

Attending:

Alethea

Brian Wolcott: Walla Walla

Greg Ciannella: Johnson Creek

Matt Clark: Johnson Creek

Michael Cairns: Luckiamute

Jane : Luckiamute

Sarah Young: Powder Basin

Jean: Yamhill council

Michael: Maps: if project has multiple sites, but all very close together, do they need separate maps or can they all be on one map?

Alethea: My understanding, from discussion with OWEB, is that it's ok to put them all on one map, as long as detail is apparent and can be labeled without confusion. [This information was verified by Ashley Seim at OWEB following the call]

Brian: One thing of note, from the OWEB call yesterday; question 5, section 2 about cost share has changed. This section now requires more information than in the past; it now requires that match dollars included on the application show whether they are in-kind donation or cash match. Also, there are more stringent mapping requirements, and a link to Oregon Explorer, which can be used to make maps that meet the new requirements. Be aware of the questions about salmon and trout, as well. Metrics section about project reporting has changed considerably, and will require more time than it has in the past.

The biggest change to the restoration application is the effectiveness monitoring sub-proposal that needs to be submitted with projects that include a request for more than \$3500 for effectiveness monitoring.

Greg: even if you aren't asking for the money for effectiveness monitoring, if you're doing the work (for example, if it's in-kind donation from a partner), you can include the extra form. Then it can be reported as match.

Matt: OWEB really cares about the application being well-written, and make sure that the budget is accurate. Have multiple people in the council review the application, spend time making sure it's professional and not just thrown together.

Jean: County road dept. requested that council do a project by one of their bridges. She suggested that to get OWEB to look at it, it would have to be a habitat restoration project, because OWEB won't fund

bridge protection. In addition, she has a couple of landowners on tributaries who are interested in doing restoration projects. If she can get everyone on board, can this be packaged as one big project?

Brian: Yes, it can definitely be done. He's done this before, but recommends that it be carefully considered, as it becomes a very big grant to manage. He suggested also that it can be grouped in one application, but OWEB may require that it be split it into individual projects for funding.

Michael: If she can get the County to pay for the related road work, OWEB might pay for restoration

Jean: If it was grouped into one project, then would that be one set of permits? Does habitat restoration require same permits as culvert replacements?

Michael: They do, for the most part, but it might change county to county. But, by the description of the project, it will probably require removal-fill permits from DSL

Jean: Question R9: With the new questions about the presence of Salmon and Steelhead, are projects that benefit these species given preference?

Alethea: If I understand correctly, these questions were added primarily to help in aligning the application with the reporting requirements, to meet federal PCSRF requirements.

Jean: Will someone provide an explanation of capital dollars v. non-capital dollars?

Brian: Capital funding is for restoration and construction; Non-capital is education, assessment, council support, etc. These are harder to come by, which is one of the reasons that Council Support Grants were lower this year.

[From the New Coordinator Handbook: Page 40 includes a box, written by an OWEB representative, explaining these two types of funding. It reads:

“Thanks to Ballot Measure 66, passed by Oregon voters in 1998, OWEB is constitutionally authorized to distribute a portion of Oregon Lottery funds through its grant programs. The same constitutional amendment restricts how OWEB can disburse the money. 65% of Lottery funds are limited to use on “capital” expenditures, which include restoration and acquisition projects. The remaining 35% of Lottery funds are directed toward “non-capital” expenditures, which include Monitoring and Assessment, Technical Assistance, Education and Outreach, and Council Support. These non-capital funds also support watershed restoration-related work undertaken by other state natural resource agencies. When economic times are tough, “watershed-related work” can be defined quite broadly, resulting in more non-capital funds going to support other agency needs. However, capital funding definitions are very narrow, so these funds cannot easily be diverted; however, it also means there is very little flexibility in their use for watershed council project work.”]

Sarah: You should note that some restoration grants have a non-capital portion to them.

Brian: OWEB review teams look very closely at project budgets, so all costs included must be very, very accurate. Might want to get a couple of quotes for each item you include in the budget so that you can be sure the prices that you include are well within the average for those items.

Jean: because implementation won't take place for a year or more, should you add a little for cost increases that will likely occur over the coming year?

Brian: I would be very careful that the budget doesn't look inflated.

Michael: costs are pretty low right now because of the economy—especially for labor—but he suspects that they may not be next year. But if you ask for way too much, it will be obvious. This is a tough one to balance, because you don't want to run out of funds in the middle of the work, but you don't want the application denied because of an inflated budget.

Greg: Justify what you include in the budget so that reviewers know where you're getting your information. Explain what you've included and why. A little narrative goes a long way.

Michael: Q R15 gives the opportunity to explain what's on the budget

Brian: I've included contingency funds on project budgets; sometimes OWEB will consider those, sometimes they won't. Might be a good question for OWEB—what is reasonable contingency, considering the fluctuations in pricing that are going on now?

Michael: do you include that contingency as a line-item or just inflate costs?

Brian: as a separate line-item.

[I called Courtney Shaff at OWEB and asked her what their position is on including contingency costs as a line item on the proposal budget. Here is her answer: it's generally frowned on, though it may be acceptable in small amounts and with good justification. When asked what that small amount might be, she replied that it would be \$5000 or less, and repeated that it should be accompanied by good justification for its inclusion in the budget. She also stated that, particularly for items whose costs are highly variable (she used pipe as an example) it is acceptable to estimate those costs on the high end of their price range, then mark those items with an asterisk and explain that they were included at the high end of their price range due to high potential for market fluctuation influencing actual costs at time of project implementation.]

Matt: The cost of culverts has decreased recently. Has anyone seen the cost of large wood fluctuate?

Michael: Mill prices for logs are pretty low right now, so it seems like you should be able to get them cheaper. We have most of our logs donated.