

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: Upper Smith Instream Restoration	3. County: Douglas
4. Project Sponsor: BLM (Chip Clough/Larry Brooks)	5. Date: 07/16/01
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-440-4930	
7. Sponsors E-mail:	

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): Upper Smith	
c. Legal Location: Township <u>20S</u> Range <u>6W</u> Section(s) <u>31</u> (See map for more details) Township <u>20S</u> Range <u>7W</u> Section(s) <u>25,28,33</u> Township <u>21S</u> Range <u>6W</u> Section(s) <u>1, 12</u> Township <u>21S</u> Range <u>7W</u> Section(s) <u>3,4,5,10</u> Description: Felling of large wood and placement of large wood/boulders instream	
d. BLM District Roseburg	e. BLM Resource Area Swiftwater
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:
Continue the Upper Smith River Watershed Restoration, which has been ongoing since 1995. BLM, Seneca Timber Company, Roseburg Resources, Douglas County, and Umpqua Water Basin Watershed Council have completed approximately 38 fish passage culvert replacements, approximately 10 miles of road decommissioning, approximately 6.5 miles of stream large wood/boulder placements, and approximately 6.5 miles of road improvement since 1995. This project would be a continuation of the watershed restoration plans which address water quality, spawning and rearing habitat restoration.

10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)
For the 2002 and 2003 field season, this project would add large wood and boulder structures to approximately 6 miles of stream. These stream miles have already been identified as priority for instream restoration and enhancement in the overall planning for Upper Smith River Restoration.

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

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" 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 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: 6
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days:	(for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] **2003**

16. Target Species Benefitted: (if applicable) Coho Salmon, Chinook, Cutthroat Trout, and Steelhead are present all or part of the year in Smith River. Coho salmon is currently listed under the ESA 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)]

Through the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council, a contract will be developed that will place structures in streams on both BLM and Seneca Timber Company lands.

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

The project will improve fish habitat in the Upper Smith River watershed. The project would also benefit the local communities by providing jobs since local contractors will be used for the improvement work.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

This watershed is listed as a TIER 1 Watershed in the Northwest Forest Plan and Essential Salmon Habitat By the National Marine Fisheries Service. Several scientific studies have targeted this watershed as a high priority for restoration. The project will help increase instream structures in Upper Smith River which will help diversify the stream channels and habitat for fisheries.

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 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 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

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: \$112,500	
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: \$62,500	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request: \$50,000	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		\$5,000.00		
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$5,000.00			
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering		\$5,000.00		
28. Contract Preparation		\$2,500.00		
29. Contract Administration		\$5,000.00		
30. Contract Cost		\$80,000.00 ¹		
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies		\$15,000	\$15,000	
33. Monitoring	2,000.00			
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total				
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)				
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$7,000.00	\$112,500.00	\$15,000	

¹Estimated cost of contract.

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

Other potential funding on private lands may come from OWEB.

Attempting to acquire logs on BLM lands in the second year of the project.

**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?**

In the 2000 OWEB grant application money was designated for monitoring in 3 overall areas throughout the Middle and Upper Smith River subwatersheds. These three areas include:

- **ODFW Habitat Surveys**
 - **Overall Stream Conditions Before and After**
 - **Compare Key Stream Attributes (amt of key LWD, pools, riffles)**
- **Photo Points at 25 Strategic Instream Sites**
- **Macroinvertebrate Sample Sites**

This monitoring is meant to show overall changes in the Middle and Upper Smith River subwatersheds. The monitoring is a collaborative effort between Umpqua Basin Watershed Council, ODFW, and BLM.

- 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 project implementation will be accomplished via contract with local companies. The Contracting Officers Representative 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 material.

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

Monitoring costs are already paid for through the 2000 OWEB grant.