

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please submit by 5:00 p.m. on August 3, 2015, to UFR.contact@gmail.com

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Sierra County Road Department
Name of Primary Contact	Tim Beals
Name of Secondary Contact	Bryan Davey
Mailing Address	P.O. Box 98 Downieville, CA 95936
E-mail	tbeals@sierracounty.ca.gov
Phone	530-289-3201
Other Cooperating Agencies /	US Forest Service, SVRCD, CA Fish and Wildlife
Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization	Yes
committed to the project through	
completion? If not, please explain	

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	MS-33:Sierra County Road Improvements		
Project Category	☐ Agricultural Land Stewardship		
	☐ Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies		
	☐ Tribal Advisory Committee		
	☐ Uplands/Forest		
Project Description	Drain stormwater on several County roads by installing		
(Briefly describe the project,	culverts and drains, building small detention basins, creating		
in 300 words or less)	drainages, implementing stream bank and land erosion		
	control measures and reestablishing historic flows.		
Project Location Description (e.g.,	Sierra County County maintained roads: Smithneck Road,		
along the south bank of stream/river	Antelope Road, Old Truckee Road, Lemon Canyon Road,		
between river miles or miles from	Campbell Hot Springs Road, Henness Pass Road (Little Truckee		
Towns/intersection and/or address):	OHV), West Willow, A-23, Heriot Lane, A-24, Calpine Cutoff		
Latitude:	39.47327		
Longitude:	-120.84616		

III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

For each of the objectives addressed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project contributes to attaining the objective and how the project outcomes will be quantified. If the project does not address *any* of the IRWM plan objectives, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity of the Region.

	Will the project		Quantification (e.g. acres of
	address		streams/wetlands
Upper Feather River IRWM	the	Brief explanation of project	restored or
Objectives:	objective?	linkage to selected Objective	enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic	⊠ Yes	Restore historic flows and	,
functions.		restore meadow/wetlands.	
	□ N/A	Implement stabilization	
		measures to stream banks and	
		hillsides to reduce erosion and	
		resulting sedimentation and	
		turbidity in local creeks and the	
		North Fork of the Feather River.	
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in	☐ Yes		
the Region.	⊠ N/A		
Build communication and	⊠ Yes	This project is a collaborative	
collaboration among water		effort of the following	
resources stakeholders in the	□ N/A	entities/agencies: USFS,	
Region.		California FWS, SVRCD, who all	
		support and contribute to	
		improvements to Public Land Resources.	
Work with DWR to develop	☐ Yes	Resources.	
strategies and actions for the	□ 162		
management, operation, and	⊠ N/A		
control of SWP facilities in the	M/A		
Upper Feather River			
Watershed in order to increase			
water supply, recreational, and			
environmental benefits to the			
Region.			
Encourage municipal service	☐ Yes		
providers to participate in			
regional water management	⊠ N/A		
actions that improve water			
supply and water quality.			
Continue to actively engage in	☐ Yes		
FERC relicensing of			
hydroelectric facilities in the	⊠ N/A		
Region.			
Address economic challenges	☐ Yes		

_	I	ivis-55. Sierra Cour	
	Will the		Quantification
	project		(e.g. acres of
	address		streams/wetlands
Upper Feather River IRWM	the	Brief explanation of project	restored or
Objectives:	objective?	linkage to selected Objective	enhanced)
of municipal service providers		,	,
to serve customers.	⊠ N/A		
to serve eastorners.	N//\		
Protect, restore, and enhance	⊠ Yes	Install storm runoff control	
the quality of surface and		management practices and	
groundwater resources for all	□ N/A	sediment traps, restore flows	
beneficial uses, consistent with	I IN/A	truncated by roads, improve	
the RWQC Basin Plan.		water quality, and implement	
the KWQC Basiii i laii.		meadow restoration. The	
		project benefits wildlife and	
		fisheries.	
Address water resources and	☐ Yes	noncreo.	
wastewater needs of DACs and			
Native Americans.	⊠ N/A		
Coordinate management of	⊠ Yes	Many road drainages are	
recharge areas and protect		adjacent to recharge areas and	
groundwater resources.	□ N/A	meadows. These meadows and	
8	L N/A	wetlands will be restored and	
		protected by this project,	
Improve coordination of land	⊠ Yes	County, State and Federal	
use and water resources		Agencies will coordinate efforts	
planning.	□ N/A	to benefit natural resources	
		through this project.	
Maximize agricultural,	☐ Yes	-	
environmental and municipal			
water use efficiency.	⊠ N/A		
Effectively address climate	☐ Yes		
change adaptation and/or			
mitigation in water resources	⊠ N/A		
management.	,		
Improve efficiency and	☐ Yes		
reliability of water supply and			
other water-related	⊠ N/A		
infrastructure.			
Enhance public awareness and	☐ Yes		
understanding of water			
management issues and needs.	⊠ N/A		
Address economic challenges	☐ Yes		
of agricultural producers.			
	⊠ N/A		
Work with counties/	⊠ Yes	Sierra County Road	
communities/groups to make		Department, and our	
sure staff capacity exists for	□ N/A	collaborators, US Forest	
and a state of the			

	Will the		Quantification
	project		(e.g. acres of
	address		streams/wetlands
Upper Feather River IRWM	the	Brief explanation of project	restored or
Objectives:	objective?	linkage to selected Objective	enhanced)
actual administration and		Service, SVRCD, CA Fish and	
implementation of grant		Wildlife Service, will ensure the	
funding.		staff capacity to successfully	
		administer and implement of	
		this grant project.	

If no objectives are addressed, describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity for the Region:				
IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS Please provide a summary of the expected proje if not applicable; do no leave a blank cell. Note				
If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of th	e project w	ith respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	⊠ N/A			
b. Disadvantaged Communities ¹	⊠ N/A			
c. Environmental Justice ²	⊠ N/A			
d. Drought Preparedness	□ N/A	Improvements will restore and/or direct previously impaired systems into watercourses or meadow areas.		
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change ³	⊠ N/A			
f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	⊠ N/A			
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	⊠ N/A			

DWR encourages multiple benefit projects which address one or more of the following elements (PRC §75026(a). Indicate which elements are addressed by your project.

a.	Water supply reliability, water	⊠ Yes	g. Drinking water treatment and		☐ Yes
	conservation, water use efficiency	□ N/A		distribution	⊠ N/A
b.	Stormwater capture, storage, clean-	⊠ Yes	h.	Watershed protection and	⊠ Yes
	up, treatment, management	□ N/A		management	□ N/A
c.	Removal of invasive non-native	⊠ Yes	i.	Contaminant and salt removal	☐ Yes
	species, creation/enhancement of	□ N/A		through reclamation/desalting,	⊠ N/A
	wetlands,			other treatment technologies	
	acquisition/protection/restoration			and conveyance of recycled	
	of open space and watershed lands			water for distribution to users	
d.	Non-point source pollution	⊠ Yes	j.	Planning and implementation of	☐ Yes
	reduction, management and	□ N/A	multipurpose flood		⊠ N/A
	monitoring			management programs	
e.	Groundwater recharge and	⊠ Yes	k.	Ecosystem and fisheries	⊠ Yes
	management projects	□ N/A		restoration and protection	□ N/A
f.	Water banking, exchange,	⊠ Yes			
	reclamation, and improvement of	□ N/A			
	water quality				

¹ A Disadvantaged Community is defined as a community with an annual median household (MHI) income that is less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual MHI. DWR's DAC mapping is available on the UFR website (http://featherriver.org/maps/).

² Environmental Justice is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. An example of environmental justice benefit would be to improve conditions (e.g. water supply, flooding, sanitation) in an area of racial minorities.

³ Climate change effects are likely to include increased flooding, extended drought, and associated secondary effects such as increased wildfire risk, erosion, and sedimentation.

V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

For each resource management strategy (RMS) employed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description in the table below of how the project incorporates the strategy. A description of the RMS can be found in Volume 2 of the 2013 California Water Plan (http://featherriver.org/2013-california-water-plan-update/).

	Will the Project	
Resource Management Strategy	incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand	KIVI3:	п аррисаріе
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Urban water use efficiency	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	⊠ Yes □ No	Reduced erosion and sediment in waterways and better flood management through
		improved drainages guiding water to meadows/wetlands.
Improve Operational Efficiency and T	ransfers	
Conveyance – regional/local	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
System reoperation	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Water transfers	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Precipitation Enhancement	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Municipal recycled water	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Surface storage – regional/local	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	□ Yes ⊠ No	
Matching water quality to water use	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Pollution prevention	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Salt and salinity management	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Urban storm water runoff management	⊠ Yes □ No	Road drainages will be better controlled and properly discharged.
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Ecosystem restoration		Reduced stream bank erosion and reduced
	⊠ Yes □ No	sedimentation and turbidity in Indian Creek improve cold freshwater habitat and spawning grounds.
Forest management	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Land use planning and management	⊠ Yes □ No	Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented, and the operation and maintenance of those BMPs will foster

	Will the Project incorporate	Description of how RMS to be employed,
Resource Management Strategy	RMS?	if applicable
		coordination among various agencies.
Recharge area protection	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Sediment management	⊠ Yes □ No	Reduced sediment in creeks & rivers
Watershed management	⊠ Yes □ No	Improved management of drainages and meadows/wetlands will result in improved watershed health and values
People and Water		
Economic incentives	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Outreach and engagement	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Water and culture	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Water-dependent recreation	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
Wastewater/NPDES	☐ Yes ⊠ No	

Other RMS addressed	and exp	lanation:
---------------------	---------	-----------

Water Quality improvements, reduce or eliminate drainage overflow onto County Roads, improve floodplain function

VI. PROJECT COST AND FINANCING

Please provide any estimates of project cost, sources of funding, and operation and maintenance costs, as well as the source of the project cost in the table below.

	PROJECT BUDGET							
Pro	Project serves a need of a DAC?: ☐ Yes ☒ No							
	Funding Match Waiver request?: ☐ Yes ☒ No							
		Requested	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source*	Cost Share: Other State				
		Grant	(Funding	Fund	Total			
	Category	Amount	Match)	Source*	Cost			
a.	Direct Project Administration	\$5,000	10,000 County Road Fund	0	\$15,000			
b.	Land Purchase/Easement	0	0	0	0			
c.	Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental	\$25,000	0	0	\$25,000			
d.	Construction/Implementation	\$400,000	0	0	\$400,000			
e.	Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement	\$5,000	5,000 County Road Fund	0	\$10,000			
f.	Construction Administration	\$15,000	0	0	\$15,000			
g.	Other Costs	0	0	0	0			
h.	Construction/Implementation Contingency	\$45,000	1,500 County Road Fund	0	\$46,500			
			(10% of to	total)				
i.	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)	\$495,000	16,500 Sierra County Road Fund	0	\$511,500			
j.	Can the Project be phased? ⊠ Yes	□ No If yes , p	rovide cost breakd	lown by phases	·			
•		Project Cost	O&M Cost	Description	of Phase			
	Phase 1	\$170,500	No O&M	Year 1: Approximately 1/3				
			anticipated	of implementat				
			during first	culverts, drain				
			year	rap, and other BMPs to				
				enhance watershed function and reduce				
				flooding of some County				
				roads included	•			
				project.				
	Phase 2	\$170,500	TBD	Year 2: Approxi	-			
				of implementat				
				culverts, drain pipes, rip				
				rap, and other enhance waters				
				function and re				
				flooding of som				
				roads included	•			

				project.
	Phase 3	\$170,500	TBD	Year 1: Approximately 1/3 of implementation: install culverts, drain pipes, rip rap, and other BMPs to enhance watershed function and reduce flooding of some County roads included in this project.
	Phase 4			
k.	Explain how operation and maintenan financed for the 20-year planning periodic implementation (not grant funded).		Annual County b	oudget
I.	Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been comp	oleted?	☐ Yes ⊠ No	
m.	Describe what impact there may be if not funded (300 words or less)	Continued bank and flooding.	erosion, water turbidity,	
*List all sources of funding. Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).				

VIII. **PROJECT STATUS AND SCHEDULE**

Please provide a status of the project, level of completion as well as a description of the activities planned for each project stage. If unknown, enter TBD.

	Check the Current			Description of	Planned/ Actual Start	Planned/ Actual
	Project			Activities in Each	Date	Completion
Project Stage	Stage	Con	npleted?	Project Stage	(mm/yr)	Date (mm/yr)
a. Assessment and			Yes	Specific site ID,	Within 60	1-3 years after
Evaluation	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	No	Agency coordination,	days of grant	grant funding
			N/A	develop scope of work	procurement	secured
b. Final Design			Yes	Implementation plans	Within 180	1-3 years after
		\boxtimes	No	and materials lists	days of grant	grant funding secured
			N/A		procurement	secureu
c. Environmental	_		Yes	Anticipated	Within 365	1-3 years after
Documentation		\boxtimes	No	exemption(s)	days of grant	grant funding
(CEQA / NEPA)			N/A		procurement	secured
d. Permitting			Yes	TBD	TBD	1-3 years after
		\boxtimes	No			grant funding
			N/A			secured
e. Construction			Yes	N/A Agency work – no	N/A Force	1-3 years after
Contracting		\boxtimes	No	contracting required	Account	grant funding
			N/A			secured

						MS-33: Sier	ra County Roa	ad Improvements
f.	Construction Implementation			Yes No	TBD		TBD	3 years after grant funding secured
				N/A				
	ovide explanation			project				
sta	age is checked as c	urrent status	}					
					•			
IX.	PROJECT TE	CHNICAL FE	ASIB	ILITY				
Ple	ase provide any re	elated docum	ents (date, title	, author, and	page numbe	ers) that desc	ribe and confirm
	e technical feasibili					_		
	thered on the UFR					<i></i>		
a.	List the adopted	planning doc	umer	nts the pro	pposed	Sierra Cou	ntv General F	Plan, RCD Plan,
	project is consist			-	-		•	CB Basin Plan for
	Plans, UWMPs, G			• •	-		•	n Joaquin Rivers
	Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).				·			
b.			Smithneck Wildlife Area EIR					
	feasibility of this project.			Antelope a	and Smithned	k CRMP		
c.	Concisely describ	e the scientif	fic ba	sis (e.g. ho	ow much	For the pr	otection of a	quatic species
	research has been	-	of th	e propose	ed project in		at, sediment l	•
	300 words or less	S.					=	ns and rivers are
					_	•	Quality Control	
						ne Sacrament		
						-	asin Plan) and by	
								is project will
							diment inputs	
							• •	of compliance
							asin Plan and	established
d.	Does the project	implement a	roon	tachnalac	nu lo a	TMDLs.		
u.	alternate forms o			_			¬ N	•
	techniques, etc.).		ycieu	materiais,	LID		□ No □ N/	А
	teeriniques, etc.).					ir yes, piea	ase describe.	
						Recycled a	schalt	
						necycleu a	13 pilait	
e.	Are you an Urba	n Water Supp	olier¹ î	?		☐ Yes □	⊠ No □ N/	′A
f.	Are you are an A	gricultural W	ater S	Supplier ² ?		☐ Yes 🛭	⊠ No □ N/	′A

¹ Urban Water Supplier is defined as a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually.

g. Is the project related to groundwater?

 \square Yes \boxtimes No \square N/A If yes, please indicate which

groundwater basin.

² Agricultural Water Supplier is defined as a water supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water to 10,000 or more irrigated acres, excluding the acreage that receives recycled water.

Climate Change – Project Assessment Checklist

This climate change project assessment tool allows project applicants and the planning team to assess project consistency with Proposition 84 plan standards and RWMG plan assessment standards. The tool is a written checklist that asks GHG emissions and adaptation/resiliency questions.

Name of project: MS-33: Sierra County Road Improvements

Project applicant: Sierra County Road Department

GHG Emissions Assessment

The project will generate electricity.

The project will include new trees.

The project will affect wetland acreage.

The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk.

Project Construction Emissions (If you check any of the boxes, please see the attached worksheet)
 ☑ The project requires nonroad or off-road engines, equipment, or vehicles to complete. ☑ The project requires materials to be transported to the project site. ☑ The project requires workers to commute to the project site. ☑ The project is expected to generate GHG emissions for other reasons. ☑ The project does not have a construction phase and/or is not expected to generate GHG emissions during the construction phase.
Operating Emissions (If you check any of the boxes, please see the attached worksheet)
The project requires energy to operate.

Project operations are expected to generate or reduce GHG emissions for other reasons.

Adaptation & Resiliency Assessment

Water Supply
Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following
high priority water supply vulnerability issues:
Not applicable ■ Not applicable Not applicable
Reduced snowmelt
Unmet local water needs (drought)
☐ Increased invasive species
Water Demand
Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following
high priority water demand vulnerability issues:
Not applicable ■ Not applicable Not applicable
☐ Increasing seasonal water use variability
Unmet in-stream flow requirements
Climate-sensitive crops
Groundwater drought resiliency
Water curtailment effectiveness

Water Quality Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority water quality vulnerability issues:
 Not applicable Increasing catastrophic wildfires Eutrophication (excessive nutrient pollution in a waterbody, often followed by algae blooms and other related water quality issues) Seasonal low flows and limited abilities for waterbodies to assimilate pollution Water treatment facility operations Unmet beneficial uses (municipal and domestic water supply, water contact recreation, cold freshwater habitat, spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, etc.)
Reduced sediment loads and turbidity result in improved cold freshwater habitat and spawning habitat.
Flooding Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority flooding vulnerability issues: ☐ Not applicable ☐ Aging critical flood protection ☐ Wildfires ☐ Critical infrastructure in a floodplain ☐ Insufficient flood control facilities
Culverts and BMPs will be implemented to reduce flooding of County roads and runoff of sediment and other possible contaminants into local waterways. The project will reduce erosion and sedimentation and direct drainage water into retention basins/meadows/wetlands for flood management.

Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Climate Change- Project Assessment Tool

Ecosystem and Habitat Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority ecosystem and habitat vulnerability issues:
 Not applicable □ Climate-sensitive fauna or flora □ Recreation and economic activity □ Quantified environmental flow requirements ☑ Erosion and sedimentation □ Endangered or threatened species □ Fragmented habitat
The project when completed will reduce the erosion and sedimentation in waterways, and will restore natural watercourses and meadows/wetlands to improve ecosystem function and habitat for wildlife and fisheries.
Hydropower Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority hydropower vulnerability issues: Not applicable Reduced hydropower output

Upper Feather River IRWMP Project Assessment - GHG Emissions Analysis

MS-33: Sierra County Road Improvements

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

The project requires non-road or off-road engines, equipment, or vehicles to complete. If yes:

	Maximum		
	Number Per	Total 8-Hour Days in	
Type of Equipment	Day	Operation	Total MTCO₂e
Excavators	1	5	2
Tractors/Loaders/Bac			
khoes	2	5	3
Dumpers/Tenders	1	5	0
Off-Highway Trucks	1	5	6
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
_	•	Total Emissions	11

Χ	The project requires materials to be transported to the project site. I	f yes:

		<u> </u>
	Average Trip	
Total Number of	Distance	
Round Trips	(Miles)	Total MTCO ₂ e
1	0 30	0

The project requires workers to commute to the project site. If yes:

Average Number		Average Round Trip Distance Traveled	
of Workers	of Workdays	(Miles)	Total MTCO₂e
5	10	60	1

The projec	t is expected to generate GHG emissions for other reasons. If yes, explain:
	

The project does not have a construction phase and/or is not expected to generate GHG emissions during the construction phase.

MS-33: Sierra County Road Improvements				
Project Operating Emissions The project requires energy to operate. If yes:				
The projec	Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total MTCO ₂ e	
		kWh (Electricity)		0
		Therm (Natural Gas)		0
The projec	t will generate electricity. If yes:	<u></u>	7	
	Annual kWh Generated	Total MTCO₂e		
	*A pagativa valua indicator CHC ro	ductions	1	
*A negative value indicates GHG reductions				
The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:				
	Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total MTCO ₂ e	1	
		0		
	*A negative value indicates GHG re	ductions	_	
The projec	t will affect wetland acreage. If yes:	I=	1	
	Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total MTCO₂e	-	
	*A pogative value indicates GHG re	ductions	<u> 1</u>	
*A negative value indicates GHG reductions				
The project will include new trees. If yes:				
	Acres of Trees Planted	Total MTCO ₂ e]	
	(0	-	
*A negative value indicates GHG reductions				
Desirat an antique and an analysis of the second and the second an				
Project operations are expected to generate or reduce GHG emissions for other reasons. If yes, explain:				
ехріанн				
GHG Emissions Summary				
	on and development will generate a		13 MTCO₂e	
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:				0 MTCO₂e
2 6.1.2 , 2.2 , 3.5 3.2				