

Watershed-scale Education and Training Grant Final Application

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Water Quality Improvement Grant Program Grant Application Form							
<p>Project Description - Watershed area and pollutants of concern. <i>Watershed Education and Training (WET) in HUC 1502000103, Coyote Creek (a 10-digit sub-watershed of HUC 15020001 HUC, Headwaters, Little Colorado River –an ADEQ Targeted Watershed) to create a cooperative-spirited Watershed Improvement Council with the express purpose to bring together Stakeholders, including landowners, lessees, managers and technical providers; change behaviors of permittees in the management of public lands; establish Best Management Practices and create purpose-designed monitoring with and immediate transition into site selection criteria for NPS Grant follow up within the shortest possible time frame (one year is desirable).</i></p>							
<p>Authorizing Agency - Name of person, agency, company, tribal authority who is applying for the grant.</p> <p>Name: Little Colorado River Plateau RC&D (Watershed Coordinating Council) Address: 51 W., Vista Drive, Suite 4, Holbrook, AZ 86025</p>	<p>Authorized Agency Contact – Person who will accept responsibility for the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement. This person must sign the signature page.</p> <p>Name: David M. Newlin Title: Watershed Projects Director Phone: (928) 524-56063, ext. 123 E-mail: david@littlecolorado.net Fax: (928) 524-2910</p>						
<p>Project Manager – Person who will have the day-to-day knowledge of the project and should be contacted if clarification is required.</p> <p>Name: David M. Newlin Address: 51 W. Vista, Suite 4, Holbrook, AZ 86025 Title: Watershed Projects Director Phone: (928) 524-6063 ext. 123 E-mail: david@littlecolorado.net Fax: (928) 524-2910</p>							
<p>Project Period</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0-1 year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> up to 2 years</p>							
<p>Project Costs</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">Funds Requested (max 60%):</td> <td>\$118,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Matching Funds (min 40%):</td> <td>\$55,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Costs:</td> <td>\$173,750</td> </tr> </table>		Funds Requested (max 60%):	\$118,250	Matching Funds (min 40%):	\$55,500	Total Project Costs:	\$173,750
Funds Requested (max 60%):	\$118,250						
Matching Funds (min 40%):	\$55,500						
Total Project Costs:	\$173,750						
<p>Are you or your organization currently debarred, suspended or otherwise lawfully prohibited from any public procurement activity? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>							

Authority Signature Page

The undersigned hereby offers and agrees to perform in compliance with all terms, conditions, specifications, and scope in this grant application. Signature certifies understanding and compliance with the application attached hereto. ADEQ may approve the grant application and modifications to scope, methodology, and schedule, final projects, and/or budget.

Authorized Signature _____ Date 4 March 2010

Printed Name: David M. Newlin

Title: Watershed Projects Coordinator

Company/Agency/Tribal Authority: Little Colorado River Plateau RC&D, Inc.

This Grant Application Form must be signed by the individual legally authorized to act on behalf of the applicant in conducting all official business relating to the project. Signing this form and submitting a grant application package, certifies that the applicant has authority to enter into the agreement, accept funding, and fulfill the terms of the proposed project if approved. Applicant is required to read the Water Quality Improvement Grant Agreement Terms and Conditions and be legally authorized to enter into an agreement with ADEQ.

Final Application Content

I. Desired Outcomes

Describe the desired outcomes of this project.

1. Develop, review, revise, promote and put into practice Best Management Practices (BMP's) for the Coyote Creek Sub-watershed (1502000103)
2. Develop and establish site selection criteria for specific projects to reduce sediment and turbidity
3. Develop and establish groundwork for NPS grant to be submitted in Cycle 13 of the ADEQ 319 Grants (2011)
4. Develop and prepare for volunteer monitoring efforts.
5. Develop and establish monitoring criteria

II. Background Information

What do we already know about the impairment issues in the watershed? What past work will this project be building on? Include previous projects (WQIG and other), data, monitoring, or Plans that have been done to address the NPS impairment. What gaps need to be filled?

