UPPER FEATHER RIVER
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
Regional Water Management Group

Sharon Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Paul Roen, Sierra County
Jeff Engel, Plumas County
Doug Teeter, Butte County
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Rick Roberti, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Groundwater Management District
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

AGENDA FOR REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GROUP MEETING OF
June 22, 2018 TO BE HELD AT 1:00 P.M. IN THE
PLUMAS COUNTY PLANNING CONFERENCE ROOM, 555 MAIN STREET, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA

www.featherriver.org

AGENDA

The Regional Water Management Group of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Program welcomes you to its meetings, which are regularly held on the fourth Wednesday of every other month, and your interest is encouraged and appreciated.

Any item without a specified time on the agenda may be taken up at any time and in any order.

Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the Regional Water Management Group Chair. Any public comments made during a regular Regional Water Management Group meeting will be recorded. Members of the public may submit their comments in writing to be included in the public record.

CONSENT AGENDA: These matters include routine administrative actions. All items on the consent calendar will be voted on at some time during the meeting under "Consent Agenda." If you wish to have an item removed from the Consent Agenda, you may do so by addressing the Chairperson.

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact Randy Wilson at 530-283-6214. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. Auxiliary aids and services are available for people with disabilities.

STANDING ORDERS

1:00 P.M. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

ADDITIONS TO OR DELETIONS FROM THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY
Matters under the jurisdiction of the RWMG, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public at the beginning of the regular agenda and any off-agenda matters before the RWMG for consideration. However, California law prohibits the RWMG from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an urgency item by the RWMG. Any member of the public wishing to address the RWMG during the "Public Comment" period will be limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/REPORTS
Brief announcements.

CONSENT AGENDA
These items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. The RWMG will act upon them at one time without discussion. Any RWMG members, staff member or interested party may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda for discussion.

A) RWMG

Approve RWMG Meeting Summary for the regular meeting held on April 27, 2018.

ACTION AGENDA

1. INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT COORDINATION UPDATES

Summaries and discussion of various IRWM coordination efforts and updates. Informational.

a. Update on the IRWM Roundtable of Regions efforts.
b. Inter-regional IRWM Coordination.
c. Legislative Update.

2. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY AND TRIBAL INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

Update on the Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project and discussion of next steps. Informational.

3. IRWM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT PROPOSALS

Review and consider project proposals for inclusion in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan.

a. Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
b. Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
c. Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
d. Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Sacramento River Watershed Program and 34 North.
e. Community Water Tank Inspection, Indian Valley Community Services District.
f. Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
g. Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
h. District-Wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair, Sierra Water Works District #1 - Calpine.

4. IRWM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS

Review current list of implementation projects and discuss next steps in preparing for the upcoming round of Proposition 1 funding.

5. GRANT OPPORTUNITIES

Update on Department of Water Resources' next round of Proposition 1 funding and summary of current grant opportunities. Informational.

6. NEXT MEETING

Discuss staff support contract and next meeting date and content.

ADJOURNMENT

Upper Feather River IRWM
Regional Water Management Group

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

April 27, 2018

Recordings of the meeting are available here:
Video #1: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XO1bCLsASfg&feature=youtu.be
Video #2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQv-CQFZvBs&feature=youtu.be
Video #3: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2AMH_gbms2g&feature=youtu.be
Video #4: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5b20lPRZqpc&feature=youtu.be
Video #5: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aBTQ5nIsdko&feature=youtu.be

Call to Order and Roll Call **(Video #1 - 0:15)**

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on April 27, 2018 at 1:05 pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Members Present:
Sherrie Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Paul Roen, Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Jeff Engle, Plumas County Board of Supervisors
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Rick Roberti, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

Members Absent:
Doug Teeter, Butte County Board of Supervisors
Jim Roberti, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

Staff Present:
Randy Wilson, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting
Leah Wills, Plumas County

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda **(Video #1 - 1:00)**

None noted

Public Comment Opportunity **(Video #1 - 1:08)**

None noted

Announcements / Reports **(Video #1 - 1:38)**

Randy Wilson mentioned currently proposed legislation (AB 3045) to remove the State Water Project, including Oroville Dam, from DWR control and establish a nine member State Water Project Commission under the Natural Resources Agency to oversee the construction, operation, and maintenance of the State

Water Project. This Bill passed unanimously through the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee on April 24, 2018 and is now headed to the Assembly Appropriations Committee. The purpose of the legislation is to separate the authority of operating and regulating the State Water Project facilities.

Trina Cunningham reported that the Tribal community is coordinating a Big Time in Sierra Valley on May 19th and 20th at Ross Meadows to bring together the Tribal voice of that place, which is the headwaters of the Middle Fork Feather River, and to look at cultural values to imbed in the Upper Feather River Water Plan. Trina also reported that it is the 50th anniversary of the Middle Fork Feather River being designated as a National Wild and Scenic River and there is a local effort to make a feature length film about it and the variety of uses in that area.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. RWMG **(Video #1 - 7:30)**

Upon motion by Jeff Engel and seconded by Jeffrey Greening, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for January 19, 2018 were unanimously approved as presented.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Integrated Regional Water Management Coordination Updates (Video #1 - 8:01)

a. Update on the IRWM Roundtable of Regions

Uma Hinman presented the update on the IRWM Roundtable of Regions (RoR) efforts. Uma noted that the RoR is a volunteer organization that has membership from all of the IRWM regions and has been advocating on behalf of the IRWM regions to DWR to make changes to the California Water Plan (CWP) and keep everyone informed of what DWR is doing around the State. Uma mentioned a few important updates from the list on page 11 of the agenda packet including: coordination meetings RoR held with DWR to discuss the next Prop 1 Proposal Solicitation Packet (PSP) and IRWM concerns regarding PSP development and the grant program, a RoR presentation to the California Water Commission on the success of IRWM regions, and a coordinated review of the 2018 CWP Update draft language conducted by RoR members. Randy Wilson added that he listened to the DAC call on April 24, 2018 and there is a RoR meeting scheduled in Sacramento on May 4, 2018 from 1-3 pm and it is possible to call in for this meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the benefit of a representative attending this meeting in person. Trina Cunningham mentioned that she has a phone call scheduled with Ted Baum, a DWR Grant Manager, to discuss grant funding issues for the Upper Feather River and invited others to listen in if desired. Randy mentioned that he and Trina attended a DWR Groundwater Workshop on April 23, 2018 and received a lot of information regarding Groundwater Management funding. Trina added that DWR acknowledged at the meeting that there is room for improvement in their process and they are interested in feedback from the IRWM regions. Uma mentioned that one of the things RoR has been focused on is that the California Water Plan Update and the proposed new Water Bonds do not really address the IRWM regions and so they are working on getting the word out about IRWM regions and their success stories. Randy noted that DWR's emphasis has shifted from IRWM to Sustainable Groundwater Management. Sherrie Thrall noted that the IRWM process is such a valuable effort and it benefits the IRWM regions to demand that DWR continue the IRWM process. Discussion ensued regarding the Groundwater Workshop and the importance of having information ready about the IRWM regions to provide to the new Governor in January since things are changing.

b. Inter-regional IRWM Coordination

Uma Hinman provided an update on Inter-regional IRWM Coordination and noted that the Upper Pit River Watershed IRWM Region is in the process of soliciting for additional projects to include in their Plan for the next round of Prop 1 funding.

c. Legislative Update

Uma Hinman presented a Legislative Update and noted two bills (AB 2064 and AB 2060) that recently passed the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee hearings and that would change IRWM grant advanced payment provisions. Uma explained that these bills are related to addressing the significant delays in receiving reimbursement payments under Prop 50 funding. Discussion ensued regarding the level of momentum for these bills and the importance of addressing this issue especially for small rural districts that cannot afford tie up their limited financial resources for a year while waiting for grant reimbursement. Uma offered to draft a letter of support for these bills to the committee and local representatives. Discussion ensued regarding the Board of Supervisors potentially preparing a letter of support for AB 3045.

d. Update on James Lee School Project

Randy Wilson presented the Staff update on the Indian Jim River Resource Center (James Lee School) project. Randy noted that there is a meeting scheduled on May 11, 2018 at the school to discuss the project scope and the potential need to modify IRWM Proposal TAC-5 accordingly. Randy noted that he provided a letter of Support to the RAC to get some funding for planning. Trina Cunningham mentioned that they are going out to bid for engineering on the project and Ms. Miles is working on this with the Greenville Rancheria. Randy also mentioned that David Steindorf from American Whitewaters is getting people together on May 11, 2018 to visit Seneca related to the FERC licensing in the canyon. Randy noted that a new Draft EIR may be released by the end of the calendar year for FERC License 2105. Discussion ensued regarding the proposal to pull cold water from Lake Almanor for a cold water fishery and identifying the most technically feasible location to put-in and take-out salmon, potentially including the North Fork of the Yuba River above New Bullards Bar Reservoir. Discussion ensued regarding the potential for Native American involvement in this process. Trina asked the group for information regarding contacts for engineering on the James Lee School project. Discussion ensued regarding the need to address the potential for increased vandalism if this area becomes more visible to those driving by as a result of this project.

2. Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project (Video #2 - 5:22)

Uma Hinman presented on the March 30, 2018 Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement (DACTI) Workshop. Uma noted that the morning session focused on Community Capacity and Needs Assessment and more clearly identifying the DACs in the region and the afternoon session focused on Water and Wastewater Needs Assessment. Uma explained that the main outcome of the afternoon session was identifying the need for additional outreach to include private water companies to get a more comprehensive and accurate picture of the water needs within the region. The UFR workshop was a pilot that will be used for each of the 10 IRWM regions within the Mountain Counties Funding Area (MCFA) and once this process is complete late spring or early summer of next year they will start drafting the Needs Assessment for the entire MCFA. Discussion ensued regarding the Community Capacity rating exercise in the morning session, the importance of building capacity in order to be successful in obtaining grant funding and managing project implementation, and the benefit to providing the questionnaire in advance of the workshop to allow more time to think about the responses and to receive broader feedback since not everyone can attend workshops. Discussion continued regarding the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan being the first Prop 1 compliant plan in the State providing a model to other regions and public agencies and the future implications of SGMA in the region.

3. Upper Feather River IRWM Support Funding (Video #2 - 18:16)

Uma Hinman presented the update from RWMG members regarding funding contributions for administrative support and coordination for the Upper Feather River IRWM Program. Uma reported that the Butte County Board of Supervisors voted to provide the funding support that was identified in the estimated funding contributions ($3,975). Uma also noted that page 15 and 16 of the agenda packet includes a projected cost for support services expenses estimated through the end of the current contract

(June 30, 2018), including one more RWMG meeting and reviewing additional projects, and asked for direction regarding the need for support services in Fiscal Year 2018-19. Discussion ensued regarding the scope of future support services and associated costs, future ability of RWMG members to provide funding contributions, the approach for putting forward an application for the next funding round, and the possibility of getting administrative support funds through the grant process. The RWMG directed staff to add this item to the agenda for further discussion at the next meeting.

4. IRWM Plan Implementation Project Proposals (Video #3 - 4:34)

Uma Hinman noted that a total of eight applications were submitted to be considered for inclusion in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan as implementation projects and staff was informed that two applications will be submitted for the next round of consideration. Uma also noted that this is an open solicitation and the application is available on the website. Uma briefly presented the following eight proposed IRWM Plan Implementation Projects.

a. Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
b. Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
c. Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
d. Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Sacramento River Watershed Program and 34 North.
e. Community Water Tank Inspection, Indian Valley Community Services District.
f. Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
g. Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
h. District-Wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair, Sierra Water Works District #1 - Calpine.

Jeffrey Greening noted that most of the lands involved are brush country which is why the costs are so high. Trina Cunningham commented that it would be helpful to see how these areas relate to fire history over the last ten years, if there is a fire map already available. Discussion ensued regarding these being high vegetation growth areas and the importance of protecting evacuation routes.

Chris Gallagher from the Indian Valley Community Services District provided more details regarding the Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project which is proposed to replace a sewer line that crossed Wolf Creek and was destroyed during the flooding in early 2017 with a foot bridge and attached new sewer line to prevent future similar issues. Chris provided more details regarding the Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project which is proposed to remove these minerals at the source instead of the treatment area in order to remove more of the mineral content and improve water quality. Chris clarified that the distance between the source and the treatment is approximately 300 yards and the type of water source. Chris more details regarding the Community Water Tank Inspection project including the water storage capacity of the water tanks.

Paul Rose from Sierra Water Works District #1 – Calpine Community provided more details regarding the District-Wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair project including the age and length of the pipelines. Approximately 2-3 miles of pipeline would be inspected and lengths identified for replacement.

Uma presented the review factors used for considering these proposals and clarified that these applications went through a more simplified review process than the projects included in the 2016 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the status of Forbestown not being a DAC, whether the review factors not yet considered for these proposals, including Tribal integration and Climate Change/greenhouse gas emissions analysis, need to be addressed. The RWMG recognized the importance of equal treatment and equal assistance provided to project sponsors in capacity building for their

projects. The RWMG directed staff to work with project sponsors in preparation for the June meeting to provide additional information in order to assist staff in more fully evaluating these (and any newly submitted) proposals consistent with the proposals in the 2016 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan and to improve the competitive nature of these proposals for future grant applications.

5. Grant Opportunities (Video #4 - 19:49)

Uma Hinman presented the update on Department of Water Resources' next round of Prop 1 funding and summary of current grant and loan opportunities and technical assistance opportunities. Uma clarified that all sponsors of the 2016 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan receive email notification of these grant opportunities. Discussion ensued regarding the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) $10 million in Proposition 1 funding to provide technical assistance to DACs to develop, fund, and implement Prop 1-eligible drinking water, wastewater, storm water (limited), or groundwater capital projects. Discussion continued regarding the methods for performing leak detection studies. Uma noted that Lynn Campbell and Christine Hoffman with the Sierra Nevada Conservancy are offering to support project sponsors in finding funding to complete CEQA work in order to be ready for the next round of Proposition 1 funding. Uma also noted that page 77 of the agenda packet includes the Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule for the next round of the DWR Prop 1 IRWM funding for implementation projects.

6. Next Steps (Video #5 - 3:07)

Next meeting is scheduled for June 22, 2018 at 1pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Rick Roberti asked what message he should give to his District Board at their next meeting regarding the delay in finding funding for IRWM Plan Implementation Project Proposals. Uma Hinman mentioned the benefits of being included in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan to enhance grant eligibility for various funding opportunities. Roger Diefendorf noted that if there are specific grant opportunities identified, his office could possible assist with grant development and management, provided administrative fees could be recovered through the grant. Discussion continued regarding urban investment in headwaters communities, using State funding for Federal projects, and the priority of watershed restoration and forest management projects versus projects to purchase conservation easements. Sierra Nevada Conservancy is a good local resource with an office in the Plumas County Planning building.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm.

ITEM NO. 1

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Integrated Regional Water Management Coordination Updates

---

a. Roundtable of Regions

The Roundtable of Regions (RoR) is an all-volunteer forum for IRWM regions engaged in preparing and implementing IRWM Plans to network, share ideas, and provide feedback to DWR on the IRWM program. Staff continues to attend the RoR meetings via webinars, including the May 4 and 24, 2018 meetings, which have focused on providing preliminary feedback to DWR regarding the Administrative Draft Prop 1 Implementation PSP package and process. Prop 1 updates are included in Item 5.

b. Inter-regional Outreach

Coordination among the IRWM regions will most likely occur as part of the Mountain Counties Funding Area DAC Coordinating Committee (CC) meeting. DWR will require a point person for coordinating the Prop 1 Implementation Funding workshops, which will be hosted one for each funding area. It is expected that the issue will be on the agenda for the CC meeting in July, during which time a range of dates for the workshop will be selected and provided to DWR. At this time, the workshops are expected to be scheduled for early 2019.

c. Legislative Update

Proposition 68 passed on the June 2018 ballot with 56% of the vote and authorizes $4.1 billion in general obligation bonds for state and local parks, environmental protection and restoration projects, water infrastructure projects, and flood protection projects.

The measure requires that between 15 and 20 percent of the bond funds, depending on the type of project, be dedicated to projects in communities with median household incomes less than 60 percent of the statewide average (severe DACs); that 60 percent threshold amounted to about $39,980 in 2016. The largest amount of bond revenue—$725 million—was earmarked for neighborhood parks in park-poor neighborhoods in accordance with the Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Act of 2008's competitive grant program. The measure also reallocated $100 million in unissued bonds that voters approved via Proposition 1 (2014), Proposition 84 (2006), and Proposition 40 (2002). The ballot summary is as follows:

- Authorizes $4 billion in general obligation bonds for: creation and rehabilitation of state and local parks, natural resources protection projects, climate adaptation projects, water quality and supply projects, and flood protection projects.
- Reallocates $100 million of unused bond authority from prior bond acts for the same purposes.
- Appropriates moneys from the General Fund to pay off bonds.
- Requires non-state matching funds for certain projects and favors disadvantaged communities for certain projects.
- Requires annual audits.

The measure distributes bond revenue per Attachment 1; categories of particular interest are highlighted yellow.

REQUEST/RECOMMENDATION

Informational.

Attachments: Proposition 68 Bond Revenue Distribution

Proposition 68 (2018)	
Amount	**Dedication**
$725 million	creation and expansion of safe neighborhood parks in *park-poor neighborhoods*
$200 million	per capita grants to local governments for the improvement of local parks
$15 million	grants to cities and districts in urbanized counties with populations of 200,000 or less that provide park and recreation services
$30 million	grants to regional park districts, counties, open-space districts, joint powers authorities, and eligible nonprofit organizations to restore and improve parks
$40 million	grants to local jurisdictions whose voters passed local measures between 2012 and 2018 to improve local or regional park infrastructure
$218 million	restoration and preservation of existing state park facilities
$30 million	grants to local agencies, state conservancies, Native American tribes, joint powers authorities, and nonprofit organizations to promote new or alternative access to parks, waterways, outdoor recreation, and natural environments
$25 million	competitive grants to rural areas for recreational projects to support economic and health-related goals
$162 million	grants to conservancies and programs to protect urban creeks and streams
$30 million	Salton Sea Authority to provide air quality and habitat projects
$170 million	restoration activities identified in the Salton Sea Management Program Phase I
$180 million	state conservancies
$137 million	Wildlife Conservation Board to provide regional conservation investment strategies, conservation plans, funds for the UC Natural Reserve System, and to improve national recreation areas serving urbanized areas
$200 million	Natural Resources Agency to implement agreements for water quality, water supply, and watershed protection projects
$50 million	Department of Fish and Wildlife to address deferred maintenance
$175 million	projects related to ocean, bay, and coastal protection
$18 million	Wildlife Conservation Board to provide wildlife corridors and open space, improve threatened and endangered species habitat, improve adaptation and resilience of natural systems to climate change, protect and improve existing open-space corridors and trail linkages, provide wildlife rehabilitation facilities, control invasive plants or insects, improve aquatic or riparian habitat, provide projects to benefit salmon and steelhead, provide hunting and wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities through agreements with private landowners

Proposition 68 (2018)	
Amount	**Dedication**
$30 million	protection and restoration of habitat associated with the Pacific Flyway
$25 million	stream restoration to benefit fisheries and wildlife
$60 million	improvement of wildlife and fish passage
$60 million	protection and restoration of upper watershed lands in the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountains that improve water supply and quality
$30 million	Department of Fish and Wildlife to improve conditions for fish and wildlife in streams, rivers, wildlife refuges, wetland habitat areas, and estuaries
$40 million	projects to assist coastal communities with adaptation to climate change, including projects that address ocean acidification, sea level rise, or habitat restoration
$30 million	projects on farms and ranches to sequester carbon, improve habitat, reduce development pressures, and increase water absorption and retention
$50 million	projects that provide ecological restoration of forests, including projects to reduce fire risk
$40 million	California Conservation Corps to rehabilitate state and local parks and restore watersheds
$60 million	competitive grants to protect natural, cultural, historic, and Native American resources; covert retired fossil fuel powerplant sites for open space, parks, or tourism; science centers; civic and athletic venues; cultural centers that recognize that contributions of the state's ethnic communities; and nonprofit aquariums
$250 million	clean drinking water and drought programs
$80 million	competitive grants for groundwater cleanup of contaminated drinking water sources
$350 million	flood protection facilities, levee improvements, and related investments that protect persons and property from flood damage in the Central Valley
$100 million	programs to prevent damages from stormwater, mudslides, and flash floods
$100 million	competitive grants for multibenefit projects in urbanized areas to address flooding, including stormwater capture and reuse, low-impact development planning, urban watershed restoration, and permeable surfaces
$290 million	drought and groundwater investments, including groundwater recharge with surface water, stormwater, and recycled water and projects to prevent contamination of groundwater sources of drinking water

ITEM NO. 2

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project Update

---

DISCUSSION

The Sierra Institute Team met in April with Carmel Brown from DWR's Financial Division to better understand how the funding will roll out, the timing of the funding, and how DWR understands the process to this point. The information will be shared with the IRWMs at the next DAC Coordinating Committee for their decision on how to proceed.

To date, the Sierra Institute Team has held three Community Capacity Assessment Workshops, three Water/Wastewater Needs Assessments Workshops, and two Tribal Orientation Workshops.

Small Community Capacity and Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment Workshops

- Sierra Institute and Sierra Water Workgroup held the first community capacity assessment workshop and water/wastewater needs assessment workshop in Quincy for the Upper Feather River region on March 30, 2018.
- Sierra Institute and Sierra Water Workgroup are compiling data for a report
    - Sierra Institute has the community capacity assessments complete and will be combining these measures with socio-economic data from census block group data to better characterize the multi-dimensional nature of the communities for a better understanding of "disadvantaged"
    - Sierra Water Workgroup has completed a number of needs assessments, but is following-up on some areas to ensure they capture water/wastewater needs in the area
- Sierra Institute & SWWG conducted the workshops in Yosemite-Mariposa and Tuolumne-Stanislaus (May 23rd and May 24th)
    - Compiling data from assessments

Tribal Updates

- California Indian Environmental Alliance hosted their first Tribal Orientation meeting on March 8th in Susanville [Agenda attached]
- California Indian Environmental Alliance hosted a second Tribal Orientation meeting in Tuolumne-Stanislaus on June 1st
- Outreach and recruitment for a Tribal Advisory Committee is ongoing
- A tribal needs assessment is soon to be launched in coordination with the SWWG needs assessment

Work Plan for July-August

- Next DAC Coordinating Committee on July 17th in Sacramento
- Madera Community Capacity and Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment on July 24th
- MAC workshops scheduled for August
- Tribal integration into Madera workshop and future workshops with a supplemental Tribal-specific component following the workshops

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Informational.

ITEM NO. 3

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Proposed IRWM Plan Implementation Projects

BACKGROUND

During the January 19, 2018 RWMG meeting, the following steps were approved for reviewing and considering proposed implementation project applications for inclusion in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan.

1. Project application submitted.
2. Project coordinator determines whether the project meets Plan objectives and its current status, and then recommends it to the RWMG for consideration.
3. The RWMG considers all aspects of the project and either includes it in the Plan or makes recommendations for improvements.
4. The Upper Feather River IRWM Plan implementation projects list is update and project is eligible for DWR IRWM grant funding opportunities.

On April 24, 2018, the RWMG reviewed eight new project applications and gave direction to staff to work with the project sponsors to complete climate change assessments and greenhouse gas emissions worksheets for each before further consideration. The project sponsors have completed and submitted the forms, which are included in the attached applications.

The implementation project solicitation remains open with application forms available on the featherriver.org website. Projects may be submitted throughout the year and will be reviewed for consideration at the following RWMG meeting, provided support funding remains available.

PROPOSED PROJECTS

A total of eight projects were submitted to the RWMG to be considered for inclusion in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan as implementation projects. If included, the projects would then be eligible to apply for DWR Proposition 1 IRWM funding. No funding is currently available with this solicitation nor is any funding guaranteed with the RWMG approval for inclusion in the Plan.

Projects were reviewed generally in accordance with the project review factors identified in the 2016 Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines (Attachment 2). Review factors not yet considered include the Climate Change/greenhouse gas emissions analysis and Tribal integration.

a. Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project – Butte Fire Safe Council (UF-14)

Description: The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction on 250 acres within the community of Berry Creek, a DAC. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the residential portions of Berry Creek, adjacent to USFS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Berry Creek FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years and the community was under evacuation warning from wildfire twice last year. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and has had past sever wildfires. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. (Attachment 3)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Fire and Fuels	$500,000	$400,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

b. Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project – Butte Fire Safe Council (UF-15)

Description: The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction on 200 acres within the community of Concow, a DAC. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the residential portions of Berry Creek, adjacent to US FS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Berry Creek FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years and the community was under evacuation warning from wildfire twice last year. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and has had past sever wildfires. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. (Attachment 4)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Fire and Fuels	$500,000	$400,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

c. Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project – Butte Fire Safe Council (UF-16)

Description: The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction on 150 acres in the vicinity of Feather Falls. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the residential portions of Feather Falls, adjacent to US FS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels

treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Feather Falls FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and had a sever wildfire last year which burned 80 homes and impacted thousands of acres. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. (Attachment 5)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Fire and Fuels	$300,000	$220,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

d. <u>Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project – Sacramento River Watershed Program and 34 North (UF-17)</u>

Description: The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction and increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place on private lands and will include approximately 250 acres. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. The Forbestown Ridge project area is includes the communities of Forbestown and Merry Mountain Village, a local homeowner association located in the community of Clipper Mills. These communities have active fire safe councils and are recognized as FIREWISE Communities. They are committed to wildfire planning and prevention, and share a common vision with SRWP and the BCFSC to create communities within a landscape that are resistant to the devastating impacts of wildland fires. (Attachment 6)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Fire and Fuels	$500,000	$413,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

e. <u>Community Water Tank Inspection – Indian Valley Community Services District (MS-44)</u>

Description: The Crescent Mills and Greenville Water Systems have a total of three water storage tanks used to store water pumped from our ground wells. These tanks are various ages and there are no records of inspection or cleaning. In order to provide for the best quality water, the district would like to inspect and clean the storage tanks every five years. Such a process would extend the life of each of these tanks and assure the best quality of water for district customers. The district has located a local company that provides such services and is willing to assist the District with the project at a much reduced rate. The project would involve diving each tank, inspecting for maintenance issues, and cleaning sediment from the bottom of the tank. (Attachment 7)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Infrastructure/ Water Supply	$30,000	$30,000	Planning	Adoption of IRWM Plan

f. Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project – Indian Valley Community Services District (MS-45)

Description: The Crescent Mills water supply comes out of the Green Mountain Mine. This water source contains high amounts of iron and manganese. The District currently treats for these elements near the area of distribution. In order to protect and improve water quality and water supply reliability in the Crescent Mills area, two new chemical pumps need to be installed and two water lines run approximately 300 years closer to the source to a point where the water could be treated for iron and manganese farther away from the distribution plant. The chemical reaction occurring up the line would increase contact and allow for additional time to remove these elements from the water source prior to de-filtration and customer distribution, thus improving water quality. The District also proposes to purchase a line cleaning tool (PIG) to remove iron buildup in the existing water distribution system, once again improving quality and reliability of the source. (Attachment 8)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Infrastructure/ Water Supply	$50,000	$50,000	Shovel ready	Adoption of IRWM Plan

g. Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project – Indian Valley Community Services District (MS-46)

Description: Replacement of a suspended sewer pipeline that crosses Wolf Creek near the town of Greenville. The pipeline in question was washed out due to a high water event during the winter of 2017. Engineering plans and specifications for the project are complete. The District proposes raising the elevation of the pipeline crossing to be better protected and prevent sewage spills associated with future flood events. Because the original pipeline connected to a sewer lift station immediately downstream from the crossing, the potential exists to move the lift station to the upstream side of the crossing and significantly raise the elevation of the pipe over the river. The scope of the project would include construction of a new sewer lift station on the upstream side of the crossing. A new bridge structure would also be installed. The bridge structure would support and protect the new pipeline at the higher elevation while also providing improvement access for maintenance personnel to access the lift station in the new location for regular maintenance activities. (Attachment 9)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Infrastructure/ Water Quality	$450,000	$325,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

h. <u>District-wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair – Sierra Water Works District #1, Calpine (MS-47)</u>

Description: Calpine has long known that its distribution system is very aged and is losing a considerable amount of water through leaks. Water meters were installed a couple of months ago and the district will now be more accurately tracking this loss. The District plans to contract with an experienced and industry respected leak detection firm to conduct a district-wide leak identification survey. From the outcome of this survey the district's contract water operator will work with the district's engineering firm to plan an effective pipe replacement and repair project consisting of replacement of the most aged and vulnerable piping. Individual site repairs will be performed in areas where sections of pipe do not need replacement. Piping that produces unfavorable water quality will be replaced with non-corrosive pipe. Quantitative results will be documented through existing production and recently installed residential meters. (Attachment 10)

Project Type	Total Cost	Grant Request	Project Status	Needs
Infrastructure/ Water Supply	$500,000	$500,000	Design	Adoption of IRWM Plan

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1) Adopt attached resolution approving the eight new project submittals as implementation projects for the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan, and direct staff to update the 2016 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan project list accordingly; OR
2) Provide additional direction to staff.

Attachments:

1. Review Summary of Proposed Projects
2. Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program Project Review Factors
3. Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
4. Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
5. Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
6. Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Sacramento River Watershed Program & 34 North
7. Community Water Tank Inspection, Indian Valley CSD
8. Crescent Hills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project, Indian Valley CSD
9. Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project, Indian Valley CSD
10. District-wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair, Sierra Water Works District #1 – Calpine
11. Draft Resolution

Summary of Proposed Projects Review

Project No.	Project Name	GHG Worksheet Complete (K,L)	Climate Adaption/ GHG Reduction	All Questions Answered	RMS Validated/ # supported (B)	Budget checked (G,H)	Objectives Validated/ # supported (A)	Technically Feasible (C)	DAC Impact (D)	Tribal ('E)	Environ-mental Justice (F)	Project Status (I)
UF-14	Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/6	Yes	Yes/7	Yes	Yes		No	design
UF-15	Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/6	Yes	Yes/7	Yes	Yes		No	design
UF-16	Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/6	Yes	Yes/7	Yes	No		No	design
UF-17	Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/11	Yes	Yes/9	Yes	No		No	design
MS-44	Community Water Tank Inspection	Yes	No	Yes	Yes/2	Yes	Yes/3	Yes	Yes		No	planning
MS-45	Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project	Yes	No	Yes	Yes/1	Yes	Yes/4	Yes	Yes		No	shovel ready
MS-46	Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/3	Yes	Yes/3	Yes	Yes		No	design
MS-47	District-Wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/3	Yes	Yes/2	Yes	No		No	design

IRWMP Review Factors (summarized from 2016 IRWM Guidelines)

The following is a discussion of the factors that a project review process should employ when considering projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan:

A. How the project contributes to the IRWM Plan objectives

This factor asks RWMG to consider how a project relates to achieving plan objectives

B. How the project is related to RMS

The IRWM Plan identifies RMS selected for use in the Plan with the goal of diversifying the water management portfolio used to meet plan objectives. Does the proposed project contribute to the diversification of the water management portfolio? If so how? If it does, that should be seen as a positive aspect of the project. If not, the project may still aid in obtaining th eplan objectives; however, depending on specific circumstances of the region, a project that contributes to the diversification of the water management portfolio may be more valuable than one that does not.

C. Technical feasibility of the project

The RWMG needs to consider the technical feasibility of the projects. Technical feasibility is related to the knowledge of the project location; knowledge of the water system at the project location; or with the material, methods, or processes proposed to be employed in the project...

D. Specific benefits to critical DAC water issues

The project review process must consider if the project helps to address critical water supply and water quality needs of DACs within the IRWM region.

E. Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities

The project review process must consider if the project helps to address critical water supply and water quality needs of Native American tribal communities within the IRWM region.

F. Environmental Justice Considerations

Consideration of EJ concerns. EJ seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burdens (i.e., pollution, industrial facilities) and access to environmental goods (e.g., clean water and air, parks, recreation, nutritious foods, etc.). EJ relies on willing awareness of impacts by project proponents and participation in decision-making by affected stakeholders.

G. Project Costs and Financing

Documented basis for costs, funding sources.

H. Economic Feasibility

A preliminary economic analysis must be included as part of the criteria in the project selection process. A cost-effectiveness or benefit-cost analysis may be used.

I. Project Status

Consider the status/readiness to proceed of the project. May have to match to funding source priorities (e.g., shovel-ready, planning grants)

J. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan implementation

Use the regional perspective to leverage any efficiency that might be gained by combining or modifying local projects into regional projects. Can restructure or integrate projects, implement as-is, modify… DWR expects RWMGs to take advantage of regional planning and integrating projects where possible, and explaining when a single purpose project needs to be implemented in order to best implement an IRWM Plan.

K. Contribution of the project in adapting to the effects of climate change in the region

Consideration as to whether adaptations to water management systems are necessary to adapt to climate change.

L. Contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives

Ability of projects to reduce GHG emissions - energy efficiency, reductions in emissions

M. Whether the project proponent has adopted or will adopt the IRWM Plan

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: ***WOLF CREEK SEWER CROSSING REPLACEMENT PROJECT***

PROJECT SPONSOR(S): ***INDIAN VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT***
Phone: (530) 284-7224
Email: chrisgallagher@frontier.com

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☐	Education
☐	Fire and Fuels
☒	Flooding
☒	Habitat and Environment
☒	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☒	Water Quality
☐	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Provide the basic details of your project, including WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW (No more than a single page, 250 words).*

Project includes the replacement of a suspended sewer pipeline that crosses Wolf Creek near the town of Greenville. The pipeline in question was washed out due to a high water event during the Winter of 2017. Engineered plans and specifications for the project are complete.

The District proposes raising the elevation of the pipeline crossing to be better protected and prevent sewer spills associated with future flood events. Because the original pipeline connected to a sewer lift station immediately downstream from the crossing, the potential exists to move the lift station to the upstream side of the crossing and significantly raise the elevation of the pipe over the river.

The scope of the project would include construction of a new sewer lift station on the upstream side of the crossing. A new bridge structure would also be installed. The bridge structure would support and protect the new pipeline at the higher elevation while also providing improved access for maintenance personnel to access the lift station in the new location for regular maintenance activities.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Provide geographical location and latitude/longitude.*
Crossing Wolf Creek about 600 ft. due West of the Sewer Ponds in Greenville, CA.

120°55'52.90"W, 40° 8'21.54" N

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Start Date	End Date	Month
Task 1: Funding Acquisition	05/01/18	03/02/2019	
Task 2: Bidding & Contract Award	04/01/19	05/30/19	
Task 3: Construction	05/30/2019	09/30/2019	

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	Confirmed Partners
California Rural Water Association	FEMA
California Department of Fish & Wildlife	

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: *Plans and specifications have been completed for the project.*
Engineering complete	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: *Plans and specifications have been completed for the project.*
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below)
	Details: *Project anticipates Categorical Exemption due to replacement of existing facilities.*
No CEQA required	*Provide details:*
No NEPA required	*Provide details:*
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: *Performance measures include:* *1. Successful project startup and operation of new lift station and bridge structure.* *2. Project acceptance and final Notice of Completion for proposed construction project.*
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.

1 Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $450,000
Match	Amount: $125,000
	Source: FEMA
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☒	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Removal of low hanging pipeline will eliminate potential obstruction to natural river course during high water events.
☐	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	
☐	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.	
☐	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	
☒	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Potential funding lessens burden to existing rate payers and reduces the likelihood of future repair costs associated with pipeline failures.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Project reduces the likelihood of future pipeline failures and sanitary sewer discharges thus enhancing surface water quality.
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	
☐	Improve coordination of land use and water resources	

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
	planning.	
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	
☐	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	
☐	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	
☐	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	
☐	*Other (please describe):*	

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☒	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☒	Conveyance – regional/local
☒	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☐	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☐	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☐	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☒	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☐	Ecosystem restoration
☐	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management

√	Resource Management Strategy
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☐	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☐	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☒	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

River obstruction removed
Potential water quality hazard removed
New facility functional acceptance testing

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

None

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: COMMUNITY WATER TANK INSPECTION PROJECT

Project applicant: _INDIAN VALLEY 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.

x The project requires workers to commute to the project site.

☐ The project is expected to generate GHG emissions for other reasons.

x 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

This project assures the continued and long-term use of our water storage systems through maintenance and cleaning of the water holding facility.

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:

- x 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

x Water treatment facility operations

x Unmet beneficial uses (municipal and domestic water supply, water contact recreation, cold freshwater habitat, spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, etc.)

Flooding

Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority flooding vulnerability issues:

x 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:

x 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:

x Not applicable

☐ Reduced hydropower output

Water Tank Inspection

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

N 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 $MTCO_2e$
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**0**

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
8	20	**0**

Y 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 $MTCO_2e$
2	6	40	**0**

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

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

Water Tank Inspection

Project Operating Emissions

The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

N The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
0	**0**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N 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:	0 $MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	0 $MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: ***Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project***

PROJECT SPONSOR(S): ***Indian Valley Community Services District***
Phone: 530-284-7224
Email: chrisgallagher@frontier.com

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☒	Community
☐	Education
☐	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☐	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☒	Water Quality
☐	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *The Crescent Mills water supply comes out of the Green Mountain Mine. This water source contains high amounts of iron and manganese. We currently treat for these elements near the area of distribution. In order to protect and improve water quality and water supply reliability in the Crescent Mills area, two new chemical pumps need to be installed and two water lines*

run approximately 300 yards closer to the source to a point where the water could be treated for iron and manganese farther away from the distribution point. The chemical reaction occurring up the line would increase contact and allow for additional time to remove these elements from the water source prior to de-filtration and customer distribution, thus improving water quality. We also propose to purchase a line cleaning tool (PIG) to remove iron buildup in the existing water distribution system, once again improving quality and reliability of the source. The project completion date would be the summer of 2019.

PROJECT LOCATION: *40° 5'53.64"N/ 120°55'4.31"W*
BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month
Task 1: Order pumps and piping	7/1/2019	7/15/2019
Task 2: Excavate trench for pipe	7/15/2019	7/30/2019
Task 3: Install pipe and connect to pump	8/1/2019	8/15/2019
Task 4: Connect to existing distribution system	8/15/2019	8/31/2019

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	Confirmed Partners
CALIFORNIA RURAL WATER	
CALIFORNIA WATER BOARD	

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☒	Yes
	☐	No (provide details below)
	Details: ***Engineer Sig Hansen has completed the engineering and design for this project. This project is shovel ready.***	
Engineering complete	☒	Yes
	☐	No (provide details below)
	Details: Engineer Sig Hansen has completed the engineering and design for this project. See attachment.	
Project does not require technical	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	

design or engineering	
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.
No CEQA required	*Provide details: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures (CEQA Guidelines §15303)*
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: Approximately $50,000
Match	Amount: Our Agency is willing to do in kind work for installing system
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in	Click or tap here to enter text.

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
	the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	We supply water to a community of 78 residences in Crescent Mills. This project would improve the water quality and supply to this community.
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	This is a much needed water source in the area. Such a project would enhance the quality of the water distributed.
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	By cleaning existing piping, we would assure the reliable transmission of water to each of the residences.
☐	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation

√	Resource Management Strategy
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☐	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☒	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☐	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☐	Ecosystem restoration
☐	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☐	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☐	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

The Outcome would be a reduction of iron and manganese in the water distributed to the Crescent Mills residents.

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

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: CRESCENT MILLS RAW WATER PROJECT

Project applicant: _INDIAN VALLEY 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.

x The project requires materials to be transported to the project site.

x 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:

x 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:

x 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

x Water treatment facility operations

☐ Unmet beneficial uses (municipal and domestic water supply, water contact recreation, cold freshwater habitat, spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, etc.)

Flooding

Describe how the project makes the watershed (more/less) resilient to one or more of the following high priority flooding vulnerability issues:

x 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:

x 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:

x Not applicable

☐ Reduced hydropower output

CRESCENT MILLS RAW WATER PROJECT

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

Y 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 $MTCO_2e$
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	5	1
Other Construction Equipment	1	1	0
Dumpers/Tenders	1	1	0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**1**

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
1	20	**0**

Y 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 $MTCO_2e$
2	2	40	**0**

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

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

CRESCENT MILLS RAW WATER PROJECT

Project Operating Emissions

Y The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
5,840	kWh (Electricity)	**1**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

N The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
0	**0**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N 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:	2 $MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	1 $MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: ***Community Water Tank Inspection***

PROJECT SPONSOR(S): ***INDIAN VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT***
Phone: (530) 284-7224
Email: Chrisgallagher@frontier.com

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☐	Education
☐	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☒	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☒	Water Quality
☒	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Click or tap here to enter text.
The Crescent Mills and Greenville Water systems have a total of three water storage tanks used to store water pumped from our ground wells. These tanks are various ages and we have no records of inspection or cleaning. In order to provide for the best quality water, we would like to inspect and clean

our storage tanks every five years. Such a process would extend the life of each of these tanks and assure the best quality of water for our customers.

We have located a local company that provides such services and is willing to assist the District with this project at a much reduced rate. This project would involve diving each tank, inspecting for maintenance issues, and cleaning sediment from the bottom of the tank.

PROJECT LOCATION: *40° 8'9.72"N 120°57'28.29"W and 40° 5'53.26"N 120°55'4.70"W*

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month
Task 1: Funding Acquisition	06/01/2019	07/02/2019
Task 2: Bidding & Contract Award	08/01/2019	08/30/2019
Task 3: Construction	08/30/2019	09/30/2019

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: This project is simply a maintenance project fact finding mission to inspect our water storage systems.*	
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Existing Facilities (CEQA Guidelines §15301) Class 1 exemptions consist of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, or mechanical equipment, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination that the project was exempt.	
No CEQA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	

No NEPA required	*Provide details: local project*
Performance Measures identified[1]	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $30,000
Match	Amount: TBD
	Source: IVCSD Project Admin.
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	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.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	The cleaning and inspection of the water storage system assures supply and quality of the water to our customers.
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Assuring water quality to customers by regular maintenance of storage facilities.
☐	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☐	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☒	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☐	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☒	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention

√	Resource Management Strategy
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☐	Ecosystem restoration
☐	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☒	Sediment management
☐	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☐	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

Water Storage Tanks Inspected and Cleaned to Improve Water Quality.

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

No

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: WOLF CREEK CROSSING PROJECT

Project applicant: _INDIAN VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT_____

GHG Emissions Assessment

Project Construction Emissions

(If you check any of the boxes, please see the attached worksheet)

x The project requires nonroad or off-road engines, equipment, or vehicles to complete.

x The project requires materials to be transported to the project site.

x 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)

x 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:

x 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:

x 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

x Water treatment facility operations

☐ Unmet beneficial uses (municipal and domestic water supply, water contact recreation, cold freshwater habitat, spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, etc.)

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

x 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:

x 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:

x Not applicable

☐ Reduced hydropower output

WOLF CREEK CROSSING

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

Y 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 $MTCO_2e$
Cranes	1	4	3
Other Construction Equipment	1	4	0
Other Construction Equipment	1	4	0
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	10	3
Excavators	1	5	2
Other Construction Equipment	1	10	1
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**9**

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
15	25	**1**

Y 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 $MTCO_2e$
4	10	50	**1**

N 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.

WOLF CREEK CROSSING

Project Operating Emissions

Y The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
6,570	kWh (Electricity)	**1**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

N The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

N The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
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:	11 $MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	1 $MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: *District-wide leak survey and pipeline replacement/repair.*

PROJECT SPONSOR(S):*Sierra Water Works District #1 - Calpine*
Phone: 775-530-7266
Email: paul@rosewatersystem.com

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☐	Education
☐	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☒	1. Infrastructure – water conservation through pipe replacement.
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☒	2. Water Quality
☐	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Calpine has long known that its distribution system is very aged and is losing a considerable amount of water through leaks. Water meters were installed a couple of months ago and the district will now be more accurately tracking this loss. The District plans to contract with an experienced and industry respected leak detection firm to conduct a district-wide leak identification*

survey. From the outcome of this survey the district's contract water operator will work with the district's engineering firm to plan an effective pipe replacement and repair project consisting of replacement of the most aged and vulnerable piping. Individual site repairs will be performed in areas where sections of pipe do not need replacement. Piping that produces unfavorable water quality will be replaced with non-corrosive pipe.Quantitative results will be documented through existing production and recently installed residential meters. This project can be executed in 2019 or beyond.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Town of Calpine, CA. 39degrees 39' 58 N by 120 degrees 26' 25 W*

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month	Month	Month
Task 1: Contract and perform leak survey	7/1/2018	7/31/2018	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 2: Evaluate data, draft plans & specs, perform CEQA-NEPA.	8/1/2018	10/1/2018	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 3: Solicit bids, sign contract.	2/1/2019	3/15/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 4: Construction/repair phase	5/1/2019	7/31/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
NONE AT THIS TIME.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Some potential areas of replacement identified.	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.	
Project does not require technical	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	

design or engineering		
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Project exempt	
No CEQA required	*Provide details: It is a replacement so we would file a notice of exemption.*	
No NEPA required	*Provide details: It is a replacement so we would file a notice of exemption.*	
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒	Yes
	☐	No (provide details below)
	Details: Performance will be measured through metering.	
Monitoring Plan complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Click or tap here to enter text.	

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $500,000
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in	Click or tap here to enter text.

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
	the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Water conservation will positively impact the Sierra Valley aquifer supply/recharge.
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Efficiency achieved through conservation.
☐	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☒	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	

√	Resource Management Strategy
☒	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☒	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☒	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☐	Ecosystem restoration
☐	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☐	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☐	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

Measurable reduction of water produced from groundwater wells.

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

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: Leak Detection and Repair

Project applicant: Sierra County Waterworks District #1 - Calpine

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.)

Conservation of groundwater sources.

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

Calpine - Leak Detection and Repair

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

[X] 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 $MTCO_2e$
Excavators	1	10	4
Paving Equipment	1	2	1
Rubber Tired Loaders	1	5	2
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**7**

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
10	20	**0**

[X] 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 $MTCO_2e$
4	20	70	**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.

Calpine - Leak Detection and Repair

Project Operating Emissions

☐ The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

☐ The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
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:	9 $MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	0 $MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: *Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project*

PROJECT SPONSOR(S)*: Butte County Fire Safe Council*
Phone: 530-877-0984
Email: firesafe@buttefiresafe.net

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☒	Education
☒	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☐	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☐	Water Quality
☒	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Provide the basic details of your project, including WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW (No more than a single page, 250 words).*

The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the residential portions of Berry Creek, adjacent to US FS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Berry Creek FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years and the community was under evacuation warning from wildfire twice last year. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and has had past sever wildfires. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. Preferably in spring of 2019.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Provide geographical location and latitude/longitude.*
Location is general area of Berry Creek with final project coordinates determined by the Community Wildfire Protection Plan landscape level planning group.

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month	Month	Month
Task 1: CEQA	1/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 2: Hire Fuels Reduction Crews	9/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 3: Oversee work and public education	6/1/2022	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 4: Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
DWR	**CAL FIRE**
PUBLIC WORKS	**BERRY CREEK FIRE SAFE COUCNIL**
OFFICE OF EMERGANCY MANAGEMENT	**US FOREST SERVICE**
MOORETOWN RANCHERIA	**SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED PROGRAM**
BERRY CREEK RANCHERIA	Click or tap here to enter text.

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: the project boundaries will be completed through the current landscape level planning process undertaken by the community wildfire protection plan landscape level working group	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)

	Details: no engineering needed
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: no technical design needed*
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: CEQA has been completed for two small prior projects in Berry Creek but will need to be completed for the entirety of the project.*
No CEQA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: acres treated or improved, number of people educated, miles of roadway improved for evacuation*
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below) *Details: past monitoring has included photo points with GPS verification but future monitoring will have more data needs to be assisted with the Sacramento River Watershed Program data portal*

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $500,000
Match	Amount: $100,000
	Source: CAL FIRE crew time, volunteer match and matching grants
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Reduce wildfire risk on 250 acres of forest
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	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.	There is a current partnership is in place with DWR and BCFSC to implement the fuel load management plan around Lake Oroville
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Forest thinning wok examples will encourage other municipal services to do the same
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Improve forest health through thinning and release of water from thinning
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Will work with multiple partners for multiple benefits
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Reduce potential green house gas emissions by reducing forest overgrowth
☐	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Provide firewise and water wise education to the community
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency

√	Resource Management Strategy
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☒	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☐	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☒	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☒	Ecosystem restoration
☒	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☒	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☒	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

This may be simple, but it must be specific. It may include measures such as: "miles of fence laid", "number of stakeholders contacted", or "acres of forest treated".

Acres treated = 250
People reached = 10,000
Miles of Roadway improved for evacuation = 5

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

The project is supported by the Butte County Community Wildfire Protection Plan and Hazard Mitigation Plan.

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: _____Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project_ __

Project applicant: _____Butte County Fire Safe Council

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

Recent drought conditions have limited water availability and impacted surrounding vegetation and wildlife. The lack of wildland fires in this fire-adapted environment has led to increased densities in trees and shrubs, and an accumulation of surface fuels. Dense vegetation limits the maximization of recharge due to interception and loss from vegetation and increases evapotranspirative loss. Snow accumulation is rapidly lost due to ablation related to crown density. This project will thin vegetation, reduce crown density and control and eradicate invasive species. It will increase forest diversity and resiliency to better adapt to the stresses of climate change, safeguard a significant reservoir that supplies drinking water to nearby communities, and contribute to the reduction of catastrophic wildfire threat to the residents who live within the watershed.

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

This project will use forest thinning and follow-up low intensity prescribed fire to achieve healthy forest conditions including ideal tree density. Groundwater recharge is maximized at an intermediate tree density. Below this ideal tree density, the benefits from any additional trees on water percolation exceed their extra water use leading to increased groundwater recharge, while the opposite occurs above the ideal density. Successful tree density requires planning. Decisions need to be made to provide a basis for realistic expectations of tree growing for groundwater recharge control.

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 project supports the federal Resilient Lands and Waters Designation for California Headwaters Region and helps direct resources towards restoration that will help improve water quality and quantity, promote healthy forests, and reduce wildfire risk in the Sierra-Cascade California Headwaters region. State and federal agencies and officials have formally acknowledged the need for periodic fire to reduce hazardous fuels and protect humans and the environment from extreme fires. This project will use forest thinning and fire treatments to effectively reduce existing hazardous fuel loads, promote forest succession, and improve the overall quality and health of the remaining forest. If dense forests are not thinned and treated with low-intensity fire, the potential for future high severity wildfires to convert the area back to the beginning stages of forest succession (brush and young trees) would remain and continue to create a threat to California's water supply, air quality, and wildlife habitat resulting from a mega-fire.

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

When forests and hillsides are severely burned, damage to trees, plants and the soil can create the potential for flooding and mudslides during a rainstorm. Intense heat from fires can also make soil repel water. These factors can significantly increase the chance for landslides and flooding, a risk that can remain for years until vegetation has regrown. This project manages fuels and reduces these risks by creating healthy forests that can mitigate these impacts.

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

Fire risk is one of the key stressors to wildlife habitat in the watershed. Wildfires can damage recreation sites and other areas that generate economic activity. The project will ultimately reduce threat of high intensity fire and resulting soil erosion and sedimentation.

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

Wildfire is a major risk hydroelectric facilities and power lines that deliver water and electricity to areas of the watershed. Wildfires can cut off the flow of energy from hydroelectric reservoirs by burning power stations and power lines. This project will make the water more resilient to reduced hydropower output by reducing the threat of wildfire.

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 $MTCO_2e$
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Rubber Tired Dozers	1	10	10
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**19**

■ The project requires biomass materials to be transported outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
		0

☐ The project requires workers from outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
1	1,000	60	**21**

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

Pile bruning will be used in areas that can not be accessed by track chippers or masticators.

☐

Project Operating Emissions

☐ The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

☐ The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

■ The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
15,000	**-94,500**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

GHG Emissions Summary

Construction and development will generate approximately:	40	$MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	-94,500	$MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: *Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project*

PROJECT SPONSOR(S)*: Butte County Fire Safe Council*
Phone: 530-877-0984
Email: firesafe@buttefiresafe.net

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☒	Education
☒	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☐	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☐	Water Quality
☒	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Provide the basic details of your project, including WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW (No more than a single page, 250 words).*

The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the Concow Lake and areas impacted by the 2008 wildfires, adjacent to US FS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Removal of dead and down trees as well as bio mass chipping may be included in the project as well. Yankee Hill FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and had several sever wildfires in the past years and is still in recovery from these wildfires. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. Preferably in spring of 2019.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Provide geographical location and latitude/longitude.*
Location is general area of Camp Fire of 2008 and within the community of Concow with final project coordinates determined by the Community Wildfire Protection Plan landscape level planning group.

