Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-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-WAW06-602

2. Project Name: Reestablishing Native Plant Species	3. County: Union
4. Project Sponsor: Arlene Blumton	5. Date: January 2005
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-962-8522	
7. Sporsors E-mail: ablumton@fs.fed.us	
8. Project Location	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC#: Upper Grande Ronde Riv	ver 17060104
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Upper Grande River/Hilgard 1706010487, Meadow Ck 1706010486, Catherine C	
c. Location: Township 2,3,4,5,6 Range 33,34,35, 36 Township 4,5 Range 40,41,42 Township Range Section(s) Township Range Section(s) 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 Ranger District
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? X Yes No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: The Native Seed Project is a continuation of a multipartner and multi-phase effort started in 2002 with RAC support. This project proposes to establish and maintain a seed bank of locally adapted native grass and forb species for use in vegetating disturbed soils in Union County. Small quantities of several species of native grasses and forbs are hand-collected by contractors. Seed is planted and grown to increase the supply by contracting with private growers to produce quantities of seed that can be stored until needed. Objectives include locating, mapping, collecting and propagation of native plant seed and materials to be used on restoration projects. Contracts to local grass producers are beginning to provide a reliable and diverse seed source. This project is facilitating the development of reasonably priced sources of native plant materials and continues to provide local landowners with an opportunity to expand and diversify the use of their land.

10. Project Description: .

Phase I (2002):

- Developed a new propagation contract limited to the growers within the Grande Ronde Valley.
- Sowed with seed collected in 2000, 2001 and 2002.
- Mapped new seed collection sites and collected from these sites and those identified in 2001.
- Three of eight grass species identified for collection and propagation are under contract.
- Native grass seed was provided for the following restoration projects: McIntyre County and Dry Beaver road rehabilitation, site restoration in noxious weed infested areas, and campground restoration.
- Provided experience and training for youth groups.

Phase II (2003)

- Continue to identify populations and collect seed for propagation on the existing contracts.
- Continue to support restoration projects by providing native plant species.
- Strengthen the in-house education program of using native species in restoration projects by developing guidelines for application.

Phase III (2004 – 2006)

- Continue supplementing species to increase species diversity.
- Promote opportunities for local grass seed growing contracts and marketing of byproducts
- Grass seed is made available for site specific ground applications including revegetation projects such as road rehabilitation, stream restoration, reseeding wildfire areas, noxious weed prevention, soil erosion control, and disturbed recreation sites
- Work will be accomplished using contracts, youth crews, volunteers, local clubs and Forest Service crews.
- Monitoring to determine application rate and species adaptability and restoration success. Determine if protection measures are needed.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?
X Yes No If yes, then describe Native seed is made available to private landowners, other agencies including County, State and Federal agencies.
12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]
☐ 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)]
Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	☐ Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)	n(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)]
X Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]	
Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:	
14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Exped	eted Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]
a. Rehabilitated acres =200 to 500 acres	b. Total Miles:
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days: 100 days	(for environmental education projects):1,000
f. Other (specify):	

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

The funding for this phase of the project will be used by October 2006.

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines)

Reestablishment of native grasses, hardwoods, and wetland vegetation. This project indirectly benefits wildlife and fish species including deer and elk and nongame species.

- **17.** How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3) Facilitate partnerships between growers, agencies, researchers and individuals in public land management.
- **18.** How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. This project provides community involvement in restoring public lands, local employment opportunities, ongoing partnerships and more desirable public recreation opportunities.
- **19.** How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)Disturbed sites will be restored by using native vegetation and benefit soil, wildlife, and fish resources.

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:	X Yes	☐ No	
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept.of Fis State Historic Preservation Officer	h and Wildlife, COE	= Army Corps	of Engineers, SHPO =
21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (cha	eck those that app	ly)	
X Contract	X Federal Work	force	
X County Workforce	X Volunteers		
Other (specify):			
22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Ma X Yes No	terials? [Sec. 204(6	2)(3)]	
23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]			
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$21,160 (\$23,000 includes	indirect cost	ts)
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes No	If yes, then displa	y by fiscal yea	ar
c. FY02 Request: \$29,250	f. FY05 Request:	\$ 27,000	
d. FY03 Request: \$42,750	g. FY06 Request:	\$ 23,000	
e. FY04 Request: \$ 32,400			

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	\$5,000	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$11,000
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation	\$1,000			\$1,000
29. Contract Administration	\$4,000			\$4,000
30. Contract Cost		\$17,160	\$9,000	\$26,160
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies (plants and plant protection materials)		\$1,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
33. Monitoring	\$1,000	\$ 1,000		\$2,000
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$11,000	\$21,160	\$15,000	\$47,160
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8% (per year for multi-year projects)		\$ 1,840		
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$11,000	\$23,000	\$15,000	\$56,000

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines) Grande Ronde Model Watershed, Federal Highway Division, BPA, National Fire Plan, Forest Service appropriated dollars

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?: The US Forest Service will monitor project effectiveness using photo points and County Extension and private landowners will monitor quality control of seed and plant materials produced. Photo points, observation, or establishment surveys will be conducted to determine survival and growth.
- 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?: The workforce includes local contractors and Union County private landowners. Supplies and materials are purchased locally. The Forest Service is responsible for developing contracts.

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)The project does not produce a product to be removed from the National Forest, however, seed production on private land will be utilized on Federal and private lands.

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: US Forest Service

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33) (max. 7 lines) Amount \$2,000 (\$1,000 County Title II funds)

Project Name: Reestablishing Native Plant Species on La Grande Ranger District

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

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

Attested by Commissioner	Date
Priority Rating:	
☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	