1. There are no past WQIP projects in the Coyote Creek Watershed
2. Baseline monitoring and measurement of turbidity, TMDL and other water quality issues have not been done by ADEQ or other agencies (as far as is known)
3. Obvious erosion is a significant impairment
4. Significant changes in native vegetation are observed. Some of these are being addressed by combined NRCS and AZ Game and Fish efforts on the H Bar V Ranch (see attached three maps: Coyote Creek Ranches)
5. A large erosion/sediment control project was completed in the late 1980's on Coyote Creek seven miles east of Springerville through a major State Appropriation for the construction of gabions, check dams and other erosion protection measures.
6. The stakeholders in the area have dealt with erosion (and the subsequent sedimentation concerns) on a case-by-case (i.e., emergency) basis for many years – in some cases, since the 1870's.
7. Establishment, acceptance, and understanding of formal Best Management Practices through cooperating stakeholders and technical standards will be a significant step forward in connecting governmental regulatory agencies and private landowners for mutual benefits.
8. In addition, clearly defined site-selection criteria and prioritization will assist all stakeholders; including the 17 remaining HUC'S in the LCR.
9. Many of the leased parcels have been cared for better than others. This may lead to conflicts on site selection and prioritization. Science is a key here – what are the sites and BMP's that will provide the most benefit.
10. Lyman Lake continues to be a moderately impaired area that may benefit from reduction of sediment in the Coyote Creek Watershed. This is peripheral issue; however, since Coyote Creek enters in the Little Colorado River a few miles above Lyman Lake and since the obvious benefits of sediment and turbidity reduction in the Headwaters is of benefit to the entire watercourse, it cannot be eliminated from or overlooked in the Grant Application and future discussions.
11. The establishment of a "self-governing" body, in conjunction with the State Land

Department, with power and ability to enforce (voluntarily) the BMP's established and accepted may be a significant issue. A Working Title for this group might be the Coyote Creek Forage Association" since cattle ranching is a major industry in the area.

12. Budget restrictions with the State Land Department, the major owner of the land in the area, are of critical concern. In general, the permittees are those who are the direct managers of the land. Other than in-kind staff support, there will likely be no funds from this source to carry forth the BMP's; thus the Association mentioned above is suggested.
13. The US Forest Service already has in place established methods for monitoring. These may be adopted by the WIC and enforced by either State Land or the above mentioned Coyote Creek Forage Association.

III. Pollutants of Concern

What is/are the pollutant/s of concern for this project? Are there any known or suspected sources? If so, reference supporting documents (TMDL reports, etc.).

Sediment and turbidity. Sources are almost always significant rainfall, storm and runoff events. Coyote Creek is generally an ephemeral stream. There are no reports that apply directly to Coyote Creek; however, the following are applicable to the Headwaters HUC (15020001) and the Little Colorado Watershed in general.

1. Coyote Creek Natural Resources Inventory. Arizona State Land Department. Phoenix, Arizona. 30 June 1982
2. Rapid Watershed Assessment, Headwaters, Little Colorado River, HUC 15020001. Natural Resource Conservation Service. Phoenix, Arizona. June 2008
3. NEMO Little Colorado River Watershed-based Management Plan.
<http://nemo.srn.arizona.edu/nemo/index.html>. University of Arizona Water Resources Research Center. Tucson, Arizona. Accessed 30 January 2010.

Will this project be able to provide load reduction data?

It will begin the process to establish baseline data.

IV. Location and Land Ownership

City/Town: N/A

County: Apache

Greater Watershed - 8 digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 15020001

Land Ownership (if applicable): Varied, see attached map

Provide documentation of landowner permission and support for all landowners within the project area.

No specific projects to be done with grant; however, see attached Letters of Support

V. Scope and Scale of the Watershed

a. Define the scope and scale of the watershed that your project will be addressing. Include a map that clearly shows the boundaries of the watershed of concern, and its location in relation to known water quality impairments as well as the greater watershed.

Coyote Creek Watershed, 10-digit HUC 1502000103 and six of the eight associated 12-digit sub-watersheds – NOT including two fully or partially in the State of New Mexico

b. Provide the HUC associated with the project area. Projects should ideally focus on 10 or 12 digit HUCs, although slightly larger or smaller drainages may be feasible dependent upon the project.

1502000103, Coyote Creek, Headwaters, Little Colorado River

VI. Scope of Work

Define the scope and scale of the watershed that your project will be addressing. Include a map that clearly shows the boundaries of the watershed of concern, and its location in relation to known water quality impairments as well as the greater watershed.

See attached maps the Coyote Creek Watershed (three maps) and the Headwaters Map from the 319 Application manual.

