



featherriver.org

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

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	Plumas Eureka Community Services District
Name of Primary Contact	Frank Motzkus, General Manager
Name of Secondary Contact	Heather Kotrc, Administrative Manager
Mailing Address	200 Lundy Lane, Blairsden, CA 96103
E-mail	frmotzkus@digitalpath.net
Phone	(530) 836-1953
Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain	Project completion would be dependent on funding alternatives.

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	MS-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant #7 Lift Station Replacement
Project Category	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land Stewardship <input type="checkbox"/> Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Municipal Services Water Supply/Water Quality Community Water/Wastewater <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Advisory Committee <input type="checkbox"/> Uplands/Forest
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	The Wastewater treatment plant #7 lift station is approaching 35 years old. It was identified in 2005 as needing to be replaced during the treatment plant upgrade project of 2007. The lift station work was cut from the original treatment plant project due to overall project costs. The existing location of the lift station borders a residence's front yard and raw sewage could flow into the Middle Fork of the Feather River if an overflow occurs. The replacement project will move the lift station to a more appropriate location and provide for 12,000 gallons of emergency storage of raw sewage.
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from	Project will remove the existing lift station at 226 Sequoia Circle and build the new across the street at 239 Sequoia

Towns/intersection and/or address):	Circle.
Latitude:	39° 47' 31.7322"
Longitude:	120° 38' 59.7588"

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.

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	N/A		
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	N/A		
Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	N/A		
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Yes	PECSD is a municipal service provider. The new, relocated, lift station with 12,000 gallons of emergency storage of raw sewage will reduce the risk of raw sewage contamination to the Middle Fork of the Feather River and a resident's yard.	Potential reduction of 12,000 gallons of raw sewage spilling into the Middle Fork of the Feather River and an resident's yard.
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Yes	Grant funding is necessary to implement this project, which will increase reliability of present	

MS-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant No.7 Lift Station Replacement

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
		and future collection and treatment of raw sewage.	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Yes	New lift station would increase the protection of the Middle Fork of the Feather River from raw sewage.	12,000 gallons of emergency storage of raw sewage
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	N/A		
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	N/A		
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	N/A		
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	N/A		
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	N/A		
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	N/A		
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	N/A		
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	N/A		
Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Yes	PECSO is prepared to work with the IRWM and the County to administer any resultant grant and see this project through to completion. We are prepared to resource accordingly.	

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 project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do not leave a blank cell**. Note that DWR encourages multi-benefit projects.

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	N/A	
b. Disadvantaged Communities¹	N/A	
c. Environmental Justice²	Yes	PECSD ensures fair and equal services regardless of race, culture, income, or any other cultural factors. The new, relocated, lift will improve sanitation for the service area.
d. Drought Preparedness	N/A	
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change³	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	
<p>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/).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>³ Climate change effects are likely to include increased flooding, extended drought, and associated secondary effects such as increased wildfire risk, erosion, and sedimentation.</p>		

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 conservation, water use efficiency	N/A	g. Drinking water treatment and distribution	N/A
b. Stormwater capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, management	N/A	h. Watershed protection and management	Yes
c. Removal of invasive non-native species, creation/enhancement of	N/A	i. Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation/desalting,	

MS-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant No.7 Lift Station Replacement

wetlands, acquisition/protection/restoration of open space and watershed lands		other treatment technologies and conveyance of recycled water for distribution to users	N/A
d. Non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring	Yes	j. Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs	N/A
e. Groundwater recharge and management projects	N/A	k. Ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection	N/A
f. Water banking, exchange, reclamation, and improvement of water quality	N/A		

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/>).

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	No	
Urban water use efficiency	No	
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	No	
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	No	
System reoperation	No	
Water transfers	No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	No	
Precipitation Enhancement	No	
Municipal recycled water	No	
Surface storage – regional/local	No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	No	
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	No	
Matching water quality to water use	No	
Pollution prevention	Yes	Protects the Middle Fork of the Feather River from raw sewage overflows.
Salt and salinity management	No	
Urban storm water runoff management	No	

MS-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant No.7 Lift Station Replacement

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	No	
Ecosystem restoration	No	
Forest management	No	
Land use planning and management	No	
Recharge area protection	No	
Sediment management	No	
Watershed management	No	
People and Water		
Economic incentives	No	
Outreach and engagement	No	
Water and culture	No	
Water-dependent recreation	No	
Wastewater/NPDES	Yes	Adding safeguards to ensure the Middle Fork of the Feather River does not get contaminated with raw sewage.

