

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): _____

2. Project Name: Peavine Creek Trail Conversion	3. County: Wallowa
4. Project Sponsors: Dana Orrick, USFS Hydrologist	5. Date: 12/14/05
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: Dana Orrick - 426-5690	
7. Sponsors E-mail: dorrick@fs.fed.us	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Lower Grande Ronde	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Upper Joseph Creek; 17060106-26M	
c. Location: Township <u>03N</u> Range <u>46E</u> Section(s) <u>17, 8, 5</u> Township <u>04N</u> Range <u>46E</u> Section(s) <u>32, 29</u>	
d. BLM District	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest Wallowa-Whitman	g. Forest Service Unit: Wallowa Mountain Zone
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines)
The goal of this project is to complete the conversion of the Forest Service 4660 road to the Peavine Trail (#1657) by removing 9 culverts and 12 cross-drains from this trail and replacing them with fords and drain dips, and narrowing the roadbed footprint to a standard OHV trail width. This would re-establish sediment transport and biologic and hydrologic connectivity in 9 intermittent tributaries to Peavine Creek and greatly reduce the risk of culvert failures and concurrent slugs of sediment entering the creek which would adversely affect threatened steelhead trout spawning habitat. This project would complete Phase II of the fish habitat restoration work in the Peavine Creek subwatershed.

10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.)
Forest Service (FS) road 4660 was converted to the Peavine Trail in 2000. The conversion is currently incomplete: at the north end, an OHV bridge was installed that connects the trail to the 4665 road; at the south end, a locked gate was installed and a few boulders were placed to prevent full-size vehicle use. All culverts were left in place. Twelve of the 21 culverts still on the trail are 50-100% plugged, 7 of which are culverts that connect tributary flow to Peavine Creek. These culverts are at great risk for failure if even a moderate rainfall or snowmelt event happens in this watershed. Failure would mean plugging completely and backing up water until the force of the water either 1) washed out the trail and culvert in that location, or 2) ran down the trail creating a gully before it could be routed off the trail toward the creek. Both of those scenarios would dump a large amount of sediment into a stream that provides important habitat for threatened steelhead trout, and destroy the OHV trail.

This project would re-establish sediment transport and biologic and hydrologic connectivity in 9 intermittent tributaries to Peavine Creek by removing those undersized culverts along the Peavine Trail and replacing them with fords. Work would be conducted in late summer when the tributaries are likely to be dry, but if there is any running water, certified weed-free straw bales would be used downstream to minimize sedimentation of Peavine Creek. Twelve cross-drains would also be pulled and replaced with drain dips that would route accumulated water off the trail and spread it onto the forest floor next to the trail where it could infiltrate. Ford and drain dip designs would be approved standard FS engineering designs. The road fill would also be pulled back from the creek to narrow the trail to a standard width. As many large trees as possible would be preserved when narrowing the road. After project completion, there would be a short term increase in sediment during high flows in the spring, but an instantaneous long-term decrease in risk of sediment degrading valuable steelhead habitat. Removing the culverts and cross-drains along the Peavine Trail would increase the sediment transport capability and therefore channel stability through elimination of constricted flows. Exposed areas following implementation would be seeded with a native seed mixture and select areas planted with hardwoods. The project will take place along the entire length of the Peavine Trail, from the trail bridge at the north 4.6 miles downstream to the 4670 road junction.

This project would be the 2nd phase of a two-phase project. Sulfur cinquefoil is currently along the south part of the trail and is being treated during Phase I of this project in 2006 and will be monitored and treated again during Phase II in 2007. Project effects to users of this Trail – OHV and horse riders, hikers and mountain bikers – would be a narrower trail experience with some fords running water during spring and early summer. NEPA and consultation will be completed by April 2007.