1. There are no measured ADEQ-quantified water quality impairments in the Coyote Creek Watershed.
2. There are significant and obvious erosion and sedimentation issues.
3. There has been little work done in the Coyote Creek Watershed to quantify baseline measurements or project implementation. This will be one of the purposes of the current grant application.
4. The Watershed Improvement Council will be established and have as their primary goals for this grant:
 - Review, revise and establish Best Management Practices for the Coyote Creek Sub-watershed.
 - Attain a significant level of Master Watershed Steward Training for education, retention and improvement of land use practices.
 - Establish site selection criteria for specific projects to reduce sediment and turbidity.
 - Prepare for a NPS grant to be submitted in Cycle 13 of the ADEQ 319 Grants (2011).
 - Prepare, organize and train for future volunteer monitoring efforts.
 - Create a website that will inform and educate and provide public access to this process within the desired goals of managing and improving livestock grazing practices on public lands for the purpose of reduction of sediment, erosion and turbidity.
 - Create useful and updated maps that will provide monitoring of the conditions in the Coyote Creek watershed.

VII. Methods and Techniques

Provide a brief description of proposed techniques to

See below

a. Describe the methods that will be used to educate and train watershed stakeholders (public meetings, classes, workshops, hands-on aspects, educational materials). Include methods for the following as applicable:

- Preliminary field modeling
- Actual physical surveys
- Social/educational needs surveys
- Pre- and post-implementation monitoring
- Data analysis

A Watershed Improvement Council will be established from the (limited) list of stakeholders in the area, including:

Seventeen identified ranch land owners and lessees as follows (note Appendix F of current lessees from Arizona State Land Department):

1. Aldrice Burk
2. George Geisler
3. Hooper Family
4. Clifford Johnson
5. Galyn Knight
6. Lance Knight
7. Bill LeSueur
8. Grover LeSueur
9. Sidney Mattock
10. Merrill Estate
11. Earl Platt
12. Elaine Rogers
13. Wendell Sherwood
14. Mike Udall
15. Bob Yost, Bar Flying V Ranch
16. Clive Wiltbank
17. H Bar V Ranch

Other Regulatory, Environmental and Land Owners as follows:

1. Arizona State Land Department
2. ADEQ
3. ADWR
4. Apache Sitgreaves National Forests
5. Apache NRCD
6. Apache County NRCS
7. Upper Little Colorado Partnership, an ADEQ recognized watershed partnership
8. Tucson Electric Power - Springerville Generating Station

Potential stakeholders in the State of New Mexico include:

1. New Mexico State Land Department
2. Gila National Forest
3. US Bureau of Land Management
4. Unidentified private land owners

Training methods will begin with Public Meetings to identify needs and active cooperation to create the WIC (facilitators are included in the budget), SWAT analysis or similar. The WIC will be trained in goal setting and with the establishment of a Technical Committee for field work,

information study and development of focus groups for development of BMP's will follow. The next step will be followed by consultant developed goals for site development.

Education materials will be provided primarily by the well-developed plans of the Gila Watershed Partnership, existing materials and information from the NRCS and previously provided materials from the ULCR. The Arizona Game and Fish Department and US Fish and Wildlife also have projects in the area that will be evaluated and brought into the WIC.

Much of these training sessions depend on the limited number of stakeholders (primarily cattle ranchers), weather and the necessary attention to their business.

There is a significant lack of data for this 10 digit watershed. Much of the existing data is older. A complete evaluation of the data *needs* will be considered by the Technical Consultants.

Physical surveys of the most heavily damaged areas will be made with the individual stakeholders and consultants to review the areas of most significant concern. These will then be reviewed with the WIC. Consideration will be given to existing photo mapping and other mapping sources, particularly from NEMO.

Social/emotional written needs surveys will be provided by the consultant(s); presented to the WIC, reviewed and discussed and then completed within the limited range of stakeholders <25 people. Consultants will provide evaluation tools and complete a report for these needs.

Pre- and post-implementation monitoring baselines will be established through technical information and surveys from the engineering consultants, provided to the WIC and evaluated according to priority and importance. These will be made a permanent part of the agreements and letters of permission obtained with the WIC and stakeholders for voluntary cooperative compliance for further NPS Grants.

