

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): OR-118-11

2. Project Name: Skull Creek Bank Stabilization **3. County:** Douglas

4. Project Sponsor: Bob Bessey, Medford BLM **5. Date:** 12/13/01

6. Sponsors Phone # 541-618-2358 _____

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

8. Project Location (attach project area map)

- a. 4th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Cow Creek (17100302)
- b. 5th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Middle Cow Creek (1710030207)
- c. Legal Location: Township 32S Range 7W Section 19
- d. BLM District Medford e. BLM Resource Area: Glendale
- f. National Forest _____ g. Forest Service District _____
- h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes No

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

The project objective is to stop stream channel head-cutting that has resulted in 150 feet of streambank destabilization in Skull Creek near its confluence with Cow Creek in the Umpqua River Basin. The project would also improve access for anadromous fish.

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

An undersized culvert on Skull Creek that was a partial barrier to fish passage was replaced in 1996 with a bridge whose base is lower than the elevation of the original culvert. The streambed immediately upstream of the new crossing responded by down-cutting for approximately 75 ft upstream to the first in a series of logs that were placed in the stream to scour rearing pools for coho salmon. The habitat enhancement structure is currently suspended about 4 feet above the streambed (rather than the original 18 inches) and is in danger of failing. If the log washes out, headcutting will advance an additional 100 yards until it reaches the natural grade, degrading even more habitat and streambank. Not only has head-cutting lowered the stream, leaving 4 to 6 foot vertical streambanks that erode during the high flow period, but productive streambed substrate downstream of the fish log has downcut to bedrock.. The 4 foot drop over the fish log has become a partial barrier to passage of adult salmon and steelhead. Raising streambed elevation by placing boulders in the channel over a 75 foot distance between the bridge and the first fish log would return streambed elevation to where it was prior to culvert replacement. This would allow streambanks to stabilize, reduce stream sedimentation, stop head-cutting, help to reconnect the stream with its floodplain and to make it easier for adult salmon and steelhead to pass the fish habitat enhancement structure.

The project would compliment \$20,000 of BLM-funded drainage improvement that was done to the Skull Creek Road during summer 2001.

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.

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)]

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 type="checkbox"/> Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): _____ [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 checked="" 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"/> Fish Habitat Restoration [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: _____
- c. No. Structures: _____
- d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental education projects): _____
- e. No. of Laborer Days: _____
- f. Other (specify): stabilize 150 feet of streambank, reduce stream sedimentation and improve fish passage to 2.7 miles of stream

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date [Sec. 203(b)(2)]: 3 days; September 2002

16. Target Species Benefited (if applicable) :

This project would benefit Oregon Coast coho salmon, Oregon Coast steelhead trout (Candidate), as well as resident cutthroat trout, other aquatic species, and water quality.

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 (adjacent to a major county road), the public would become more aware of BLM's multiple responsibilities in managing its lands. Higher awareness will hopefully encourage private and corporate landowners to enter into partnerships with 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?

Streambank stability and anadromous fish passage would be improved and stream sedimentation would be reduced.

20. Status of Project Planning

- a. NEPA Complete: Yes No b. If No, give est. date of completion: 4/2002
- 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 Federal Workforce
- County Workforce Volunteers
- Other (specify): _____

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

- Yes No

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

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

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 17,250
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? Yes No If yes, then display by fiscal year
 - c. FY02 Request: \$ 17,250
 - d. FY03 Request: \$ _____
 - e. FY04 Request: \$ _____
 - f. FY05 Request: \$ _____
 - g. FY06 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	\$1500			\$1500
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation	\$6400			\$6400
26. Permit Acquisition	\$100			\$100
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$3000			\$3000
28. Contract Preparation	\$1500			\$1500
29. Contract Administration	\$2000			\$2000
30. Contract Cost		\$15,000		\$15,000
31. Workforce Cost	10 days \$2400			\$2400
32. Materials & Supplies	\$3600			\$3600
33. Monitoring	\$1000			\$1000
34. Other				
35. Project Subtotal	\$21,500	\$15,000		\$36,500
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)	\$ 3225	\$ 2250		\$5475
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$24,725	\$17,250	\$	\$41,975

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

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 fish biologist and hydrologist would inspect the project several times during the first winter with typical peak stream flows and periodically thereafter to evaluate if objectives have been met, including adequacy of rock placement and to determine maintenance needs (if any).

- 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 would be determined through the survey and design process. It will be up to the contractor to hire the number of people with appropriate skills that are needed to complete the project according to design specifications within the required time frame.

- 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