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

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

The Peavine Creek Trail Conversion is the 2nd phase of two-phase project. Phase I, the Upper Joseph Creek (UJC) Restoration Project which will be implemented in 2006, will modify 24 instream structures in Peavine creek to allow for complete juvenile fish passage and improved habitat diversity, and treat sulfur cinquefoil along the Peavine Trail. Phase I will be completed with funding by the Grande Ronde Model Watershed and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) continuing implementation of project recommendations developed through the UJC Watershed Assessment. Phase II would complete the Peavine Trail conversion by narrowing the trail footprint which would effectively reduce the risk of use by full-sized vehicles, and removing all culverts and cross-drains which would reduce the risk of sedimentation to steelhead spawning habitat in Peavine Creek.

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)]

Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify):

X Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]	X 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)]	X 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:	b. Total Miles: approx 4.6 miles of closed road
c. No. Structures: 21 pulled culverts	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days: 10	(for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

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

Phase I Activities (NEPA, Consultation, Project Design) – Project design: November 2006;
NEPA/Consult: April 2007

Phase II Activities (Implementation) – September 2007

16. Target Species Benefited:

ESA listed Snake River steelhead, and a variety of other fish and wildlife species that depend on good water quality.

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

This project will be a cooperative effort between the USFS, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wallowa Resources, the Wallowa OHV club, the Grande Ronde Model Watershed and BPA. By working together to identify issues and develop solutions, relationships are strengthened through education and understanding.

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

Since the USFS' budget has been declining precipitously for at least the last 5 years, the FS has very little money for road maintenance, and virtually no money for trail maintenance. Removing all the culverts along this trail and installing fords and drain dips where appropriate will practically eliminate the need for trail maintenance. By narrowing the trail, Peavine Creek will be less confined in places and riders will have an enhanced trail riding experience. From a transportation perspective, this project will help this part of the subwatershed to be able to maintain itself, which saves the government and local community money in the long run. In addition, threatened Snake River steelhead and other aquatic species communities will benefit from a reduced risk of sedimentation.

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

The implementation of this project will improve the forest and watershed health through conserving soil resources by reducing the amount that the trail crowds Peavine Creek and re-establishing sediment transport and hydrologic connectivity in intermittent tributaries to Peavine Creek. This will reduce the risk of large amounts of sediment entering Peavine Creek which will in turn improve water quality, trail quality, and fish habitat.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	April 2007
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	April 2007
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	April 2007
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	May 2007
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	May 2007
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Nov 2006
* 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 <i>(check those that apply)</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):	

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: \$10,800	
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. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request: \$22,000
e. FY04 Request:	Note: "FY06 Request" represents funding by the GRMW, BPA and USFS to be spent for Phase I of this project (2005-2006). Title II funds are requested for Phase II of this project.

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

2006 REQUEST 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	\$800			\$800
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$2,000			\$2,000
26. Permit Acquisition	\$600			\$600
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$4,000			\$4,000
28. Contract Preparation	\$500	\$500		\$1,000
29. Contract Administration	\$1,500	\$1,500		\$3,000
30. Contract Cost		\$7,000	\$8,000	\$15,000
31. Workforce Cost		\$1,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring	\$400			\$400
34. Other: writing editing, community meetings, evaluation panels				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$9,800	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$29,800
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8%) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$784	\$800	\$800	\$2,384
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$10,584	\$10,800	\$10,800	\$32,184

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

Wallowa Resources – \$2,000 (not secured)

Grande Ronde Model Watershed/ BPA – \$8,000 (not secured)

Contributions in Column C will be solicited from BPA through the GRMW in September 2006 for the 2007 field season.

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?:

Three photo points will be established to monitor project effectiveness. The USFS will take these photos and maintain the monitoring database.

- 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 contract will be let to a local contractor and implementation will be tracked by the local Natural Resource Advisory Committee.

- 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?:

N\A

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

\$400

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

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

(See attached letter from County Commissioners)

Attested by Commissioner

Date

Priority Rating:

High Medium Low

Comments/Rational: