

CLACKAMAS
Agricultural Water Quality Management Area
Biennial Review Report to the Board of Agriculture & ODA Director
Submitted by the Local Advisory Committee (LAC)



Meeting Date(s): January 13, 2022
LAC Members Present: Judy Bible, Barry Bushue, Bob Underwood, Roger Fantz, Paul Staehley, Lydon Scheeff, Kurt McKnight, Ambrose Calcagno, Jacqueline Tommas, Sam Doane
Reporting Time Frame: Calendar years 2018-2021

PROGRESS MEASUREMENT

Management Area: For TSS, the mercury TMDL establishes a measurable objective for maximum instream TSS at 4 mg/L in 2049, with a 2019 milestone of 17 mg/L.

Focus Area: No Focus Area

Strategic Implementation Area (SIA): 2020 Lower and Middle Clear Creeks SIA

ODA Measurable Objective: By July 29, 2025, all 40 tax lots identified as a Potential Violation or an Opportunity for Improvement will be downgraded to Low or Limited.

Current Conditions: As of July 29, 2021, 40 tax lots were identified as either a Potential Violation or an Opportunity for Improvement. LIMITED = 1,998, LOW = 215, OPP = 35, PV = 5

Progress Towards Measurable Objective: SIA is open and SIA work is continuing. Adaptive management discussion will be available at the next Area Plan review.

Management Areawide Activities (Clackamas SWCD and Clackamas River Basin Council)	No.	Discussion
Events That Actively Engage Landowners	22	Small farm school, Clackamas County Fair, Manure Horse Workshop, North Willamette Horticultural Society Meeting
Landowners Participating in Active Events	1,254	
Riparian restoration work parties	1,033;4,056	# volunteers; # hours
Landowners Provided Technical Assistance	40	
Site Visits	23	
Conservation Plans Written	7	
Funding Applications Submitted	3	
Funding Applications Awarded	??	Not reported to ODA

LAC DISCUSSION

Summary of Progress

- Strong cooperation amongst all groups (community, organizations, agencies, and SWCD)
- Local groups have realistic understanding of what's achievable
- Good communication with landowners
- Many opportunities for cost-share
- Good networking and coming up with solutions
- Landowners have healthy relationship with SWCD
- There are more fish in the river so WQ must be improving
- Some increase in water quality monitoring
- LAC meeting and discussions are helpful

Impediments

- Landowners grow hundreds of specialty crops; there is not enough research and knowledge to provide plans for all these crop types (e.g., customized integrated pest management)
- State agencies don't communicate enough amongst themselves
- TMDL process is not ag-friendly
- TMDLs set unrealistic targets
- Landowners don't get credit for the work they are doing on their own, e.g., planting cover crops
- Lack of water quality monitoring data to show status of agricultural streams

- Lack of data to show improvements in either land conditions or water quality
- Local organizations do not have the capacity to design monitoring programs

Recommended Modifications and Adaptive Management

- DEQ and ODA provide TMDL information to landowners (e.g., presentations to commodity groups)
- DEQ and ODA need to be clearer on what landowners need to do to respond to TMDLs
- Collect baseline data to determine and set realistic goal posts
- Need a monitoring strategy, probably led by ODA and DEQ
- Set goals to limit erosion

ODA COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES

Location	Letter of Compliance	Pre-Enforcement Notification	Notice of Noncompliance	Civil Penalty
Outside SIA(s)	8	11	3	0
Within SIA(s)	0	0	0	0