

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): **BA-WAW06-102**

2. Project Name: Silver Creek Road Reconstruction	3. County: Baker
4. Project Sponsor: Whitman Unit – Kelly Cahill	5. Date: February 17, 2005
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-523-1909	
7. Sponsors E-mail: kcahill@fs.fed.us	

8. Project Location: . (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Upper Powder River 1705020320	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Silver Creek 1705020320H	
c. Location: Township <u>8S</u> Range <u>36E</u> Section(s) 23,24,25,36 Township <u>9S</u> Range <u>37E</u> Section(s) 23,24,25,26 Township <u>8S</u> Range <u>36E</u> Section(s) 31	
f. National Forest Wallowa-Whitman NF	g. Forest Service District: Whitman Unit
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

<p>9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:</p> <p>Goal: Forest Road (FR) 5540, Silver Creek Road, is a rutted, incised, native surface, 5.7 mile long road located adjacent to Silver Creek. Sediment from this native surfaced road and adjacent features are channeled directly into Silver Creek through extensive ruts and gullies that currently exist on the road surface. The purpose of this project is to reconstruct FR 5540 to minimize erosion from the roadway and provide a safe, stable running surface for users. Silver Creek is a DEQ 303d listed stream and Redband and Bull Trout are present. This project would assist in improving overall environmental conditions by reducing the sediment input to Silver Creek from FR 5540</p> <p>In addition, a Biological Opinion issued by the US Fish and Wildlife Service for Ongoing and Proposed Forest Service actions requires the Forest Service to reconstruct this road.</p>
--

10. Project Description:

This is a road reconstruction project. The work required to reconstruct 5.7 miles of FR 5540 includes scarification and ripping of the existing roadbed, reshaping the roadway, installing drainage structures (primarily drainage dips), and armoring the running surface with aggregate.

While this project has been identified in several planning and NEPA documents, no analysis has been performed on the effects of reconstructing FR 5540. Part of the work required to implement this project would be the necessary NEPA and Consultation with other agencies. The NEPA work would be contracted to local vendors. The Forest Service would perform consultation work.

The Forest Service would provide 50% of the salary to design, prepare and administer the construction contract.

Implementation of the reconstruction work would be by contract to local contractors.

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

Yes No This project will require coordination with landowners and mining operators in the area.

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)]

Version: April 13, 2001

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: 5.7
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days:	
f. Other (specify):	

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

Project planning, NEPA, design, and contract preparation would be completed by October, 2006. Construction would be completed by November, 2007.

16. Target Species Benefited: Primarily Bull Trout and Redband Trout.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? This project will improve access to the Silver Creek drainage area for all users. Completing this project will show that the Forest Service and County are committed to improving the water quality of Silver Creek, which is a 303d listed stream. Completing this project will also satisfy one of the terms and conditions set by the US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion for ongoing and proposed actions in the Upper Powder River Watershed.

18. How is this project in the best public interest?

Community Benefits: The public will be served through improved access to federal and private lands. Water quality and fish habitat will also improve, benefiting local users and visitors to the area. The citizens of Baker County will benefit from a variety of jobs and contracting opportunities ranging from equipment operators for construction work to biologists for NEPA activities. Implementing this project would put \$190,000 into the local economy over 2006 and 2007 through contracts with local vendors.

19. How does the project benefit federal lands/resources?

This project will reduce sedimentation into Silver Creek, improving water quality and fish habitat. It will provide a road that is not as susceptible to washouts or damage due to runoff or rain events. This improved road will provide required access for fire prevention and initial attack activities.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If no, give est. date of completion: October, 2006			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Ongoing
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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	

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (<i>check those that apply</i>)	
<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): Youth Crew	

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: \$ 218700	
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. FY06 Request: \$ 47,500	f. FY09 Request: \$
d. FY07 Request: \$ 171,200	g. FY10 Request: \$
e. FY08 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	\$5000			
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$5000	\$40000		
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$5000	\$5000		
28. Contract Preparation	\$2500	\$2500		
29. Contract Administration	\$5000	\$5000		
30. Contract Cost		\$150000		
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring (PART OF PROJECT)	\$2500			
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total		\$202500		
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8%) (per year for multi-year projects)		\$16,200		
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$25,000	\$218,700		

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]
(max. 7 lines)

At this time, no other funding has been identified, however, funding from US Fish and Wildlife, ODF&W, BPA, and other agencies will be sought to match Forest Service and Title II funding.

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? Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:** Provisions in the construction contract require specific plans of operation to ensure the project meets all federal, state and local pollution prevention requirements. The assigned Forest Service Contracting Officer and Contracting Officers Representative are responsible for administering the contract. Currently there is no data to represent the direct effects this road may have on ecological conditions. Studies have shown however, that roads such as the Silver Creek road can be reconstructed to significantly reduce sediment input to adjacent waterways.
- 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? [Who is responsible for this monitoring item]**The Forest Service Contracting process has specific criteria to award contracts to firms or local individuals that provide the best service in terms of employment and economic benefit to Baker County. The Forest Service Contracting Officer is responsible for monitoring this 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? Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:**
The primary benefit to product removal would be the improved access that would improve travel times and reduce wear and tear on hauling equipment.
- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33) Amount** \$2,500

Project Name: Silver Creek Road Reconstruction

County Court Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

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

Attested by _____ County Judge

Date

Priority Rating:

- High Medium Low

Comments/Rational: