

Yellowhawk Streamkeepers

1. Please indicate which matching funds are non-state, only non-state funds are eligible.

The matching funds are all in-kind in this proposal and so are not cash funds. Additional applications for funding include the National Fish and Wildlife Community Salmon Funds that are partially federal funds. That application is due later this year. There is approximately \$10,000 in federal funding through the current grant that may be a match for the Phase IV grant if the start date of July 1 is not a barrier.

2. The application claims the following benefits: opportunities for trust water savings; increased flow; reduction of lawn turf; reduction of in-stream vegetation; removal of water wheels, bridges, confinement, concrete, or rock structures; these benefits were not realized in the Streamkeepers Phase I project funded by Phase IV funding, have the been realized under other funding, or are they deliverables for this project?

The criteria for selection of properties to restore in the Phase I pilots selected against properties with in-stream structures and confinement. The pilot properties selected did not have in-stream structures or stream confinement. There was reduction of lawn turf and reduction of in-stream vegetation on properties in the Phase I pilot properties. At least one property selected for this spring's restoration will remove considerable lawn turf, revise the sprinkler system to low flow and include removal of rock wall confinement. That property also has converted to city water and is no longer pumping out of Yellowhawk Creek. There may be an opportunity for trust water.

3. According to the application there are 220 landowners and at least 16 demonstration projects + CURB projects have been completed, is the program still considered to be in the "demonstration pilot" stage?

This year the program will reach beyond the pilot stage to become a strategy for long term watershed implementation focusing on urban riparian restoration.

Six properties were restored in Phase I and 10 properties are slated for restoration this spring under other grants obtained by Kooskooskie Commons.

The Creating Urban Buffers Program conducted by the Walla Walla County Conservation District and lists 30 properties to be restored over the next five years on Yellowhawk, Garrison, Stone and Russell Creeks. Kooskooskie Commons is a partner on the CURB grant and is specifically working on one public school property. Kooskooskie Commons also, recently applied for a Husseman Grant for the Jefferson Park portion of Garrison Creek.

4. Does the program envision a future were landowners implement restoration actions with private funding, or increased cost-share, if so at what point will that occur?

Yellowhawk Creek urban restoration is listed as a priority in the WRIA 32 DIP and much like the agricultural CREP builds on itself and is designed to spread outward from publicly partnered projects so that adjacent property owners find the restoration attractive and volunteer to invest in restoration on their own. A “critical” mass needs to be restored in a number of areas along Yellowhawk Creek to be effective in developing public awareness for urban riparian habitat restoration. Additionally, the infrastructure to support individual landowners in accomplishing their own restoration needs to be established. As these publicly partnered projects gain attention, the local market for native plants and people trained to design and plant urban riparian areas will increase. Several local nurseries participated in a CURB partnered workshop in February and several are willing to stock native plants and provide advice to homeowners. Additional workshops are planned for landscape companies.

Currently, a minimum cost share of %15 is required from property owners, but some are providing much more in major revisions for site preparation. Others are willing to purchase plants to help defray costs.

5. There is an inconsistency in the application as to the number of sites that will be developed, please clarify.

- Restoration of the riparian area with site preparation and planting will be accomplished on a minimum of five properties with a goal of 1500 linear feet.
- Priority properties will be selected to reduce lawn turf thus reducing water use and delivery of sediments and pollutants to the creek.

6. With \$36,500 allocated to the program under the two grants subsequent to the previous Phase IV Streamkeepers contract what fiscal efficiencies have been achieved as the program matures, related to the amount of “on the ground restoration” per dollar?

Yes, efficiency has been gained in the ordering of plants to meet a larger demand and reduce the costs per project.

As this program is new, much of the effort is still related to identifying properties and developing landowner contacts and agreements. Also, each property varies tremendously from one to the other and requires considerable time in site design, especially as the landowners are purposefully engaged. Planting schedules also depend on the capability and timing of the homeowner for site preparation. So, planting templates and selections are not a means to efficiency. When possible, properties that are contiguous are selected to provide efficiency in planting. At present there is one neighborhood association on Yellowhawk Creek and our work with them is creating some efficiency for this spring.

Efficiencies may be gained in future as landowners begin to take on their own restoration and so the work may become more advisory and can cover more area than in the past. At the same time, plant prices, even at the wholesale level have increased. Also, planting with bare root plants is less of an option as it is difficult to go back in and replant under the grant timelines. Last year some of the plants did not break dormancy and so they had to be replaced in the fall after the grant had expired. Though the nursery replaced the plants, the time and energy to make the re-order, bookkeeping and delivery of plants was not compensated.

6. Please separate out the cost of producing a video as a separate task, from the overall project.

The video production is listed at \$4000 and will include some final production time from the media staff at Walla Walla Community College. If approved, match funding of \$2000 from a private foundation grant will be applied.

Because of the public access television availability, a well crafted video production would be very useful in spreading word about successful restoration projects. There is no funding in the CURB grant that can be applied to a video production.

7. What kind of equipment is proposed as a budget cost?

There are several larger properties identified in which the landowners need help with removal of non-native vegetation that requires heavy equipment to which they do not have access. The equipment costs are to cover contractor fees for those properties. These properties do not qualify for CREP but are within the urban growth boundary and are important restoration opportunities.