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-WAW06-606

2. Project Name: Thinning for Release and Fuel Reduction	3. County: Union	
4. Project Sponsor: Arlene Blumton	5. Date: February 2005	
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-962-8522		
7. Sponsors E-mail: ablumton@fs.fed.us		

8. Project Location

8. Project Location			
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Upper Grande Ronde River 17060104			
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Grande Ronde River/5-Points 1706010404			
c. Location: Township 2	Range <u>36</u>	Section 24	
Township	Range		
Township	Range	Section(s)	
		e. BLM Resource Area	
f. National Forest Wallowa-Whitman g. Forest Service District La Grande Ranger District		g. Forest Service District La Grande Ranger District	
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes No			

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: This project proposes to thin young Ponderosa pine stands in the Pelican Creek area to increase growth, reduce effects of insects and disease, and provide wildlife habitat. Without thinning, stands will be at higher risk to insect and disease, wildfire and delayed tree growth. This is a two phase project that includes thinning 400 acres in 2006 and an additional 200 acres in 2007. Root disease is currently threatening the growth and development of these trees. Thinning will reduce the impact of the disease, accelerate stand development and provide big game hiding cover. This project will be done in cooperation with the Blue Mt. Pest Management specialists who will monitor thinning effectiveness.

10. Project Description:

Local contractors will thin 15 to 20 year old Ponderosa pine trees during summer 2006 to accelerate stand growth and health in the Pelican Creek area on the La Grande Ranger District. Project work includes:

- Thin 400 acres in 2006 and 200 acres in 2007 of young Ponderosa pine trees at a variable spacing (approximately 10 to 20 feet apart);
- Reduce excess slash created by thinning to reduce insect and fuels build-up; and
- Monitor contractual specifications, fuel reduction, insect and disease.

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)]

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

X 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)]	X 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: 400 acres (200 acres funded by Forest Service/partners and 200 acres funded by Title II)	b. Total Miles:	
c. No. Structures	d. Est. People Reached	
e. No. Laborer Days: 800 days	(for environmental education projects):	
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)

This project indirectly benefits wildlife species including deer, elk and neotropical migratory birds.

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

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. Provides local employment opportunities and ongoing partnerships and manages a forest investment.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)Improves forest health conditions that will benefit other resources such as wildlife species.

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:	The Yes	🗌 No	X Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	Tes Yes	🗌 No	X Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	Tes 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 Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer			

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: \$35,200	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes \Box No	If yes, then display by fiscal year
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request: \$ 35,200
e. FY04 Request:	h. FY07 Request: \$ 20,000

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)]	<i>Column D</i> Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys				
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation	\$1,500			\$1,500
29. Contract Administration	\$4,000			\$4,000
30. Contract Cost	\$32,380	\$32,384		\$64,764
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies(includes vehicle costs)				
33. Monitoring	\$3,000			\$3,000
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$56,880	\$32,384		\$89,264
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8% (per year for multi-year projects)		\$ 2,816		\$2,816
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$56,880	\$35,200		\$92,080

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

- **38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above:** [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines) Blue Mt. Pest Management, 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?:

Blue Mt. Pest Management specialists will monitor project effectiveness, Forest Service forester will assure contract specifications are met and fuel reduction will be measured.

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?: Local contractors will conduct all thinning and fuel reduction.

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?: The project has the potential to produce a product in 30 to 60 years. The US Forest Service is responsible for this monitoring.

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33) (max. 7 lines)
Amount: \$3,000

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	
Comments/Rational:	