FINAL PROJECT REPORT

1. NAME OF COOPERATOR: Portland Parks and Recreation
   Natural Resources Program

   PROJECT TITLE: Springwater Corridor (OMSI/Springwater)

   COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT NUMBER: 14-16-0001-91551

   CONTRACT NUMBER: 922547

   GRANT TIME PERIOD: 1-1-2001 to 6-1-2002

   DATE OF REPORT: 8-16-2002

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Springwater Corridor is a former rail corridor that has been converted to an alternative transportation and recreational trail. It is the major southeast segment of the 40-Mile Loop, linking the cities of Portland, Milwaukie, Gresham and Boring. This particular site, the OMSI-Springwater Corridor will bring the existing trail closer to downtown Portland. The ultimate goal of this project is to revegatate 14.5 acres with appropriate natives along the length of this new segment of trail from the Sellwood Bridge to the Ross Island Bridge. This is a large project. The plan from the beginning was to do it in phases. The initial grant application was for $40,000, but was funded for $20,000. Subsequently, Phase One objectives were reduced to:

A. 14.5 acres of site prep (cutting the existing exotic vegetation and spraying the regrowth with herbicides).
B. Replant native grasses and plants on 2 of those acres.
C. Monitoring and maintenance.

Some of the factors influencing the project were changing trail construction dates and grant approval dates that did not correspond to timing of treatments (cutting, spraying and planting).

We found out site prep would take longer than expected. In the most disturbed sites after two seasons of working to rid the site of exotics, we still determined they needed additional treatments before replanting.

The use of native grass seed brought up questions. Should native grasses be used when it is not going to be a part of the final plant community? If it is not going to be sustainable is it fiscally responsible? Should native grasses be planted early in the site prep process? This reduces treatment options or puts it at risk during future treatments. Is this a waste

of native seed? Would it be fiscally more responsible to use cereal wheat grain seed or chewings fescue seed in these scenarios? These would provide erosion control at a more affordable cost and arguably more effectively. What are the goals?

We initially planned to plant 2 acres at 7'-8' spacing. In order to establish a dense hedgerow that would close canopy and provide a denser barrier sooner, the decision was made to plant at 2'-3' spacing instead. This cut the planting area in half, but upped the total number of plants put in the ground. Due to site conditions, we also ended up spending more time watering than anticipated. This was to insure survival and extend the growing season to promote more rapid growth.

One of the unexpected benefits was the grant provided seed money for future restoration work on site. Since there was money to start site prep and purchase native seed, the BES Willamette Watershed Team agreed to pay for additional site prep and future planting of the 8 acre hand cut steep bank portion of the project. They have also committed to an adjacent 8 additional acres of steep riparian bank restoration. Additionally part of this acreage ties into a 3 acre restoration site on private property. Hopefully, all this work will help leverage the restoration of the last remaining large section along the OMSI/Springwater. This is the ODOT owned escarpment below McLaughlin Blvd south of the Ross Island Bridge we envision as an Oak/Madrone savanna.

3. WORK TASK AND TIMELINES: *(needs dates)*

X	Site prep hand spray – broadcast (pre grant funding)	8-00
X	Site prep manual cut (pre grant funding)	9-00
A.	Volunteer monitoring – picture taking from fixed points	1-01 to present
B.	Rip, grade and clean 2001 north planting area (1/4 acre)	2-01
C.	Plant 2001 planting areas with volunteers (1/2 acre)	3-01
D.	Site prep manual cut (3 acres)	3-01
E.	Mow north scots broom meadow (6 acres)	4-01
F.	Monitor and maintain 2001 plantings (1/2 acre)	4-01 to present
G.	Monitoring site prep areas (14 acres)	4-01 to present
H.	Site prep hand spray – broad cast (3 acres)	5-01
I.	Maintenance spot spray (4.5 acres)	7-01
J.	Sow native seed (5 acres)	9-01
K.	Rip, grade and clean 2002 planting area (1/2 acre north)	2-01
L.	Plant 2002 planting area with volunteers (1/2 acre north)	3-01
M.	Monitor and maintain 2001 and 2002 planting areas (1 acre)	3-01 to present
N.	Monitor site prep areas (14 acres)	1-01 to present

4. PROJECT STAFF AND PARTNERS:

Portland Parks Natural Resources:

Louise Shorr, Volunteer Coordinator - volunteer recruitment and management
Mark Wilson, Ecologist – planting plan, monitoring, maintenance supervision

Steve Bricker , Supervisor – monitoring, grant management
Maintenance Staff – weeding and watering

Portland Parks Equipment Section:
Equipment supervisor – site visit, schedule work
Tractor operator – ripping and grading
Truck driver – haul concrete debris

BES Reveg Program:
Contractor scheduling and management for site prep hand cutting, spraying
Native grass seed and seeding

Friends Of Trees:
Plant material
Planning help
Volunteer crew leaders
Volunteer maintenance crews

Friends of Oaks Bottom – volunteer assistance

SE Works – volunteer summer maintenance crew

Envirocorp – crew leaders

Enviromental Middle School – volunteer planting

Winterhaven School – volunteer planting and maintenance

Portland State University – volunteer planting

Fray Repp Mowing – mowing contractor

5. PROJECT AREA: Attachment A (site map)

6. METHODS USED:

Contracted mowing
Contracted hand cutting
Contracted herbicide application
Staff monitoring, volunteer supervision and education
Staff equipment support
Volunteer planting, maintenance and monitoring.

These methods were highly effective for a project of this scale. We will continue this method for future phases. The exception being, in areas with steep slopes, we will use contract crews to plant. This is due to safety concerns.

7. ON-GOING TASKS: Continue with additional phases of site prep, additional native plantings, continued monitoring and maintenance.

8. EXPENDITURES AND COST: Attachment B

9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: This was a large project. The work was spread out over a large area, with many people involved, and many time dependent elements. I might not bite off quite as large of a piece in the future. It was a lot to keep straight and manage on top of our other day to day duties.

   In retrospect, a longer site prep period would likely have reduced maintenance needs. This is especially true in the first year planting area.

10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Attachment C (photo monitoring)