, council support, education projects and monitoring	Priority given to projects with other federal or non-state funding
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (503)229-5400	Green Forage Program		Private landowners		Planting and seeding

Table C-1 Potential Funding Sources for Private Recipients

Agency	Program	Assistance	Recipients	Purpose	Comments
	General habitat improvement		Private (and public) ownership	Develop or enhance habitat for wildlife	Sites should have potential for the establishment or maintenance or perennial forage, forage seeding, tree and shrub planting, and vegetation control.
Oregon Dept. of Forestry (503)945-7200	Forestry Incentives Program	Financial assistance	Private, non-industrial landowners	Assist in planting forest trees and improving production of timber and related forest resources	Cost share up to 65 % of average annual cost of practice
	Stewardship Incentive Program	Grants	Woodland owners with 1-5,000 acres forest land	Financial cost/share, stewardship, reforestation, fish & wildlife, soil & water	Cost share 50-75 % and up to \$10,000 per owner per year for riparian, wetland, and fisheries protection
Oregon Water Trust (503)222-9091		Lease or purchase of water rights	Water right holders	Convert rights to instream use	
Isaac Walton League (206)443-3253		Volunteer assistance		Environmental improvements	
SOLV (503)844-9571		Volunteer assistance, in-kind, and direct payment (\$250)	Private entities, non-profit		
Oregon Community Foundation	Tualatin Valley Endowment Fund				

Table C-2 Potential Funding Sources for Public and Non-profit Agencies					
Agency	Program	Assistance	Recipients	Purpose	Comments
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (formerly SCS) (503)648-3014	Resource Conservation & Development	Loans	States, counties, cities, & local non-profit org.	Water storage facilities, water-based recreation facilities	
	Small Watershed Program	Technical assistance and grants	State agencies, municip., districts	Planning & construction of projects for small watershed resources	Covers up to 100% flood control, up to 50% most other purposes
	Resource Conservation & Development	Advisory service and construction grants	States, local governments, non-profit org.	Flood prevention, erosion control, water-based recreation fish & wildlife development, agricultural pollution prev.	Available only for RC&D authorized areas; pays up to 100% for flood control, up to 50% other projects; up to \$50,000 per year
Farmers Home Administration, USDA (503)414-3304	Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Loans	Loans	Municipalities, SWCDs, local non-profit org.	Watershed projects including irrigation, flood control, recreation, and storage	Used in conjunction with NRCS's Small Watershed Program
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (208)378-5084	Small Reclamation Projects Act	Loans and grants	Cities, counties, irrigation districts, water districts	Flood control, fish & wildlife, recreation, irrigation, and hydropower	Cannot claim other federal funds as local cost share for SRPA funding
Oregon Economic Development Department (503)986-0066	Regional Strategies Program	Grants (lottery funds)	Counties	Economic development	
Oregon Water Resources Department 1-800-624-3199	Water Development Loan Program	Loans	Municipalities under 30,000 pop.; water supply, irrigation, drainage, water improvement, and water control districts	Irrigation or drainage of agricultural lands, municipal water, or watershed enhancement	Important to have secondary benefits of recreation, flood control, or hydropower

Table C-2 Potential Funding Sources for Public and Non-profit Agencies					
Agency	Program	Assistance	Recipients	Purpose	Comments
Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board (GWEB) (503)299-8455 ext. 315 or 285	GWEB Program	Grants (from lottery funds) and technical assistance	Individuals or businesses (also public)	Watershed improvements, assessment, action plans, council support, education projects and monitoring	Priority given to projects with other federal or non-state funding
	GWEB Program	Grants & technical assistance	Soil and Water Conservation Districts	Watershed improvements	\$2,000 per biennium to each district for watershed enhancement projects
Oregon Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Division (503)378-3810	Planning of Soil and Water Conservation Practices (SB617)	Grants	Soil and Water Conservation Districts	Gather data to develop strategy & costs for conservation project	Erosion control, water conservation & development, water quality enhancement projects
	Implementation of Soil & Water Conservation Practices	Grants	Soil and Water Conservation Districts	Construction and start-up costs for conservation and development projects	
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (503)229-5400	Restoration and Enhancement Program	Grants	Public or private non-profit org.	Restore/enhance fish production; provide additional public access; support on-the-ground non-point source water quality projects	
	General habitat improvement		Public and private ownership	Develop or enhance habitat for wildlife	Sites should have potential for the establishment or maintenance or perennial forage, forage seeding, tree and shrub planting, and vegetation control.
Department of Environmental Quality (503)229-5696	Clean Water Act Section 319	Grants	State or federal government entities, watershed councils, tribes	Non-point source management to improve natural watershed & quality of surface & ground water	

Table C-2 Potential Funding Sources for Public and Non-profit Agencies					
Agency	Program	Assistance	Recipients	Purpose	Comments
Oregon Dept. of Forestry (503)945-7200	Stewardship Incentive Program	Grants	Woodland owners with 1-5,000 acres forest land	Financial cost/share, stewardship, reforestation, fish & wildlife, soil & water	Cost share 50-75 % and up to \$10,000 per owner per year for riparian, wetland, and fisheries protection
Oregon Water Trust (503)222-9091		Lease or purchase of water rights	Water right holders	Convert rights to instream use	
Isaac Walton League (206)443-3253		Volunteer assistance		Environmental improvements	
Metro	Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces	Financial grants	Cities, counties, school districts, special districts, non-profits	Education & habitat restoration	Encourage environmental awareness, educate citizens about greenspaces and restore/enhance wildlife habitat
SOLV		Volunteer assistance, in-kind, and direct payment (\$250)	Government agencies, and non-profit		
Oregon Community Foundation	Tualatin Valley Endowment Fund				

Appendix D: Contributors

Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) Members:

Bob Baumgartner, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Lauren Elmore, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (formerly with USA)
Craig Harper, Woodward-Clyde Consultants
Dr. Wes Jarrell, Oregon Graduate Institute
Dave Johnson, Oregon Department of Forestry
Dean Moberg, Natural Resources Conservation Service
Neil Rambo, (formerly with OSU Cooperative Extension)
Stacy Renfro, Student Watershed Resource Project
Jerry Rodgers, Oregon Water Resources Department
Stewart Rounds, United States Geological Survey
Dawn Sanders, CH2M Hill Consultants
Gail Shaloum, Woodward-Clyde Consultants
Kendra Smith, Unified Sewerage Agency
Dr. Rob Stockhouse, Pacific University
Dr. Mark Sytsma, Portland State University
Tom VanderPlaat, Unified Sewerage Agency
David Whitaker, CH2M Hill Consultants
Greg White, CH2M Hill Consultants
Paul Whitney, Beak Consultants
Mike Wiltsey, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Geographic Information System maps:

Mike Mertens, Interrain Pacific

Graduate Student Assistants:

Nancy Breuner, Resource Assistance for Rural Environments, University of Oregon
Steve Hanson, Oregon Graduate Institute
Chuck Harman, Oregon Graduate Institute (now with ODA)
Beth Woodward, Portland State University (now with DEQ)

Appendix E

List of Beneficial Uses

DEQ designates beneficial uses for the waters of the state under Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 340 Div 41. The beneficial uses listed for water in the Tualatin River Basin are:

- Public Domestic Water Supply
- Private Domestic Water Supply
- Industrial Water Supply
- Irrigation
- Livestock watering
- Anadromous Fish passage
- Salmonid Fish Rearing
- Salmonid Fish Spawning
- Resident Fish and Aquatic Life
- Wildlife and Hunting
- Fishing
- Boating
- Water Contact Recreation
- Aesthetic Quality
- Hydro Power