

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**1. Project Number** (Assigned by federal unit): OR-118-05

**2. Project Name:** Fortune Branch Creek Culvert Replacement    **3. County:** Douglas

**4. Project Sponsor:** Bob Bessey, Medford BLM    **5. Date:** 07-05-2001

**6. Sponsors Phone #** 541-618-2358

**7. Sponsor's E-mail:** bbessey@or.blm.gov

**8. Project Location** (attach project area map)

a. 4<sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): **Cow Creek (17100302)**

b. 5<sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): **Middle Cow Creek (1710030207)**

c. Legal Location:

**Township 32S**

**Range 5W**

**Section 20 NWSE**

d. BLM District: **Medford**

e. BLM Resource Area: **Glendale**

f. National Forest \_\_\_\_\_

g. Forest Service District \_\_\_\_\_

h. State / Private / Other lands involved?  **Yes (within County R/W; and possibly private**

**adjacent to the R/W and county road)**  No

**9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:**

To improve passage for adult and juvenile anadromous fish past Douglas County Road 12 under all but the most extreme streamflow conditions.

**10. Project Description:** (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

A deteriorating concrete box culvert on Douglas County Road 12 at Fortune Branch Creek impedes and occasionally blocks passage of adult coho salmon and steelhead trout due to a combination of 1-2 foot drop at the outlet and a 40 foot long concrete slab that creates high water velocities during winter peak flows; the structure is a total barrier to juvenile fish and other aquatic species. This conclusion is based on the professional judgement of a fish biologist with over 20 years of experience managing habitat for anadromous fish in the Medford BLM district. The proposed project involves replacing the existing box culvert with a bridge or bottomless arch culvert that would maintain the natural streambed substrate and gradient, be large enough to pass the theoretical 100 year flood, and in the process, would allow adult salmon and steelhead to reach suitable spawning and rearing habitat upstream on BLM managed lands under virtually all streamflow conditions. Juvenile anadromous fish would also be able to move freely throughout the stream to seek suitable rearing habitat at any season.

The project would help maintain the county's road infrastructure, as well as improve fish passage.

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?**

**Yes**     No    If yes, then describe.

The Medford BLM replaced three (3) stream crossing structures on its roads upstream of the proposed project with fish-friendly structures in 1996 and 1997 at a cost of approximately \$242,000. Replacing the culvert on the county road would remove the last impediment to migration of adult and juvenile anadromous fish in Fortune Branch Creek.

**12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation?** [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure.** [Sec. 2(b)]
- Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems.** [Sec. 2(b)]
- Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
- Restores water quality.** [Sec. 2(b)] **(would help ensure road integrity during peak flows)**

**13. Project Type** (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]  | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]  | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify):</b> <b>Major stream culvert replacement</b> [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]   | <input type="checkbox"/> Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]   | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Fish Habitat Restoration</b> [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]  | <input type="checkbox"/> Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]  |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: _____  |   |

**14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes** [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

- a. Total Acres: \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Total Miles: improved access for fish to an additional 2.8 miles of stream**
- c. **No. Structures: one (1)**
- d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental education projects): \_\_\_\_\_
- e. **No. of Laborer Days: 78**
- f. Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date** [Sec. 203(b)(2)]: **One week of construction time to be completed by 09-15-2002**

**16. Target Species Benefited** (if applicable) :

Oregon Coast coho salmon (Threatened) and Oregon Coast steelhead trout (Candidate), listed under the federal Endangered Species Act

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved?** [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

Due to the highly visible nature of the project, the public would become more aware of BLM's multiple responsibilities in managing its lands and hopefully encourage private and corporate landowners to enter into partnerships with the BLM in order to improve fish and wildlife habitat and watershed health near their communities.

**18. How is this project in the best public interest?** [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities?**

The project would complement objectives of the Oregon Salmon Plan and help to increase production of anadromous fish, including opportunities for recreational and commercial fishing.

**19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?**

Adult anadromous fish would be able to reach suitable spawning and rearing habitats on public lands on a regular basis.

**20. Status of Project Planning**

- a. NEPA Complete:  Yes  **No**    b. est. date of completion: Spring 2002
- c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:  Yes  **No**  Not Applicable
- d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:  Yes  No  **Not Applicable**
- e. Survey & Manage Complete:  Yes  No  **Not Applicable**
- f. DSL/ODFW\* Permits Obtained:  Yes  **No**  Not Applicable
- g. DLS/COE\* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:  Yes  **No**  Not Applicable
- h. SHPO\* Concurrence Received:  Yes  **No**  Not Applicable
- i. Project Design(s) Completed:  Yes  **No**

\* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

**21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment**

- Contract** (actual construction)                       **Federal Workforce** (for survey/ design, contract preparation)
- County Workforce     Volunteers
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials?** ( Sec. 204(e)(3))

- Yes  **No**

## Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

**23. Anticipated Project Costs** [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: **\$115,000**
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request?  Yes  No If yes, then display by fiscal year
- c. FY02 Request: \$ 115000 \_\_\_\_\_ f. FY05 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- d. FY03 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ g. FY06 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- e. FY04 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Item	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys	\$ 1,500			\$1500
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation	\$ 6,400			\$6,400
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$ 4,500			\$4500
28. Contract Preparation	\$ 3,000			\$5000
29. Contract Administration	\$ 5,000			\$5000
30. Contract Cost		\$100,000		\$100,000
31. Workforce Cost	78 days \$18,500			
32. Materials & Supplies	\$ 1,000			\$1000
33. Monitoring	\$ 1,000			\$1000
34. Other				
35. Project Subtotal	\$40,900	\$100,000		\$140,900
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)	\$ 6,135	\$ 15,000		\$21,135
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$47,035	\$115,000	\$	<b>\$162,035</b>

**38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding in Column C. Above** [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

None at the present time but we have applied for BLM Challenge Cost Share and intend to explore funding possibilities with OWEB and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

**Title II Project Application**  
**Medford District Resource Advisory Committee**

**39. Monitoring Plan (Sec.203(b)(6))**

- a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

A spawning survey for coho salmon and/or steelhead trout would be conducted at the appropriate time of year. The BLM Glendale fish biologist would have lead responsibility for monitoring.

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

The number of laborers required for this project would be determined through the survey and design process. It would be up to the contractor that is selected to hire the number of people with appropriate skills needed to complete the project according to design specifications within the required time frame. The lead engineer for the Glendale Resource Area would be responsible for determining labor needs.

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

Not applicable

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)

Amount:    \$1000   (appropriated funds)\_\_\_\_\_