## Board of Commissioners

Regular Monthly Board Meeting Agenda
Thursday, April 11, 2024, @ 4:00 p.m.
Public Meeting by Zoom Video Conference
SRWD will conduct this meeting using Zoom video conferencing due to the restricted capacity for in-person gatherings and our commitment to prioritize the safety of the public and our employees. We strongly encourage the public to participate in this meeting electronically. To access further information, including registration details, please visit the SRWD website at www.srwd.org on the day of the meeting. We invite members of the public to submit written comments regarding agenda items by emailing tkarlsen@srwd.org no later than 2:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Submitted comments will be shared with the SRWD Board of Commissioners and will become part of the permanent record.

## - Call Regular Meeting to Order:

- Announcements/Visitor Public Comments:

The public comment period provides the public with an opportunity to address the Commissioners regarding items on the agenda. Please limit comments to (3) minutes.

- Consent Calendar:

Managers' reports included under the consent calendar are an executive summary provided to Commissioners as an update of system conditions, projects, and programs. Management welcomes your feedback and requests more detailed information regarding any item before or during the meeting:

- Invoice List
- Board Meeting Minutes
- Financial Report / Approve Invoices
- USDA PMR Phase IV No. 43
- General Manager's Monthly Report

March 2024 to April 2024
March 14, 2024
March 2024 to April 2024
April 11, 2024
March 2024 to April 2024

- Discussion and Information Items:
- Consider Primary Source Water Project.

Presented by: Adam Denlinger, General Manager
Jeff Hollen, SRWD General Counsel

- Consider providing staff direction regarding rate adjustment for 2024-2025.

Presented by: Adam Denlinger, General Manager
Joy King-Cortes, SRWD Office Manager

- Decision Items:
- Consider approving the Scope of Services from GSI Water Solutions for Continued Streamflow and Temperature Monitoring.
Presented by: Adam Denlinger, General Manager
- Consider authorizing the district to adopt a resolution for funding through the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) to develop a Drinking Water Protection Plan and Authorize the General Manager, or designee to execute the funding agreement on behalf of the district.
Presented by: Adam Denlinger, General Manager
- Consider approving Amendment No. 6 of EJCDC Owner Engineers Agreement.

Presented by: Adam Denlinger, General Manager

- Reports, Comments, and Correspondence:
- SRWD Annual Budget Committee Meeting April 18, 2024, at 6:00 PM
- Oregon Health Authority (OHA) Water Testing Scam Community Advisory.
- Mid-Coast Watershed Council (MCWC) 25-year Celebration Report.
- Executive Session: according to ORS 192.660(2), Concerning:

The SRWD Board may meet in Executive Session, pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h); To consult with legal counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Representatives of the news media and designated staff shall be allowed to attend the executive session. All other members of the audience are asked

| Seal Rock Water District |  | Payment Approval Report - by GL <br> Report dates: 3/15/2024-3/15/2024 | Mar 15, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page } \quad 1 \\ 2024 \text { 10:56AM } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Report Criteria: <br> Detail report. <br> invoices with totals ab <br> Paid and unpaid invoi | uded |  |  |  |
| Vendor Name | Invoice Number | Description | Invoice Date | Net Invoice Amount |
| 01-1310 |  |  |  |  |
| LARRY WATTS | 031524 | Refund Overpayment - Leak Adjustment | 03/15/2024 | 372.05 |
| Total 01-1310 |  |  |  | 372.05 |
| Grand Totals |  |  |  | 372.05 |

Dated: $\qquad$

Treasurer: $\qquad$

| Seal Rock Water District | Payment Approval Report - by GL |  | Page: 1Mar 26, 2024 08:35AM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Report Criteria |  |  |  |  |
| Detail report. |  |  |  |  |
| Invoices with totals above \$0 included. |  |  |  |  |
| Paid and unpaid invoices included. |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor Name | Invoice Number | Description | Invoice Date | Net Invoice Amount |
| 01-1310 |  |  |  |  |
| DANIEL ORTIZ | 031924 | Refund Overpayment Final Bill | 03/19/2024 | 100.27 |
| Total 01-1310 |  |  |  | 100.27 |
| 01.5271 |  |  |  |  |
| CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS | 001293703192 | Internet (Office) | 03/19/2024 | 134.98 |
| Total 01-5271; |  |  |  | 134.98 |
| 01-5272 |  |  |  |  |
| AT\&T MOBILITY | 03232024 | Wireless | 03/15/2024 | 198.61 |
| Total 01-5272: |  |  |  | 198.61 |
| 01-5274 |  |  |  |  |
| AT\&T MOBILITY | 03232024 | Wireless WTP | 03/15/2024 | 5149 |
| Total 01-5274 |  |  |  | 51.49 |
| 01-5291 |  |  |  |  |
| US POSTAL SERVICE - WALDP | 032224 | Bulk Mailing | 03/22/2024 | 910.57 |
| Total 01-5291: |  |  |  | 910.57 |
| 01-5605 |  |  |  |  |
| CASCADE COLUMBIA DISTRIBU | 887559 | Sodium Permanganate 20\% NSF (530 lb drum) | 03/18/2024 | 1,378.00 |
| CASCADE COLUMBIA DISTRIBU | 887559 | Freight | 03/18/2024 | 791,09 |
| CASCADE COLUMBIA DISTRIBU | 887559 | Environmental Surcharge | 03/18/2024 | 35.00 |
| CASCADE COLUMBIA DISTRIBU | 891021 | Container Return - Credit Memo | 03/13/2024 | 900.00 - |
| CASCADE COLUMBLA DISTRIBU | 891021 | Container Return - Credit Memo | 03/13/2024 | $800.00-$ |
| CASCADE COLUMBIA DISTRIBU | 891021 | Freight | 03/13/2024 | 235.00 |
| USA BLUE BOOK | INV00294329 | Hach RoVer\® Rust Remover, $454 \mathrm{~g}, 30001$; | 03/04/2024 | 28.55 |
| Total 01-5605: |  |  |  | 767.64 |
| 01.5610 |  |  |  |  |
| CENTRAL LINCOLN P.U.D. | 032024 | Utility Services | 03/20/2024 | 2.921.87 |
| Total 01-5610: |  |  |  | 2,921.87 |
| 01-5611 |  |  |  |  |
| CENTRAL LINCOLN P.U.D. | 032024 | WTP Utility Services | 03/20/2024 | 1,973.08 |
| Total 01-5611: |  |  |  | 1,973 08 |
| 01.5629 |  |  |  |  |
| ABOVEBOARD ELECTRIC, INC. | 101224 | Water Plant: Labor - Journeyman Electrician - Diconnected \& installed 1 of 3 CIP h | 03/19/2024 | 797.50 |
| ABOVEBOARD ELECTRIC, INC. | 101224 | CAT Surcharge | 03/19/2024 | 4.55 |
| CHROMALOX INC | 1965613 | Shipping \& Handling | 01/08/2024 | 71.34 |
| CHROMALOX INC | 1972019 | Shipping \& Handing | 02/09/2024 | 67.43 |
| CHROMALOX INC | 1975963 | CIP Skid Heat Eelement EMTI-3180E4TPXX 480V,3P, 1 | 02/29/2024 | 2,206.00 |
| CHROMALOX INC | 1975963 | Shipping \& Handling | 02/29/2024 | 47.72 |


| Seal Rock Water District | Payment Approval Report - by GL <br> Report dates: 3/26/2024-3/26/2024 |  | Mar 26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page: } 2 \\ & 2024 \text { 08:35AM } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor Name | Invoice Number | Description | Invoice Date | Net Invoice Amount |
| CREATIVE LANDSCAPE \& MAIN | 1145-1579 | Backflow Test/WTP \& Intake | 03/17/2024 | 180.00 |
| Total 01-5629: |  |  |  | 3,374.54 |
| Grand Totals: |  |  |  | $\underbrace{10,433.05}$ |



Dated $\qquad$

Treasurer: $\qquad$

## Report Criteria:

Detail report.
Invoices with totals above $\$ 0$ included.
paid and unpaid invoices included.

| Seal Rock Water District |  | Payment Approval Report - by GL <br> Report dates. 3/27/2024-3/27/2024 | Mar 27 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page: } 1 \\ 2024 \text { 08:23AM } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Report Criteria: <br> Detail report. <br> Invoices with totals above $\$ 0$ included. Paid and unpaid invoices included. |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor Name | Invoice Number | Description | Invoice Date | Net Invoice Amount |
| 01-1310 |  |  |  |  |
| SARA VANDEHEY | 032624 | Refund Overpayment Final Bill | 03/26/2024 | 7.75 |
| Total 01-1310 |  |  |  | 7.75 |
| Grand Totals: |  |  |  | d 775 |

Dated: $\qquad$

Treasurer: $\qquad$

| Seal Rock Water District |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| Seal Rock Water District | Payment Approval Report - by GL <br> Report dates: 4/3/2024-4/3/2024 |  |  | Apr 03, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page: } \quad 1 \\ 2024 \text { 08:41AM } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Report Criteria: <br> Detail report. <br> Invoices with totals above $\$ 0$ <br> Paid and unpaid invoices inc | ded. |  |  |  |  |
| Vendor Name | Invoice Number |  | Description | Invoice Date | Net Invoice Amount |
| 01.5064 |  |  |  |  |  |
| GLEN MORRIS | 173 | Stipend |  | 04/11/2024 | 50.00 |
| Karen otta | 89 | Stipend |  | 04/11/2024 | 50.00 |
| PAUL HIGHFILL | 34 | Stipend |  | 04/11/2024 | 50.00 |
| ROB MILLS | 172 | Stipend |  | 04/11/2024 | 50.00 |
| SAUNDRA MIES-GRANTHAM | 172 | Stipend |  | 04/11/2024 | 50.00 |
| Total 01-5064: |  |  |  |  | 250.00 |
| Grand Totals: |  |  |  |  | 250.00 |

Dated: $\qquad$

Treasurer: $\qquad$

# 1SEAL ROCK WATER DISTRICT <br> MINUTES OF THE <br> Regular Board Meeting <br> by Zoom Conference Call and In Person <br> March 14, 2024 

## Introduction to Remote Meeting:

SRWD held this meeting through Zoom video conferencing. Due to the limited capacity for in-person meetings, the public was encouraged to attend the meeting electronically.

## Present:

Commissioner Saundra Mies-Grantham was present on the Zoom Conference Call. Present in person in the board room were Commissioner Rob Mills, Board President; Commissioner Paul Highfill, Member, Commissioner Glen Morris, Member; and Attorney Jeff Hollen, Legal Counsel. Staff: Adam Denlinger, General Manager; Joy King-Cortes, Office/Finance Manager; Trish Karlsen, Bookkeeper; and Brad Wynn, Lead Operator
Excused Absences: Commissioner Karen Otta

## Call Regular Meeting to Order:

President Rob Mills called the regular board meeting to order 4:00 p.m., Thursday, March 14, 2024, and introduced the commissioners and staff present in the board room. No member of the public was in attendance in person. Present in Zoom was John French.

## Announcements/Public Comments:

President Rob Mills asked if there were any announcements. Commissioner Saundra Mies-Grantham had no announcement; Commissioner Paul Highfill had no announcement; Commissioner Glen Morris had no announcement; General Manager, Adam Denlinger had no announcement; Joy King-Cortes, Office/Finance Manager announced that there is an updated Financial Report for the meeting; Trish Karlsen, Bookkeeper had no announcement; Attorney Jeff Hollen had no announcement; Brad Wynn, Lead Operator had no announcement; and President Rob Mills had no announcement.

## Public Comments:

President Rob Mills asked John French who attended through Zoom if he had a comment and he responded that he had no comment.

