

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): CB02-URA4

2. Project Name: South Sister 8 and 18 Culvert Replacement	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: Terri Colby	5. Date: 2/13/02
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: (541) 756-0100	
7. Sponsors E-mail: Terri_Colby@or.blm.gov	

8. Project Location (see attached project area map)

Umpqua Subbasin (17100303)
Upper Smith River Watershed (1710030306)
Township 20S, Range 07W, Section 8
Township 20S, Range 07W, Section 18
Coos Bay BLM District
Umpqua Field Office

State / Private / Other lands involved? No

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

. This is a watershed restoration project whose primary goals are to reduce existing risks to aquatic species/habitats and to restore habitat quality and connectivity for aquatic and riparian dependent species. The project is designed to implement objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, as described in the Northwest Forest Plan including maintaining and restoring: watershed complexity, aquatic ecosystem connectivity, water quality, natural instream flows, sediment regimes, and native species. Site specific objectives include improving passage for aquatic organisms, including fish, and reducing the risk of road failure-related sediment delivery.

10. Project Description:

This project proposes to replace two existing culverts with a culvert that facilitates aquatic organism passage. Grade control structures (boulders weirs) would be placed below the culvert to help raise the water level within the culvert helping to improve juvenile fish and amphibian passage. Replacing the existing culvert will improve juvenile and adult fish passage for resident and anadromous fish. Approximately 0.9 mile of habitat will be opened as a result of this culvert replacement. Furthermore, it can be expected that movements of less mobile aquatic species, especially amphibians, would also benefit from this culvert replacement. Installation of a culvert sized to the appropriate channel dimensions would allow for reestablishing a more natural sediment and large wood routing regime.

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

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

Yes. These projects will indirectly compliment other restoration projects planned in the Oxbow planning area, which is within the Upper Smith River Watershed.

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
- Watershed Restoration and Maintenance
- Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

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

- a. Total Acres: N/A
- b. Total Miles: 0.5
- c. No. Structures: 1 culvert
- d. Est. People Reached N/A
- e. No. Laborer Days: 30
- f. Other (specify): N/A

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

Duration: 10 days **Completion Date:** September 2002

16. Target Species Benefited:

South Sister 8 - This project is expected to benefit a variety of fish and wildlife species including, but not limited to coho salmon, steelhead trout, and cutthroat trout..

South Sister 16 – This project is expected to benefit primarily cutthroat trout as well as a variety of wildlife species.

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

This project is expected to foster cooperative relationships among individuals and groups with diverse interests because it focuses on an area of agreement rather than controversy. Regardless of differing views on other aspects of public land management, clean water and healthy streams, and supporting stable populations of native fish and wildlife species are long-term ecological goals that most Coos Bay District user's support. .

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

This project is considered to be in the best public interest because it contributes positively toward maintaining and enhancing water quality and fish and wildlife habitat for both current and future

**Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee**

generations of Federal Land users. Additionally, implementation of the project may benefit the community by providing local employment opportunities. Furthermore, the replacement of the culvert maintains and upgrades existing infrastructure..

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

The project will improve fish passage to spawning and rearing habitat upstream of the culverts. It will also help improve habitat access and increase population viability for other vertebrate and invertebrate species that exist on public land by increasing habitat connectivity.

20. Status of Project Planning

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. NEPA Complete: | | No |
| If no, give est. date of completion: April 2002 | | |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | Yes | |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | Yes | |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete: | | No |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained: | | No |
| g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: | | No |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: | | No |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed: | | 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

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

No

**Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee**

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

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$72,500 for FY2002.
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? No

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	<i>Column A</i> Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column B</i> Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column C</i> Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column D</i> Total Available Funds
24. Project Development/NEPA		\$3,000		\$ 3,000
25. Contracting*		\$68,000		\$68,000
26. Monitoring		\$1,500		\$ 1,500
27. Total Cost Estimate				\$72,500

* Contracting includes project design and implementation

28. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

Agency appropriated funds may be available at some time in the future, but currently there are more restoration opportunities than there is funding available.

29. 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?**

BLM Fisheries Biologist - Monitoring will be done primarily through spawning surveys above the site to determine fish passage, photo points to document visible changes, and pebble counts to determine substrate retention. This will occur annually for four years.

**Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee**

- 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 District Manager – This project will be considered successful at emphasizing local employment and training opportunities if local contractors are hired to complete the road improvement work and if local contractors, high school students, YCC groups, or other local interest groups are trained and utilized to complete monitoring activities

- 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 federal 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?**

NA.

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks.**
Amount: \$1,500

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

County Commissioner Concurrence
(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of _____ County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the BLM Coos Bay District Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Commissioner

Date

Comments/Rational: