

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): CB02-MRA2

2. Project Name: Yankee Run Right Fork Culvert	3. County: Coos
4. Project Sponsor: Coos Bay BLM – Scott Lightcap/Pam Olson	5. Date: 2/13/02
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541 751-4276	
7. Sponsors E-mail: scott_lightcap@blm.gov pamel_olson@blm.gov	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)

Coquille SubBasin (1710030505)

East Fork Coquille River

Township 28 Range 11 Section(s) 9; SW1/4 of SW1/4

_Coos Bay BLM District, Myrtlewood Resource Area

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

This project proposes to replace the existing 42" squash pipe-style culvert with a larger bottomless arch culvert. The bottom of the existing culvert is currently rusted out and the inlet end is partially blocked by deformation of the culvert. Replacing the existing culvert will improve juvenile and adult fish passage for resident and anadromous fish. Approximately 0.5 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.

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

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

Yes No **If yes, then describe**

In 2000, the culvert located approximately 0.3 mile downstream from this culvert was replaced, and an instream project within the left fork of Yankee Run Creek included the placement of 100 pieces of wood to improve spawning habitat, over-wintering habitat for juveniles, and increase habitat complexity. Culvert replacements to improve fish passage are currently proposed for both Yankee Run Right Fork and Yankee Run Left Fork Creeks.

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)]
- Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]
- 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: 9
- f. Other (specify): N/A

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

Duration: 3 days

Completion Date: September 2002

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable)

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

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.

Title II Project Application
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee

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 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 culvert. 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: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| If no, give est. date of completion: | | | |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input 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
COOS BAY DISTRICT
Resource Advisory Committee**

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

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$60,700
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? Yes 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*		\$10,200		\$10,200
25. Contracting		\$50,000		\$50,000
26. Monitoring		\$500		\$500
27. Total Cost Estimate:				\$60,700

* Project design completed as part of project development

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 -will complete spawning surveys to document adult use above the project site, and will complete site visits to ensure the culvert meets the design criteria and is functioning properly.

**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? N/A**

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks.**

Amount: \$500 for photo points and spawning surveys.

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: