

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000
PUBLIC LAW 106-393
TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): _____

2. Project Name: Fate Creek Culvert Replacement	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: Roseburg UBWC, Bob Kinyon	5. Date: February 1, 2002
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: (541) 673-5756	
7. Sponsors E-mail: bkinyon@rosenet.net	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known):	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): South Umpqua	
c. Legal Location: Township <u>30 S</u> Range <u>3W</u> Section(s) <u>6</u> (See map for more details) Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____	
Description:	
d. BLM District Roseburg	e. BLM Resource Area South River
f. National Forest	g. Forest Service District
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

Restore Fish passage for both juvenile and adult fish to approximately three miles of habitat in Fate Creek by replacing an existing culvert on a county road that is a barrier to fish passage. The BLM and Umpqua Basin Watershed Council (UBWC) have already completed several projects that have improved fish passage and habitat conditions upstream from the proposed project site. Completion of this project would ensure that fish could access the habitat opened up and improved by the previous projects.

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

The project would replace the existing 8-foot diameter culvert with a new 14-foot wide pipe arch that would allow both upstream and downstream passage for juvenile and adult fish to Fate Creek. The UBWC would design and administer the project, while Douglas County would provide oversight and review. The BLM would conduct the environmental analysis and consultation, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife would obtain the necessary permits.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000
PUBLIC LAW 106-393
TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then describe The project would occur on county property and adjacent private land.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]	
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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: Restores 3.0 miles of fish habitat.
c. No. Structures: 1	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days:	(for environmental education projects): N/A
f. Other (specify):	

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] 08/01 – 06/02: Planning; 07/02 – 09/02: Implementation

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) Coho and Chinook salmon, steelhead and cutthroat trout are present during all or part of the year. Coho Salmon are currently listed under the Endangered Species Act as a threatened species and steelhead are a candidate species for listing.

**TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

This project would allow the watershed council, the county, and the BLM to work together to restore fish passage to a stream that has multiple ownerships along it and has already had a number of restoration projects completed along it.

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

Culvert replacement will restore fish spawning gravels and rearing habitat, which are blocked by the existing culvert. This project would also benefit the local communities by providing jobs since local contractors could on this construction work.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

This project will allow fish to access 3.0 additional miles of Fate Creek, which passes through both private and federal land. The BLM and watershed council have already completed projects in this portion of stream to remove barriers and improve habitat. This proposed project would complete a long effort to return anadromous fish to and improve habitat in Fate Creek

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): Umpqua Basin Watershed Council	

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000
PUBLIC LAW 106-393

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]
 Yes No

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$16,036	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request:
e. FY04 Request:	

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. Field Work & Site Surveys			\$2,040	
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation		\$6,000		
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation				
29. Contract Administration				
30. Contract Cost			\$19,864	
31. Workforce Cost			\$2,394	
32. Materials & Supplies		\$9,250	\$20,750	
33. Monitoring			\$500	
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total				
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)		\$786	\$1,556	
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$0	\$16,036	\$47,104	\$63,140

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

The following organizations will provide either grant funding or in kind contributions: Douglas County, Oregon Watershed and Enhancement Board, Umpqua Fisheries Restoration Enhancement Derby, Joe Merchep Foundation, US Fish and Wildlife Service,

**TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG 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?**

The new structure would be monitored during and after construction to ensure that it was constructed to minimize the diversion of natural hydrologic flow paths, reduce the amount of sediment delivery into the stream, protect fish and wildlife populations, and accommodate a 100-year flood. The Contracting Officer and Project Inspector would be responsible to monitor sedimentation during the contract period and again after a year has passed.

- 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?**

Project implementation will be completed via contracts with local companies. No further evaluation is planned. The Contracting Officer will report the number of person days used to complete this project.

- 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?**

This project will not remove any merchantable materials.

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

Monitoring cost are estimated to be a one-time cost of approximately \$500 for Fish ODF&W fish presence and absence surveys for five years following the project.