## Consent Calendar:

Items on the consent calendar are the February/March 2024 Invoices List for approval; the February 15, Regular Board Meeting minutes; the February/March 2024 Financial Report; USDA Project Monitoring Report No. 42; and the General Manager's Monthly Report. President Rob Mills asked if each commissioner reviewed the consent calendar items. Commissioner Glen Morris answered YES; Commissioner Saundra Mies-Grantham answered YES; Commissioner Paul Highfill answered YES. Commissioner Paul Highfill motioned to approve the consent calendar. Commissioner Saundra Mies-Grantham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 3 YES votes and 0 NO votes, and Commissioner Glen Morris abstained from voting since he was not present at the February 15 board meeting.

## Discussion and Information Items:

Primary Source Water Project Update:
The Water Treatment Plant operators were successful at installing another new heater rod to one of the three heater elements used in the Clean in Place (CIP) process. Several modifications have been made to the programming and performance of the WTP Filter Skids by WesTech during the week-long performance visit to the WTP. Before the modifications it took 8 hours to do the CIP process and now it only takes 45 minutes to complete the CIP process. It took 3-4 days to fill up the water tank before the modifications, now it only takes half a day. The WTP is now programmed to start and stop at Clearwell level in an automated condition, as most WTP do, and would benefit from longer run-times at lower flow rates. Many other adjustments to the treatment process were performed and performance testing and monitoring will continue for several weeks. In all, the weeklong performance testing of WesTech equipment was overwhelmingly successful.

## Decision Items:

## Leak Adjustment Amendment:

The freezing weather in February caused broken pipes for 4 customers, one from South Bay Road, 3 from 130 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Drive, and 1 from $98^{\text {th }}$ Street. Only two customers qualified for a leak adjustment. The current SRWD Leak Adjustment Policy was adopted on October 13, 2005, and revised on February 12, 2009. The Leak Adjustment Policy calculation was based on the cost of water purchased from the City of Toledo which is no longer applicable since the district's water treatment plant is now producing water. Staff presented an updated draft Leak Adjustment Policy for approval. Commissioner Glen

Morris motioned to approve the updated Leak Adjustment Policy. Commissioner Paul Highfield seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

## Reports, Comments, Correspondence:

The GM Performance Review is scheduled for June 2024. The performance review packet will be sent electronically to each commissioner and paper versions are also available. President Robert Mills explained that the GM performance review will be done by each commissioner by completing the GM Performance review form and President Mills will consolidate them into one form. The employee performance evaluation by the managers was also discussed. Most of the employees' evaluations need to be done by July 2024.
The SRWD Annual Budget Committee Meeting is scheduled for April 18, 2024, at 6:00 pm.
It was the consensus of the board to schedule the September board meeting on September 19 to accommodate the GM's schedule who will be out of the office on September 10,11, and 13 to attend the arbitration.

## Recessed Regular Session to go into Executive Session:

President Rob Mills recessed the regular session at 4:24 p.m. to go into Executive Session, pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h); To consult with legal counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body regarding current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Representatives of the news media and designated staff shall be allowed to attend the executive session. All other members of the audience were asked to leave the room and sign off from Zoom. Representatives of the news media are specifically directed not to report on any of the deliberations. No final decisions shall be made in the Executive Session.

Adjourned the Executive Session/Reconvened Regular Board Meeting:
President Rob Mills adjourned the executive session and reconvened the regular board meeting at 4:50 p.m.
Adjournment: Commissioner Glen Morris motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Saundra Mies-Grantham seconded the motion. President Rob Mills adjourned the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Next Board Meeting: April 11, 2024, at 4:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting.

Date:




1037 NW Grebe Street
Seal Rock, Oregon 97376
Phone: 541.563.3529 - Fax: 541.563.4246
www.srwd.org
Seal Rock Water District
General Manager's Report:
Board Meeting - April 11, 2024
This report serves as an executive summary for the Board meeting agenda. It provides recommendations for actions to be taken if necessary. Detailed information, staff reports, and supporting materials can be found in the full agenda packet.

## PHASE-IV BEAVER CREEK SOURCE WATER PROJECT:



Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Operators continue working with Jacobs Engineers and the membrane filter skid provider, WesTech to improve operational performance at the water treatment plant. Filter skids are using much less power and chemicals during the clean in place (CIP) process and operators are recognizing much longer run times between CIP's.

Recently water treatment plant operators began phasing in remote operation of the water treatment plant. Implementation of remote operation allows operators to monitor functions at the water treatment plant through a human machine interface (HMI) program. While this phase in the process is relatively new for the district, it is standard throughout the industry and while recently implemented we are recognizing promising results.

Operators are able to allow the WTP to operate after hours with successful starts and stops, to include automated routine maintenance cleans during production. The result to the district is less overall cost to produce water and an increased overall level of stored water in the drinking water system. Operators continue to monitor conditions as they work collaboratively with engineers and WesTech technicians to build greater optimization as continued monitoring is performed.

## SRWD COMPLIANCE WITH LEAD AND COPPER SERVICE LINE INVENTORY:

Seal Rock Water District distribution operators began the task of field verifying 284 random water services to meet compliance with the Lead and Copper Rule Revision (LCRR). On January 15, 2021, the US EPA issued revisions to the federal LCR. US EPA's new Lead and Copper Rule Revisions (LCRR) aim to strengthen the LCR to better protect communities and children in elementary schools and childcare facilities from the impacts of lead exposure. On January 20, 2021, under federal Executive Order 13990, the LCRR was identified as an agency action requiring review. Consequently, US EPA delayed the effective and compliance dates established in the LCRR to December 16, 2021, and October 16, 2024, respectively, while engaging with local communities, states, local governments, utilities, and stakeholders for input on any changes that should be made to the LCRR.

On December 17, 2021, following US EPA engagement activities, US EPA published Docket No. EPA-HQ-OW-2021-0255 in the federal register. Within the Docket, the US EPA committed to propose and revise the LCRR by October 2024 with the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements (LCRI). The LCRI is expected to delay the implementation of portions of the LCRR beyond the October 16, 2024 compliance date, however, US EPA maintains the October 16, 2024 compliance date for the lead service line inventories. Water systems are to keep their current tap sampling plans until the LCRR comes into effect on October 16, 2024.

The statistical approach provides a method to complete a service line inventory without inspecting every unknown service line. This approach will demonstrate a minimum 95 percent level of statistical confidence. A key factor in the success of this strategy is the use of a randomly generated list of unknown service lines to be physically inspected. If ANY service line is found to be a lead service line (either through the initial records review or the verification process) then this framework will not be able to be used and an alternate process will be discussed with the state. If NO service line is found to be lead through the records review and verification process then the remaining unknown service lines will be classified as non-lead and the submitted inventory will be final (e.g. contain all non-lead service lines).

Known service lines are defined as a service line where the pipe materials are classified using records (Previous Materials Evaluation, Construction and Plumbing Codes and Records, Water System Records, Distribution System Inspections and Records, and other required or related records) or other state approved verification methods and the water system has high confidence in the material classification. Records showing that service lines were installed after the state lead ban.

Unknown service lines are defined as a service line of unknown material with no/low-confidence documented material history.

The statistical method includes the following steps:
Step 1: Identification of all service lines of unknown material.
Step 2: Identification of the number of service lines to be physically inspected.
Step 3: Random selection of service lines for physical inspection.
Step 4: Physical inspection of the service lines.
Step 5: Record of the physical inspection process.
Step 6: Results input of unknown service lines into the inventory.
Step 7: Retention of identification records.

## Step 1: Identify known and unknown service lines.

Table 1 shows the total number of service connections in Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798).

| Public Water System Name | Total Service Line Count |
| :--- | :--- |
| Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798) | 2,676 |

Table 2 shows the classification of service connections in Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798).

| Public Water System Name | Lead Status Known Count | Lead Status Unknown Count |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798) | 1,506 Non-Lead | 1,170 |

Step 2: Identify how many unknown service lines must be verified.

Table 1 shows the total of unknown service connections in Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798).

| Public Water System Name | Lead Status Unknown Count |
| :--- | :--- |
| Seal Rock, OR (OR4100798) | 1,170 |

## Type of Service Line Verification Method:

Public Side Service Line Verification Methods Used:

- Visual - Excavation

Private Side Service Line Verification Methods Used:

- Visual - Excavation


## Step 3: Determine approach for verification of lead status unknown.

Stratified Random Sampling - At this time, the only statistical verification and minimum sample size calculation accepted is the $95 \%$ confidence level (with $+/-5 \%$ margin of error and $50 \%$ sample proportion) approach. Examples are Oregon and Michigan.

The statistical approach provides a method to complete a service line inventory without inspecting every unknown service line. This approach will demonstrate a minimum 95 percent level of statistical confidence. A key factor in the success of this strategy is the use of a randomly generated list of unknown service lines to be physically inspected; however, this list of randomly selected locations will be randomized per the categorized decade of installation records. If installation records don't exist the location will still be included in the decade of highest risk. If ANY service line is found to be a lead service line (either through the initial records review or the verification process) then this framework will not be able to be used and an alternate process will be discussed with the state. If NO service line is found to be lead through the records review and verification process, then the remaining unknown service lines will be classified as non-lead and the submitted inventory will be final (e.g. contain all non-lead service lines). If, in the future, an LSL is found then the water system will contact the state within 30 days to discuss a path forward.

Known service lines are defined as a service line where the pipe materials are classified using records (Previous Materials Evaluation, Construction and Plumbing Codes and Records, Water System Records, Distribution System Inspections and Records, and other required or related records) or other state approved verification methods and the water system has high confidence in the material classification. Records showing that service lines were installed after the state lead ban (or local ordinance with an earlier lead ban) and service lines $>2$ inches (diameter allowance depends on state) will be considered known and classified as non-lead.

Unknown service lines are defined as a service line of unknown material with no/low-confidence documented material history.

## Step 4: Randomly select service lines for verification.

## The generation of a uniformly random set of service lines for inspection using the direction as provided

 below:1. In the first column of a spreadsheet, list every unique service line of unknown material.
2. In the second column, generate uniformly random numbers, so that each service line is associated with a randomly generated number.

Follow these steps:
a. Enter the formula =RAND() into the second column next to each location and press Enter. This generates a number between 0 and 1 for each service line.
b. Select the second column (the column with the random values) and copy it, using the spreadsheet's Copy feature.
c. With the second column still selected, use the Paste Special option to Paste Values Only into that same column. This will ensure your random numbers remain static.
d. Use the Sort feature to list the randomly generated numbers from lowest to highest. If the Sort Warning appears, select Expand the Selection, then Sort.
e. Select only the top $N$ service lines, where $N$ is the number requiring inspection. For example, if you need to inspect 20 service lines, select the first 20 service lines on the list. These are the 20 uniformly random service lines to be inspected.
f. In addition to the number of locations requiring inspection, use the same process outlined above to generate 50 additional locations as a buffer if any issues arise with residents not being willing to comply with inspection.

## Step 5: Conduct service line verifications.

## Type of Service Line Verification Method

At least one point of verification is required for each portion of the unknown service line. If the service line is jointly owned, each portion that is unknown (utility and/or customer) must be verified. Verification methods include approved verification methods. If one or more of the original randomly selected sites cannot be verified, the next available location from the random number generation will be used. Example: If a system has 2,000 unknowns and has to verify 322 SLs but was only able to verify 312 SLs, then the next 10 SLs will be taken from the original random number list (e.g. 323 to 333).

## Public Side Service Line Verification Methods used:

- Visual at the Meter Pit - Excavation


## Private Side Service Line Verification Methods used:

- Visual at the Meter Pit - Excavation

| Inventory <br> Approach | Public Water <br> System Name | Lead Status <br> Unknown Count | Number of Service <br> Lines to Verify <br> (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stratified Random <br> Sampling | Seal Rock, OR <br> (OR4100798) | 1,170 | 284 |

## Other notable activities for the month include:

- Attended the Mid Coast Water Conservation Consortium Meeting.
- Attended SDAO/SDIS Joint meeting in government camp on April $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$.
- Attended the OWRD Place-Based Planning Coordinating Committee Meeting, on March 19th.
- Met with GSI Water Solutions to review progress on MC-WPP, the Water Management and Conservation Plan, and Beaver Creek streamflow and temperature monitoring scope of services.
- Attended the Monthly Oregon Water Utility Council (OWUC) meeting, on March 21st.
- Staff attended the quarterly IT and Cybersecurity Briefing with OrchoTech on March $15^{\text {th }}$.
- Staff are working to complete the Annual SRWD 2024/2025 Budget Packets.
- Staff worked with Jacobs Engineering to satisfy the request for production of documents related to arbitration.
- Met with consultants developing Lead and Copper Rule Revision service line inventory report.

1037 NW Grebe Street
Seal Rock, Oregon 97376
Phone: 541.563.3529 -Fax: 541.563.4246
www.srwd.org
Seal Rock Water District

DATE ACTION REQUESTED: April 11, 2024

| DATE ACTION REQUESTED: April 11, 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Ordinance | Resolution | Motion | Information | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |  |  |

Date Prepared: March 25, 2024
SUBJECT: Consider Water Rate Adjustment for
FY 2024-2025 FY 2024-2025

## Dept.: Administration

## Contact Person for this Item:

Adam Denlinger, General Manager
adenlinger@srwd.org. 541-563-4447

## RECOMMENDED BOARD ACTION:

Consider a water rate adjustment for the 2024/2025 budget year.

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

The philosophy of the district has been to maintain a program of small annual increases to lessen the need for large one-time increases. Other considerations include the transition to the district's primary source water supply, satisfying annual debt service, transfers to capital and source water reserves, and planning for the long-term operation of the district's water distribution and membrane water treatment facility.

## DISTRICT GOAL:

Identify and prioritize challenges that must be overcome to ensure successful District operations dependent upon effective financial planning for the annual operation of the district.

## BACKGROUND:

Historically, the SRWD Board of Commissioners evaluates the rate annually for addressing any necessary increase and then requests that staff develop a proposal (potential scenarios) for a rate increase that will be provided to the Board and the community at a future public hearing. The U. S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics reports that over the last 12 months, the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U) advanced 3.2 percent. Food prices advanced 2.3 percent. Energy prices advanced 0.6 percent, largely the result of an increase in the price of electricity. The index for all items less food and energy advanced 3.6 percent over the year. Maintaining pace with inflation annually supports the likelihood that significant rate adjustments will not be necessary in the future.

Adjustment in the rate is a policy decision and is subject to public hearing in accordance with ORS, Chapter 264.312. If the Board of Commissioners elects to adjust the rate, the Board will need to direct staff to reflect the adjusted rate in the budget and schedule a rate hearing for no later than June 13, 2024.

Presented By:


Water Solutions, Inc.

## Scope of Work and Fee Estimate

To:

Adam Denlinger<br>Seal Rock Water District<br>PO Box 190<br>1037 NW Grebe Street<br>Seal Rock 97376

From: Owen McMurtrey, GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
Zach Pike-Urlacher, GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
Date:
March 11, 2024
RE: $\quad$ Scope of Work and Cost Estimate for Year 7 Water Temperature Monitoring Support on Beaver Creek for Water Right Permit S-55012

Dear Adam,
GSI Water Solutions, Inc. (GSI) appreciates the opportunity to provide this scope of work and budget to Seal Rock Water District (District) for monitoring water temperature in Beaver Creek. The purpose of the monitoring is to meet requirements outlined in the District's water use Permit S-55012, which states that stream temperature must be monitored between May 15 and October 31 at 30 minute intervals upstream and downstream of the point of diversion (POD) for 2 years prior to diversion and 5 years after diversion. GSI understands that the District began diverting water from Beaver Creek in June of 2022; it is likely that Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) will require the District to continue to monitor water temperatures through May 2027. As a result, this will represent year 2 of the required (post diversion) monitoring period. We will confer with OWRD and adjust as needed.

## Scope of Work

GSI will perform water temperature monitoring in Beaver Creek and submit the data to OWRD and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) at the end of the year as outlined in the Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP). This work is organized into three tasks which are described below.

## Task 1 - Stream Temperature Monitoring

This task will include:

- Install the loggers in stilling wells and ensure all devices are functioning properly prior to May $15^{\text {th }}$.
- Routinely inspect stilling wells and download logger data.
- Remove the loggers after October 31st for post-deployment quality control checks.
- Perform quality control tests on loggers, as outlined in the SAP, including pre- and post-deployment water baths and at least two in-stream temperature confirmations.

Additionally, the thermometer used for transducer data quality control may be NIST calibrated prior to the season.

Assumptions:

- Time is based on an 8 hour field day for (1) GSI staff from Portland for each of the 6 routine monitoring trips included in the scope of work. GSI will overlap temperature monitoring visits with streamflow measurement site visits completed under a separate scope of work to the extent possible.
- For installation of the loggers, time is based on an 11 hour field day for (1) GSI staff from Portland. For logger removal, time is based on an 11 hour field day for (1) GSI staff from Portland. Installation of data loggers will be coordinated with streamflow monitoring if possible.
- The District is responsible for any repairs to the stilling wells in case of damage.
- Thermometer calibration cost is $\$ 150$.
- GSI received returned data loggers after battery replacement in February 2021. Battery life is expected to last through the 2024 season, but GSI has included the cost of battery replacement in the event that data logger batteries require replacement after the monitoring season.


## Task 2 - Data and Reporting

During the monitoring period, the data will be downloaded by GSI approximately once per month and reviewed to ensure data quality and logger functionality. Following our quality review, GSI will submit the electronic water temperature data and any required documentation to OWRD and DEQ by December 31, 2024, consistent with the SAP.

## Task 3 - Project Management

GSI will manage the project, which will include invoicing, tracking budget and schedule, progress updates with the District, and internal management. As needed, GSI will set up a conference call or meeting with DEQ and/or OWRD to review monitoring results and procedures.

## Assumptions

- Meeting with the District and DEQ, if needed, will be by video conference.


## Continuing Temperature Monitoring during Subsequent Years

Temperature monitoring is required for at least five years after initiation of diversions, as outlined in the District's water use permit S-55012. The temperature monitoring during the subsequent years of monitoring is anticipated to be similar to Year 7 as outlined in this scope of work.

## Fee Estimate

Our proposed scope of work will be completed on a time and materials basis. The total estimated not to exceed fee for Year 7 temperature monitoring in Beaver Creek is $\$ 22,510$. Table 1, presented below, shows a breakdown of the budget by task. The level of effort by task may vary but the overall budget will not be exceeded unless approved by the District. GSI's 2024 labor rates are attached.

| Tasks | Labor <br> Hours | Labor <br> Cost | Direct <br> Expenses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Task 1 - Stream Temperature Monitoring | 97 | $\$ 14,065$ | $\$ 2,470$ | $\$ 16,535$ |
| Task 2 - Data Review and Reporting | 23 | $\$ 3,825$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3,825$ |
| Task 3 - Project Management | 15 | $\$ 2,150$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,150$ |
|  |  | Project Totals | 135 | $\$ 20,040$ |

The work completed under this scope of work will be consistent with the terms and conditions of the Professional Service Agreement for Temperature Monitoring signed by the District on March 15, 2019. Please sign below as your notice to proceed.

Please give me a call if you have any questions regarding this scope and budget. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to work with the District on this project.

Approved by:

Adam Denlinger, General Manager
Seal Rock Water District

Date


3/11/24
Date

Water Solutions, Inc.

## Scope of Work and Fee Estimate

| To: | Adam Denlinger <br> Seal Rock Water District <br> PO Box 190 <br>  <br> 1037 NW Grebe Street <br>  <br> Seal Rock 97376 |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Zach Pike-Urlacher, GSI Water Solutions, Inc. <br>  <br> Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions, Inc. |
| Date: | March 11, 2024 |
| RE: | Scope of Work and Fee Estimate for Year 6 Streamflow Monitoring Support on Beaver | Creek for Water Use Permit S-55012

Adam,
GSI Water Solutions, Inc. (GSI) appreciates the opportunity to provide this scope of work and budget to Seal Rock Water District (District) for streamflow monitoring on Beaver Creek. The purpose of the monitoring is to meet requirements outlined in the District's water use permit S-55012, which require:

- Maintain and operate the streamflow monitoring station installed in 2019 near the District's intake to monitor streamflow and water depth (according to USGS standards) during the period of May 15 to October 15, 2023.
- Collect streamflow measurements (at various rates of flow) every four to six weeks during the required monitoring period ( 4 to 6 measurements).
- Prepare an annual report of the collected data to the Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD).


## Scope of Work

This scope of work includes the tasks to be completed during Year 6 of streamflow monitoring support and is organized into four tasks that are described below. We have included a description of the tasks to continue the streamflow monitoring during additional years of monitoring but have not included costs beyond Year 6 in this scope and budget.

## Task 1 - Streamflow Monitoring Planning and Coordination with State Agencies

 GSI will develop a plan and schedule for streamflow monitoring during Year 6, update the health and safety plan for the project, and, as needed, coordinate with state agencies regarding the resumption of streamflow monitoring for Year 6.
## Task 2 - Streamflow Monitoring Station Inspection and Maintenance

GSI will complete an initial site visit prior to the start of the required monitoring period to inspect the streamflow monitoring station and to prepare the station for monitoring during Year 6. Any repairs and maintenance items will be assessed during the initial site visit to the streamflow monitoring station.

## Assumptions

- One visit to the streamflow monitoring station will be completed prior to the start of the required monitoring period to collect a streamflow measurement to ensure the streamflow monitoring station equipment is operating correctly. GSI's time is based on a 10-hour field day for GSI staff and a subconsultant, including travel time.
- One additional site visit and an equipment repair allowance of $\$ 1,200$ is assumed for repairs and maintenance of the streamflow monitoring station, if required. GSl's time is based on a 10-hour field day for GSI staff and a sub-consultant, including travel time.


## Task 3 - Data Collection

GSI will conduct six regularly scheduled field visits to the streamflow monitoring station during the monitoring period (May 15 to October 15) of Year 6 to measure the streamflow of Beaver Creek. The field visits will occur approximately every four to six weeks, with the objective of measuring various rates of streamflow during the required monitoring period. (To the extent possible, GSI staff will combine trips to coincide with temperature monitoring field work). Water level data collected by the pressure transducer (installed at the streamflow monitoring station) will also be downloaded by GSI during each visit. The overall objective of this task is to collect data to continue refinement of the rating curve relating the stage (water depth) of Beaver Creek to streamflow.

## Assumptions

- A total of six visits to the streamflow monitoring station. Travel time for this task is included in the year seven temperature monitoring scope of work.


## Task 4 - Data Processing and Reporting

GSI will review and process the streamflow data collected during the field visits and the data files retrieved from the pressure transducers. The compiled data will be compared to the previous years of streamflow monitoring and will either be used to refine the existing rating curve (relating the stage of Beaver Creek to streamflow) or to develop a new rating curve. The refined or new rating curve will be used to calculate the flow of Beaver Creek based on the continuous stage (water level) measurements of the creek collected at the gaging station. After the end of the required monitoring period, GSI will prepare a summary of the processed data for the District, and GSI will submit the collected data and any required documentation to Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) by December 31, 2024.

## Continuing Streamflow Monitoring after Year 6

The streamflow monitoring during subsequent years of monitoring is anticipated to be similar to Year 6 as outlined in this scope of work.

## Fee Estimate

Our proposed scope of work will be completed on a time and materials basis. The total estimated not to exceed fee for Year 6 of streamflow monitoring in Beaver Creek is $\$ 43,445$. Table 1, presented below, shows a breakdown of the budget by task. The level of effort by task may vary but the overall budget will not be exceeded unless approved by the District. GSI's 2024 labor rates are attached.

Table 1. Fee Estimate for Year 6 Streamflow Monitoring

| Tasks | Labor Hours | Labor Cost | Outside <br> Services | Direct Expenses | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Task 1 - Streamflow Monitoring Planning and Coordination with State Agencies | 8 | \$1,063 | \$1,155 | \$0 | \$2,218 |
| Task 2 - Streamflow Monitoring Station Inspection and Maintenance | 16 | \$2,320 | \$3,686 | \$2,198 | \$8,240 |
| Task 3 - Data Collection | 24 | \$3,405 | \$15,023 | \$4,200 | \$22,628 |
| Task 4 - Data Processing and Reporting | 32 | \$4,620 | \$5,775 | \$0 | \$10,395 |
| Project Totals | 80 | \$11,408 | \$25,639 | \$6,398 | \$43,445 |

The work completed under this scope of work will be consistent with the terms and conditions of the Professional Service Agreement for Year 1 Streamflow Monitoring signed by the District on March 15, 2019. If the District agrees to this scope of work, please sign below as your notice to proceed.

Please give me a call if you have any questions regarding this scope and budget. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to work with the District on this project.

Approved by:

Adam Denlinger, General Manager
Seal Rock Water District

Date


Adam Sussman, Principal GSI Water Solutions

March 11, 2024
Date

1037 NW Grebe Street
Seal Rock, Oregon 97376
Phone: 541.563.3529 -Fax: 541.563.4246
www.srwd.org
Seal Rock Water District

| DATE ACTION REQUESTED: April 11, 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ordinance | Resolution | $\mathbf{X}$ | Motion | $\mathbf{X}$ | Information |  |
| Date Prepared: March 18, 2024 | Dept.: Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBJECT: Consider Application for Funding <br> Through Clean Water State Revolving <br> Fund | Contact Person for this Item: <br> Adam Denlinger, General Manager <br> adenlinger@srwd.org. 541-563-4447 |  |  |  |  |  |

## RECOMMENDED BOARD ACTION:

Consider adopting a resolution for funding provided by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF).

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

Principal forgiveness is an additional subsidy that reduces the amount of principal a Clean Water State Revolving Fund borrower is required to pay back on a loan. In order to receive an award of principal forgiveness, a project must be eligible and there must be principal forgiveness funds available at the time of loan signing.

## DISTRICT GOAL:

Identify and prioritize challenges that must be overcome to ensure successful District operations dependent upon safe reliable source water.

## BACKGROUND:

The focus of the planning effort will be to develop a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP) for Seal Rock Water District's Beaver Creek drinking water source and to engage the community in the process. The DWPP will be structured to meet the requirements for approval by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Oregon Health Authority (OHA).

Presented By:


## Seal Rock Water District

RESOLUTION NO. 0424-01

> A RESOLUTION OF THE SEAL ROCK WATER DISTRICT, OREGON, AUTHORIZING SEAL ROCK WATER DISTRICT TO ACCEPT FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, THROUGH THE STATE OF OREGON CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND PROGRAM IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000

WHEREAS, the Seal Rock Water District, Oregon (the "District") recognizes the risk to the district's primary source water and seeks to finance the completion of a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP);

WHEREAS, a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP) for Seal Rock Water District's (District) Beaver Creek drinking water source will prioritize risks to the district's primary drinking water source;

WHEREAS, the District application through the Oregon Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) was approved on March 19, 2024;

WHEREAS, the District desires to use funding in the form of principal forgiveness to complete a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP);

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of the Seal Rock Water District, Oregon, that:

Seal Rock Water District hereby authorizes the General Manager, or designee to execute all documents to satisfy funding provided by and through the Oregon Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) in the amount of $\$ 50,000$ to complete a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP).

ADOPTED by the Board of the Seal Rock Water District, Oregon this $11^{\text {th }}$ day of April 2024.

# SEAL ROCK WATER DISTRICT, OREGON 

By
President

## ATTEST:

By $\qquad$
Secretary

Page 1 - Resolution

Clean Water State Revolving Fund

## Planning Loan Application

State of Oregon
Department of Environmental Quality

Contact: Regional Project Officer

Answer all requests for information in this application. List "N/A" for items that do not apply. Do not leave any section of this application blank.
DEQ will accept completed applications that are printed, signed and mailed to DEQ, postmarked by the application due date.

## Applicant Information

1. Public agency/Legal applicant:

Seal Rock Water District
Name
1037 NW Grebe Street
Address

Seal Rock, OR
City, State
97376-9773
Zip + 4
541-563-4447
Telephone
adenlinger@srwd.org
Lincoln
County
OR-4 (Hoyle)
Congressional District(s)

053053203
Email Address
DUNS Number (9 Digits)
2. Cite your agency's authority to take on debt, noting the exact Oregon Revised Statute reference located on the state website, ORS 264.250
3. Only public agencies are eligible for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Does your agency meet the definition of a "public agency" as defined by ORS 468.423? If you are unsure, contact DEQ at 503-229-LOAN.

$$
X \mathrm{Yes} \square \mathrm{No}
$$

4. Identify your type of public agency:

| $\square$ | Tribal government |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ City |  |
| $\square$ County |  |
| $\square$ Sanitary district/Sanitary authority |  |
| $\square$ State agency |  |
| $\square$ Irrigation district |  |
| $\square$ School district |  |
| $\square$ County service district |  |
| $\square$ Metropolitan service district |  |
| $\boxed{\text { Other special district (please specify): Water Supply District }}$$\square$ Intergovernmental agency (please specify): I |  |

Note: Eligibility includes certification of no disbarment and no suspension through the System of Award Management. Certification is required at time of loan signing.

## 5. Project contact:

Adam Denlinger
Name
541-563-4447
Telephone

Seal Rock Water District
Dept./Organization
adenlinger@srwd.org
Email Address
6. Project Location:

1037 NW Grebe Street
Address

Seal Rock, OR
City, State
44.498860

Latitude WGS84

97376-9773 Lincoln
Zip + 4
County -124.079920

OR-4 (Hoyle)
Congressional District(s)

Longitude WGS84
$\square$ If no address, describe the location:
$\square$ Location not known
7. Water quality permit information (if applicable):

| Type | Number | Administratively <br> Extended | Renewed | Current | New | No <br> Permit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| National Pollutant <br> Discharge Elimination <br> System permit number <br> (EPA reference number <br> beginning with "OR") | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water Pollution Control <br> Facility permit number | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |

## 8. Will this project require?

Permit renewal$\square$ New permit
Х N/A

## 9. Permit includes:

A compliance schedule associated with loan requestA Mutual Agreement and Order (MAO) associated with loan requestLoan request is being made to address potential compliance concerns10. CWSRF loan request amount: $\$ 50,000.00$
11. Total estimated project cost: $\$ 65,000.00$

Use this section to describe the objectives, components and expected outcomes of the plan. The loan agreement will refer to this section in defining what expenses can be reimbursed.

## 12. Planning effort description

Name of project: Seal Rock Water District Drinking Water Protection Plan

Project objective: Develop a Drinking Water Protection Plan to protect the District's water source
Provide the complete scope of planning effort: Drinking Water Protection Plan development and associated outreach
Describe the major project components of the planning effort (the means of achieving the objectives):
The focus of the planning effort will be to develop a Drinking Water Protection Plan (DWPP) for Seal Rock Water District's (District) Beaver Creek drinking water source and to engage the community in the process. The DWPP will be structured to meet the requirements for approval by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Oregon Health Authority (OHA). The major components of the planning effort include:
(1) Assembling a planning team and conducting public engagement. A planning team will be convened with broad representation from local and regional stakeholder groups, landowners, and water users, along with technical experts. A robust public engagement process will ensure that community priorities are addressed.
(2) Risk inventory and prioritization. The team will review and (as needed) update the inventory of potential contaminant sources described in the Source Water Assessment prepared by DEQ and will prioritize these risks to the water source based on the likelihood of their occurrence and impact if they do occur.
(3) Strategy development. The team will develop strategies to eliminate, minimize, or mitigate identified risks. A variety of options are anticipated to be considered, such as public education, critical area protection, and watershed restoration, and others as recommended by the planning team. Efforts will be focused on addressing the highest-priority risks as determined during the risk inventory and prioritization process.
(4) Implementation plan development. An implementation plan for the selected strategies will be developed to guide source water protection activities over the following 5 years. The plan will include activities, proposed timelines, responsible parties and potential partnerships, anticipated deliverables, and information about potential funding sources.
(5) Contingency plan. The team will develop a contingency plan for addressing possible interruptions or loss of the District's primary water source. The contingency plan will consider short-term and long-term disruptions to the water supply.
(6) Consideration of future water sources. Based on the District's assessment of whether additional sources of drinking water are anticipated to be needed to meet projected demands, the team will determine whether there are activities to undertake or areas that should be protected now to provide high-quality drinking water in the future.

List all of the water quality and public health objectives addressed by the proposed planning effort:
In 2022, the District began using Beaver Creek as its primary water source. Previously, it relied on wholesale purchases of water conveyed through an 8 -mile-long pipeline from the City of Toledo, but vulnerability of this supply to landslides and earthquakes led the District to search for alternatives. The District selected Beaver Creek based on water availability to meet current and projected demands, generally suitable water quality, improved resilience to earthquakes, cost-effectiveness, and minimal expected environmental impacts from construction and operation of new infrastructure. Water supply from Toledo will continue to serve as an emergency backup system.
Protecting the new Beaver Creek drinking water source watershed is a high priority for the District to safeguard its investment in a clean, safe, and reliable source of water for its customers. High rainfall is common here, and runoff can increase turbidity and dissolved organic matter in the water source. In September 2022, the District had a detection above the MCL for total trihalomethanes (TTHM), a disinfection byproduct formed when chlorine in the water treatment process reacts with dissolved organic matter. In the Beaver Creek watershed, $88 \%$ of stream miles are located in areas of highly erodible soils, and significant areas with landslide deposits are located on the south side of the watershed around South Fork Beaver Creek. This increases the susceptibility of the water source to runoff containing sediment, organic matter, and chemical contaminants from agricultural, forestry, and residential land uses. In addition, the new intake has experienced high salinity events due to unusual tidal influence.
DEQ's Source Water Assessment for the system describes activities in the watershed that may pose risks to water quality, including forestry, industry, agriculture, recreation, rural residential development, off-grid encampments, and river recreation. Specific activities that may increase water quality risks include 13 high-risk stream crossings, a quarry, a logging maintenance shop and equipment storage facility, rural homesteads, agriculture, and forestry operations including clearcut harvests and aerial spraying. The District is seeking funding to develop a DWPP to better understand these risks and identify any additional risks, to identify strategies to address those risks, and to involve the community and technical experts in development of the DWPP.

Describe how planning will address these issues (achieve objectives):
Having recently transitioned to using Beaver Creek as its primary water supply source, the District's overall planning objective is to create a DWPP that will function as a framework for implementing forward-thinking drinking water protection and enhancement activities within the source watershed. Risk reduction strategies will be designed to address specific concerns identified in the Source Water Assessment (e.g., stream crossings, forestry, agricultural, mining, and rural residential development) as well as other concerns that may arise during the process of developing the DWPP.
There is high public interest in the protection of Beaver Creek as a drinking water source, popular recreational destination, and important habitat for fish and wildlife. Recent aerial spraying in the watershed has elevated community concerns about water quality and has increased interest in drinking water protection. Public engagement will be an essential element of the planning process and will include making documents available for public review and comment during plan development, hosting two public meetings to gather community feedback and ideas, and preparing meeting outreach materials to share information about the planning process and opportunities to be involved in planning. Outreach will also increase public awareness of the new water source, strategies for protecting the watershed proactively, and the District's efforts to protect its drinking water supply. Outreach methods may include water bill inserts, flyers sent to customers, and website content.
Through this planning process, the District expects to deepen its understanding of the potential threats to its new water supply from Beaver Creek. The risk assessment will build on the Source Water Assessment to include planning team members' knowledge of recent activities and events in the watershed that may have an impact on water quality. Assessing and prioritizing potential contaminant sources will guide efforts to protect the water supply from turbidity, pathogens, pesticides, and other water quality hazards. Once risks are better understood, the planning team will formulate strategies to address these risks with input from the local community and technical experts. The implementation plan will provide a roadmap for developing partnerships, seeking funding, and carrying out activities that will directly reduce threats to water quality and improve watershed conditions.

Describe the intended outcome of this plan and any other pertinent information that explains why this project is proposed:

The intended outcome of the planning effort is to create a DWPP that is tailored to local needs and ready to be implemented with concrete actions and descriptions of partnerships and funding sources. The long-term outcome of the planning effort will be a clean, safe, reliable drinking water source for the District's customers and a healthy Beaver Creek watershed. The planning effort is also expected to strengthen partnerships among local stakeholders and landowners that will facilitate shared learning about water issues and will be critical for future implementation. Drinking water protection strategies will be designed to reduce the likelihood of sediment and chemical contaminants affecting the water supply in the future, thereby ensuring safe drinking water and minimizing future treatment costs. Involving the community and landowners early in the process will help raise public awareness and build trust and ownership of the resulting strategies developed.
Drinking water source protection planning, such as the proposed planning effort, has been identified as a priority in DEQ's Non-Point Source Management Plan (Sections 4.1.3, 4.2.5, and 4.3.3). The plan's intended outcome is to identify strategies to be implemented to reduce non-point sources of pollution from the various land uses in the Beaver Creek watershed that may affect the District's water supply. Having this plan will enable the District and its partners to seek implementation funding and complete projects that reduce risks and protect water quality.

## 13. Will the planning effort include sustainability, establishing long-term reliability and viability of a facility or a water resource (refer to OAR 340-054-0010(32) for the definitions of sustainability and natural infrastructure)?

X Yes $\square$ No
If yes, please describe:
Creating a Drinking Water Protection Plan for the District is a proactive effort to enhance the long-term reliability and viability of the Beaver Creek drinking water source as a safe, sustainable, resilient, and scalable water supply for the District's customers. Beaver Creek is centrally located within the District's service area, avoiding the vulnerabilities of the District's previous water source. Prior to developing Beaver Creek as a water source, the District purchased water from the City of Toledo that had to be conveyed through an 8 -mile-long, 12 -inch-diameter asbestos concrete pipeline constructed in the 1970s. The District conducted a thorough alternatives analysis and selected Beaver Creek based on adequate streamflow, good natural water quality, environmental impacts, and regulatory complexity. The District has constructed all of the necessary diversion, conveyance, and treatment infrastructure to begin using Beaver Creek as its primary water source while maximizing seismic resilience, implementing fish protection design criteria, minimizing visual and noise impacts for recreational users of the creek, and maximizing operator and public safety.
Effective water treatment and reliable supply depend on maintaining the quality and quantity of raw water entering the system from Beaver Creek. Drinking water protection strategies focused on supporting and enhancing the natural infrastructure of the watershed are vital to promoting long-term sustainability of the District's water resource: a healthy watershed is better able to produce clean water for drinking water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation. The District is committed to a collaborative approach, working together with landowners and stakeholders throughout the planning effort to seek sustainable solutions that will address any activities identified that could pose risks to the water source. Protecting and enhancing the natural infrastructure of the watershed (e.g., forestlands, riparian zones, and healthy soils) will help avoid the need for costly changes to the water treatment infrastructure to treat poorer quality raw water.

## 14. Will the planning effort take advantage of an opportunity with respect to project timing, finances, partnerships or other advantageous condition?

$\square$
If yes, please explain:
The District started using Beaver Creek as its water source in 2022, and DEQ completed a Source Water Assessment for the system in 2023. While Beaver Creek was selected for its favorable characteristics as a water source, the Source Water Assessment did identify potential risks to water quality from activities such as forestry, agriculture, and rural residential development. Beginning development of a DWPP now will allow the District to be a proactive partner in addressing potential risks before they become major problems that degrade water quality and threaten the new drinking water source in the future.
The District intends to approach this planning effort in a manner that is coordinated with other regional drinking water protection efforts (e.g., Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership (Partnership), and the cities of Yachats, Toledo, Lincoln City, and Newport). The District will seek to learn from other water providers' efforts and look for opportunities to coordinate and collaborate around strategies and implementation activities that could have broader applicability. As an active participant and current Convener of the Partnership, the District works closely with a wide variety of stakeholder groups on regional water issues. The Partnership's Water Action Plan was approved as a place-based integrated water resource plan by the State in 2022, and the Partnership has moved from planning into implementation. Developing regionally integrated drinking water protection plans is one of the plan's recommended actions, so this proposed planning effort will directly contribute to implementation of the Water Action Plan, and the Partnership will provide a forum for regional coordination. The District will also continue to coordinate with the City of Newport and the City of Toledo regarding any water quality issues and strategies identified related to the backup water supply that those systems provide through interconnections.

# 15. Do you use an asset management tool (Examples are Check Up Program for Small Systems, Effective Utility Management and Lean)? 

XNo
If yes, briefly explain the methods, how long they have been used by applicant and how they will be applied in this planning effort:

The District uses a short-lived asset renewal and replacement program. As a condition of funding, the USDA Rural Development Rural Utilities Service grant funding program requires the District to set aside money each year for replacement of assets.

## 16. Will the planning effort consider integrating natural infrastructure?

$X$ Yes $\square$ No
If yes, briefly explain this aspect of the project, the problem to be solved, and advantage of using natural infrastructure over a conventional treatment system:

The primary focus of the planning effort will be protection and enhancement of the natural infrastructure of the Beaver Creek watershed. Supporting ecosystem function of the watershed will protect and potentially improve water quality in the raw water source, making it efficient and cost-effective to treat for drinking water. Starting with high-quality raw water provides significant advantages for public health and safety as well as reduced treatment costs compared to complex systems required to treat low-quality water. Well-functioning riparian zones help filter pollutants and provide wildlife habitat, while healthy forestlands promote water infiltration and storage, carbon sequestration, biodiversity, and resilience to climate change. Several conservation-based organizations are active in the region and have participated in drinking water protection efforts in the surrounding area, and the District anticipates collaborating with these groups during the planning process to identify multi-benefit actions that will support clean drinking water, natural infrastructure, and ecosystem services. Examples of such actions could be critical area protection through land acquisition or conservation easements, or implementing best management practices for erosion control to prevent excess sediment from entering the water source and increasing turbidity.

## 17. Will the scope of the planning effort demonstrate cost effectiveness by considering three or more project alternatives such as optimizing an existing facility, regional partnership or consolidation? <br> $\qquad$

List the project alternatives the scope of this planning effort will be considering and explain what makes them cost effective:
a.

Alternative A: No Action Alternative. This alternative would be to make no changes to existing infrastructure, land management practices, or water system management practices. Risks to the water system and the watershed from forestry activities, agriculture, rural development, off-grid encampments, and other activities would not be addressed until a specific problem arises. Although these risks would persist, this alternative would be cost-effective as no additional actions would need to be taken.

## b.

Alternative B: Land Acquisition Alternative. This alternative would entail purchasing as much of the drinking water source watershed as possible, which would give the District greater control over activities and land uses. Approximately half of the watershed is owned by the US Forest Service and would not be considered available for purchase. It is currently unknown whether there are willing landowners in the watershed, and critical areas for protection have not yet been prioritized. Funding may be available for land acquisition or conservation easements; however, the District would need to identify a funding source for ongoing operations and maintenance, including forestland management. Therefore, this alternative may be less cost-effective, but the District may continue exploring land acquisition options in the future once critical areas have been identified and if there is a willing landowner.

## c.

Alternative C: Drinking Water Protection Plan Alternative. This alternative consists of developing a DWPP to create a framework of strategies for minimizing and mitigating non-point sources of pollution in the Beaver Creek watershed that could impact the District's water source. The process for developing the plan would involve substantial engagement from stakeholders and landowners, along with broad public outreach to raise awareness of the planning process among the District's customers. The plan would include an assessment and prioritization of potential risks to the drinking water source from known or expected activities and land uses as well as natural disasters. Next, strategies to address each of these risks would be developed, and an implementation plan would outline actions to be taken to implement the strategies. To make sure that proposed activities are realistic in acknowledging the District's staff capacity and resources, the implementation plan could group actions into phases, focusing on addressing the highest-priority risks first. The implementation plan would also describe likely partnerships and potential funding sources. Finally, the DWPP would include a contingency plan and consideration of future water sources. This alternative is expected to produce a coherent, implementable DWPP that will protect water quality through proactive actions and collaboration with landowners. Maintaining high quality source water is expected to enable the District to continue providing clean and reliable drinking water to its customers without the need for additional costly treatment infrastructure. Therefore, this alternative is considered cost-effective.

## 18. Project Categories:

Estimate the percentage of the CWSRF loan expected to be used for each of the appropriate categories shown below:

| Project <br> category | Description <br> (Please enter all numbers as decimals (ex: 22.34\% = .2234)) | CWSRF <br> Funding |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| CWT | Secondary Treatment |  |
| CWT | Advanced Treatment |  |
| CWT | Infiltration/Inflow |  |
| CWT | Sewer System Rehabilitation |  |
| CWT | New Collector Sewers |  |
| CWT | New Interceptors |  |
| CWT | CSO Correction |  |
| Stormwater | Gray Infrastructure |  |
| Stormwater | Green Infrastructure |  |
| Energy <br> Conservation | Energy Efficiency |  |
| Energy <br> Conservation | Renewable Energy |  |
| Water <br> Conservation | Water Efficiency |  |
| Water <br> Conservation | Water Reuse |  |
| NPS | Agricultural BMPs, Croplands |  |
| NPS | Agricultural BMPs, Animals |  |
| NPS | Silviculture |  |
| NPS | Ground Water, unknown source |  |
| NPS | Marinas |  |
| NPS | Resource Extraction |  |
| NPS | Brownfields |  |
| NPS | Storage Tanks |  |
| NPS | Sanitary Landfill |  |
| NPS | Hydromodification/Habitat Restoration |  |
| NPS | Individual/Decentralized Systems |  |
| NPS | Land Conservation |  |
| Other | Planning and Assessments |  |
| Other | Estuary (§320) Assistance |  |
| Other | Desalinization |  |
|  |  | 0000 |

Waterbody and Water Quality / Public Health Benefits
19. Provide the name, eight digit Hydrologic Unit Code of waterbody receiving discharge:

Primary affected waterbody:
Other affected waterbody:
GPS Location WGS84

Beaver Creek

Latitude: $\quad 44.498860$

HUC\#
HUC\#
Longitude: $\quad-124.079920$
20. Discharge affected by proposed project (check all that apply):

Ocean outfall
$\square$ Estuary/Coastal
$\square$ Wetland
$\square$ Surface water (stream, river, lake)
$\square$ Groundwater
$\square$ Land application
$\square$ Other/reuse
$\square$ Eliminates discharge
$\square$ Seasonal discharge
$\square$ No change
区 No discharge
21. Indicate if the project will protect or restore beneficial uses of the waterbody. If the project provides both protection and restoration, indicate which beneficial uses are primary and which are secondary (Not all will apply):


Information on beneficial uses of Oregon's waters is available at https://www.oregon.gov/deq/wq/Pages/WQ-Standards-Uses.aspx

22．Identify other beneficial uses the project will protect or restore．If the project results in both protection and restoration，indicate which beneficial uses are primary and which are secondary．The project description must support expected outcomes．Not all listed outcomes will apply．

|  | Protection |  | Restoration |  | N／A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Primary | Secondary |  |
| Infrastructure improvement | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |
| Regionalization／Consolidation | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |
| Water Reuse／Recycling／Conservation | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | Х |
| Groundwater protection | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | Х |
| Drinking water supply（e．g．，groundwater source） | Х | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Other public health／pathogen reduction | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |
| Wetland restoration | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |
| Security | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | X |
| Industrial | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |
| Habitat restoration | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | Х |
| Other（please describe below） | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

23．Planning effort will address water quality or public health issue within（check all that apply）：
$\square$ Federally designated Wild and Scenic River
$\square$ Federally designated Sole Source Aquifer
$\square$ State designated scenic waterway
$\square$ Lower Columbia River Estuary
$\square$ Tillamook Bay Estuary
$\square$ River designated under OAR 340－041－0350（Three Basin Rule）
$\square$ Wetland or riparian area listed by the state or a local government
区 None of the above
24．Planning effort supports the implementation of which of the following：
$\square$ Existing Total Maximum Daily Load（TMDL）
区 Projected TMDL
$\square$ DEQ water quality status and action plan
$\square$ Designated groundwater management area declared under ORS 468B． 180
$\square$ Other qualifying plan，specify
$\square$ None of the above
Specify which TMDL，Plan or GWMA the plan will support：
Beaver Creek is listed as Category 5 （Water quality limited－TMDL needed）for dissolved oxygen（spawning season）， temperature（year－round）and alkalinity．

## Schedule and Budgeting

25．Planning schedule：
Estimated planning start date：September 2024
Estimated planning completion date：December 2025．We are
Please explain if the estimated dates are before the loan application date or the date a loan will be signed：
December 2025．We are considering the estimated planning start date to be the date the loan will be signed．
26. Planning effort costs and funding:

| Table A. Project budget |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total project budget | Amount funded by CWSRF |  |  |  |
| Administration and Legal | $\$ 65,000.00$ | $\$ 50,000.00$ |  |  |  |
| Contingency |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Expense |  |  |  |  |  |
| Basic Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Costs |  |  |  | $\$ 65,000.00$ | $\$ 50,000.00$ |


| Table B. Funding sources |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Amount | Interim |
| DEQ Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan | \$ 50,000.00 |  |
| Business Oregon Special Public Works Grant and/or Loan |  |  |
| Business Oregon Water/Wastewater Grant and/or Loan |  |  |
| Business Oregon Community Development Block Grant |  |  |
| USDA Rural Development Grant and/or Loan |  |  |
| General Obligation Bonds |  |  |
| Revenue Bonds |  |  |
| Local Funds (note source of funds): |  |  |
| In-Kind Assistance | \$ 15,000.00 |  |
| Other: |  |  |
| Total Funding (must equal total costs in Table A) | \$ 65,000.00 |  |

27. Existing sewer-related debt service (before CWSRF project funding):

|  | Current <br> balance | Interest <br> rate | Year <br> issued | Annual <br> payment | Bond rating |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General obligation bonds | $\$ 0.00$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer revenue Bonds | $\$ 0.00$ |  |  |  |  |
| Other debt | $\$ 0.00$ |  |  |  |  |

## 28. Service area data:

Population served by the current system: 5,500
Population served by the proposed plan: 5,500
29. Some public agency borrowers who are not considered economically distressed still have portions of their population that might experience financial hardship due to the cost of their sewer rates. These borrowers have established programs to assist these ratepayers.

Does your community have a ratepayer hardship program in place?
$\checkmark$ Yes $\quad \square$ No

## Required Documentation

This application provides the necessary information for DEQ to determine eligibility, scoring, ranking and to complete reporting requirements for the proposed project. Once deemed eligible and scored, the project will be included in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan and the applicant can then complete the remaining required documents. Consult the Checklist for a complete list of required documents. The documents require time to prepare and complete. DEQ recommends that applicants become familiar with these required documents early in the application process. The checklist is online.

Check here to receive DEQ program updates through GovDelivery. You may unsubscribe at any time.

## Certification

The public agency or applicant certifies that:

- Clean Water State Revolving Fund loan proceeds will be used only for the project described in this application and that project work will be consistent with project objectives.
- The public agency or applicant will comply with all applicable rules and laws.
- The public agency or applicant will obtain all applicable local, state, and federal permits, approvals, and licenses, and comply with their terms and conditions.
- The undersigned is duly authorized to request this loan on behalf of the public agency.
- The public agency or applicant declares under penalty of law that all facts given and information attached are true and correct.
- The public agency or applicant authorizes DEQ to verify all information.
$\qquad$
Authorized Signature Date
Adam Denlinger, General Manager
Typed Name and Title

4212; Please let us know if it is possible to use the District's Umpqua Bank PFMMA account instead of LGIP
LGIP Account Number (for processing loan disbursements)

Return the completed application to your DEQ Project Officer. A complete list of Clean Water State Revolving Fund staff is online.

Alternative formats Documents can be provided upon request in an alternate format for individuals with disabilities or in a language other than English for people with limited English skills. To request a document in another format or language, call DEQ in Portland at 503-229-5696, or toll-free in Oregon at 1-800-452-4011, ext. 5696; or email deqinfo@deq.state.or.us

## DEQ USEONLY

Application Name:
Application \#:
GPR Amount:
GPR Category:

## Application Deemed Eligible and Complete:

Initial:
Date:

This is EXHIBIT K, consisting of 2 pages, referred to in and part of the Agreement between Owner and Engineer for Professional Services dated May 11, 2020.

# AMENDMENT TO OWNER-ENGINEER AGREEMENT Amendment No. 6 

## The Effective Date of this Amendment is: March 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2024$

Background Data

Effective Date of Owner-Engineer Agreement: May 11, 2020
Owner: Seal Rock Water District
Engineer: Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.
Project: Phase IV Beaver Creek Water Supply Project
Nature of Amendment:

X Additional Services to be performed by Engineer
X Modifications to services of Engineer
$\qquad$ Modifications to responsibilities of Owner
X Modifications of payment to Engineer
_ X Modifications to time(s) for rendering services
Modifications to other terms and conditions of the Agreement
Description of Modifications:
Additional engineering services have been required with project extension from the original final completion date of August 24th, 2021. Additional services provided with this amendment to cover work since January 2024 and extending through the end of October 2024. Jacobs services and costs are subject to change pending certified substantial and final completion dates.

- Remaining engineering services (project management, project closeout, document controls - meetings, invoicing/project controls, continued contractor interface, continued WesTech interface, expenses, finalize as builts); resident project representation (RPR) field inspection services as needed for the time, ongoing automation, SCADA and integration support, ongoing engineering services regarding operation of treatment plant and Owner directed activities- \$57,500.

Agreement Summary:

Original agreement amount:
Net change for prior amendments:
This amendment amount:
Adjusted Agreement amount:
$\$ 1,056,000$
$\$ \quad 440,379$
$\$ \quad 57,500$
$\$ \quad 1,553,879$

Change in time for services (days or date, as applicable): Project continues to extend past original contract final completion thus requiring engineering and project management time. Services also include support and coordination with WesTech, owner's supplied packaged system. In addition, this includes allowance up to the revised contracted amount for Owner directed services and activities for SCADA and integration support along with warranty support and on call engineering support to operations and maintenance.

The foregoing Agreement Summary is for reference only and does not alter the terms of the Agreement, including those set forth in Exhibit C.

Owner and Engineer hereby agree to modify the above-referenced Agreement as set forth in this Amendment. All provisions of the Agreement not modified by this, or previous Amendments remain in effect.

OWNER:

| Seal Rock Water District |
| :--- |
| By: |
| Print |
| name: Adam Denlinger |
| Title: General Manager |

Date Signed: $\qquad$

## ENGINEER:

Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

By:
Print
name: Alan Chang

Title: Designated Manager

Date Signed:

## Agency Concurrence:

As lender or insurer of funds to defray the costs of this Contract, and without liability for any payments thereunder, the Agency hereby concurs in the form, content, and execution of this Agreement.

$$
\text { Agency Representative } \quad \text { Date }
$$

Name and Title

| ssc Wo | dment $6, \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Title: | PM | Engineer | RPR | Senior Engineer | Junior Engineer | Senior Lead Engineer | Senior Lead Engineer | Engineer | Senior CAD Technician | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Senior } \\ \text { Scientist } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Administrative Assistant |  |  |  |  |
|  | Billing Rates: | 5225 | \$150 | \$150 | \$175 | \$120 | \$200 | \$200 | \$150 | \$120 | \$150 | \$100 |  |  |  |  |
| wBS | Task | Craig Massie | Jennifer Koch | Art Bowcock | Darren Edwards | Humberto Jaramillo | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tom Engleson/Paul } \\ & \text { Mueller } \end{aligned}$ | Don Watson/Sherman Walker | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Mari } \\ \text { Valenzuela/Tiana } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bistra } \\ \text { Gyaourova } \end{gathered}$ | Dana Larson | Lori Hurt / Garrett Bates | Labor Hours | Labor | Expense | Total |
| 1 | Project Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Project Management | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | \$3,000 |  | 53,000 |
| 1.2 | Project Controls |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 8 | \$800 |  | 5800 |
| 2 | Resident Project Representative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Construction Observation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | 50 |
| 3 | Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | submittals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | 50 |
| 3.6 | о\&M |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | \$1,300 |  | \$1,300 |
| 3.9 | As Built and Record Drawings |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$300 |  | \$300 |
| 3.10 | Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 | \$3,100 | \$3,100 |
| 3.11 | Allowance - Owner Directed Activities | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | \$11,200 |  | \$11,200 |
| 4 | Post Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | Warranty Period | 2 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | S6,200 |  | 56,200 |
| 4.2 | startup Support |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | \$9,600 |  | 59,600 |
| St | Software Integration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01.A.PN.OE.SIS-3C | HM1 support and troubleshooting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | 50 |
| O1,.a.PN.O.E.ST-3 | Win-911 alarm notification configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | S0 |  | 50 |
| O1.A.PN.OE.S-S-4A | Sotware O\&M manual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $\stackrel{50}{50}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{50}$ |
| 01.A.PN.OE.ST-3E | Thin client setup at district office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | 50 |
| 01.A.PN.OC.S.S-4B | Final tuning and onsite assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | 50 |
| 01.A.PN.OS.S.S-AB | Power monitoring: ETC 8 hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |  | 50 |
| O1.A.PN.OS.S.S-AB | Conductivity Probe Redundancy Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 50 |  | S0 |
| 01.A.PN.OE.S.-4B | Allowance - Owner Directed Activities | 26 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{112}$ | 70 |  |  | 0 | 8 | $\frac{110}{288}$ | $\frac{522,000}{554400}$ |  | S22,000 |
|  |  | 26 | 34 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 112 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 288 | \$54,400 | \$3,100 | 557,500 |

1037 NW Grebe Street
Seal Rock, Oregon 97376
Phone: 541.563.3529 - Fax: 541.563.4246
www.srwd.org
Seal Rock Water District

Date: March 20, 2024

To: SRWD Community Residents

## RE: Water Testing Scam

This is a customer service alert provided by the Oregon Health Authority:

Seal Rock Water District (SRWD) was informed by the Oregon Health Authority (OHA), through the Drinking Water Program, of a water testing scam after some Oregon residents started receiving water sampling kits in the mail and had questions about their validity.

While not a criminal scam, these businesses operate in a manner that raises serious concerns. The small print at the bottom of their mailers clearly states they are not affiliated with EPA or city or county health departments. Instead, this private business uses fake home testing kits to collect information to identify leads and sell expensive point-of-use (POU) filtration. By submitting the kit and answering the questions, homeowners are providing them with a wealth of information [name, address, water source, your opinion of your water, whether you have POU, etc.]. They can use this data to contact the homeowner to say their test results are bad, but the company can perform a thorough in-home analysis for free. Then, they push to sell an expensive water softener or POU when they're in the individual's home.

Growing public awareness of potential water quality problems, aided by increased marketing efforts by the industry, have resulted in a significant increase in scamming activity. SRWD is bringing this to the attention of our customers in an effort to inform the community that the SRWD continually delivers drinking water that meets or exceeds state and federal regulatory limits. Safe, reliable drinking water is a basic life necessity. SRWD understands this and appreciates the opportunity to provide this essential service to the Seal Rock community every day. We believe it is important for our customers to understand where their water comes from, how safe it is, and what actions we take to ensure its continued quality.

If you have questions or concerns, we invite you to visit the district's website at www.srwd.org to review a copy of the district's most recent Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) or, obtain more information provided by Oregon Health Authority (OHA) Drinking Water Program regarding water testing scams.

Thank you.

## A CELEBRATION OF PARTNERSHIPS FOR CONSERVATION AND restoration on oregon's central coast





Habitat conservation and restoration happens through the engagement and work of the many people committed to stewardship of their lands, waters, resources and communities. Thank you.




## PROTECTING AND RESTORING OUR LANDS AND WATERS -A TRIBUTE-

This document reflects work done over the last 25 years to help restore land and streams once stewarded in a sustainable manner by the ancestors of those who are now known as the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of the Coos Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde. It is a tribute to the collective efforts of the individuals and groups who have provided the vision, science, skills, and passion to restore salmon, forests and streams in the place we call home.

Watershed councils, land trusts, conservation groups, timber companies, private landowners, schools, Federal, Tribal, state and local governments, soil and water conservation districts, agencies and businesses have conserved thousands of acres and have implemented many hundreds of restoration projects from Cascade Head to Heceta Head.

Over $\$ 102,000,000$ from government programs, private foundations, and individual donations has been invested, resulting in improved habitat for salmon and other wildlife species, cool and cleaner water, and beautiful places for recreation and reflection. These investments have also provided local jobs and educational opportunities.

Local, state, private and federal plans and assessments have been used to prioritize and implement on the ground projects. Use of these plans has added to larger scale stream and watershed benefits. Conserving connected areas adds resilience to the environment.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's Conservation Strategy has also guided selection of the best sites to conserve and restore habitat for rare or sensitive species such as Coho salmon, Marbled Murrelet, Silver Spot butterfly and Western Lily.


[^0]
## PLEASE JOIN IN THESE CONTINUING EFFORTS!

We look forward to supporting and celebrating the new faces and partnerships, conservation and restoration projects and scientific knowledge that will continue to help our natural resources and communities into the future!
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## INVESTMENTS IN CONSERVATION, RESTORATION, EDUCATION \& JOBS

While project goals and success stories are generally about conservation and habitat enhancement for water, fish and wildlife, the work could not be done without collective efforts. To succeed, input from ecologists, surveyors, assessors, equipment operators, helicopter pilots, tree planters, and plant propagators, as well as technical planners, biologists, hydrologists,
engineers and monitors is essential. We also thank all the planting, invasive species removal, seed collection, nursery, and trail volunteers. The expertise and support of agency staff is also critical.
THANK YOU!
A University of Oregon study found that between 19 and 24 jobs are generated per million dollars spent on
a restoration project.
So, the $\$ 56$ million restoration work alone, done by the multiple partners over the last 25 years has provided jobs for between 1064 and 1344 people.


[^1]Expenditures by central Oregon coast partners since 1995.

Total \$102,118,154


## BUILDING ON EARLIER EFFORTS

## CONSERVATION \& RESTORATION ON OREGON'S CENTRAL COAST

For many thousands of years prior to EuropeanAmerican settlement, multiple coastal bands of native people inhabiting the watersheds of the Coast Range between the Salmon and Siuslaw rivers harvested and managed natural resources from the ridge tops to the sea. This included use of fire to maintain meadows for harvest of root plants, reeds and grasses for food, medicine, baskets, weaving and ceremony. As tribal lands were appropriated, exploitation of beaver, oysters, fish, and trees and the draining, diking and filling of wetlands became the common practice, degrading habitat quality, streams, wetlands, and forests.

Awareness of the scale and impacts of these changes to our lands and waters in Oregon and across the United State led to passage of the federal Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. Additionally, Oregon's land use planning laws have provided the framework for citizens and agencies to watchdog and gain environmental protections. The largescale federal and state conservation efforts on the
central coast created the foundation for the work undertaken over the past twenty-five years by Mid Coast Watersheds Council. A key partner is Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) which has facilitated watershed council work since 1995 here and around the state.

The Northwest Forest Plan, adopted in 1994, was instrumental in conserving much of the remaining old forest habitats, including on the Siuslaw National Forest. Subsequent enhancements have included thinning younger stands to accelerate mature forest development for spotted owls and Marbled Murrelets. Riparian planting, adding logs to the stream and replacing undersized culverts have improved conditions for coho salmon.

Citizens have worked tirelessly and patiently to add acreage to these federally protected forests. For example, a forty-year citizen effort resulted in saving 186 acres of land near the mouth of Big Creek, south of Yachats from a resort development.

BLM's Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area designated in 1980, is another story of long citizen efforts that conserved coastal

shoreland habitat, large colonies of seabirds and harbor seals, and the peregrine falcons that call the area home.

Over the years, Oregon State Parks and Recreation has conserved land for habitat for rare plants and animals and for recreation. Brian Booth Natural Area is one of the largest examples of park land conserved on the central coast for its
 habitat importance.

In the 1950s, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) began surveying coastal streams to understand the conditions influencing juvenile salmonid survival. Continued annual monitoring of juvenile and adult populations of salmon and steelhead by ODFW has provided data on population levels and fluctuations and relationships to changing land use, hatchery production, weather and climate.

Additionally, the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians has gathered essential information about habitat restoration success including the fish use of restored sites.


## SALMON RIVER WATERSHED

In the early 1960s, volunteers organized an effort to protect Cascade Head from development, resulting in The Nature Conservancy acquiring the headlands in 1966. The surrounding forest land owned by the USFS received its own protection in 1974 with a Congressional designation as a Scenic-Research Area to maintain and enhance its scenic and ecological qualities. In 1975, the area was also designated by the United Nations as a Biosphere Reserve. In 2014 an offshore marine reserve was established to protect marine biodiversity. Land stewardship is provided from adjacent landowners, individuals, organizations and agencies.

## Results from Oregon Silverspot

 Butterfly inventories and conservation and restoration planning and action by The Nature Conservancy and U.S. Forest Service have worked to increase violet and nectar plant presence for caterpillars and butterflies in the upland meadows.In parallel with these early conservation efforts, the Sitka Center for Art and Ecology was established to expand awareness of the relationships between art, ecology, and humanity, through hosting artists and scientists studying, working and teaching together. Additionally, In 1998 Lincoln City voters approved a bond measure resulting in acquisition of over $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ of land for parks and natural areas.

With the uplands largely protected, attention turned to restoring the estuary and its associated wetlands to a "natural estuarine system free from man's developments". This goal was based on the role that estuaries and their tidal marshes, swamps, and channels play in providing vital habitat for salmon and hundreds of other species.

However, most of the Salmon River estuary had already been diked for decades to provide land for agriculture, cattle grazing, a trailer park and an amusement park. Like many other conservation success stories, it took 40 years of work led by U.S. Forest Service and assisted by many others, with work on many separate small and large projects between 1978 and 2018, to achieve this vision.

The work included removing pavement, structures, dikes and
undersized culverts that restricted tidal flow, the filling of drainage ditches and the re-creation of natural channels and native plant communities. Today, 636 acres of high value tidal marshes and channels have been restored.



## New Discoveries!

As Oregon's first estuary restoration project, extensive research was conducted by Oregon Division of State Lands, Oregon State University, NMFS, ODFW, and USFS. The results have informed goals and designs for later restoration efforts, including in the Siletz, Yaquina, and Alsea. NMFS and ODFW research has shown that
some juvenile Coho salmon use estuaries extensively and those that do tend to survive proportionately better in the ocean before coming back upriver as adult fish. Survival rates for Coho using the is estuary is 20-35\% greater than fish that do not use the estuary (and 50-75\% higher for Chinook salmon).

Salmon River Watershed- Conservation and Restoration Areas



## SILETZ WATERSHED

The Siletz Bay National Wildlife
Refuge (Siletz NWR) lies near the mouth of Siletz Bay. It is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as one of six wildlife refuges that form the Oregon Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex. This Complex, supports a rich diversity of wildlife habitats including coastal rocks, reefs, and islands essential for seabirds, forested and grass-covered headlands, estuaries, and freshwater marshes.

The donation of 46 acres of salt marsh near Lincoln City in 1989 became the catalyst for the establishment of the Siletz NWR in 1991. Over time, the USFWS has acquired, 8,830 acres of land and 230 acres of easements from willing landowners, which has allowed cooperative work to restore and enhance marsh and upland habitats for fish, wildlife, and public recreation.

Over the years, a variety of small and large tidal marsh restoration projects have been undertaken to allow salt
water to flow into the marsh. Other actions include filling 1200 feet of artificial ditches, planting native trees and shrubs for salmon habitat. In total about 96 acres of tidal marsh have been restored to health. In 2016 at Alder Island, a new visitor parking area, information kiosk, trailhead, fishing access, and kayak launch area opened to the public.

## Restoration Work Highlights

North Creek fish passage project: North Creek is a beautiful cold stream that joins Drift Creek to flow into the Siletz River. However, an undersized road culvert prevented Chinook and Coho salmon and other fish from accessing 16 miles of the stream in the largely undisturbed upper watershed, managed by the USFS for old growth forest conditions. In 2019, the USFS and the MidCoast Watersheds Council completed a $\$ 1.05$ million dollar project installing a 50 foot wide, 24 foot tall culvert under the road to allow fish access as well as allowing logs and gravel to pass through the culvert to create healthy downstream conditions. Within months of the project's installation, salmon were spawning in the project area.

Schooner Creek sediment reduction project: Schooner Creek is both an important salmon stream and Lincoln City's primary drinking water source. Sediment from road fill, poorly designed road drainage and culverts and landslides degraded the quality of
the drinking water making treatment costs more expensive and constraining fish use. The Salmon Drift Creek Watersheds Council, USFS, Lincoln City and Lincoln County worked together to assess problems, and design and implement solutions for the problematic 4.6 miles of the road system. Work began with assessments in 2017 and was completed in 2020 at a cost of $\$ 100,000$.


## Siletz River Watershed- Conservation and Restoration Areas




## YAQUINA WATERSHED

The 252 -square mile Yaquina watershed provides habitat for thirty species of concern and includes an estuary that supports commercial oyster operations and provides nursery grounds for the salmon and crab that fuel the local fishing fleet.

However, the ecological and economic benefits of the estuary were long under-valued. A 1950's oil spill, identification of several superfund sites in the 1970s and a 2005 ship breaking proposal helped catalyze community interest in conserving and enhancing the Yaquina Estuary.

In response, the MidCoast Watersheds Council (MCWC) began assessments of estuary conservation and restoration opportunities in 1999. As a result, the first two restoration projects occurred in the 2000s, totaling about 70 acres. They were done in a partnership between MCWC, Green Diamond Timber and Georgia Pacific. Those assessments in conjunction
with The Wetlands Conservancy's (TWC)'s 2011 Yaquina estuary Conservation Atlas have resulted in the permanent protection by TWC of 358 acres of habitat in the Lower Yaquina Preserve and 89 acres in the Upper Yaquina Preserve. Other large scale conservation efforts include the Yakona Nature Preserve and the Van Eck Forest.

In 2017, TWC implemented estuary enhancements in Poole Slough, under a mitigation agreement between ODFW and ODOT for fish passage impacts to streams from the construction of the new highway segment between Pioneer Mountain and Eddyville. Fish passage was improved and habitat quality enhanced through placement of large wood, removal of a road and dike, and creation of new tidal channels.

Further tidal marsh and eelgrass restoration work was done in the estuary as mitigation for projects by the Ports of Toledo and Newport. Additionally, Oregon State University and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians have been pursuing native oyster restoration projects to restore this habitat-forming species. Native oysters once were luxury items shipped to restaurants in San Francisco
and New York in the late 1800s. These oysters were overharvested and mostly gone by 1915 .

In the upper watershed, culvert repairs that allowed salmon passage upstream to necessary stream habitat, large wood placements, riparian protection and native plantings and road repairs were also undertaken by timber companies, the MCWC, Pacific Forest Trust, the Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District, and others.