Data analysis will be undertaken through the consultants, reported to the WIC and stakeholders and updated and evaluated after baseline measurements have been established and a (necessarily) short history provided (for this grant). This phase will become significantly more important during the NPS implementation grants, to be applied for in the 2011 cycle.

b. If water quality monitoring is a component of the project, provide an Abbreviated Monitoring Plan. See RFGA Appendix F for the Abbreviated Monitoring Plan outline. Grantees will be required to work with ADEQ to complete a detailed monitoring plan for the project post-award.

Methods for recording, establishing and providing baseline data through technical engineering consultants is to be considered and planned for in this grant.

VIII. Self-evaluation and Effectiveness Monitoring

Explain how the project will measure the following:

- a. Desired behavioral changes,
- b. Retention of educational messages,
- c. Active involvement by participants in water quality improvements or improvement projects
- d. Success in terms of contributing to water quality improvements

Desired behavioral changes: Stakeholders will implement recommended erosion and sediment control practices on private and state lands through acceptance of and agreement with engineering recommendations. As previously stated, many of the stakeholders have an excellent understanding of what needs to be done and are seeking assistance to clarify and identify these needs and then find funding sources for them. In other areas, fencing and revegetation have been the primary means of controlling erosion and sediment due to over grazing. Improved grazing compliance and riparian monitoring are key parts to this and retention of educational messages, below. A major goal would be sustained livestock management.

Retention of Education Messages: will be monitored and evaluated by the number of applications for NPS projects in the next grant cycle. More importantly, State Land will need to adopt and or recommend these practices to the State Land lessees as BMP's and work with stakeholders to enforce them. This is a very difficult measure to enforce on private lands with limited governmental authority. The success of these messages will be mostly determined by cooperation among stakeholders, most of whom are cattle ranchers, availability of funding and understanding of the methods used for many years combined with newer, technologically and financially feasible and engineering-recommended methods. Improved livestock health and more effective grazing is a direct result of retention of education messages. A web site for frequent reminders, announcements and updates may be a significant contribution to this project.

Active Involvement by participants in water quality improvement or improvement projects: has already been significantly shown by the participation (sign-in sheets available) of the combined ULCR and Apache NRCD meetings). It is anticipated that the interest generated by the grant and the establishment of the WIC will also bring together many who have not previously participated. Thus, the significant participation by the <25 stakeholders in the area will only increase.

Success in terms of contributing to water quality improvements will be measured by establishing technically acceptable and engineering feasible baselines, and determining significant contributors to the erosion in the area, establishment of BMP's and implementation in the next few years. Baseline data does *not* exist for the area (or is very old). This grant is an initial process.

IX. Key Personnel and Partnerships

Describe the organization that is requesting funds as well as the key personnel and their expertise. Identify all and the duties they will be performing. Be sure to include personnel handling the following project aspects at a minimum:

a. Project manager (*Responsibilities include tracking project progression, submitting quarterly and final reports as well as budget and reimbursement request documents to ADEQ, providing additional load reduction and project information upon request, and serving as the day-to-day contact person regarding the project*)

David M. Newlin, Little Colorado Plateau RC&D Watershed Projects Director

b. BMP engineering/implementation expertise (*Responsibilities may include load reduction modeling, pre-implementation BMP design and site evaluation*)

G. Allen Hayden and others, Natural Channel Design; Dr. George Ruyle, PhD, University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

c. Field surveying/monitoring expertise (*Responsibilities may include volunteer coordination, developing monitoring plan and survey form development, and data interpretation*)

Natural Channel Design, Flagstaff, AZ and/or Bill Zeedyk (New Mexico)

d. Education and Outreach Coordinator (*Responsibilities may include leading workshops, training project volunteers, and development of educational and outreach materials*)

David M. Newlin, Little Colorado River Plateau RC&D, Holbrook, AZ

e. Other (*Please specify role and associated duties*)

Meeting and Training Facilitators: Debra Mendelssohn and Suzanne Menges; also Jan Holder, Gila Watershed Partnership; Dr. George Ryle, PhD, University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Kristine Uhlman, Arizona NEMO Program

f. Qualifications

If individuals have not yet been identified to fill the above positions, what qualifications will be used to determine who will fulfill each of these duties?

N/A

X. Conflict of Interest

Avoid appearance or existence of bias within the plan. Provide statement of policy for hiring/subcontracting

See Appendix I: Little Colorado River Plateau RC&D Conflict of Interest Form. This form is signed by all RC&D employees, contractors and Board Members. The LCRP RC&D is required by law to conform to all Federal Non-Discrimination, Hiring and Contracting Practices.

XI. Smart Growth Scorecard

Is there a completed Smart Growth Scorecard for the municipality in which the project will take place? If so, please identify the community and Scorecard score below. If multiple completed Scorecards apply, the applicant may select the Scorecard with the highest score. If you are unsure as to whether your community has a completed Scorecard, view the full list on-line at:

<http://www.azcommerce.com/WebApps/Scorecard/PublicScoreCard.aspx>

Apache County has not completed a Smart Growth Scorecard

XII. Work Plan Steps and Milestones

Develop a work plan with a series of steps and associated dates that are necessary to complete the plans. Each step must have a milestone that provides a description of what will be accomplished. For example, if the step is to establish Watershed Improvement Council, the milestone would be to bring together at least 10 people representing different groups that might be affected by plan implementation in the watershed and are committed to participating in plan development. A form is provided below. Pre-defined work plan steps identified in the form are mandatory and must be addressed.

WORK PLAN STEP	MILESTONE	DATE TO COMPLETE	ASSOCIATED COSTS
1. Execute contact with ADEQ	<u>Signed Contract</u>	<u>1 June 2010</u>	<u>None</u>
2. Execute Contract with Natural Channel Design	<u>Signed Contract</u>	<u>30 June 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$1,000</u> <u>Match: \$250</u>
3. Locate, contact and confirm land ownership in Coyote Creek HUC	<u>Completed list of addresses of all Stakeholders</u>	<u>30 June 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$5,000</u> <u>Match: \$500</u>

4. Public Outreach for Project, WIC members, stakeholders, etc.	<u>Establish deadline for responses, follow up on all interested parties, evaluate interest levels</u>	<u>31 July 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$3,200</u> <u>Match: \$2,000</u>
5. Set Training Sessions schedules for Watershed Improvement Council	<u>Training Schedule established for 2010 and 2011</u>	<u>31 July 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,200</u> <u>Match: \$2,000</u>
6. Begin Natural Channel Design Analysis of existing information	<u>Finish Review (one month at 10 hours per week)</u>	<u>31 August 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$7,300</u> <u>Match: \$2,000</u>
7. Complete Watershed Improvement Council	<u>Complete establishment of Council</u>	<u>31 August 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,000</u> <u>Match: \$2,000</u>
8. Establish Policies, Procedures and Goals for WIC	<u>Formal Procedural Documents Adopted</u>	<u>30 Sept 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,250</u> <u>Match: \$4,000</u>
9. Evaluate and Hire Facilitators and/or Trainer for WIC Training	<u>Complete short term contract</u>	<u>31 August 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$7,000</u> <u>Match: \$1,000</u>
10. Natural Channel Design Engineering Services	<u>Evaluation of BMP's (three months at 10 hours per week)</u>	<u>31 Dec 2010*</u>	<u>Grant: \$36,650</u> <u>Match: \$10,500</u>
11. Regular Training Session for WIC for Evaluation of BMP's (six to nine sessions)	<u>Acceptance of BMP's (six months of field and technical work at 10 hours per week plus travel)</u>	<u>28 Feb 2011*</u>	<u>Grant: \$7,500</u> <u>Match: \$9,750</u>
12. Establishment of WIC Technical Committee	<u>Bring together a sub group of the entire WIC for Technical Study and Review</u>	<u>30 Sept 2010</u>	<u>Grant: \$5,500</u> <u>Match: \$2,500</u>
13. Master Watershed Steward Training	<u>Training Sessions and classes from the University of Arizona MWS Program</u>	<u>30 June 2010*</u>	<u>Grant: \$3,000</u> <u>Match: \$3,000</u>
14. Begin Work on Site Selection Criteria by WIC and Technical Committee	<u>Establish sound selection criteria for NPS projects in area</u>	<u>31 May 2010*</u>	<u>Grant: \$10,500</u> <u>Match: \$4,500</u>
15. Public Meetings, Notification and Information Dissemination	<u>Notify, disseminate and discuss WIC and Technical Committee recommendations for BMP's and Site Selection Criteria. Identify grazing compliance and riparian management rules and regulations. This may include the establishment of a web page as well as conventional media outlets (press, radio – there are no Public Television outlets in the Target Watershed)</u>	<u>31 May 2010*</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,200</u> <u>Match: \$5,000</u>
16. Publication of Information	<u>Completion of formal Report and acceptance by WIC</u>	<u>30 June 2010*</u>	<u>Grant: \$5,000</u> <u>Match: \$1,000</u>
17. Begin 2011 Cycle Preparation for ADEQ 319 Grant	<u>Begin review and preparation of 2011 ADEQ 319 WQIG</u>	<u>Upon Release of ADEQ Grant</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,800</u> <u>Match: \$2,500</u>

Application Process	Process	Manuel – Fall 2010+	
18. Submit 2011 Cycle Grant for NPS Projects	<u>Complete Packet with BMP's and Site Selection Criteria based on previous years study and WIC recommendations</u>	<u>Spring 2011+</u>	<u>Grant: \$4,000</u> <u>Match: \$1,000</u>
19. Establish Sites Ready for NPS Projects	<u>WIC to determine priorities for sites for establish of BMP's</u>	<u>Spring 2011</u>	<u>Grant: \$5,400</u> <u>Match: \$5,000</u>

- *Note: Weather conditions during the winter months throughout Northern Arizona (late October through early April) may cause these dates to slip 30-90 days beyond projected completion date.
- +Note: The 2011 ADEQ 319 WQIP Cycle depends on many factors and may vary as much as 90 days from past practice
- NOTE: All goals implementation dates are subject to date of signing contract with ADEQ.

XIII. Budget Form & Narrative

There is no cap on the funding request per project; however, project costs should be reasonable and commensurate with project benefits. Use the following guidelines when developing your project budget:

- **Administrative costs** (including salaries, overhead, or indirect costs associated with grant administration): No more than 10% of requested budget.
- **Personnel costs (Non-administrative)**: Include individual's title/responsibility, rate of pay, hours to be worked on project. Identify all subcontractors. *(See RFGA Attachment G for more information regarding paying subcontractors with WQIG funding).*
- **Equipment costs**: Specify equipment needs for Phase I planning and surveying. Individual pieces of equipment costing \$500 or more must be separately identified.
- **Monitoring costs**: Consider the type of equipment and supplies necessary both pre- and post-implementation. If you lack the necessary technical expertise to estimate these costs, please contact Grant Coordinator Krista Osterberg by phone (602.771.4635) or e-mail (ko1@azdeq.gov) to arrange a meeting to help you determine appropriate estimates.
- **Non-federal match requirement**: Non-federal match funds may be cash, goods, equipment usage, and/or services. Some examples of items and in-kind services that may contribute to the non-federal match requirement include: cash, in-kind services such as donated labor, office space, equipment usage, existing building usage, and base salaries of existing employees.
 - Match sources and/or activities must be pertinent to the proposed project.
 - Match amounts must be fully identified in the proposed Budget
 - Entity providing match and associated cost must be identified.
 - Federal agencies must be able to provide matching funds from non-federal sources. Federal salaries may not be used for match (and will not be reimbursed as project expenditures).

Note: All matching fund contributions or expenditures must occur within the effective dates of the Grant Agreement. ADEQ has the right to disallow contributions determined inappropriate or unreasonable.

XIII.1. Budget Narrative

Identify how costs were determined, including comparative quotes used to determine costs or worth where applicable as well as sources of all project match (funding and in-kind). Adequate justification

should be provided to show that the cost of implementing the project is reasonable for the benefits anticipated toward improving water quality.

Costs for this WET program have been estimated as follows:

- 1. The Watershed is large. Travel will be extensive. Reimbursement rate from the IRS is now 50 cents per mile.**
- 2. Natural Channel Design - Consulting Engineers, cost is \$105.00 per hour plus travel**
- 3. Salary for Project Manager is designed as half time at \$35.00 per hour for one year (1040 hours)**
- 4. Cost of Training Sessions/Meeting times - \$25.00 in kind value per hour for the participants; logs and sign-in sheets to be kept**
- 5. Refreshments and food will attract more members to the Training Sessions/meetings.**
- 6. Suzanne Menges, PhD, has served as a facilitative consultant for numerous ranchers along the San Francisco and the Blue. Her expertise in assistance in conducting Training Sessions/Meetings will be invaluable.**
- 7. Debra Mendelssohn, Consultant for the Gila Watershed Partnership, is recommended for visioning and directing groups such as this.**
- 8. Dr. George Ruyle, PhD, University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, has spent considerable time in the are working with the NRCD and will be of inestimable value in developing BMP's for livestock grazing, educational programs and application of grazing compliance and monitoring riparian areas.**
- 9. Modest amounts of additional computer, printer, cell phone and, camera equipment and assorted programs will be needed to supplement existing equipment, particularly for the Technical Committee.**
- 10. RC&D has modest amount of matching funds (cash direct) to assist in Watershed programs.**
- 11. RC&D has modest amounts of existing equipment, space and materials to assist in watershed related projects**
- 12. State Agencies (ADEQ, ADWR, State Land, Game and Fish) are all stakeholders in this project and will be making in-kind contribution to training, meetings, historical records, data and past e experience.**
- 13. Apache NRCD has been the driver behind much of this project; their contributions in terms of private time and expertise, can hardly be overvalued. In addition, many of their members will serve, without recompense, on the Technical Committee**
- 14. UCLR Partnership has created the ULCR HUC 15020001 Watershed Management Plan which, kept updated with the assistance members of the group, are invaluable in bring together the Watershed Improvements Council. In addition, many of their members will serve, without recompense, on the Technical Committee.**

XIII.2. Budget Form

Develop a draft budget based on the anticipated costs for completing the project within the proposed time schedule. Budget sheet is provided below. Applicants are encouraged to provide as much detail as possible. You may add lines and cost categories as needed.

GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED (60% of total cost maximum)		
Line Item	FUNDS	Additional Description and Comments
Admin. Costs (10% maximum)		
RC&D Administrator	\$12,250	RC&D changes for managing contract
SUBTOTAL:		
Salaries (Non-administrative)		
Project Manager	36,400	One year at half-time @ \$35 per hour
Ranch Consultants	5,000	Suzanne Menges, PhD, Clifton, AZ, used extensively by Gila Watershed Partnership; Dr. George Ruyle, PhD, University of Arizona College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Consulting Engineer	50,000	Natural Channel Design, their cost estimate
SUBTOTAL:		
Equipment		
Computer equipment	1,500	State of the art computer and notebook
Digital Camera	300	Specific for project
Four-in-one	300	Printer, scanner, copier, fax
Programs	1,500	Mapping and other specialized programs
GPS Monitors	300	For locations
Cell phone w/ wireless capability	1,500	Critical in an area without broadband, much less wireless
SUBTOTAL:		
Supplies		
Room rental, refreshments and food	2,500	For various training sessions, meeting times and spaces
Miscellaneous office	1,200	Office supplies, paper, etc., printer cartridges
SUBTOTAL:		
Education and Outreach		
Printing	2,500	Final report, other mailings
Advertising	2,500	Newspaper, radio and flyers
Travel and contact	5,000	Locating and coordinating with individual property owners in the watershed
Mediator Consultant	2,500	Facilitators and compliance managers (Debra Mendelsohn, Dr. George Ruyle)
Postage and Mailings	1,000	Mail, supplies and postage
Newsletter and E-mail groups info	500	Time and efforts to create and distribute e-mail notifications
SUBTOTAL:		
Other (Specify)		
Arizona NEMO	5,000	Mapping Services
Master Watershed Training Courses	3,000	Training Courses
SUBTOTAL:	\$122,500	
Total Grant Funds	\$134,750	

MATCHING FUNDS (40% of total cost minimum)		
	FUNDS	Description and Comments
Admin. Costs (10% maximum)		
RC&D In-kind match	2,500	RC&D Meeting space, staff support, administrative expenses
SUBTOTAL:		
Salaries (Non-administrative)		
RC&D Direct Match	5,000	Direct cash contribution from available RC&D funds
SUBTOTAL:		
Equipment		
RC&D In kind	750	Use of existing office equipment
SUBTOTAL:		
Supplies		

