South Santiam – 17090006

8-Digit Hydrologic Unit Profile

FINAL

SWCD	Acres
Linn	665,982



Introduction

The South Santiam 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) subbasin is comprised of 665,900 acres in Linn County. Seventy-eight percent of the subbasin is forestland, most of which is under private industrial ownership. Fifteen percent of the subbasin is under grass/pasture/hay, which includes areas used for grass seed and as commercial dairies and beef operations and many small acreage farms. Resource concerns include soil and streambank erosion, diminishing water quality and aquatic habitat, invasive weeds, inadequate grazing management, and insufficient irrigation water management, especially on small acreage farms. Economic issues with agriculture, such as the high capital costs and unreliable profits, impede the diffusion of conservation in the subbasin. There are 17 permitted CAFOs, as many as 200 non-permitted AFOs, and thousands of animals in the subbasin. Serious resource concerns are associated with the management of these operations.

There are 1,073 farms in the South Santiam subbasin. Nearly 70 percent of the farms are less than 50 acres in size. Many owners of the small acreage operations are new to resource management and have limited experience with conservation. Most of these landowners are most interested in the rural lifestyle. Social capital is minimal in the subbasin, and local communities cannot be expected to actively support natural resource management. Marketing and technical assistance will need to be substantially enhanced to increase the diffusion of conservation throughout the South Santiam subbasin.

Conservation assistance in the subbasin is provided by the NRCS service center in Tangent, the Linn Soil and Water Conservation District, the South Santiam Watershed Council, the Cascade Pacific Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) office, and other local conservation organizations.

Profile Contents

Relief Map



Produced by the Water Resources Planning Team Portland, OR

Physical Description

Back to Contents

ALL NUMBERS IN THIS PROFILE ARE FOR OREGON ONLY

Land Cover/Land Use (NLCD[12])	Ownership - (2003 Draft BLM Surface Map Set[11])							
	Public		Private		Tribal		Totals	%
	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%		
Forest	215,400	32%	306,500	46%	0	0%	**521,900**	**78%**
Grain Crops	*	---	13,200	2%	0	0%	**13,200**	**2%**
Conservation Reserve Program Land [a]	0	0%	*	---	0	0%	*	--
Grass/Pasture/Hay	4,400	1%	98,700	15%	0	0%	**103,100**	**15%**
Orchards/Vineyards	0	0%	*	---	0	0%	*	---
Row Crops	*	---	*	---	0	0%	*	---
Shrub/Rangelands	*	---	*	---	0	0%	**8,300**	**1%**
Water/Wetlands/Developed/Barren	*	---	12,400	2%	0	0%	**12,800**	**2%**
Oregon HUC Totals [b]	**223,000**	**33%**	**442,900**	**67%**	**0**	**0%**	**665,900**	**100%**

**: Less than 1 percent of total acres. See below for special considerations.*
a: Estimate from Farm Service Agency records and includes CRP/CREP.
b: Totals are approximate due to rounding and small unknown acreages.

Special Considerations for This 8-Digit HUC:

- Eighty-eight percent of the private forestland is under industrial forest ownership (OSU, Forestry Sciences Laboratory).
- Grain commonly is grown in rotation with grass seed and other crops.
- Orchards/Vineyards includes other perennial crops, such as mint, nursery stock, and Christmas trees. (Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research Consortium)
  - ~ Orchard/Vineyards - 2,500 acres
  - ~ Nursery stock - 100 acres
  - ~ Christmas trees - 2,000 acres
- Grass/Pasture/Hay includes approximately:
  - ~ 25,000 acres of grass seed and turf(Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research Consortium)
  - ~ 24,200 acres of pasture (Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research Consortium)
  - ~ 12,800 acres of hay (Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research Consortium)
- Pasture includes commercial dairy and beef operations as well as small farms and ranches.
- Urban land use makes up 10,200 acres.

Irrigated Lands (1997 NRI[13] Estimates for Non-Federal Lands Only)	Type of Land	ACRES	% of Irrigated Lands	% of HUC
	Cultivated Cropland	11,200	93%	2%
	Uncultivated Cropland	0	0%	0%
	Pastureland	800	7%	0%
	Total Irrigated Lands	**12,000**	**100%**	**2%**

(Continued on the following pages)

Back to Contents

17090006
Land use/Land cover Map



17090006
Average Annual
Precipitation in Inches



Common Resource Area Map

Back to Contents

Only the major units are described below - for descriptions of all units within the HUC, go to: http://ice.or.nrcs.usda.gov/website/cra/viewer.htm



2.2 - Willamette and Puget Valleys - Willamette River Flood Plains and Tributaries: This unit is comprised of the flood plain of the Willamette River and its major tributaries. It includes historic riparian areas and areas used for intensive row crops. The temperature regime is mesic, and the moisture regime is xeric.

2.3 - Willamette and Puget Valleys - Prairie Terraces: This unit is comprised of the terraces in the Willamette Valley. The soils are well drained to poorly drained. Land use is variable. The temperature regime is mesic, and the moisture regime is xeric. There are numerous ponded seasonal wetlands.

2.4 – Willamette and Puget Valleys - Valley Foothills: This unit is comprised of the foothills of the Willamette Valley. The soils are underlain by basalt and sedimentary rock and typically are red and clayey. The vegetation is dominantly Douglas fir and Oregon white oak. The temperature regime is mesic, and the moisture regime is xeric. This unit does not support western hemlock, which is characteristic of the adjacent units in the Coast and Cascade MLRAs.

3.1 - Olympic and Cascade Mountains - Western Cascades Lowlands and Valleys: This unit comprises the lower elevations of the Cascade Mountains, adjacent to the Valley Foothills unit (2.4). The bedrock is basalt, andesite, and rhyolite. The vegetation is dominantly Douglas fir and western hemlock. This unit is one of the most important timber-producing areas in the Northwest. The temperature regime is mesic, and the moisture regime is udic.

3.2 - Olympic and Cascade Mountains - Western Cascades Montane Highlands: This unit comprises the middle to high elevations of the Cascades. The vegetation is dominantly Douglas fir, western hemlock, mountain hemlock, Pacific silver fir, and noble fir. Elevation typically is above about 3,000 feet. The mountains are highly dissected with steep slopes. The temperature regime is frigid and "warm" cryic, and the moisture regime is udic. This unit normally has a deep annual snowpack.

Physical Description – Continued

Back to Contents

		ACRES	ACRE-FEET
Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights *(OWRD[4])*	Surface	23,350	58,411
	Well	9,007	22,531
	Total Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights	32,357	80,942
Stream Flow Data	USGS 14187500 SOUTH SANTIAM RIVER, AT WATERLOO, OR	**Total Avg. Yield**	2,141,244
		May – Sept. Yield	380,245
		MILES	**PERCENT**
Stream Data[5] **Percent of Total Miles of Streams in HUC*	Total Miles – Major (100K Hydro GIS Layer)	968	---
	303d/TMDL Listed Streams (DEQ)	228	24%
	Anadromous Fish Presence (StreamNet)	69	7%
	Bull Trout Presence (StreamNet)	0	0%
		ACRES	**PERCENT**
Land Cover / Use[2] Based on a 100-foot stretch on both sides of all streams in the 100K Hydro GIS Layer	Forest	21,088	73%
	Grain Crops	472	2%
	Grass/Pasture/Hay	5,433	19%
	Orchards/Vineyards	41	0%
	Row Crops	290	1%
	Shrub/Rangelands – Includes CRP Lands	241	1%
	Water/Wetlands/Developed/Barren	1,204	4%
	Total Acres of 100-foot Stream Buffers	**28,770**	**---**
Land Capability Class *(Croplands & Pasturelands Only)* *(1997 NRI[3] Estimates for Non-Federal Lands Only)*	**1** – slight limitations	7,000	7%
	2 – moderate limitations	38,200	40%
	3 – severe limitations	31,000	32%
	4 – very severe limitations	19,300	20%
	5 – no erosion hazard, but other limitations	0	0%
	6 – severe limitations; unsuitable for cultivation; limited to pasture, range, forest	900	1%
	7 – very severe limitations; unsuitable for cultivation; limited to grazing, forest, wildlife habitat	0	0%
	8 – miscellaneous areas; limited to recreation, wildlife habitat, water supply	0	0%
	Total Croplands & Pasturelands	**96,400**	**---**

Confined Animal Feeding Operations – Oregon CAFO Permit – 12/2004

Animal Type	Dairy	Feedlot	Poultry	Swine	Mink	Other
No. of Permitted Farms	14	1	1	0	1	0
No. of Permitted Animals	8,291	900	66,800	0	5,350	0

Resource Concerns

Back to Contents



- Sheet and rill erosion by water on the cropland and pastureland in the subbasin have been reduced by nearly 75,000 tons of soil per year from 1982 to 1997.
- NRI estimates indicate that none of the agricultural land in the subbasin still had water erosion rates above a sustainable level in 1997.
- Controlling erosion not only sustains the long-term productivity of the land, but it also affects the amount of soil, pesticides, fertilizer, and other substances that move into the Nation's waters.
- Through NRCS programs, many farmers and ranchers have applied conservation practices to reduce the effects of erosion by water. As a result, erosion rates on the cropland and pastureland fell 71 percent, from 1.1 to 0.3 tons/acre/year from 1982 to 1997.



