2. **Project Name:** Douglas District Cattleguards  

3a. **State:** Arizona  
3b. **County:** Cochise

4. **Project Submitted By:** Joseph Harris, USFS  
5. **Date:** January 21, 2011

6. **Contact Phone Number:** (520) 364-6821  
7. **Contact E-mail:** josephharris@fs.fed.us

8. **Project Location:** District wide (Chiricahua, Peloncillo and Dragoon Mountains)  
   a. **National Forest(s):** Coronado Natl. Forest  
   b. **Forest Service District:** Douglas Ranger District  
   c. **Location** (Township-Range-Section) District Wide

9. **Project Goals and Objectives:** To purchase cattleguards and bases that would be installed in various locations across the Ranger District. Locations where vehicular traffic causes conflict with livestock management in the form of gates being left in the wrong position (open when they should be shut, for instance). This would minimize the impacts to the permittee and rangeland, keeping cattle distributed where they should be and lessening the workload of returning those cattle to their correct pasture. The installation of cattleguards would also decrease the inconvenience to motorists, allowing passage through pasture fences without having to exit their vehicles to open gates.

10. **Project Description:**  
   a. **Brief:** *(in one sentence)* Obtain funding necessary to purchase cattleguards and bases to install as necessary across the Douglas Ranger District.  
   b. **Detailed:** Due to increased vehicular traffic in some areas across the Douglas Ranger district, many gates are being left in undesirable positions for the livestock owner (open gates being shut, and closed gates being left open). This allows the livestock to move into pastures they aren’t supposed to be in, creating more work for the rancher. This also can create dangerous situations for the livestock when they drift into a pasture without water and get trapped there. Also, when gates are left open onto roadways, motorists can be in danger of collision as well. Cattleguards would increase motorist convenience as well, since getting out of their vehicles to open or close gates would no longer be necessary.

11. **Types of Lands Involved?** US Forest Service land  
   State/Private/Other lands involved? ☐ Yes    X No  
   **Land Status:**
   If Yes, specify:
12. How does the proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? (Check at least 1)

- X Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure.
- X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems.
- X Restores and improves land health.
- ☐ Restores water quality

13. Project Type

a. Check all that apply: (check at least 1)

| X Road Maintenance          | ☐ Trail Maintenance          |
| ☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration | ☐ Trail Obliteration         |
| X Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): replacing gates with cattleguards |
| ☐ Soil Productivity Improvement     | ☐ Forest Health Improvement |
| ☐ Watershed Restoration & Maintenance | ☐ Wildlife Habitat Restoration |
| ☐ Fish Habitat Restoration        | ☐ Control of Noxious Weeds   |
| ☐ Reestablish Native Species      | ☐ Fuels Management/Fire Prevention |
| ☐ Implement CWPP Project          | ☐ Other Project Type (specify): |

b. Primary Purpose (select only 1): Existing infrastructure maintenance

14. Identify What the Project Will Accomplish

- Miles of road maintained:
- Miles of road decommissioned/obliterated:
- Number of structures maintained/improved: Several (approx. 10) cattleguards placed on various road/fence crossings on the Douglas Ranger District
- Acres of soil productivity improved:
- Miles of stream/river restored/improved:
- Miles of fish habitat restored/improved:
- Acres of native species reestablished:
- Acres of hazardous fuel treatment:
- Miles of trail maintained:
- Miles of trail obliterated:
- Acres of forest health improved (including fuels reduction):
15. Estimated Project Start Date: 03/01/2011
16. Estimated Project Completion Date: 07/15/2012

17. List known partnerships or collaborative opportunities: Permittees on the various allotments will be asked to contribute labor and/or some fence materials to assist in the installation of the cattleguards.

18. Identify benefits to communities: Improve livestock distribution thereby increasing rangeland health, provide job opportunities for local heavy equipment operators, increase safety to livestock and motorists, and provide convenience to motorists by not having to open gates.

19. How does the project benefit federal lands/resources? By increasing distribution/rangeland health, increasing convenience to motorists and creating a safer environment for livestock/motorists.

20. What is the Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment? (check at least 1)
- X Contract
- X Federal Workforce
- ☐ County Workforce
- ☐ Volunteers
- ☐ Grant
- ☐ Agreement
- ☐ Americorps
- ☐ YCC/CCC Crews
- ☐ Job Corps
- ☐ Stewardship Contract
- ☐ Merchantable Timber Pilot
- X Other (specify): Permittees or other local heavy equipment operators

21. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Timber? ☐ Yes  X No

22. Anticipated Project Costs
a. Title II Funds Requested: $55,000.00
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? ☐ Yes  X No
23. **Identify Source(s) of Other Funding:** Federally allocated funding to oversee operations, provide heavy equipment where applicable or necessary and participate in the installation, as well as permittee funding to assist with labor and heavy equipment costs.

24. **Monitoring Plan (provide as attachment)**
   a. Provide a plan that describes your process for tracking and explaining the effects of this project on your environmental and community goals outlined above:

   Initially, an inspection will be made to determine if the cattleguard is needed in a certain location. During installation, inspections will also be made to determine if the work done was completed according to the specifications. Following that, annual inspections are made of all structural range improvements to determine their condition and functionality.

   b. Identify who will conduct the monitoring:

   Forest Service personnel will conduct the monitoring of the structures themselves and the rangeland surrounding them on a yearly basis in concurrence with grazing allotment inspections.

   c. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Worksheet 1, Item k):

      See below

25. **Identify remedies for failure to comply with the terms of the agreement.**

If project cannot be completed under the terms of this agreement:

   X Unused funds will be returned to the RAC account.

   □ Other, please explain:

---

**Project Recommended By:**

/s/ (INSERT Signature)  
Chairperson  
Resource Advisory Committee

**Project Approved By:**

/s/ (INSERT Signature)  
Forest Supervisor  
National Forest
## Project Cost Analysis Worksheet

### Worksheet 1

*Please submit this worksheet with your proposal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution</th>
<th>Column B Requested Title II Contribution</th>
<th>Column C Other Contributions</th>
<th>Column D Total Available Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Field Work &amp; Site Surveys</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NEPA/CEQA</td>
<td>Not req’d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ESA Consultation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Permit Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Project Design &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contract/Grant Preparation</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Contract/Grant Administration</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Contract/Grant Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Salaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Monitoring</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Partner Indirect Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Project Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. FS Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$80,050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:

  a. Pre-NEPA Costs
  
g. Includes Contracting/Grant Officer Representative (COR) costs. Excludes Contracting/Grant Officer costs.
  
i. Cost of implementing project
  
l. Examples include overhead charges from other partners, vehicles, equipment rentals, travel, etc.
  
n. Forest Service indirect costs, including contracting/grant officer costs if needed.