## Yaquina River Watershed- Conservation and Restoration Areas

Restoration Project Activities
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Q Fish Passage
Instream

- Riparian planting or Weed Control
- Upland



## BEAVER CREEK WATERSHED

The 32,500-acre Beaver Creek basin is largely undeveloped, and supports forestry, agriculture, and recreation. About $40 \%$ of the watershed is currently managed for conservation. This includes 11,000 acres of the upper watershed managed by the Siuslaw National Forest for old growth forest conditions.

Wetland and habitat conservation efforts in the basin started in 1996 with a phone call from a local Beaver Creek resident. That call to The Wetlands Conservancy led to their acquisition of the 77-acre Matilda Happ Preserve.

Fourteen years later, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) acquired an additional 400 acres next to this preserve and the adjoining Ona Beach State park. This established the Brian Booth State Natural Area, the 2010 Park of the Year.

Additional acquisitions and easements of old growth forest to protect endangered Marbled Murrelet habitat by OPRD and TWC have also
occurred. As a result, the lower Beaver Creek conservation area now protects a total of 1647 acres of estuary, wetland, riparian and lowland mature forest habitats, and provides lowimpact recreational access to the beach, the estuary, and the river. The large complex of fresh water wetlands supports a diversity of migratory and resident birds, waterfowl, and is a critical habitat component for salmon populations in the basin. The adjacent uplands support a range of habitats from meadows to young Sitka spruce and western hemlock forests to older forests suitable for nesting by Marbled Murrelets.

## Restoration:

Enhancement efforts by a variety of organizations and individuals have removed yellow flag iris from the wetlands and planted native shrubs and trees along agricultural ditches and channels.

OPRD and the MCWC have established a native plant nursery at Beaver Creek and 13 private property owners are engaged with the MCWC in a coordinated effort to plant 20,000 native trees and shrubs along 60 acres of stream and in the floodplain, working to lower the temperature of the stream and provide cover so that fish will have good shade, food, and refuge.


## Lower Beaver Creek Watershed- Conservation and Restoration Areas




## LOWER ALSEA WATERSHED

The Alsea River drains a watershed of about 470 square miles containing landscapes that range from heavily forested hillsides to open pastures along the lowlands and riverbanks to an open water inlet and estuary fringed by nearly 700 acres of wetlands. The upland habitats in the Alsea watershed support a range of habitats from meadows to young Sitka spruce/western hemlock forests to older forests suitable for nesting by the rare Marbled Murrelet. Forested areas are owned by federal and private timber companies.

Once supporting a prolific commercial salmon fishery,a dramatic decline in coho salmon coastwide

has resulted in curtailed sport and commercial fishing. This reduction in salmon abundance is severe. Alsea Bay alone once supported 5 fish canneries. Alsea Bay has also been identified as an Important Bird Area for shorebirds, Brown Pelicans, and Greater Yellowlegs

Conservation: In 2003, the Siuslaw National Forest in partnership with Western Rivers Conservancy secured 1,200 acres of upland and tidal marsh habitat in Lower Drift Creek. The NW Forest Plan directs the forest to manage for older growth forest conditions. Pacific Forest Trust's adjacent forest land acquisitions in combination with The Wetlands Conservancy's 241 acre ownerships in Starr Creek and Bayview Oxbow secure connectivity between the Drift Creek Wilderness Area and the Alsea estuary.

Restoration: In 2006, USFS, Alsea Watershed Council and partners

breached 1600 feet of dike and restored hydrology to 82 acres of former marsh habitat.

Large scale, multi-year restoration projects were completed in Lint Slough by ODFW and the MCWC in 2010. This work allows its marshes to become a productive natural fish nursery, after earlier and failed alterations to create a hatchery.

A Starr Creek culvert replacement by Natural Resources Conservation Service and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and an instream enhancement project by MCWC improved spawning habitat conditions resulting in return of coho salmon for the first time in 25 years.


## Alsea River Watershed- Conservation and Restoration Areas




## CAPE PERPETUA/ TEN MILE CREEK CONSERVATION AREA

The Ten Mile Creek watershed within the Cape Perpetua area near Yachats encompasses approximately 20 thousand acres. The watershed is primarily managed by the Siuslaw National Forest and is located between the Cummins and Rock Creek wilderness areas. This area is part of the largest contiguous coastal spruce/hemlock temperate rain forest left in the lower Pacific Northwest.

Portland Audubon Society has led many successful efforts to protect and restore critical habitat for multiple endangered species. This work includes efforts within the 116 acre Ten Mile Creek Sanctuary and surrounding conservation properties.

ODFW has recognized and managed Ten Mile Creek and surrounding streams (Cummins, Rock, Bob, and Cape Creeks) as an important haven
for production of wild salmonids.
Young steelhead and cutthroat trout, endangered coho and chinook salmon rear in these streams. Pacific lamprey and endangered eulachon also use these coastal creeks.

The Cummins Creek/Ten Mile/Rock Creek areas total approximately 80,000 acres. They are the centerpiece of a designated Globally Significant Bird Area, an international designation for a conserved site which differs in character, habitat or importance from the surrounding habitat.

Portland Audubon's work with private landowners and foundations and the work of Oregon State Parks and the USFS has led to the protection and restoration of an additional 1,500 acres of forest and stream habitat for multiple endangered species including the Marbled Murrelet. This seabird has been both federally and state listed as threatened since the mid 1990's.

The corresponding Marine Reserve off Cape Perpetua is included in the Globally Significant Bird Area designation since Marbled Murrelets spend most of their life at sea, except for nesting in old growth forests where there are thick mats of moss on large branches for eggs to be laid. The adult birds catch ocean prey such
as sandlance and herring and fly up to 60 miles back to the forest to feed their young.


## Cape Perpetua/ Ten Mile Creek- Conservation and Restoration Areas



## A SALUTE TO OUR

## COLLECTIVE WORK

The commitment to and stewardship of the landscape we call home has involved a lot of individuals and groups, built new collaborations and fostered long time friendships. It is truly an impressive legacy to leave for those who will lead efforts into the future

## FUNDERS

$\diamond \quad$ City of Lincoln City
$\diamond$ Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians
$\diamond$ Cooperating Landowners
$\diamond$ Dike and Dierdre Dame
$\diamond$ Philip Darney and Uta Landy
$\diamond$ Joanne Daschel
$\diamond$ Devils Lake Water Improvement District

- Diack Ecology Education Fund
$\diamond$ Jack and Laura Doyle
$\diamond$ Drinking Water Providers Partnership
$\diamond$ Jennie Sue Dunn-Dixon
$\diamond$ Holly Endersby and Scott Stouder
$\checkmark$ Federal Highways Administration
$\diamond$ Fish America Foundation
$\diamond$ Fisheries Restoration and Enhancement Board
$\diamond$ For the Sake of the Salmon
$\checkmark$ Sandy Gruber
$\checkmark \quad$ Mary Beth Guerena
$\diamond$ Hampton Tree Farms
$\diamond$ Hire the Fisher Program
$\checkmark$ Kathleen Holt
$\diamond$ Alan and Dorcas Holzapfel
$\diamond$ John and Diane Howieson
$\diamond \quad$ Mac and Gay Jervey
$\diamond$ Shannon Johnson
$\diamond \quad$ Kathy Keller Jones and Barry Jones
$\diamond$ Jubitz Foundation
$\diamond \quad$ Cheryl and Paul Katen
$\diamond$ Joell Keller
$\diamond$ Diana Lett
$\diamond$ Lincoln County Commission
$\diamond$ Lincoln Land Legacy Project
- John Marshall
$\diamond$ Gloria McDougal and Mike Smithers
$\diamond$ Bary and Denise McPherson
Finlay Anderson and Amy Turnball Benton County
Jane and Frank Boyden
Cascade Pacific Resource Conservation \& Development

For the Sake of the Salmon

Lincoln County Commission
$\checkmark$ David Powell
$\diamond$ Mountain Rose Herbs
$\diamond$ National Audubon Society
$\diamond \quad$ National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)
$\diamond \quad$ National Forest Foundation (NFF)
$\diamond \quad$ National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
$\diamond \quad$ Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
$\checkmark \quad$ Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership (NORP)
$\diamond$ NOAA Restoration Center
$\diamond$ Oregon Community Foundation
$\diamond$ Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA)
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon Dept of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
$\diamond$ Oregon Ecology Education Fund
$\diamond$ Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD)
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)
$\diamond$ Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation
$\diamond$ Gale Ousele

- George Page

Fran Recht
Joan Robinson
$\diamond$ Douglas Schadd
$\checkmark$ John Sherman
Shotpouch Creek Foundation
$\diamond$ Doug Skidmore and Heidi Beebe
$\diamond$ Sheryl Smith
$\diamond$ James Stannard Foundation
Jubitz Foundation
$\diamond$ Peter Tronquet
$\diamond$ Royal Rangers Oregon Council
$\diamond$ The Timber Company
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Forest Service-Siuslaw National Forest (USFS)
$\diamond$ Wild Salmon Center
$\diamond$ Marjorie Wolfe, Wolf Water Resources
$\diamond$ Worthy Garden Club
$\diamond$ Martha and Tim Wylder

## SCIENTIFIC AND

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
$\diamond$ Biosurveys, Inc.
$\checkmark$ Boise Cascade
$\diamond$ Career Tech Charter High School
$\diamond$ Coastal Cutthroat Consulting
$\checkmark$ ESA Associates
$\diamond \quad$ Greenpoint Consulting
$\diamond$ Institute for Applied Ecology
$\diamond \quad$ National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS)
$\diamond$ Oregon Coast Community College
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL)
$\diamond \quad$ Oregon State University (OSU)
$\diamond$ Plum Creek Timber
$\diamond \quad$ River Design Group
$\diamond$ South Slough Estuarine Research Reserve
$\diamond$ Si Simenstad
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
$\diamond$ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Forest Service (USFS)
$\diamond \quad$ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
$\diamond \quad$ University of Washington Wetlands Ecosystem Team
$\diamond$ Weyerhaeuser

- Wolf Water Resources


## IMPLEMENTERS

Hull Oakes Company<br>Knottworks Construction<br>Lane County Public Works<br>Lincoln County Public Works<br>Lincoln County Soil and Water Conservation District<br>Lincoln County School District<br>Paul Lindsey<br>Luckini Construction<br>Miami Timber<br>MidCoast Watersheds Council<br>Mountain Rose Herbs<br>Quinn Murk<br>Native Fish Society<br>Natural Resource Conservation Service<br>Natural Resource Crews<br>North Lincoln Sanitary Service<br>Oregon Coast Community Forest Association<br>Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife<br>Oregon Department of Forestry<br>Oregon Parks and Recreation<br>Oregon Shores<br>Oregon State Bridge Construction<br>Oregon State Police<br>Oregon State University Community<br>Engagement \& Leadership<br>Oregon State University Extension Service<br>Pacific Forest Trust<br>Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission<br>Plum Creek Timber<br>Port of Alsea<br>Port of Newport<br>Port of Toledo<br>Road and Driveway<br>Salmon Drift Creek Watersheds Council<br>Seal Rock Water District<br>Siletz Valley School<br>Siletz Watershed Council<br>Simpson Resources Company<br>SOLVE<br>Starker Forests<br>Ten Mile Creek Sanctuary of Portland Audubon Society<br>The Nature Conservancy<br>The Wetlands Conservancy<br>Thompson Disposal<br>Toledo Department of Parks and Recreation<br>Trask Design and Construction<br>Trask Consulting
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We apologize for any inadvertent omissions of names of individuals or groups

Please contact the MidCoast Watersheds
Council with corrections for our online version.


[^0]:    This document was produced by The MidCoast Watersheds Council in 2020. We thank Paul Engelmeyer of Portland Audubon's Ten Mile Creek Sanctuary, Fran Recht of Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, Esther Lev, Evan Hayduk of The MidCoast Watersheds Council, The Alsea Stewardship Group, Central Coast Land Conservancy and Pacific Digital Works for making this document a reality, Please see http://midcoastwatersheds.org for more details.
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