- All of the listed stream miles exceed State water quality standards for temperature. Elevated stream temperatures may be due to inadequate riparian shade, stream channel widening, and other anthropogenic or natural causes.
- Conservation practices that can be used to address these water quality issues include livestock waste management, grazing management, nutrient and pest management, and use of riparian buffers.

Watershed Projects, Plans, Studies, and Assessments			
NRCS Watershed Projects[6]		NRCS Watershed Plans, Studies, and Assessments[7]	
Name	Status	Name	Status
None	None	None	None
ODEQ TMDL's[8]		ODA Agricultural Water Quality Management Plans[9]	
Name	Status	Name	Status
Willamette Basin	Completed	South Santiam	Completed

OWEB Watershed Council[10]	Watershed Council Assessments[11]	NWPCC Subbasin Plans and Assessments[18]
South Santiam Watershed Council	South Santiam River Watershed Assessment	Willamette Subbasin Plan

(Continued on page 8)



Map Footnote [17]

FEDERALLY LISTED THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES[12]	
THREATENED SPECIES	**CANDIDATE SPECIES**
Mammals- Canada lynx, Columbian white-tailed deer **Birds –** Bald eagle, Northern spotted owl, Marbled murrelet **Fish –** Coho salmon, Steelhead, Chinook salmon, Oregon chub, Bull trout **Invertebrates –** Fender's blue butterfly, Oregon silverspot butterfly **Plants –** Golden Indian paintbrush, Willamette daisy, Water howellia, Bradshaw's lomatium, Kincaid's lupine, Nelson's checker-mallow	**Fish** – Steelhead **Birds –** Yellow-billed cuckoo, Streaked horned lark **Amphibians and Reptiles –** Oregon spotted frog **Invertebrates-** Taylor's checkerspot, Whulge checkerspot butterfly **PROPOSED SPECIES** - None
ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT[13] **-** Chinook	

Resource Concerns - Continued

Back to Contents

Resource Concerns / Issues by Land Use							
SWAPA +H Concerns	**Specific Resource Concern / Issue**	**Pasture \ Hay**	**Grass Seed**	**Grain Crops**	**Row Crops**	**Crops (Orch / Vine /**	**Forest**
Soil Erosion	Sheet & Rill		X	X	X	X	
	Concentrated Flow or Gully					X	
	Streambank	X	X	X	X		X
	Irrigation Induced				X		
Soil Condition	Tilth, Crusting, Infiltration, Organic Matter		X	X	X		
Water Quantity	Water Management For Irrigated Land				X		
Water Quality, Surface	Pesticides		X	X	X	X	
	Nutrients & Organics	X	X	X	X		
	Suspended Sediments & Turbidity	X	X	X	X		X
	Low Dissolved Oxygen	X	X	X	X		
	Temperature	X	X	X	X		
	Pathogens	X					
	Aquatic Habitat Suitability	X	X	X	X		
Air Quality	Airborne Sediment Causing Safety/Health Problems		X	X	X		
	Smoke Particulates Causing Safety/Health Problems		X				
	Undesirable Odors from Agricultural Sources	X					
Plant Condition	Productivity, Health, & Vigor	X					
Plant Management	Establishment, Growth, & Harvest	X					X
Animal Habitat, Wildlife	Food, Cover, & Shelter		X	X	X		
Human, Economic	High Risk & Uncertainty		X		X	X	
	High Capital/Financial Costs			X	X	X	
	High Labor Costs or Availability					X	
	High Management Level Required				X	X	
	Low or Unreliable Profitability	X	X	X	X	X	
Human, Political	Inadequate Availability of Cost Share Programs		X				
	High Degree of Controversy		X				

Pasture / Hay

- Pastureland, especially on small farms and ranches, commonly is overgrazed or lacks needed fertility.
- Invasive weeds are an issue on pastures and other open grassy areas.
- Proper waste management is needed for CAFOs to avoid water quality problems associated with nutrients and pathogens.

