Secure Rural Schools and Community Sel f-Determination Act of 2000 Public Law 106-393 Title II Project Submission Form Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by Designated Federal Official): UN-WAW05-605

2. Project Name: Bear Creek Road Relocation (Restoration)	3. County: Union
4. Project Sponsor: Jeff Stein/Paul Boehne	5. Date: December 3, 2004
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-426-5656/ 541-962-8521	
7. Sponsors E-mail: jstein@fs.fed.us, pboehne@fs.fed.us	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)		
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Upper Grande Ronde 17060104		
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Meadow Creek 17060104-86		
c. Location: Township <u>4 S.</u> Range <u>34 E.</u> Section(s) <u>21,22</u> Township Range Section(s) Township Range Section(s)		
d. BLM District e. BLM Resource Area		
f. National Forest Wallowa-Whitman g. Forest Service District La Grande		
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes X No		

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines)

This project will construct 1 mile of road and recontour 1 mile to reduce sediment delivery to a fish bearing stream. This project will also improve stream channel conditions by adding Large wood to the channel at 15 locations to improve rearing habitat for steelhead.

10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.)

This project is the second year of a two year project, with Year 1 receiving Title II funding. This second phase will construct a little over 1 mile of road to replace a drawbottom road in and immediately adjacent to the Bear Creek stream channel, a fish bearing stream for Federally listed Snake River steelhead. This road segment (approximately 1 mile) will be recontoured and seeded with native seed for erosion control, and planted with conifers to accelerate the riparian vegetation recovery. Some large wood placement will take place in this I mile of stream with approximately 50 pieces placed in the stream channel to accelerate stream channel restoration and provide habitat for rearing steelhead. This project is located in the Meadow Creek watershed a high priority watershed for restoration as based on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest prioritization process.

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

X Yes No If yes, then describe (max. 10 lines)

This project is the second and final phase of the Bear Creek Restoration Project. The first phase was partially funded by Title II funds in 2004. The second phase was necessary due to shortfalls in appropriated funding

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

X Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]

X 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)]	
X 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)]	
X Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	
X 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)]		
X Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: Road Reconstuction		

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]	
a. Total Acres:	b. Total Miles: 2.0 miles
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days:	(for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

15. Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] October 2006

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines) Federally listed Snake River Steelhead

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)] (max. 12 lines)

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. (max. 12 lines)

This project will reconstruct 1.0 miles of road to improve travel and obliterate/recontour 1.0 miles of drawbottom road to improve water quality and fish habitat. This project will met objectives of the EPA approved TMDL (2000) for the Upper Grande Ronde

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)

This project improves the transportation system by reconstruction of 1.0 miles of road. It also assists in recovery of federally listed Snake River Steelhead by obliterating 1.0 miles of drawbottom road thereby improving water quality, riparian vegetation and fish habitat

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	X Yes	🗌 No	
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	X Yes	🗌 No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	X Yes	🗌 No	
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	🗌 Yes	🗌 No	X Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	🗌 Yes	🗌 No	X Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	🗌 Yes	🗌 No	X Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	X Yes	🗌 No	Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	🗌 Yes	X No	
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept.of Fish and V State Historic Preservation Officer	Wildlife, COE =	Army Corps of	Engineers, SHPO =

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (check those that apply)		
X Contract	Federal Workforce	
County Workforce	Volunteers	
Other (specify):		

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

Yes X No

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$16,200	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes 🗌 No	If yes, then display by fiscal year
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request: \$16,200
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request:
e. FY04 Request: \$28,430	

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	\$3,250			\$3,250
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$5,355			\$5,355
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$8,750			\$8,750
28. Contract Preparation	\$1,375			\$1,375
29. Contract Administration	\$2,750			\$2,750
30. Contract Cost	\$35,000	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$70,000
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies	\$750		\$2,520	\$3,270
33. Monitoring	\$5,000			\$5,000
34. Other (i.e. Section 106 Compliance)				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$62,230	\$15,000	\$22,520	\$99,750
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8%) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$4,978	\$1,200	\$1,801	\$7,980
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$67,208	\$16,200	\$24,321	\$107,730

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines) The following funding source will be applied for in the spring of 2004: GRMWP, OWEB. The District and Engineering Zone has been successful at securing funds from these sources in the past.

- 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)] (max. 7 lines) Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:
 - 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)] (max. 7 lines) Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: _____
 - 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 National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] (max. 7 lines)
 Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: _____
 - d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33) (max. 7 lines)
 Amount

County Court Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of Grant County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the Grant County Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Grant County Judge	Date
Priority Rating:	
High Medium Low	
Comments/Rational:	

County Commissioner Concurrence

This proposed Public Law 106-393 project to be presented to the Northeast Oregon Forest Resource Advisory Committee has been reviewed by the Harney County Court (or representative thereof). This County Court agrees with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Harney County Judge/Commissioner	Date
Priority Rating:	
High Medium Low	
Comments/Rational:	