

**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: Holmes Creek Density Management 2002	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: Jeannette Griese, Kevin Carson	5. Date: 6/21/2001
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: (541) 464-3334, 464-3363	
7. Sponsors E-mail: jgriese@or.blm.gov, k1carson@or.blm.gov	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Coquille 17100305 (T28S-R8W-17; T29S-R9W-3, 15, 23, & 27) and South Umpqua 17100302 (T28S-R8W-17)	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): East Fork Coquille River 1710030504 (T28S-R8W-17) and Olalla Creek/Lookinglass Creek 1710030212 (T28S-R8W-17); Middle Fork Coquille River 1710030503 (T29S-R9W-3, 15, 23, & 27).	
c. Legal Location: Township <u>28S</u> Range <u>08W</u> Section(s) <u>17</u> (See map for more details) Township <u>29S</u> Range <u>09W</u> Section(s) <u>3, 15, 23, & 27</u>	
Description: The unit boundaries (see map for more details) are preliminary project areas that gives the ID Team an area to begin to evaluate and are subject to change during the Environmental Assessment process.	
d. BLM District Roseburg	e. BLM Resource Area South River Field Office
f. National Forest	g. Forest Service District
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

The project is located within the Late-Successional Reserve (LSR) land allocation as described in the April 13, 1994, Record of Decision (ROD). LSRs are to be managed to maintain and enhance conditions of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems. The purpose of the Density Management - Commercial Thinning is to maintain or improve tree growth rates and vigor, manipulate species composition, and spatial arrangement. The benefits include the development of structural diversity which will enhance wildlife habitat, The generation of work for the local community, and the production of a commodity. The resulting stand will be more similar to late-successional forest due to variation in density and distribution of overstory and understory vegetation. The goals of the proposed project are to develop old-growth forest characteristics including snags, large trees for recruitment of coarse woody debris (CWD), large limbed trees, and canopy gaps that enable establishment of multiple tree layers and diverse species composition. The current stands are even-aged 34-50 year old Douglas-fir forests that have been regenerated following timber harvest and have been precommercially thinned. Without treatment, the hardwood component of the stand would die out due to suppression by conifers and the stand would continue developing as a single-storied stand. This is inconsistent with late-successional objectives.

The Density Management is located within the South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR (LSR 261). LSR 261 is ranked as high priority for management actions because it is one of the large key links in the LSR network. Treatment within this LSR provides the opportunity to either increase or develop large contiguous stands of interior late-successional habitat.

Title II Project Application
Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

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

The Holmes Creek Density Management 2002 Project includes three treatment areas; Power Wagon Density Management, T. 28 S., R. 8 W., section 17; Bogey Gap Density Management T. 29 S., R. 9 W., sections 3 and 15; and Sherlock's Denn Density Management T. 29 S., R. 9 W., sections 23 and 27.

The density management would consist of merchantable and non-merchantable treatments. It would be designed to accelerate the development of late successional characteristics. This silviculture treatment is an intermediate treatment to increase tree size and crown development, to provide various stand components beneficial to late-successional related species, and to treat Port Orford cedar to reduce the spread of the POC root disease. The treatment would increase diversity by including areas of variable spacing, unthinned patches, heavily thinned patches or small openings. Desirable hardwood species would be maintained in the stand by thinning conifers around them.

Port-Orford-cedar root disease is present in the project areas. Port-Orford-cedar (*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*) is affected by an introduced pathogen *Phytophthora lateralis* that causes Port-Orford-cedar root disease. *P. lateralis* is highly adapted for spread in water and soil and is also capable of surviving for considerable periods of time when conditions are unfavorable for spread and infection. After infection, mycelia of *P. lateralis* grow in the cambium until the entire root system is colonized and the tree dies. Viable resting spores may survive in infected root systems for at least 7 years after host death. Management of this disease is important because Port-Orford-cedar has a very limited natural range along the Pacific Coast from Coos Bay, Oregon, south to the Mad River near Arcata, California.

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

Yes No **If yes, then describe**

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)]

**Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393**

**Title II Project Application
Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee**

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]
<input 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: Approximately 460	b. Total Miles: Road work total approximate 4 miles. (Construct/Decommission 2; Renovate/Decommission 1; No Use/Decommission .5; and Renovate/Permanent-Rock .5) These are estimates.
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached (for environmental education projects):
e. No. Laborer Days: Federal Workforce Laborer Days 1,500; Timber Sale Contractor Laborer Days 1,800; Road Construction Laborer Days 190. These are estimates.	
f. Other (specify):	

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

- NEPA, field work, and 1st year surveys is proposed for 2002.
- Project Design, 2nd year surveys and contract preparation is proposed for 2003.
- Contract implementation and administration is proposed for 2004.
- Monitoring would occur throughout the process.

16. Target Species Benefitted: (if applicable)

- Port-Orford-cedar and hardwood species would be maintained.
- Old Growth related species: Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet.

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

- The proposed project will improve cooperative relationships between the BLM and the public by implementing the plan, involving the public, improving the habitat for wildlife, and as a result of the project there will be economic benefit.

Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

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

- The proposed action responds to multiple needs, the two primary ones being the need for forest habitat and the need for forest products.
 - To maintain a healthy forest ecosystem with habitat that will support populations of native species (particularly those associated with late-successional and old-growth forests) including protection for riparian areas and waters.
 - To produce a sustainable supply of timber products that will help maintain the stability of local and regional economies.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

- This project allows us to meet Roseburg District Record of Decisions/Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) goals. It allows us to perform silviculture activities such as density management in young even-aged, single storied stands in late-successional reserves to enhance late-successional conditions.

20. Status of Project Planning	
a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If no, give est. date of completion: October 2002	
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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

Estimated Total 6.0 MMBF for entire project. This is an estimate and will change as the project is designed by the ID Team. This is a preliminary project proposal and acres will change. Road decommissioning and temporary road construction will be determined by the ID Team, thus no road renovation costs are included.

Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 343,000	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request: \$107,800 f. FY05 Request:	
d. FY03 Request: \$191,100 g. FY06 Request:	
e. FY04 Request: \$44,100	

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		\$53,900		
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation		\$68,600		
26. Permit Acquisition	-----			
27. Project Design & Engineering		\$161,700		
28. Contract Preparation		\$14,700		
29. Contract Administration		\$44,100		
30. Contract Cost	-----			
31. Workforce Cost	-----			
32. Materials & Supplies	\$11,300			
33. Monitoring	\$4,900			
34. Other	-----			
35. Project Sub-Total	\$16,200	\$343,000		
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)				
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$16,200	\$343,000		

Title II Project Application
Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

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

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?

- Areas will be checked as the stand is painted for thinning by the Silviculturist.
- Foresters will cruise the stand for Government estimates.
- Contract administrators will inspect the sale area for contract compliance.
- Stand will be recommended in BLM Micro*Storms data base tracking system for evaluation in ten to fifteen years to ensure the stands are on the proposed trajectory and for the need of any subsequent treatments.

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?

- Contract days and number of people will be reported.

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?

- By removing surplus trees more resources will be available for the remaining vegetation. This will allow for the remaining trees to grow larger crowns, limbs and diameters than leaving the stands in the overstocked conditions they are presently in. The added value is to the remaining stand for habitat and future products. Stand exams will be preformed in the future by Foresters to monitor the project.

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