Senate Bill 1511

Senate Environment and Natural Resources Committee
February 7, 2020
Shannon Hurn, ODFW Deputy Director
Ken Loffink, ODFW Fish Screening and Passage





Stream Variability









Stream Restoration Tools and Techniques

- Plug and pond
- Roughened channels
- Rock weirs
- Beaver Dam Analogues
- Dam Removal
- Side Channel Construction
- J Hooks
- Large Wood Placement
- Riparian Planting
- Cattle Exclusion
- Riparian GrazingManagement







Traditional Design and Permitting Process

- Site Visit, Analysis, and Site Selection
- Alternatives Analysis
- Design
- Permit Application
 - ODFW Review/Comments
- ODFW Fish Passage Review and Approval (if applicable)
- Implementation
 - Best Management Practices
- Monitoring (if necessary)



Successful Stream Restoration









Stream Restoration Unintended Impacts







Stream Restoration Partners

- Funding Partners
 - OWEB
 - USFWS Partners Program
 - Trout Unlimited
 - Watershed Councils
 - County SWCDs (NRCS)
 - Others Tribes, ONDA
- Permitting and Design
 - County SWCDs (NRCS)
 - Watershed Councils
 - University Extension Services
 - ODFW
 - DSL

ODFW Role

- Fish Passage
- Connecting Landowners to Technical Resources
- Identifying Funding Sources
- Technical and Design Input
- Site Selection
- Wildlife Guidance



SB 1511- Comments/Questions/Concerns

- Site Selection, Project Variability, and Unintended Impacts
 - Enforcement
 - Offsite Impacts
 - Impacts to downstream or adjacent landowners
- Fish Passage
 - Bill language largely consistent with existing fish passage rules and statutes
 - Existing flexibility allows for projects to proceed, with permits
- Monitoring and Reporting
 - Only requires photo monitoring
 - Or ODFW Pays third party
- ODFW Reports on Environmental and Economic Impacts of stream restoration projects after 10 years
 - What does this mean?
 - How do we obtain scientifically valid data with limited monitoring and reporting requirements?
 - Success depends on perspective