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month	Month	Month
Task 1: CEQA	1/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 2: Hire Fuels Reduction Crews	9/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 3: Oversee work and public education	6/1/2022	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 4: Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
DWR	**CAL FIRE**
PUBLIC WORKS	**BERRY CREEK FIRE SAFE COUCNIL**
OFFICE OF EMERGANCY MANAGEMENT	**US FOREST SERVICE**
Click or tap here to enter text.	**SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED PROGRAM**
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: the project boundaries will be completed through the current landscape level planning process undertaken by the community wildfire protection plan landscape level working group	
	☐	

Engineering complete	☒	Yes No (provide details below)
	Details: no engineering needed	
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: no technical design needed*	
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ ☐	Yes No (provide details below)
	Details: CEQA has been completed for work along Lumpkin Road but will need to be completed for the entirety of the project.	
No CEQA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ ☐	Yes No (provide details below)
	Details: acres treated or improved, number of people educated, miles of roadway improved for evacuation	
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ ☒	Yes No (provide details below)
	Details: past monitoring has included photo points with GPS verification but future monitoring will have more data needs to be assisted with the Sacramento River Watershed Program data portal	

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $500,000
Match	Amount: $100,000
	Source: CAL FIRE crew time, volunteer match and matching grants
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Reduce wildfire risk on 250 acres of forest
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	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.	There is a current partnership is in place with DWR and BCFSC to implement the fuel load management plan around Lake Oroville
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Forest thinning wok examples will encourage other municipal services to do the same
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Improve forest health through thinning and release of water from thinning
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Will work with multiple partners for multiple benefits
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Reduce potential green house gas emissions by reducing forest overgrowth
☐	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Provide firewise and water wise education to the community
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency

√	Resource Management Strategy
☐	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☒	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☐	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☒	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☒	Ecosystem restoration
☒	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☒	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☒	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

This may be simple, but it must be specific. It may include measures such as: "miles of fence laid", "number of stakeholders contacted", or "acres of forest treated".

Acres treated =200
People reached = 8,000
Miles of Roadway improved for evacuation = 3

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

The project is supported by the Butte County Community Wildfire Protection Plan and Hazard Mitigation Plan.

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: _____Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project_____

Project applicant: _____Butte County Fire Safe Council

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

Recent drought conditions have limited water availability and impacted surrounding vegetation and wildlife. The lack of wildland fires in this fire-adapted environment has led to increased densities in trees and shrubs, and an accumulation of surface fuels. Dense vegetation limits the maximization of recharge due to interception and loss from vegetation and increases evapotranspirative loss. Snow accumulation is rapidly lost due to ablation related to crown density. This project will thin vegetation, reduce crown density and control and eradicate invasive species. It will increase forest diversity and resiliency to better adapt to the stresses of climate change, safeguard a significant reservoir that supplies drinking water to nearby communities, and contribute to the reduction of catastrophic wildfire threat to the residents who live within the watershed.

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

This project will use forest thinning and follow-up low intensity prescribed fire to achieve healthy forest conditions including ideal tree density. Groundwater recharge is maximized at an intermediate tree density. Below this ideal tree density, the benefits from any additional trees on water percolation exceed their extra water use leading to increased groundwater recharge, while the opposite occurs above the ideal density. Successful tree density requires planning. Decisions need to be made to provide a basis for realistic expectations of tree growing for groundwater recharge control.

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 project supports the federal Resilient Lands and Waters Designation for California Headwaters Region and helps direct resources towards restoration that will help improve water quality and quantity, promote healthy forests, and reduce wildfire risk in the Sierra-Cascade California Headwaters region. State and federal agencies and officials have formally acknowledged the need for periodic fire to reduce hazardous fuels and protect humans and the environment from extreme fires. This project will use forest thinning and fire treatments to effectively reduce existing hazardous fuel loads, promote forest succession, and improve the overall quality and health of the remaining forest. If dense forests are not thinned and treated with low-intensity fire, the potential for future high severity wildfires to convert the area back to the beginning stages of forest succession (brush and young trees) would remain and continue to create a threat to California's water supply, air quality, and wildlife habitat resulting from a mega-fire.

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

When forests and hillsides are severely burned, damage to trees, plants and the soil can create the potential for flooding and mudslides during a rainstorm. Intense heat from fires can also make soil repel water. These factors can significantly increase the chance for landslides and flooding, a risk that can remain for years until vegetation has regrown. This project manages fuels and reduces these risks by creating healthy forests that can mitigate these impacts.

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

Fire risk is one of the key stressors to wildlife habitat in the watershed. Wildfires can damage recreation sites and other areas that generate economic activity. The project will ultimately reduce threat of high intensity fire and resulting soil erosion and sedimentation.

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

Wildfire is a major risk hydroelectric facilities and power lines that deliver water and electricity to areas of the watershed. Wildfires can cut off the flow of energy from hydroelectric reservoirs by burning power stations and power lines. This project will make the water more resilient to reduced hydropower output by reducing the threat of wildfire.

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 $MTCO_2e$
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Skid Steer Loaders	1	15	1
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**11**

■ The project requires biomass materials to be transported outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
		0

☐ The project requires workers from outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
1	1,000	60	**21**

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

Pile bruning will be used in areas that can not be accessed by track chippers or masticators.

☐

Project Operating Emissions

☐ The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

☐ The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

■ The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
15,000	**-94,500**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

GHG Emissions Summary

Construction and development will generate approximately:	31	$MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	-94,500	$MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: *Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project*

PROJECT SPONSOR(S)*: Butte County Fire Safe Council*
Phone: 530-877-0984
Email: firesafe@buttefiresafe.net

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☐	Community
☒	Education
☒	Fire and Fuels
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☐	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☐	Water Quality
☒	Water Supply
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Provide the basic details of your project, including WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW (No more than a single page, 250 words).*

The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction. The project will increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place around the residential portions of Feather Falls, adjacent to US FS lands, along key ingress and evacuation routes as well as ridge lines for wildfire defense. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. Feather Falls FSC formed over a decade ago and received Firewise USA recognition. Coordination with the group, CALFIRE and USFS has taken place for many years. The area is in the CAL FIRE high hazard risk area and had a sever wildfire last year which burned 80 homes and impacted thousands of acres. The project will take place when funding is available and CEQA is complete. Preferably in spring of 2019.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Provide geographical location and latitude/longitude.*
Location is general area of Feather Falls with final project coordinates determined by the Community Wildfire Protection Plan landscape level planning group.

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month	Month	Month
Task 1: CEQA	1/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 2: Hire Fuels Reduction Crews	9/1/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 3: Oversee work and public education	6/1/2022	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 4: Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
DWR	**CAL FIRE**
PUBLIC WORKS	**BERRY CREEK FIRE SAFE COUCNIL**
OFFICE OF EMERGANCY MANAGEMENT	**US FOREST SERVICE**
MOORETOWN RANCHERIA	**SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED PROGRAM**
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: the project boundaries will be completed through the current landscape level planning process undertaken by the community wildfire protection plan landscape level working group	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)

	Details: no engineering needed
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: no technical design needed*
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: CEQA has been completed for work along Lumpkin Road but will need to be completed for the entirety of the project.*
No CEQA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: acres treated or improved, number of people educated, miles of roadway improved for evacuation*
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below) *Details: past monitoring has included photo points with GPS verification but future monitoring will have more data needs to be assisted with the Sacramento River Watershed Program data portal*

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $300,000
Match	Amount: $80,000
	Source: CAL FIRE crew time, volunteer match and matching grants
Match	Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.
	Source: Click or tap here to enter text.

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Reduce wildfire risk on 250 acres of forest
☐	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	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.	There is a current partnership is in place with DWR and BCFSC to implement the fuel load management plan around Lake Oroville
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Forest thinning wok examples will encourage other municipal services to do the same
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Improve forest health through thinning and release of water from thinning
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Will work with multiple partners for multiple benefits
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Reduce potential green house gas emissions by reducing forest overgrowth
☐	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Provide firewise and water wise education to the community
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency

√	Resource Management Strategy
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☒	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☐	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☒	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☒	Ecosystem restoration
☒	Forest management
☐	Land use planning and management
☐	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☒	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☐	Outreach and engagement
☒	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

This may be simple, but it must be specific. It may include measures such as: "miles of fence laid", "number of stakeholders contacted", or "acres of forest treated".

Acres treated = 150
People reached = 5,000
Miles of Roadway improved for evacuation = 3

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

The project is supported by the Butte County Community Wildfire Protection Plan and Hazard Mitigation Plan.

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: _____Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project__

Project applicant: _____Butte County Fire Safe Council

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

Recent drought conditions have limited water availability and impacted surrounding vegetation and wildlife. The lack of wildland fires in this fire-adapted environment has led to increased densities in trees and shrubs, and an accumulation of surface fuels. Dense vegetation limits the maximization of recharge due to interception and loss from vegetation and increases evapotranspirative loss. Snow accumulation is rapidly lost due to ablation related to crown density. This project will thin vegetation, reduce crown density and control and eradicate invasive species. It will increase forest diversity and resiliency to better adapt to the stresses of climate change, safeguard a significant reservoir that supplies drinking water to nearby communities, and contribute to the reduction of catastrophic wildfire threat to the residents who live within the watershed.

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

This project will use forest thinning and follow-up low intensity prescribed fire to achieve healthy forest conditions including ideal tree density. Groundwater recharge is maximized at an intermediate tree density. Below this ideal tree density, the benefits from any additional trees on water percolation exceed their extra water use leading to increased groundwater recharge, while the opposite occurs above the ideal density. Successful tree density requires planning. Decisions need to be made to provide a basis for realistic expectations of tree growing for groundwater recharge control.

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 project supports the federal Resilient Lands and Waters Designation for California Headwaters Region and helps direct resources towards restoration that will help improve water quality and quantity, promote healthy forests, and reduce wildfire risk in the Sierra-Cascade California Headwaters region. State and federal agencies and officials have formally acknowledged the need for periodic fire to reduce hazardous fuels and protect humans and the environment from extreme fires. This project will use forest thinning and fire treatments to effectively reduce existing hazardous fuel loads, promote forest succession, and improve the overall quality and health of the remaining forest. If dense forests are not thinned and treated with low-intensity fire, the potential for future high severity wildfires to convert the area back to the beginning stages of forest succession (brush and young trees) would remain and continue to create a threat to California's water supply, air quality, and wildlife habitat resulting from a mega-fire.

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

When forests and hillsides are severely burned, damage to trees, plants and the soil can create the potential for flooding and mudslides during a rainstorm. Intense heat from fires can also make soil repel water. These factors can significantly increase the chance for landslides and flooding, a risk that can remain for years until vegetation has regrown. This project manages fuels and reduces these risks by creating healthy forests that can mitigate these impacts.

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

Fire risk is one of the key stressors to wildlife habitat in the watershed. Wildfires can damage recreation sites and other areas that generate economic activity. The project will ultimately reduce threat of high intensity fire and resulting soil erosion and sedimentation.

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

Wildfire is a major risk hydroelectric facilities and power lines that deliver water and electricity to areas of the watershed. Wildfires can cut off the flow of energy from hydroelectric reservoirs by burning power stations and power lines. This project will make the water more resilient to reduced hydropower output by reducing the threat of wildfire.

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 $MTCO_2e$
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**10**

■ The project requires biomass materials to be transported outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
		0

☐ The project requires workers from outside of the UFR watershed. If yes:

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
1	1,000	60	**21**

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

Pile bruning will be used in areas that can not be accessed by track chippers or masticators.

☐

Project Operating Emissions

☐ The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

☐ The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

■ The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
15,000	**-94,500**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

☐ The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

GHG Emissions Summary

Construction and development will generate approximately:	30	$MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	-94,500	$MTCO_2e$

STEP 1 UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM
Implementation Project Application 2018

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group is accepting applications from interested stakeholders who wish to have project(s) included in the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. Please note that this is not a grant application at this stage; this application is to submit your project for consideration for inclusion in the IRWM Plan as an implementation project, which will then be eligible to apply for upcoming IRWM grant solicitations.

Projects eligible for inclusion in the Plan must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River IRWM Region (see website for the Region Description and map).
- Address water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, including water supply, water quality, forest and watershed management, and/or natural resource enhancement.
- Be consistent with the Region's goals and objectives (http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/).

See the Upper Feather River IRWM website for the Plan, maps, current list of implementation projects, and information about the Regional Water Management Group: http://featherriver.org/. Questions may be directed to Uma Hinman, IRWM Program Coordinator, at ufr.contact@gmail.com or (916) 813-0818.

PROJECT NAME: *Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project*

PROJECT SPONSOR(S)*: Sacramento River Watershed Program and 34 North*
Phone: 530-781-2220
Email: holly@sacriver.org

PROJECT TYPE:
Place an "x" next to the appropriate project type. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other." If your project consists of more than 1 project type, please use a "1, 2, 3" mechanism to rank the types in order of importance or share of the budget.

☐	Agriculture
☒	Community - 4
☒	Education - 3
☒	Fire and Fuels - 1
☐	Flooding
☐	Habitat and Environment
☐	Infrastructure
☐	Invasive Species
☐	Recreation
☐	Water Quality
☒	Water Supply - 2
☐	Other – *please describe:*

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *Provide the basic details of your project, including WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW (No more than a single page, 250 words).*

The project will reduce wildfire risk by improving forest health through thinning and fuels reduction and increase water release by reducing the amount of water taken by overstocked forested stands. The project will take place on private lands. A variety of fuels treatments have been successful in Butte County historically and will be used for this project including: hand cut and pile burn, mastication, prescribed fire, lop and scatter, as well as hand cut and chip. The Forbestown Ridge project area is includes the communities of Forbestown and Merry Mountain Village, a local homeowner association located in the community of Clipper Mills. These communities have active fire safe councils and are recognized as FIREWISE Communities. They are committed to wildfire planning and prevention, and share a common vision with SRWP and the BCFSC to create communities within a landscape that are resistant to the devastating impacts of wildland fires.

PROJECT LOCATION: *Provide geographical location and latitude/longitude.*
Location is general area of Berry Creek with final project coordinates determined by the Community Wildfire Protection Plan landscape level planning group.

BRIEF PROJECT TIMELINE: *Include basic information regarding project milestones or deliverables with timeline.*

	Month	Month	Month	Month
Task 1: CEQA	1/1/2019	8/31/2019	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 2: Restoration Work	9/1/2019	9/1/2021	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 3: Education and Outreach	9/1/2019	9/1/2021	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.
Task 4: Web-based Tool Development	9/1/2019	9/1/2021	Click or tap to enter a date.	Click or tap to enter a date.

COLLABORATORS/PARTNERS: *List partners in the appropriate columns below. Add more lines to table as needed.*

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
DWR	CAL FIRE
BUTTE COUNTY OEM	BUTTE COUNTY AND FORBESTOWN RIDGE FIRE SAFE COUNCILS
AMERICAN FOREST FOUNDATION	US FOREST SERVICE
SOPER WHEELER COMPANY	SWRCB - CVRWQCB
NRCS	MOORETOWN RANCHERIA

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: the project boundaries will be completed through the current landscape level planning process undertaken by the community wildfire protection plan landscape level working group	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)

	Details: no engineering needed
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: no technical design needed*
CEQA/NEPA complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: CEQA has been completed on areas adjacent to project area but will need to be completed for the entirety of the project.*
No CEQA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
Performance Measures identified[1]	☒ Yes ☐ No (provide details below) *Details: Acres treated or improved and number of stakeholders engaged.*
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☒ No (provide details below) *Details: Web-based tool will be developed to support the prioritization, implementation and monitoring of this and other projects in the UFR.*

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $500,000
Match	Amount: $65,000
	Source: CWPP Workgroup in-kind including CalFire
Match	Amount: $22,000
	Source: 34 North technical assistance

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all issues that your project deals with. If none of the provided categories are appropriate, please provide your own in the box called "other."

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☒	Restore natural hydrologic functions.	Restore natural watershed functions
☒	Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Contribute to the reduction of catastrophic wildfire threats

[1] Performance measures are a required component of DWR-funded implementation projects, and can also be described as deliverables.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☒	Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	Web-based forest health tool links regional, state and federal priorities and provides framework to support the prioritization, implementation and monitoring of watershed planning and restoration efforts
☒	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.	Web-based forest health tool links regional, state and federal priorities and provides framework to support the prioritization, implementation and monitoring of watershed planning and restoration efforts
☒	Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Web-based forest health tool encourages strategic prioritization of projects, reduces redundancy, and helps achieve synergistic watershed level restoration benefits
☐	Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☐	Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	Restore natural watershed functions and improve comprehensive watershed planning and restoration efforts
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	Restore natural watershed functions and improve comprehensive watershed planning and restoration efforts
☒	Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	Web-based forest health tool encourages strategic prioritization of projects, reduces redundancy, and helps achieve synergistic watershed level restoration benefits
☐	Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	Click or tap here to enter text.
☒	Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	Increase forest diversity and resiliency to better adapt to the stresses of climate change
☒	Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Safeguard a significant reservoir that supplies drinking water to nearby communities
☒	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	Restore natural watershed functions, improve comprehensive watershed planning and restoration efforts, and foster understanding and information sharing
☐	Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	Click or tap here to enter text.

√	Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective
☐	Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Web-based forest health tool encourages strategic prioritization of projects, reduces redundancy, and helps achieve synergistic watershed level restoration benefits
☐	*Other (please describe):*	Click or tap here to enter text.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ADDRESSED

Place an "x" next to all resource management strategies that your project addresses.

√	Resource Management Strategy
Reduce Water Demand	
☐	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
☐	Urban water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management	
☐	Flood management
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers	
☐	Conveyance – regional/local
☐	System reoperation
☐	Water transfers
Increase Water Supply	
☒	Conjunctive management
☐	Precipitation Enhancement
☐	Municipal recycled water
☐	Surface storage – regional/local
Improve Water Quality	
☐	Drinking water treatment and distribution
☒	Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation
☐	Matching water quality to water use
☐	Pollution prevention
☐	Salt and salinity management
☐	Urban storm water runoff management
Practice Resource Stewardship	
☐	Agricultural land stewardship
☒	Ecosystem restoration
☒	Forest management
☒	Land use planning and management
☒	Recharge area protection
☐	Sediment management
☒	Watershed management
People and Water	
☐	Economic incentives
☒	Outreach and engagement
☒	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

This may be simple, but it must be specific. It may include measures such as: "miles of fence laid", "number of stakeholders contacted", or "acres of forest treated".

- **Acres of forested watershed treated = 250**
- **Number of stakeholders reached via meetings, presentations, materials, web-based tools, and social media = 14,850**

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Are there any local planning documents that address and/or support your project? If so, explain.

The proposed project is supported by the Butte County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) and is in conformance with the Butte County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan strategy for "minimizing risk and vulnerability of the community to hazards and reduced damages and protect lives, properties and public health in Butte County". The proposed Project complements the Sierra Nevada Conservancy's Watershed Improvement Program's (WIP) effort to increase the pace and scale of forest restoration by contributing to the unifying framework required to restore the resiliency of California's primary watersheds.

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: _____Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project ____

Project applicant: _____Sacramento River Watershed Program_____ ___

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

Recent drought conditions have limited water availability and impacted surrounding vegetation and wildlife. The lack of wildland fires in this fire-adapted environment has led to increased densities in trees and shrubs, and an accumulation of surface fuels. Dense vegetation limits the maximization of recharge due to interception and loss from vegetation and increases evapotranspirative loss. Snow accumulation is rapidly lost due to ablation related to crown density. This project will thin vegetation, reduce crown density and control and eradicate invasive species. It will increase forest diversity and resiliency to better adapt to the stresses of climate change, safeguard a significant reservoir that supplies drinking water to nearby communities, and contribute to the reduction of catastrophic wildfire threat to the residents who live within the watershed.

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

This project will use forest thinning and follow-up low intensity prescribed fire to achieve healthy forest conditions including ideal tree density. Groundwater recharge is maximized at an intermediate tree density. Below this ideal tree density, the benefits from any additional trees on water percolation exceed their extra water use leading to increased groundwater recharge, while the opposite occurs above the ideal density. Successful tree density requires planning. Decisions need to be made to provide a basis for realistic expectations of tree growing for groundwater recharge control. This project will develop web-based decision-support tools that will improve strategic planning efforts by facilitating communication and cooperation and aggregating and organizing data and information to inform forest management decisions.

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 project supports the federal Resilient Lands and Waters Designation for California Headwaters Region and helps direct resources towards restoration that will help improve water quality and quantity, promote healthy forests, and reduce wildfire risk in the Sierra-Cascade California Headwaters region. State and federal agencies and officials have formally acknowledged the need for periodic fire to reduce hazardous fuels and protect humans and the environment from extreme fires. This project will use forest thinning and fire treatments to effectively reduce existing hazardous fuel loads, promote forest succession, and improve the overall quality and health of the remaining forest. If dense forests are not thinned and treated with low-intensity fire, the potential for future high severity wildfires to convert the area back to the beginning stages of forest succession (brush and young trees) would remain and continue to create a threat to California's water supply, air quality, and wildlife habitat resulting from a mega-fire.

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

When forests and hillsides are severely burned, damage to trees, plants and the soil can create the potential for flooding and mudslides during a rainstorm. Intense heat from fires can also make soil repel water. These factors can significantly increase the chance for landslides and flooding, a risk that can remain for years until vegetation has regrown. This project manages fuels and reduces these risks by creating healthy forests that can mitigate these impacts.

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

Fire risk is one of the key stressors to wildlife habitat in the watershed. Wildfires can damage recreation sites and other areas that generate economic activity. The project will ultimately reduce threat of high intensity fire and resulting soil erosion and sedimentation.

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

The South Feather Water and Power and the North Yuba Water District has critical infrastructure in the watershed that includes several hydroelectric plants, miles of canals and conduits, dams and tunnels and a water treatment plant that serves residents in both Butte and Yuba Counties. Wildfire is a major risk hydroelectric facilities and power lines that deliver water and electricity to areas of the watershed. Wildfires can cut off the flow of energy from hydroelectric reservoirs by burning power stations and power lines. This project will make the water more resilient to reduced hydropower output by reducing the threat of wildfire.

Forbestown Ridge Roest Health and Waterhsed Protection Project

GHG Emissions Analysis

Project Construction Emissions

[X] 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 $MTCO_2e$
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
Other Construction Equipment	1	60	5
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
		Total Emissions	**10**

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total $MTCO_2e$
		0

[X] 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 $MTCO_2e$
1	1,000	40	**14**

[X] The project is expected to generate GHG emissions for other reasons. If yes, explain:

Pile burning

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

Forbestown Ridge Roest Health and Waterhsed Protection Project

Project Operating Emissions

[ ] The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total $MTCO_2e$
	kWh (Electricity)	**0**
	Therm (Natural Gas)	**0**

[ ] The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

[X] The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk. If yes:

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total $MTCO_2e$
15,000	**-94,500**

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

[ ] The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total $MTCO_2e$
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

[ ] The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total $MTCO_2e$
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:	23	$MTCO_2e$
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	-94,500	$MTCO_2e$

A RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER FEATHER RIVER REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GROUP APPROVING THE ADDITION OF IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS TO THE 2016 UPPER FEATHER RIVER INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, by Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU"), a broad array of governments, agencies, and organizations created the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group ("RWMG"); and

WHEREAS, the Department of Water Resources approved the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan on November 4, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the RWMG adopted the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan on November 18, 2016;

WHEREAS, the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan contains a list of implementation projects, thereby making them eligible for Department of Water Resources grant funding opportunities;

WHEREAS, the RWMG periodically updates the list of implementation projects contained in the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, the RWMG has reviewed eight (8) project applications submitted for consideration to be included in the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and has determined them to be a) located within the geographic boundaries of the Upper Feather River Region, b) addressing the water resource management issues in the Upper Feather River Region, and c) consistent with the Upper Feather River Region's goals and objectives.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Upper Feather River RWMG hereby approves the following applications as implementation projects to be included in the 2016 Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan:

1. Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
2. Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
3. Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council
4. Forbestown Ridge Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Sacramento River Watershed Program & 34 North
5. Community Water Tank Inspection, Indian Valley CSD
6. Crescent Hills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project, Indian Valley CSD
7. Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project, Indian Valley CSD
8. District-wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair, Sierra Water Works District #1 – Calpine

Passed and adopted this 22nd day of June, 2018, by consensus of a quorum of the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group.

SIGNED: _____

Sherrie Thrall, Chair, Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

ATTEST: _____

Paul Roen, Vice-Chair, Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

ITEM NO. 4

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: IRWM Plan Implementation Projects

DISCUSSION

The UFR IRWM Plan 2016 included 81 implementation projects, 41 of which were municipal services projects. Eleven municipal projects are road/culvert improvement projects and the remaining are drinking water, wastewater, and infrastructure improvement projects.

The attached table summarizes the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan implementation projects. In 2017, staff performed outreach to project sponsors to 1) solicit updates on their projects, and 2) provide information regarding the SWRCB TA grant opportunity. At that time five projects had received at least partial funding.

Additionally, eight new projects have been submitted for consideration by the RWMG for inclusion in the Plan implementation project list. Further, several new Tribal project submittals and project updates are anticipated in the next couple of months.

There are a number of funding opportunities for DAC and Tribal drinking water and wastewater projects. In order to move some of these projects forward, staff is suggesting the following steps, focusing in particular on DAC and Tribal drinking water and wastewater projects:

1. Staff to review projects with project sponsors to determine project
    a. readiness to proceed
    b. status and need for technical assistance
    c. availability of funding match
    d. addressing critical need of community
2. Identify and select projects that best match the funding sources (below).
3. Work with resources to prepare project

Funding Sources

<u>DWR Proposition 1 IRWM Funding</u>
DWR Prop 1 Implementation Funding Round 1 steps:

1. RWMG review and select suite of projects to put forward in an application
2. Applicant submits proposal summary and project information form
3. Pre-Application Workshop
4. DWR provides feedback on project(s)
5. Region submits application
6. DWR scores application and makes draft funding recommendation
7. Final award

State Water Board

Funding for drinking water and wastewater is available through the State Water Board. Projects could be identified and coordination for funding initiated.

Sierra Nevada Conservancy

SNC has indicated they may have funding available to assist with DAC, Tribal, environmental project development. Potential assistance may consist of funding or capacity building for developing grant applications or CEQA.

Proposition 68 Water Bond

The new water bond has allocated $250 million for clean drinking water and drought programs. This bond has a substantial amount of funding for restoration, parks, agricultural water, and disaster preparedness as well. Staff will follow this one closely to see how it rolls out.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Informational and possible direction to staff:

a. Direct staff to review projects, identifying those that best match the eligibility criteria of grant opportunities for RWMG consideration.
b. Direct staff to work with the Plumas County Community Development Commission, or other entity, to identify and pursue grant opportunities for DAC and Tribal drinking water and wastewater projects.

Attachments: 2016 UFR IRWM Implementation Project list

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget ($)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
Feather River Resource Conservation District	ALS-1:Taylorsville Mill Race Dam resurfacing	150,000			
Feather River Resource Conservation District	ALS-2: Water quality and infrastructure upgrades on working lands	1,567,500			X
Feather River and Sierra Valley Resource Conservation Districts	ALS-3: Enhanced management of livestock grazing	1,500,000			X
Plumas and Sierra County Agricultural Commissioner	ALS-4: Invasive weed management	450,000		X	X
Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District	ALS-6: Sierra Valley agricultural water diversion efficiency and improvements	150,000			
Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District	ALS-7: Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District Resource Management Plan	155,000	X		X
Feather River Resource Conservation District	ALS-8: Upper Feather River weather monitoring infrastructure	380,200			X
University California Cooperative Extension	ALS-9: Soil health assessment	580,000-800,000			X
Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District	ALS-10: Sierra Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan	572,000	X		
Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District	ALS-11: Cold Stream Ag & Fire Storage Impoundment	300,000	X		
Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District/University California Cooperative Extension	ALS-12: Alfalfa alternative	130,000			X
Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District/Sierra Watershed Habitat Conservation Foundation	ALS-13: Little Last Chance Lake	265,000		X	
Lake Almanor Watershed Group	FMW-2: Water quality monitoring program for Lake Almanor and its tributaries	120,000		X	
Mountain Meadows Conservancy	FMW-4: Wildlife enhancement project	238,062		X	
Mountain Meadows Conservancy	FMW-5: Upper Feather River Interpretive and Education Sites	60,500			
Natural Resources Conservation District	FMW-6: Watershed monitoring program	40,000			

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget ($)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
County of Plumas	FMW-8: Spanish Creek restoration	1,250,000			
Plumas County Unified School District	FMW-9: Watershed education	48,000	X		
Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute	FMW-10: Lake Almanor Basin stewardship and outreach program	142,224	X	X	
Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute	FMW-11: Lake Almanor Basin water quality improvement plan	510,000	X		
US Forest Service	FMW-14: Folchi Meadow project	300,000			
Trout Unlimited	FMW-15: Fish habitat assessment/restoration, public awareness/education	180,000		X	X
Trout Unlimited	FMW-16: Fish distribution modeling in relation to climate change	166,500		X	X
WM Beaty and Associates	FMW-18: Mountain Meadows livestock fencing	174,600	X		
Trout Unlimited	FMW-19: Debris dam survey, inventory and characterization	97,000			
City of Portola	MS-1: Wastewater system infrastructure improvements	1,424,522	X		X
City of Portola	MS-2: Turner Springs improvement	403,000	X		
East Quincy Services District	MS-4: Water tank project	630,000	X		
Feather River Canyon Community Services District	MS-6: Old Mill Ranch	500,000	X		
Gold Mountain Community Services District	MS-7: High elevation water tank and well	2,030,150	X		
Gold Mountain Community Services District	MS-8: Water reclamation facility	1,758,000	X		
Grizzly Lake Community Services District	MS-9: Crocker water service meters	1,500,000	X		
Grizzly Lake Community Services District	MS-10: Crocker Welch ground tank repair	200,000	X		
Grizzly Lake Community Services District	MS-11: Delleker water meters	1,500,000	X		
Grizzly Lake Community Services District	MS-12: Delleker water tank rehabilitation	200,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-13: Groundwater monitoring	40,000	X		

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget ($)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
County of Plumas	MS-15: Chandler Road bridge erosion	897,000			
County of Plumas	MS-16: Humbug Valley Road bridge erosion	408,000			
County of Plumas	MS-17: Road 311 culvert improvement	251,000			
County of Plumas	MS-18: Road 318 culvert improvement	251,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-19: North Valley Road bridge erosion	670,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-20: Mill Creek erosion	835,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-21: Smith Creek erosion	105,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-22: Wapaunsie Creek erosion	427,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-23: Stampfli Land bridge erosion	432,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-24: Walker Ranch Community Services District infrastructure improvements	100,000	X		
County of Plumas	MS-25: Humbug Valley Road 307 culvert improvement	728,000			
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-26: Municipal well No. 3	1,050,000			
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-27: Treated wastewater reuse	N/A	X		
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-28: Water meter installation	989,205			
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-29: Water storage tank replacement	531,750			
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-30: Wastewater treatment plant No. 6 upgrade	N/A			
Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	MS-31: Wastewater treatment plant No. 7 lift station replacement	N/A			
Quincy Community Services District	MS-32: Water system improvements	589,000	X		
County of Sierra	MS-33: Sierra County road improvements	495,000			
Sierraville Public Utilities District	MS-35: Alternative water storage analysis and development	660,000	X		
Westwood Community Services District	MS-36: Water storage project	750,000	X		
Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute	MS-37: Almanor Basin solid and wastewater treatment plant	135,000	X	X	

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget ($)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
Sierraville Public Utilities District	MS-38: Leak detection and repair	155,500	X		
Sierraville Public Utilities District	MS-39: Meter replacement	194,000	X		
Sierraville Public Utilities District	MS-40: Pumphouse improvement	243,400	X		
Sierraville Public Utilities District	MS-41: Tank replacement project	630,000	X		
East Quincy Services District	MS-42: Automatic meter reading project	666,679	X		
East Quincy Services District	MS-43: Replace copper service lines project	1,107,685	X		
Maidu Summit Consortium	TAC-2: Big Springs vegetation management	400,000		X	
Maidu Summit Consortium	TAC-3: Mud Creek habitat recovery	450,000		X	
Maidu Summit Consortium	TAC-5: Indian Jim River Resource Center	350.000	X	X	
Maidu Summit Consortium	TAC-6: Tradition Ecological Knowledge	200,000		X	X
University of California, Cal Poly	UF-1: Marian Meadow	55,000		X	
Collins Pine Company	UF-2: Rock Creek meadow restoration	180,000		X	
US Forest Service	UF-6: Round Valley/Keddie hand thin	189,000	X		
US Forest Service	UF-7: US Forest Service road improvements	1,000,000			X
WM Beaty and Associates	UF-8: Goodrich Creek biomass	715,600		X	
WM Beaty and Associates	UF-10: Greenville Creek biomass	345,630		X	
WM Beaty and Associates	UF-11: Mountain Meadows Creek biomass	435,230		X	
Soper Company	UF-12: Upper Feather River cooperative regional thinning	50,400-52,920		X	X
County of Plumas	UF-13: Upper Feather River cooperative LiDAR and GIS support program	3,000,000-4,000,000		X	X

ITEM NO. 5

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Grant Opportunities

INTRODUCTION

This agenda item includes information regarding current grant and loan opportunities and technical assistance opportunities.

State Water Resources Control Board

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) allocated $10 million in Proposition 1 funding to provide technical assistance to DACs. The SWRCB Prop 1 Technical Assistance is available to help small (less than 10,000 people) DAC entities develop, fund, and implement Prop 1-eligible drinking water, wastewater, storm water (limited), or groundwater capital projects. Technical Assistance may include project coordination and development, legal assistance, engineering and environmental analysis, and/or leak detection/water audits.

From the SWRCB website: Requests relating to one or more of the following will generally be given priority: systems that are out of compliance or experiencing insufficient water delivery capabilities, extension of service for drought/contamination impacted communities, consolidation projects, systems serving less than 200 connections, and applicants with small or relatively low cost needs that will enable an otherwise complete funding application to move forward.

This opportunity is tentatively scheduled to end in early 2019, depending on funding availability. See the following link for more information: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/proposition1/tech_asst_funding.shtml.

Water Infrastructure, Planning, Construction and Technical Assistance:

- State Water Board website on the Prop 1 technical funding programs: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/proposition1.shtml
    - Drinking Water Fund: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/dwsrf/scoping_workshops.shtml

    - Small Community Wastewater Program: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/small_community_wastewater_grant/projects.shtml
- Launch Site for all Applications to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (and instructions for how to apply, generally, for funding from the State Water Board): http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/srf_forms.shtml

USEPA Water Finance Clearinghouse

The Finance Clearinghouse provides a searchable database with more than $10 billion in water funding sources and over 600 resources to support local water infrastructure projects. Communities across the nation have aging or inadequate water infrastructure. The Clearinghouse helps financing get where it's needed most by offering up-to-date finance information: https://www.epa.gov/waterfinancecenter. The following two programs may be of particular interest:

- Capacity Development Program
  EPA's capacity development program helps small system owners and operators, state and tribal agencies, technical assistance providers, and consumers help small water systems provide safe drinking water and protect public health. Every state has a capacity development program to help small systems improve their finances, management, infrastructure, and operations.
- Environmental Finance Center (EFC) Network
  EFCs partner with, states, tribes, local governments and the private sector to deliver targeted technical assistance to the water sector. EFCs and their partners provide innovative solutions to help manage the costs of environmental financing and program management.
    - CSU, Sacramento - Supporting and improving the capabilities of Region 9 by providing resource tools and on-site training and technical assistance related to financing and planning of environmental and public health programs in areas such as drinking water, wastewater, stormwater, groundwater, and solid waste management.

Sierra Nevada Conservancy

The Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) Funding Opportunities Newsletter for June-July 2018 is attached. Additionally, the SNC is offering to support project sponsors in finding funding to complete CEQA work in order to be ready for the next round of Proposition 1 funding. Please reach out to Lynn Campbell or Christine Hoffman in the Quincy SNC office if interested: (530) 283-3011.

Department of Water Resources Proposition 1 IRWM

The IRWM Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) Project is currently in process.

The Final Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for the next round of Prop 1 IRWM funding for implementation projects is anticipated to be released by DWR in late Fall 2018. While originally intended to be solely for DACs, the second round will likely be a mixture of DAC and non-DAC implementation funding. The intent for opening it up is to include some DAC-specific funding in the final round so as to incorporate projects identified and developed through the DACI (round 1) effort.

Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grants[1] Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule	
Milestone/Activity	**Tentative Schedule[2]**
Coordination with Stakeholders RE: development of implementation grant program concepts	May 2017-August 2018
DWR releases Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for minimum 45-day public comment period	September 2018
3 public meetings (Northern, Central, Southern – locations TBD)	October 2018
Draft PSP public comment period closes	October 2018
DWR releases Final PSP	Late Fall 2018
Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR[3]	April 2019
Round 1 Grant Awards	2019
Round 2 Grant solicitation process begins	2020
Notes: [1] Includes funding for projects benefitting disadvantaged communities. [2] Schedule subject to change. [3] DWR intends to work with potential grant applicants on a Funding Area basis following the release of the Final PSP and prior to submittal of the grant applications	

Source: https://www.water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Proposition-1

DWR staff have stated that once the final PSP is released, DWR plans to conduct consultations/ workshops with each of the 12 legislated funding areas. Several state agencies will be involved in this effort and will participate as a multi-agency team to discuss proposed projects and conduct reviews. During this process, state agencies will learn about each region's priorities and unique needs, and then provide feedback on projects. IRWM regions within each funding area will be encouraged to work cooperatively with each other and take longer-term strategic approaches. IRWM regions will be asked to talk about all of their upcoming projects at the consultations, including when those projects will be ready to proceed, and when funding will be needed. Regarding disadvantaged communities (DACs), the outcomes of the DACTI process will be used to inform Proposition 1 DAC implementation projects. Of the $420M statewide, $51M is committed for DACs.

Following are comments that were offered during the May 4, 2018 Roundtable of Regions-hosted meeting with DWR (meeting notes attached):

General – DWR needs to acknowledge the varying stages of evolution, capacity and geographical challenges in each of the funding areas. Three funding areas have only one region each, several have developed funding area agreements whereby funds are split between the regions so competitiveness is no longer an issue, and the rest have many regions each with lots of competition. Having one point person per funding area, and/or one workshop in one location per funding area, may not be feasible in some cases.

Process – comments from the group included more time needed between steps and more flexibility needed depending on a funding area/region's situation

Project Information Form – comments to DWR encouraged flexibility in allowing those funding areas who wish to, to use their own databases and forms when the information is all the same.

Evaluation Criteria/Scoring – CEQA – DWR clarified that CEQA must be completed within six months of grant award; however, this requirement does not apply to DAC and/or Tribal projects.

Evaluation Criteria/Scoring - other – comments provided to DWR:

- Climate change - should each project be required to demonstrate that it addresses climate change (and how)?
- Regional self-reliance criteria and interregional/funding area benefit criteria might work against each other; give it more consideration.
- DAC- need more thought given to what is meant by "DAC benefit" so that the benefits claimed by applicants are not tangential/ancillary as has sometimes occurred in the past.

Funding Available

- Planning funds – Planning funds/technical assistance funds through the DACTI project could help some folks with their CEQA readiness issues, especially DACs. Could work for research/development type projects. Could also help regions to update their IRWM Plans again after the DAC needs assessments are done.

Other

- Stakeholders want the Water Board and DWR to work together on the two funding programs as much as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Informational.

Attachments: Sierra Nevada Conservancy Funding Opportunities Newsletter, June-July 2018
May 4, 2018 Roundtable of Regions/DWR Meeting Summary

Sierra Nevada Conservancy
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES NEWSLETTER
June-July 2018

Funding Research Memos for fuel reduction, parks and trails, habitat preservation, environmental education, and other program areas are available on the SNC funding opportunities webpage. This is a great way to find funding opportunities for your projects!

Upcoming Grants that Might be of Interest:

- Clif Bar Family Foundation Small Grants (due June 1) support efforts to protect the Earth's beauty and bounty, create a robust and healthy food system, increase opportunities for outdoor activity, reduce environmental health hazards, and build stronger communities.
- The Bella Vista Foundation Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program (applications accepted June 4 – 15) focuses on protecting, restoring, and revitalizing high-priority watershed ecosystems in California, including Truckee River, Yuba/Bear/American, and the North Fork Feather River watersheds.
- The National Forest Foundation's Matching Award Program (due June 13) provides funds for direct on-the-ground projects that benefit National Forests and that enhance outdoor experiences, forest and ecosystem health, and engage local communities in caring for their public lands.
- CA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Watershed Restoration Grants (due June 13) build resiliency and address immediate issues from the aftermath of recent wildfires, as well as address long-standing environmental challenges, by supporting water quality, river, and watershed protection and restoration projects of statewide importance.
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF): Developing the Next Generation of Stewards Grants (due June 21) provide funding for urban, tribal and minority youth to engage with the natural world and discover career opportunities available in conservation.
- CA Natural Resources Agency Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Grants (due June 22) can fund the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of resource

lands to mitigate the loss of or detriment to resource lands from new transportation projects.