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

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					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	Direct Project Administration	75%	25%	0	Unknown
b.	Land Purchase/Easement	75%	25%	0	Unknown
c.	Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental	75%	25%	0	Unknown
d.	Construction/Implementation	75%	25%	0	Unknown
e.	Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement	75%	25%	0	Unknown
f.	Construction Administration	75%	25%	0	Unknown
g.	Other Costs	75%	25%	0	Unknown
h.	Construction/Implementation Contingency	75%	25%	0	Unknown
i.	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)				1,000,000 (Estimate based on 2005 costs)
j.	Can the Project be phased? No If yes, provide cost breakdown by phases				
		Project Cost	O&M Cost	Description of Phase	
	Phase 1				
	Phase 2				
	Phase 3				
	Phase 4				
k.	Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).	Service rates would be increased to meet O&M costs when needed.			
l.	Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?	No			
m.	Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)	Possible lift station failure. Raw sewage would overflow into the Middle Fork of the Feather River.			
*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**.

Project Stage	Check the Current Project Stage	Completed?	Description of Activities in Each Project Stage	Planned/ Actual Start Date (mm/yr)	Planned/ Actual Completion Date (mm/yr)
a. Assessment and Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
b. Final Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
d. Permitting	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
e. Construction Contracting	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
f. Construction Implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	TBD	TBD	TBD
Provide explanation if more than one project stage is checked as current status					

IX. PROJECT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

Please provide any related documents (date, title, author, and page numbers) that describe and confirm the technical feasibility of the project. See www.featherriver.org/catalog/index.php for documents gathered on the UFR Region.

a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	2005 Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) "PECSW Wastewater Treatment Plant #7 Improvement Project" prepared by Shaw Engineering.
b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	The PER would need to be updated to reflect current PECSW conditions.
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) of the proposed project in 300 words or less.	The Wastewater treatment plant #7 lift station is approaching 35 years old. It was identified in 2005 as needing to be replaced during the treatment plant upgrade project of 2007. The lift station work was cut from the original treatment plant project due to overall project costs. The existing location of the lift station borders a residence's front yard and raw sewage could flow into the Middle Fork of the Feather River if an overflow occurs.
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	No
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier¹?	No
f. Are you an Agricultural Water Supplier²?	No
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	No
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

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-31 Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 7 Lift Station

Project applicant: Plumas Eureka Community Services District

GHG Emissions Assessment

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.
- The project will generate electricity.
- The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk.
- The project will affect wetland acreage.
- The project will include new trees.
- 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
- 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
- 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.)

The new, relocated, lift station with 12,000 gallons of emergency storage of raw sewage will reduce the risk of raw sewage contamination to the Middle Fork of the Feather River and a resident's yard.

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

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

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-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant No.7 Lift Station Replacement

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

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

Type of Equipment	Maximum Number Per Day	Total 8-Hour Days in Operation	Total MTCO ₂ e
Surfacing Equipment	1	4	3
Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	1	0
Cranes	1	5	4
Crushing/Proc. Equipment	1	2	1
Skid Steer Loaders	1	10	1
Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	1	10	3
			0
			0
			0
			0
Total Emissions			11

The project requires materials to be transported to the project site. If yes:

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total MTCO ₂ e
5	100	1

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

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total MTCO ₂ e
2	30	100	2

The project 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.

Upper Feather River IRWMP
Project Assessment - GHG Emissions Analysis

MS-31: Wastewater Treatment Plant No.7 Lift Station Replacement

Project Operating Emissions

The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total MTCO ₂ e
7,000	kWh (Electricity)	1
	Therm (Natural Gas)	0

The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total MTCO ₂ e
	0

*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
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total MTCO ₂ e
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total MTCO ₂ e
0	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

Project operations are expected to generate or reduce GHG emissions for other reasons. If yes, explain:

GHG Emissions Summary

Construction and development will generate approximately:	14 MTCO ₂ e
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	1 MTCO ₂ e