

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): OR-118-10

2. Project Name: Skull Creek Log Bridge Replacement **3. County:** Douglas

4. Project Sponsor: Bob Bessey **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 30 SWSWSW

d. BLM District Medford

e. BLM Resource Area Glendale

f. National Forest _____

g. Forest Service District _____

h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes No

The culvert or bridge is located on Superior Lumber Company land. BLM has their permission to replace the existing stream crossing structure.

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

We propose to replace a log stringer bridge that is less than one foot above Skull Creek during typical winter streamflows with a railroad flatcar or culvert. The new structure would be capable of passing the theoretical 100 year peak flow. It would protect water quality and would not impede fish passage. Purpose of the project is to aid in recovery of Pacific salmon populations in support of the Northwest Forest Plan, the Oregon Salmon Plan and the Endangered Species Act.

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

It is certain that the existing crossing structure will eventually force the stream out of its channel if large wood floating downstream during a peak flow lodges against the upstream side of the bridge. Under such a scenario, the stream would flow down the road for several hundred yards before returning to the streambed. A large quantity of sediment from the road prism would degrade 1 ½ miles of anadromous and resident fish habitat on private and public lands. We propose to raise the elevation of the road surface several feet to accommodate installing a railroad flatcar or culvert that would pass the 100 year peak flow (which it not do at the present time).

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.

During summer 2001, \$20,000 of Clean Water Act funds were used to improve road drainage and decrease erosion on 3 miles of this road system.

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)]

- Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
 - Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
 - Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): _____ [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
 - Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]
 - Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]
 - Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
 - Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]
 - Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: _____
- Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
 - Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
 - Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]
 - Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
 - Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

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

- a. Total Acres: _____
- b. Total Miles: 1.5 miles. Reduce potential for sedimentation downstream of project
- c. No. Structures: 1
- d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental education projects): _____
- e. No. of Laborer Days: _____
- f. Other (specify): _____

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date [Sec. 203(b)(2)]: 1 week; 9/2002 .

16. Target Species Benefited (if applicable) :

Oregon Coast coho salmon, Oregon Coast steelhead trout (ESA Candidate), as well as resident cutthroat trout and other aquatic species.

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)]

Local residents driving this popular forest road would become more aware of BLM's multiple responsibilities in managing its lands. A higher level of 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?

The project will help ensure that a large amount of road sediment is not deposited in segments of Skull Creek on federal lands when the existing log stringer bridge washes out.

20. Status of Project Planning

- | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| a. NEPA Complete: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | b. If No, give est. date of completion: | 4/2002 |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| g. DLS/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce |
| <input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce | <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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: \$28,750
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? Yes No If yes, then display by fiscal year
- c. FY02 Request: \$ 28,750
- 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	\$4500			\$4500
28. Contract Preparation	\$3000			\$3000
29. Contract Administration	\$5000			\$5000
30. Contract Cost		\$25,000		\$25,000
31. Workforce Cost	\$18,500			\$18,500
32. Materials & Supplies	\$1000			\$1000
33. Monitoring	\$1000			\$1000
34. Other				
35. Project Subtotal	\$41,000	\$25,000		\$66,00
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)	\$ 6150	\$3750		\$9885
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$47,035	\$28,750	\$	\$75,885

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 forest road engineer, fish biologist and hydrologist would inspect the new bridge or culvert several times the first winter and periodically thereafter to make sure the project is meeting it's objectives of passing peak streamflows and fish under virtually all conditions.

- 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