

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

2. Project Name: Fish Barrier Inventory	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: Bob Kinyon, UBWC	5. Date: August 3, 2001
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):	
c. Legal Location: Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ (See map for more details) Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____	
Description: Entire Umpqua Basin	
d. BLM District Roseburg	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest Umpqua NF	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:
 The goal of this project is twofold: (1) to compile existing inventories of fish passage barriers for the entire 3 million acre Umpqua Basin and identify remaining data needs, and (2) to prioritize barriers for replacement. Once complete, this inventory will provide a tool to strategically plan replacement barriers with structures that allow for juvenile and adult passage.

The BLM Roseburg District estimates that on its road system there are 500 drainage structures on fish-bearing streams on its road system. Approximately 180 of these block fish passage; the estimated cost of replacement is 19.8 million dollars. The Umpqua National Forest estimates that it has approximately 236 culverts on fish-bearing streams, 212 of which block fish passage. They have no estimate of cost to replace these culverts, but it would probably be equal to the BLM cost estimate of 19.8 million. Many other barriers exist on private, state, and county land, but we have no compiled estimate of the number. However, we can guess that we would have to spend at least 60 million dollars to replace all fish barriers in the Umpqua basin. Given this enormous workload, a complete and prioritized inventory is essential.

10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)
 The project will follow a methodology developed during a similar effort already complete in the Rogue Basin. The project would consist of two parts: (1) compiling existing barrier inventories, and (2) prioritizing barriers for replacement. All data will be entered into a single database with standard attributes and a link to a geographic information system and ranked in order of need for replacement. All participating agencies and organizations will have access to this information (eventually via a website).

A contractor working for the DSWCD and partially funded by OWEB (see budget below) will serve as the project manager. An employee of the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council will complete the GIS work. A number of organizations will participate in the process, including the following: the Bureau of Land Management, the US Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Umpqua Soil and Water

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

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Conservation District, the Smith River Watershed Council, Douglas County, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, numerous private industrial timber companies, private non-industrial land owners, and other organizations such as the Douglas Small Woodland Owners Association and Umpqua Watersheds, Inc.

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

Yes No **If yes, then describe**
This project would inventory fish barriers on all roads, regardless of ownership, provided the landowner agreed to participate.

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 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: N/A	b. Total Miles: N/A
c. No. Structures: N/A	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days: N/A	(for environmental education projects): N/A
f. Other (specify): Database showing fish passage barriers throughout basin	

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]
The project began in December 2001 and will be completed by December 2003

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) Coho and Chinook salmon, steelhead, cutthroat trout, and other aquatic species

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 will require many different organizations and agencies to work together, share information, and identify projects of common interest. This process will strengthen the relationships among these entities.

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

Fish passage barriers occur on all ownerships. Solutions can only be reached by working across ownership boundaries. Restoring fish passage on BLM lands does little good, if passage downstream on private land is not restored.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

The inventory will identify barriers to fish passage both on and off federal land and will lead to projects that allow fish to reach streams on federal lands.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): UBWC employees, DSWCD employees	

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
ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: 30,800	
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				
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation				
29. Contract Administration				
30. Contract Cost		\$18,270	\$18,270	\$36,540
31. Workforce Cost	\$31,600	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$47,600
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring				
34. Other			\$12,000	\$12,000
35. Project Sub-Total				
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)		\$4,530	\$4,530	\$9,060
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$31,600	\$30,800	\$42,800	\$105,200

¹Combined labor contributions from the USFS and BLM

²ODF&W labor contributions

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

The amount shown in Column A represents Forest Service and BLM labor contributions to assist in data compilation and analysis. The ODF&W (Column C) will also contribute labor for data compilation and analysis.

**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?**

N/A

- 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 contractor will likely be a local resident. Thus the money will likely contribute to the local workforce. The watershed council staff will report how many days of labor for the local workforce were created by 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?**

N/A

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33):**
No additional funding is needed.