RC&D in kind	750	Direct cash contribution
SUBTOTAL:		
Education and Outreach		
Participants time	12,000	Average 24 Training Sessions/meetings, 10 person per session @ 25.00 per hour times two hours
Participants travel	1,500	As above, average travel 25 miles round trip @ .50 per mile
Participants individual one-on-one time	5,000	AS above, 20 stakeholders, 10 hours (life of project) x \$25.00
Participants study time with Natural Channel Design	7,500	Meeting with Natural Channel Design employees to explore area, review old projects, travel throughout their land area and educate on their thoughts on BMP's
State Land Department	5,000	In kind hours and contribution, 100 hours at \$50.00
Non Federal ADEQ	7,500	In kind consultation
Apache RC&D Board	2,500	Non-land owners, advisors and members
ULCR	3,500	Upper Little Colorado Partnership, in kind consulting
AZ Game and Fish	2,000	In kind consultations
Master Watershed Training	3,000	
SUBTOTAL:		
Other (Specify)		
SUBTOTAL:	\$58,500	
Total Matching Funds	\$58,500	

XIV. State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Form

STATEMENT: This project is a Watershed Training and Education Project. There is no planned disturbance of any lands, as noted below. Future NPS projects may fall into this category.

Any ADEQ action, including grant projects paid in-part with ADEQ funds, on state, federal, or private lands that may impact historic properties (i.e., any prehistoric or historic-period district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the State Register of Historic Places) require consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to the State Historic Preservation Act (ARS 41-861 to 864).

In order to make informed decisions and facilitate consultation with SHPO, ADEQ requires applicants to provide the project related information requested the SHPO form included in Appendix E of the RFGA. Please append the information requested in the SHPO form below.

Appendix E. State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Form

Any ADEQ action, including grant projects paid in-part with ADEQ funds, on state, federal, or private lands that may impact historic properties (i.e., any prehistoric or historic-period district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the State Register of Historic Places) require consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to the State Historic Preservation Act (ARS 41-861 to 864). ADEQ is legally responsible for making determinations and findings.

In order to make informed decisions and facilitate consultation with SHPO, ADEQ requires applicants to provide the project related information requested below. By working together, we can seek out ways that “the historical and cultural foundations of this state can be preserved as a living part of our community life and development” (State Historic Preservation Act).

For Each On-the-ground Project Site

Please prepare and answer the following questions pertaining to historic properties and preservation. Use multiple forms as needed. Add map(s), drawings and pictures where appropriate. When complete, copy and paste this information into your grant application in the requested area.

1. Project Location

Indicate the location of the project sites, including:

- County,
- Township, range and section
- Nearest Town or City

Describe the conditions of the land in the project area. Attach a copy a USGS topographic map with the project area clearly marked. On the map, please specify the area(s) where impacts will occur.

Provide project location information (use as much space as needed)

2. Project Description:

Describe the buildings or structures within project area and their age. Describe any ground-disturbing activities. Indicate whether the proposed project could impact historical properties, should they be present.

Provide project description (use as much space as needed)

3. Steps Taken to Identify Historic Properties

- Indicate whether the project area has been previously surveyed to determine the presence or absence of historic properties? If it has, attach a report.
- Are buildings, structures, or objects 50 years old or older present in the project area? If yes, include description.
- Are any prehistoric or historic-period archaeological sites present? If yes, please list and briefly describe.
- What does the state or federal land manager, if any, say about historic properties present in the project area? Attach letter, if applicable.
- What efforts, if any, would be reasonable to determine the presence or absence of historic properties?

Provide synopsis of steps taken to identify historic properties (use as much space as needed)

4. Potential for Historic impacts

In the applicant's opinion, which determination listed below is appropriate for this project based on the information presented above:

- ☐ No impacts/ historic properties not present
- ☐ No impacts/ historic properties present. Describe how historic properties will be avoided or protected.
- ☐ Negative impacts to historic properties. Suggest treatment measures.
- ☐ Positive impacts to historic properties. Describe any positive impacts to historic properties that could be attributed to the proposed project.

Describe how any negative impacts to historic properties will be avoided and describe potential positive impacts (use as much space as needed)

For SHPO Use Only - Record of Consultation

SHPO advises ADEQ on the completeness of identification effort, determination of effect, and any proposed treatment measures.

- ☐ Concur with determination
- ☐ Do not concur with determination
- ☐ Request More Information
- ☐ Recommend that the project area be surveyed to determine the presence or absence of historic properties by a qualified professional
- ☐ Additional comments attached

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Final LCR Coyote Creek 319 WQIG 1