

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: Thompson Creek LWD Enhancement	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: BLM, Chuck Wheeler	5. Date: 06/29/01
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-464-3348	
7. Sponsors E-mail: c1wheele@or.blm.gov	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): South Umpqua River HUC # 17100302	
b. 5th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Ollala Creek/Lookingglass Creek HUC #1710030212	
c. Legal Location: Township <u>30S</u> Range <u>7W</u> Section(s) <u>3</u> (See map for more details) Description:	
d. BLM District <u>Roseburg</u>	e. BLM Resource Area <u>South River</u>
f. National Forest	g. Forest Service District
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:
Thompson Creek is critical habitat for Oregon coastal coho salmon (previously listed as Threatened; its status is currently under review). Even though properly functioning levels of spawning gravels do not exist, Thompson Creek has supported moderate numbers of spawners (10-20 per mile) in recent years. The Creek also lacks the instream structure and complexity needed to support large populations of juveniles through the summer and winter.

The goal of this project is to increase the amount of large woody debris within the stream channel to a level that will restore the systems ability to maintain function. The benefits will include: aggrade spawning gravel, create and deepen pools, narrow and deepen the stream channel, dissipate energy to prevent bank erosion, provide refuge for fish, create diversity in water depth, flow velocity, substrate and structure, retain coarse particulate matter, connect the stream with the floodplain, raise the water table, increasing floodplain inundation, creating side channels, preventing incision, and gives homes to amphibians, insects, small mammals and birds as well. Aggradation of substrates behind structures will reduce the width to depth ratio of the stream, provide spawning gravels for salmonids, and provide habitat for macroinvertebrates, which are the primary food source for salmonids. Deepening of the channel and pools will provide cold-water refuge for juvenile and adult fish in low flow periods and winter refuge from high flows.

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

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

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

Three quarters of a mile of Thompson Creek would be enhanced with 30-50 key pieces of Large Woody Debris (18 inches minimum diameter). The pieces will be placed according to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife guidelines. These pieces will start the healing process. The healing process will quicken as natural woody debris accumulates upon these "backbone structures".

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)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]

Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]

Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]

Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]

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: 0.75

c. No. Structures: 30-50

d. Est. People Reached (for environmental education projects):

e. No. Laborer Days:

f. Other (specify):

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

This project will take approximately 1 month to complete, during the summer of 2002.

16. Target Species Benefitted: (if applicable)

Oregon coastal coho salmon (previously listed as Threatened; its status is currently under review).

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

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.**
 The purpose is to restore the functionality of Thompson Creek and contribute to restoring the coho salmon populations. Coho salmon are a commercial commodity; increases in salmon would create jobs. They are also an important recreational resource that supports the economy through tourism. Furthermore, this project would be contracted out, adding approximately \$31,000 to the local economy.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?
 It will begin to restore the functionality of Thompson Creek and contribute to restoring the coho salmon populations.

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce
<input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):	

**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: 56,307	
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: 56,307	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request:
e. FY04 Request:	

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys	\$8,825			
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$13,494			
26. Permit Acquisition		\$500		
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$4,156	\$2,100		
28. Contract Preparation		\$2,100		
29. Contract Administration		\$2,300		
30. Contract Cost		\$15,500		
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring		\$1,200		
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$41,475	\$23,700		
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)				
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$26,475	\$23,700		

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

Physical habitat was surveyed by BLM using the Rosgen system in 1999 and will be surveyed by ODFW using ODFW protocols in 1995. These surveys will serve as a baseline for post treatment surveys. BLM biologists have been and will continue to conduct coho spawning surveys. BLM hydrologists have been and will continue to monitor stream temperature. Photo points will be established to monitor any movements in the logs. BLM will be responsible for the monitoring.

- 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?**

Not applicable

- 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?**

Not applicable

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

The monitoring costs are estimated at \$2,482. This corresponds to a ½ of a hydrology work month. This amount of effort would be needed to conduct another Rosgen survey of the treated stream reach and photo points of structures.