Grass Seed

- Grass seed commonly is produced under contract; however, pest management and erosion control are concerns during establishment.
- Smoke from burning stubble after harvest sometimes creates health and safety concerns for humans.

Grain, Row, & Perennial Crops

- Management of residue, nutrients, and pests and use of filter strips and buffers are needed to control erosion and maintain water quality.
- Water management is needed in areas of irrigated crops to conserve water and maintain water quality.
- The risk of sheet & rill erosion increases on steeper slopes used for Christmas trees, vineyards, and orchards.
- Producers assume more risk when adopting integrated pest management in lieu of the use of chemicals on high-valued orchards and vineyards.

Forest

- Non-industrial forest landowners commonly do not actively manage the land for timber production.

General

- Land use constraints and pressure to develop the land hinders conservation efforts and jeopardizes the long-term future for agriculture.
- Controversy surrounds producer eligibility for USDA programs in areas that have been previously drained.
- High land values and conflict between agriculture and urban/suburban land uses increase the cost and social issues for farming.

Census and Social Data[/14]

Back to Contents



Number of Farms: 1,073

Number of Operators: 1,745

- Full-Time Operators: **604**
- Part-Time Operators: **1,141**

Estimated Level of Willingness and Ability to Participate in Conservation[/15]: LOW

Many of the farmers in the South Santiam subbasin are new to agriculture and resource management, have small acreages, are unaware of local resource concerns, and have little knowledge or appreciation of conservation systems. To increase the diffusion of conservation throughout the subbasin, substantial resources need to be dedicated to marketing conservation and increasing conservation technical assistance for the new, small acreage landowners.

Evaluation of Social Capital[/16]: LOW

Communities in the South Santiam subbasin are reported to have never been highly effective at solving problems. In the last decade or so, controversy over forest management and the spotted owl and its effect on labor and the economy is perceived by many to have caused a significant out-migration of residents and have left the remaining residents with a very low sense of community and individual well-being. Lately, however, some communities have been showing signs of economic recovery with new landowners moving into the area. If this continues and conflict between newcomers and long-time residents can result in positive changes, communities in the subbasin might increase their social capital and become a force behind increasing resource management and the well-being of the subbasin.





Progress/Status

Back to Contents

PRMS Data	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	Avg/Year	Total
Total Conservation Systems Planned (Acres)	20	165	762	16	543	301	1,506
Total Conservation Systems Applied (Acres)	0	65	269	72	629	207	1,035
Conservation Treatment (Acres)							20
Waste Management	0	35	1	0	0	7	36
Buffers	2	83	0	0	0	17	85
Erosion Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation Water Management	0	52	0	0	0	10	52
Nutrient Management	0	52	0	0	0	10	52
Pest Management	0	65	0	0	0	13	65
Prescribed Grazing	0	52	0	0	0	10	52
Trees & Shrubs	0	0	151	123	40	63	314
Conservation Tillage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildlife Habitat	0	100	297	0	0	79	397
Wetlands	0	0	229	0	0	46	229



Estimates are based on information received from local conservationists in the watershed.

- Progress over the last 5 years has been focused on:
  - Nutrient, pest, and irrigation water management on CAFOs and cropland.
  - Wildlife habitat management in riparian and wetland areas.
- Row crop (e.g. corn, beans, and cole crops) farmers commonly rely on crop consultants.
- Grain producers typically have not worked with NRCS, but they have adopted a high level of management.
- Farmers who grow perennial crops generally operate at a high level, with the exception of filbert growers.
- Much of the pasture that is at the benchmark level is on small farms.
- Much of the forest land is associated with riparian areas and oak savannahs and is not managed for forage or timber production.

Lands Removed from Production through Farm Bill Programs

- Conservation Reserve Program (CRP): **None**
- Wetland Restoration Program (WRP): **705 acres**
- Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP): **24 acres**

Footnotes/Bibliography

Back to Contents

1. Ownership Layer – Source: The 1:24,000 scale public ownership layer is the land ownership/management for public entities, including Federal, Tribal, State, and local entities. This is a seamless, statewide Oregon Public Ownership vector layer composed of fee ownership of lands by Federal, State, Tribal, county, and city agencies. The layer is comprised of the best available data compiled at 1:24,000 scale or larger, and the line work matches GCDB boundary locations and ORMAP standards where possible. The layer is available from the State of Oregon GIS Service Center: http://www.gis.state.or.us/data/alphalist.html. For current ownership status, consult official records at appropriate Federal, State, and county offices. Ownership classes grouped to calculate Federal ownership vs. non-Federal ownership by the Water Resources Planning Team.

