

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): **GR-MAL04-116**

2. Project Name: Upper South Fork John Day River Watershed Restoration – Year #2, 3, and 4	3. County: Grant
4. Project Sponsor: Grant Soil & Water Conservation District	5. Date: Rev. Mar 28, 2003
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541/575-0135	
7. Sponsors E-mail: gswcd@oregonvos.net Ken Delano	

8. Project Location (attach project area map) Upper South Fork John Day Subbasin, Grant County, Oregon																																									
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Upper John Day River Sub-basin #1707																																									
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Upper South Fork #170702																																									
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr><td style="width: 30%;">c. Location:</td><td style="width: 30%;">Township 18S</td><td style="width: 10%;">Range 27E</td><td style="width: 30%;">Section(s) 8-29, 33-36</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 19S</td><td>Range 27E</td><td>Section(s) 1-3, 11-12</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 16S</td><td>Range 28E</td><td>Section(s) 25,35,36</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 17S</td><td>Range 28E</td><td>Section(s) 1-2, 11-13, 24-25, 35-36</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 18S</td><td>Range 28E</td><td>Section(s) 1-2, 7-36</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 19S</td><td>Range 28E</td><td>Section(s) 1-17, 20-26</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 16S</td><td>Range 29E</td><td>Section(s) 29-32</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 17S</td><td>Range 29E</td><td>Section(s) 3-11, 14-23, 26-35</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 18S</td><td>Range 29E</td><td>Section(s) 1-23, 26-35</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Township 19S</td><td>Range 29E</td><td>Section(s) 2-11, 15-19</td></tr> </table>		c. Location:	Township 18S	Range 27E	Section(s) 8-29, 33-36		Township 19S	Range 27E	Section(s) 1-3, 11-12		Township 16S	Range 28E	Section(s) 25,35,36		Township 17S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-2, 11-13, 24-25, 35-36		Township 18S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-2, 7-36		Township 19S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-17, 20-26		Township 16S	Range 29E	Section(s) 29-32		Township 17S	Range 29E	Section(s) 3-11, 14-23, 26-35		Township 18S	Range 29E	Section(s) 1-23, 26-35		Township 19S	Range 29E	Section(s) 2-11, 15-19
c. Location:	Township 18S	Range 27E	Section(s) 8-29, 33-36																																						
	Township 19S	Range 27E	Section(s) 1-3, 11-12																																						
	Township 16S	Range 28E	Section(s) 25,35,36																																						
	Township 17S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-2, 11-13, 24-25, 35-36																																						
	Township 18S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-2, 7-36																																						
	Township 19S	Range 28E	Section(s) 1-17, 20-26																																						
	Township 16S	Range 29E	Section(s) 29-32																																						
	Township 17S	Range 29E	Section(s) 3-11, 14-23, 26-35																																						
	Township 18S	Range 29E	Section(s) 1-23, 26-35																																						
	Township 19S	Range 29E	Section(s) 2-11, 15-19																																						
d. BLM District Prineville	e. BLM Resource Area																																								
f. National Forest; Malheur	g. Forest Service District; Blue Mountain R.D.																																								
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																																									

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines)
<p>To restore properly functioning watershed and channel conditions in headwater streams to improve fish habitat, watershed health, and sustainable agriculture in the project area. OBJECTIVES: (Streams): (1) Stabilize banks, (2) Arrest migrating headcuts, (3) Remove fish passage barriers, (4) Restore native riparian vegetation and stream shade; Uplands: (5) Eliminate road related sediment sources, (6) Reduce erosion and sediment delivery, and (7) Demonstrate that dynamic landscape management is a viable concept when private land managers, interest groups, local government, and state and Federal agencies can access resources to pursue resource management on a landscape scale.</p>

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

This proposal is for the second, third, and fourth years of a multi-year effort to address restoration needs throughout the Upper S. Fork. Watershed for the next several years. Major cooperators with the Grant SWCD are private landowners, the Upper South Fork John Day Watershed Council, the U.S. Forest Service, ODFW, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and NRCS. Matching funding will be sought from OWEB and USFWS and each cooperator will contribute to the effort with in-kind services or other appropriate means. Several streams within the Upper South Fork watershed are on the State 303(d) list for not meeting temperature or biological criteria and are contributing sediment to downstream water systems and anadromous fishery resources. Specific needs for restoration have been identified in a 1995 Watershed Analysis Report (USFS) and a 1992 BOR Stream Restoration Program for Upper South Fork Final Draft document. A watershed assessment to identify restoration needs for the Upper South Fork John Day (funded by OWEB for 2002) is near completion. Community based contractors will be utilized to accomplish the restoration work to meet the above listed objectives. Local community governmental and private groups will be involved as cooperators, consultants, and project work force. The landscape scope and significance of this project as a demonstration will incorporate all the available Team disciplines to plan and design appropriate restoration practices, implement the plan, disburse funds and perform program effectiveness monitoring. Landowners and agency personnel have identified restoration actions by sub-watershed. Site monitoring will evaluate the restoration effort. Monitoring will most often be photo point reference with site-specific monitoring measurements as needed. NEPA work will be contracted. The proposed project includes site-specific invasive weed treatments (private & public land), placement of large wood to stream channels, repair various head cuts in the tributary drainages, continue to stabilize migrating head cuts in tributaries using juniper posts and slash, as well as rock grade control structures, control of invasive juniper to improve percolation and release of water for late season flows (private & public lands) in the sub-drainages. This project will demonstrate a balance among sustainable agriculture, water quality, and fisheries. Restoration work will address the ESA and the Clean Water Act. Natural resources on both private and public lands will benefit from improved watershed conditions. All landowners will benefit by improved natural resources that help support sustainable agriculture and public owned natural resources while supporting the local economy through work contracting.

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

Yes No **If yes, then describe** (max. 10 lines) The proposed work will be a continuation of the work started with the 2003 Title II funds. Invasive weed control will be coordinated with the Grant SWCD noxious weed control plan. Weed control and juniper control areas have been identified on private and public lands. Restoration work has been accomplished over the past fifteen years on private lands below the Forest boundary, including replacing push-up diversions with fish friendly permanent structures, screening of irrigation ditches, installing grade control structures in deeply cut channels, installing juniper riprap and down wood in channels to control sediment, slow water velocity, and reduce bank erosion, and riparian hardwood planting and grass seeding. Off channel work has included stock water developments, juniper control, noxious weed control and rangeland seeding. This project will continue the growing landowners, resource manager partnerships.

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 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)]
X X Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
XX Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	XX 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: 600	b. Total Miles:1
c. No. Structures: 7	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days: 232	(for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

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

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

Direct habitat benefit to interior redband trout and indirect benefit to Columbia Basin summer steelhead habitat below Izee Falls. Direct habitat benefit to mule deer, elk, antelope, birds and numerous non-game species. The project will also address specific criteria for de-listing streams currently on the State's 303(d) list.

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

This project will bring together County, Tribal, State, and Federal land resource managers, private landowners, and community contractors in a cooperative and joint effort to restore watershed conditions that will benefit natural resources and support the local community. This project includes numerous site-specific treatments that will involve a wide variety of resource management expertise and subsequent local implementation opportunities. The opportunity to perform watershed restoration across ownership boundaries on a landscape scale may go from textbook to reality through this project.

The teamwork established in the community and spreading to include these many partners should benefit similar projects well into the future.

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

(max. 12 lines)

It will improve overall natural resource conditions in the South Fork John Day river system, which will improve habitat conditions for sustainable agriculture, for anadromous fish habitat and resident fish, and the eventual de-listing of streams from the 303d list. It will employ local contractors and workers in an economically distressed area and will provide merchantable juniper products. It will bring private interests, public land management agencies, and local government together in a cooperative project. This project provides a unique opportunity to approach watershed restoration across ownership boundaries to the maximum benefit of all stakeholders and citizens. This project is designed with the ultimate goal of completing restoration work throughout an entire watershed over a period of several years with total community involvement and pride of accomplishment. This project has the potential for Grant County to take the lead in large-scale watershed restoration.

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

Several stream channels on public lands have been in a deteriorated condition for several decades and have been a source of sediment delivery into the South Fork John Day River. Fish habitat and water quality will be improved in the headwater and main stem streams. The headwaters of the basin streams on Federal lands should be the first to improve if downstream improvements on private ownerships are to be effective and long-lasting. Streams on the 303d list can be improved and de-listed. The aquifer can benefit from increased water flows from juniper removal and aspen stand conservation improvements. Fish habitat will benefit from removal of fish passage barriers, improved water quality and increased water quantity.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete: NEPA will be contracted by the Grant County SWCD.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not All	
If no, give est. date of completion: April 2004			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: Restoration sites are several miles above a natural fish passage barrier, i.e., Izee Falls.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	No listed anadromous species in project area.
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: There are no listed inland fish species in the watershed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	No listed species in project area.
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:		<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 (check those that apply)

Version: April 13, 2001

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Contractors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce /NEPA coordination.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): Grant SWCD, Private landowners, and agriculture related organizations.	

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

Yes No

Juniper cutting will provide merchantable materials for local industry that uses juniper in manufacture of posts and furniture.

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 155,450	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request: \$ 156,000
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request: \$ 156,000
e. FY04 Request: \$ 155,450	

Note: The requested funds amount includes Indirect Costs Overhead at 8% of the contract costs which will be retained by the Forest Service and will not be part of the Grant SWCD grant.

This request covers less than 8% of the watershed restoration work identified in the 1995 Watershed Analysis Report (USFS) and the 1992 BOR Stream Restoration Program for Upper South Fork Final Draft document, and by the South Fork Watershed Council and private landowners.

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)] (OWEB)/USFW	<i>Column D</i> Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys	3,000	7,600		7,900
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation		6,080		6,080
26. Permit Acquisition		2,400		2,400
27. Project Design & Engineering		6080		6,080
28. Contracts Preparation		10,888		10,888
29. Contract Administration		3,691		3,691
30. Contract Cost		75,159	50,000/25,000	150,159
31. Workforce Cost				Included in Contract Cost
32. Materials & Supplies				Included in contracts
33. Monitoring		12,540		12,540
34. Other Cultural Resources Survey		25,000		25,000
35. Project Sub-Total	3,000	149,438	50,000/25,000	224,438
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8.0% Maximum) Contract cost only. (per year for multi-year projects)	786	6,013		6,799
37. Total Cost Estimate	3,786	155,450	50,000/25,000	234,236

Note: Indirect Costs shown in Item 36 will remain with the Forest Service and will not be included in the Grant Amount.

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

Malheur National Forest in-kind services, OWEB and US Fish and Wildlife match (not committed at this time).

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?:

Grant SWCD & cooperators will take the lead in working with resource specialists from the agencies and outside consultants when needed. Photo point documentation and other resource measurement (as appropriate by site) will be collected and recorded in the project records. This will include hydrology; water quality & quantity measurements relative to juniper removal. Each site treatment will be monitored to evaluate the treatment and make appropriate recommendations for future years work. Aspen treatment sites will be monitored to record response such as new aspen shoots and survival.

- 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?: Grant SWCD & cooperators will monitor the contracts awarded to local community contractors and labor force and provide the results to the County Court and the Upper South Fork Watershed Council. The total contract awards and accomplishments will be recorded and used to evaluate local employment.

- 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 only product that is planned for removal from National Forest System lands is fire wood. This will be accomplished through the Forest Service standard wood gathering permit process and will be monitored to determine the quantity removed under this project by the Forest.

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)**
(max. 7 lines)

Amount \$12,540.

Project Name: Upper South Fork John Day Watershed Restoration.
Title II Submittal for Years 2004

County Court Concurrence

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

Attested by County Judge Dennis Reynolds

April _____, 2003

Priority Rating:

X High Medium Low

Comments/Rationale:

Project Name: Upper South Fork John Day Watershed Restoration.