2. National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) - Originator: U.S. Geological Survey (USGS); Publication date: 19990631; Title: Oregon Land Cover Data Set, Edition: 1; Geospatial data presentation form: Raster digital data; Publisher: U.S. Geological Survey, Sioux Falls, SD, USA; Online linkage: http://edcwww.cr.usgs.gov/programs/lccp/nationallandcover.html; Abstract: These data can be used in a geographic information system (GIS) for any number of purposes, such as assessing wildlife habitat, water quality, pesticide runoff, land use change, etc. The State data sets are provided with a 300-meter buffer beyond the State border to facilitate combining the State files into larger regions.

3. ESTIMATES FROM THE 1997 NRI DATABASE (REVISED DECEMBER 2000) REPLACE ALL PREVIOUS REPORTS AND ESTIMATES. Comparisons made using data published for the 1982, 1987, or 1992 NRI may produce erroneous results. This is because of changes in statistical estimation protocols and because all data collected prior to 1997 were simultaneously reviewed (edited) as 1997 NRI data were collected. All definitions are available in the glossary. In addition, this December 2000 revision of the 1997 NRI data updates information released in December 1999 and corrects a computer error discovered in March 2000. For more information: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/NRI/

4. Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights – Water Rights Information System (WRIS), Oregon Water Resources Department, http://www.wrd.state.or.us/maps/wrexport.shtml

5. StreamNet is a cooperative venture of the Pacific Northwest's fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and is administered by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. StreamNet provided data and data services in support of the region's fish and wildlife program and other efforts to manage and restore the region's aquatic resources. Official StreamNet website: http://www.streamnet.org/

6. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Watershed Projects Planned and Authorized, http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/Purpose.

7. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Watershed Plans, Studies, and Assessments completed, http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/Surveys_Plng.html#Watershed%20Surveys%20and%20Plan

8. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Total Maximum Daily Loads, http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/TMDLs/TMDLs.htm

9. Oregon Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.oregon.gov/ODA/NRD/water_agplans.shtml

Footnotes/Bibliography Continued

Back to Contents

10. Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, http://oregon.gov/OWEB/WSHEDS/index.shtml

11. Watershed Assessments completed by local watershed councils following the Oregon Watershed Assessment Manual, http://oregon.gov/OWEB/docs/pubs/ws_assess_manual.shtml.

12. NRCS Field Office Technical Guide, Section II, Threatened and Endangered List.

13. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Public Law 94-265. As amended through October 11, 1996.

14. Data were taken from the 2002 Agricultural Census and adjusted by percent of HUC in the county or by percent of zip code area in the HUC, depending on the level of data available. Data were also taken from the U.S. Population Census, 2000.

15. Conservation participation was estimated using NRCS Social Sciences Technical Note 1801, Guide for Estimating Participation in Conservation, 2004. Four categories of indicators were evaluated: Personal characteristics, farm structural characteristics, perceptions of conservation, and community context. Estimates are based on information received from local conservationists in the watershed.

16. Social capital is an indicator of the community's ability and willingness to work together to solve problems. A high amount of social capital helps a community to be physically healthy, socially progressive, and economically vigorous. A low amount of social capital typically results in community conflict, lack of trust and respect, and unsuccessful attempts to solve problems. The evaluation is based on NRCS Technical Report Release 4.1, March, 2002: Adding Up Social Capital: An Investment in Communities. Local conservationists provided information to measure social capital. Scores range from 0 to 76.

17. Surface and Groundwater Resource Protection Map
    a. 2002 303d Listed Streams designated by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency, Section 303d Clean Water Act, http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/303dlist/303dpage.htm
    b. Groundwater Management Areas designated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Revised Statutes – Ground Water ORS 468B.150 to ORS 468B.190, http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/groundwa/wqgw.htm
    c. Groundwater Restricted Areas designated by Oregon Water Resources Commission, Oregon Department of Water Resources, http://egov.oregon.gov/OWRD/PUBS/aquabook_protections.shtml
    d. The Sole Source Aquifer (SSA) Protection Program is authorized by Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-523, 42 U.S.C. 300 et. seq), http://www.epa.gov/safewater/ssanp.html

18. Subbasin assessments and plans are developed by local groups (SWCDs, watershed councils, tribes, and others) as part of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's fish and wildlife program in the Columbia River Basin. This program is funded and implemented by the Bonneville Power Administration. http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/subbasinplanning/Default.htm.