- USDA Rural Community Development Initiative Grants (due June 25) develop the capacity of community development organizations; low-income rural communities; and federally recognized Native American tribes to undertake projects related to housing, community facilities, or community and economic development in rural areas.
- The NPS Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program (due June 30) has a network of conservation and recreation planning professionals partners that help community groups, nonprofits, tribes, and state and local governments design trails and parks, conserve and improve access to rivers, protect special places, and create recreational opportunities.
- North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA): U.S. Standard Grants (due July 13) fund projects which increase bird populations and wetland habitat while supporting local economies and American traditions, such as hunting, fishing, bird-watching, family farming, and cattle ranching.
- The CA Active Transportation Program (due July 31) provides funding for projects that increase active modes of transportation, such as walking and bicycling.
- The Rose Foundation for Communities and the Environment: Northern California Environmental Grassroots Fund (due August 1) provides modest general support grants to small grassroots organizations that address tough environmental problems such as toxic pollution, sustainable agriculture, climate change, environmental degradation of rivers and wild places, and the environmental health of communities.
- Glide Foundation Grants (due August 15) provide funding for animal protection, land and wildlife conservation, and wetland preservation.

Department of Water Resources (DWR) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Grant – Updated Timeline: IRWM grants can support a broad range of water and watershed activities. Proposition 1 provided $510 million in grants through this program, the bulk of which is for implementation projects. The new draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grants is expected to be released by DWR in **late June**, with a 45-day public comment period. The final PSP will be published in the fall, and IRWM grant applications will be **due in January 2019**. In order to be eligible for this grant program, projects must be listed in the IRWM Plan for your Region. Contact your local Regional Water Management Group (your County should be able to give you a contact) for more information.

Your SNC Area Representative can help you set up an individual consultation with the SNC Funding Team to get advice about specific funding opportunities or general fund development strategies. To take advantage of this resource, contact your Area Representative.

Grant Writing Workshops are available to help build the capacity of organizations that serve the Sierra Nevada Region. If you are interested in organizing or attending a workshop, contact your Area Representative.

Listserv: You are receiving this email because you joined the SNC Funding Opportunities listserv. If you no longer want to receive email notifications you can unsubscribe by sending a blank email to funding-leave@list.sierranevada.ca.gov. If you have friends or colleagues who are interested in subscribing, they can do so here.

Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
Proposition 1: Draft Concepts Implementation Grant Program
Roundtable of Regions Meeting

Date: Friday, May 4, 2018
Time: 1:30pm to 3:30pm
Attendees: see Attachment 1 (4 stakeholders in person; almost 90 via Skype)
Location: DWR Sacramento and Skype

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Goals – 15 min
- CA Water Plan 2018 & Regional Water Atlas Update – 5 min
- Status of other Prop 1 funding programs - 10 min
- Prop 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Program: PSP Concepts – 80 min
- Wrap Up/Next steps – 10 min

Welcome, Introductions, Goals

Carmel Brown (DWR) and Lynn Rodriguez (Co-Chair of the IRWM Roundtable of Regions and Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County) welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the intent of the meeting and the agenda. The main goal of the meeting is for DWR to continue to share the concepts for the Prop 1 IRWM implementation PSP and Guidelines, receive feedback, and open a time period to receive more comment.

CA Water Plan 2018 & Regional Water Atlas Update

Carmel provided an update on the Regional Water Atlas being piloted by DWR as part of the CA Water Plan Update 2018. The intent is to provide a web/GIS-based interface for the public to get information on conditions in, and accomplishments being made by the 48 IRWM regions in the state. The American River Basin and San Diego regions are the pilots for this update. The Atlas will complement (not duplicate) and link to regional websites/database management systems and replace the "Regional Reports" previously published in the CA Water Plan. See slides for DWR contact information.

Status of Other Prop 1 Funding Programs

Carmel provided an update on the other Prop 1 grant programs:

- Planning Grants: $4.2M has been distributed to 15 grantees for developing or updating IRWM Plans. A new table has been added to DWR's website to show the status of all 48 IRWMP updates: https://www.water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Plan-Review-Process ; please send your updated schedule to: DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov .
- DACI Grants: DWR is finishing up awards of over $51M in DAC Involvement grants; 10 agreements have been executed, one is close to execution, and DWR is reviewing the proposal recently received by the final Funding Area (San Joaquin). One of the key deliverables from the DACI grants are the needs assessments to help identify Prop 1 implementation projects with DAC benefit. DWR is now

participating in the DACI grantees' working group conference calls held every few months to share information, discuss needs assessments and performance metrics. EJCW is leading that effort for now.

Green Bond Initiative

Monica Reid spoke to the group about pursuing an opportunity for Green Bonds, as a means for local agencies to pool local funding to help satisfy the Proposition 1 funding match requirement (50%). Green bonds are a priority of the CA State Treasurer's office right now. Each region could potentially have a pooled bond to help meet their grant match contributions. The State organizes the pooling of local funds/bonds and each issuer/city would need a repayment stream for their portion of the bond. Any regions with interest in this opportunity should send an email to Monica at: monica@kestrel-inc.com.

Prop 1 IRWM Implementation PSP Concepts

Carmel began with an overview of the IRWM Grant Program's previous solicitation processes, past experience, feedback received from stakeholders and practitioners, and the progress made thus far developing the draft PSP concepts building on the feedback. Carmel mentioned that some of the recommendations in the April 2017 "Stakeholders Perspectives" document have influenced DWR's proposed approach.

Jason Brabec and Rachel Ballanti took turns walking through the Prop 1 Implementation PSP Concepts in various segments, each segment followed by a set of questions for consideration and Q+A. Refer to the slides for the presentation content and the Q+A is summarized below.

Proposed Prop 1 IRWM Implementation Solicitation Process

Suggested questions for discussion:

- ***Recommendations to schedule Funding Area pre-application workshops?***
- ***Should any additional entities not listed in the slides be represented at the Pre-Application Workshop?***
- ***Do the proposed timeframes between the steps allow applicants enough time to prepare for each step of the pre-application and application process?***

Q: Will DWR come to the Funding Area or will the Funding Areas come to DWR?
A: DWR will come to the Funding Areas and invite appropriate state funding agencies (e.g., State Board, CDFW) to join us (we will need your help identifying the other agencies who should be invited).

Q: Will the Funding Area Workshops be held as public meetings?
A: That is up to the regions in the Funding Area to determine.

Q: How much time is there between DWR's release of the final PSP and the workshop date notification? We would like to recommend at least a month.
A: People can start notifying DWR now of when they think they would be ready for their workshops.

Comment: Need to have a good period of time available between releasing the final PSP and Step 1 on the process flowchart, at least for regions that need it.

Comment: See the same issue between steps 1 and 2; the timing may be too short. For us in our region for our governance structure, our executive committee has a formal approval process for each project being put forth for funding. Since this is new, my interpretation is that we would have to get their permission for the presentation, and then again before we submit the application. Just in case there are other changes or if there is a different project. We would have to work that into our existing meeting structure (our meetings are held quarterly).

Comment: (Several echoed this comment) The time between steps 4 and 5 should be longer, it may be 8 weeks because we might want to add a whole new project based on the feedback we receive from DWR and the other state agencies during the workshop.

Q: Since this is new, it will take more time. Can there be some flexibility built into the process, based on a region's/Funding Area's existing governance structure?
A: As soon as you identify who your logistical point of contact is for the workshop, we can talk about those things that so that we are responsive to needs of each Funding Area as much as possible.

Q: If a Funding Area must identify a point person to funnel information to DWR, that may be a very burdensome request for the point of contact. In our San Joaquin Funding Area, there are 8 IRWM regions and only a couple of agencies are equipped to take on that type of leadership role. They are already doing that for the DAC Involvement Grant Program. It would be very burdensome for those agencies to take on that role for Implementation as well. Can DWR can take on that leadership role or initiate that conversation so that it does not fall back on these agencies that already have limited resources for organizing efforts on behalf of the entire Funding Area?
A: For practicality and planning purposes, DWR will need one "logistical" point of contact to organize and host the workshop somewhere in the funding area. In your case we could look at using DWR facilities in Fresno if that works. For those funding areas like yours with many regions and lacking an existing governance structure for those regions to work together, we will need to talk to you about how this will work. In the meantime, comments can be submitted individually by regions to DWR and we will group comments by Funding Area.

Comment: The DAC Involvement process is going to well for regions that have a history of working well together collaboratively and for Funding Areas that are composed of a single IRWM Regions. Other areas have a history of holding their projects close to the vest and will not want to publish their projects and their costs and their strategies prior to a public meeting. I'm not sure how to fix that.
A: Duly noted. The original intent of IRWM was to promote as much interregional cooperation as possible and this money was allocated by Funding Area. So, we are reorienting ourselves in that perspective.
Comment: Although the intent of IRWM is to promote interregional cooperation, we believe each region should still have control over their own project development and goals.

Comment: There are Funding Areas with regions that have various capacities and some have projects ready to go that check the CEQA box as soon as money is available. Others would be in favor of having their Funding Area workshop 12 months down the road so they have more time. That's going to be a potential conflict for the Funding Areas with many diverse regions.

Comment: Regarding the original slide talking about the quality of the projects and DWR is seeking to fund projects with a greater probability of getting completed - caution DWR not to equate "quality" project with "projects that can get completed on time". Need to remember that projects these days are getting more complex and the complexity is what is driving a lot of the changes and the integration. When you bring multiple agencies together, there are multiple variables. At least in the San Diego region, with different agencies working together, things change and projects fall off the list, and we shouldn't be afraid of that. Let us not start swapping complex, integrated projects for simple projects just so we can "get them done". That is not what IRWM is about. We need better education and information-sharing about the necessary complexity of these projects.

Comment: More IRWM money should go in the research and development (R&D) stage. And need to recognize that DAC have a different level of needs for projects, not just implementation. We should not only be taking the "status quo" projects off the shelf that are ready to go, just because we can get them done in two years' time. We should be thinking of the process as evolutionary and where we should be in five years' time so we can better meet future needs.

Comment - Need a better sense of how this process will work for the 3 funding areas that do not have competitiveness and for funding areas with funding area agreements, whereby regions have already determined the split of grant funding and there is no longer competitiveness.

Q – Is there only two rounds of funding?
A – There will be an initial round of funding (starting Jan 2019) and then there will be subsequent rounds of funding. It will be on a case by case basis; whatever works best for each funding area.

Lynn Rodriguez provided an overview of how the Concept PSP process might work at the local level for Ventura County. Ventura already started amending our IRWM plan. We started out by looking at our critical water resources needs. We work individually and then up to the leadership committee and then the general membership.
Step 1, each of the watershed groups looked at critical water needs then they were amalgamated into one list that we use in this new process to put into our new grant application. We have updated our goals accordingly and we are about to issue a call for projects which includes the project review process that we always use. That's for projects that will be included in the plan, whether or not that will be included in the Prop 1 application.
Step 2 would be to schedule our pre-proposal conference and work with the other IRWM Regions in our Funding Area as early as possible and perhaps share our critical water needs and identify opportunities for possible project collaboration.
Step 3 would be preparing for Round 1 solicitation, selecting from the projects, in the next few months, that have been identified in the IRWM Plan from our general call for projects. We also have a fillable PDF form that we will be using to upload our projects to a data portal. It would be interesting to see what the form will look like for DWR's Project Information Form. It sounds like you are going to use a similar process and will be asking similar questions. So, we would like to see what that form looks like before we roll out our project info form to make sure there is consistency between them. Then we

begin our process of matching up the projects to our critical needs and we also must consider the issue of (funding) match. In general, we have a process to ensure each project meets the eligibility criteria and the priorities identified in the PSP. Now, with the higher Prop 1 funding match, thinking about the match early will be especially important. Securing funds or working with the Green Bond tool Monica mentioned could take some time.
Step 4, conduct a workshop at the regional level, is intended to get everyone together to talk about the projects. At that point, a list of recommendations would be prepared for the leadership committee for a list of projects to be included in Round 1. This all needs to happen before we have our meeting with the Funding Area. And we would need to coordinate with the other IRWMs to prepare the whole package for our consultation with you. So that has to happen before we meet with DWR.

Pre-Application Workshop Components

Suggested Questions for Discussion:

- ***Suggestions for other topics to be discussed or covered in the Pre-Application Workshop?***
- ***Suggestions to make the Pre-Application Workshop more valuable?***

Q – Can you clarify what the proposal summary is? Is it for the whole Funding Area, or each set of projects coming from a single region?
A – Not for the whole funding area. The proposal summary form is specific to each application. We will accept one application from each of the 48 regions, although we are encouraging you to work complementarily with the other regions in your funding area.

Q – What about when a region is in two Funding Areas? What does that application process look like?
A – If there is a desire to get funding from both funding areas, the region needs to collaborate with both areas and participate in both workshops. That is a special case where we might accept more than one application from a region; we can talk to you more about that on a case-by-case basis as you make those decisions. Note that for the DAC Involvement funding, where regions were in two funding areas, a few regions made the decision to participate in just one of the funding area programs.

Comment: It would be great if we didn't have to use DWR's form. We can produce our own version with the same information by doing an export from our database. Less burdensome for us than manually filling out your PDF. One of the things our stakeholders often complain about is the number of times they have to type the same thing over and over again into different (but similar) forms, and we're trying to minimize that.
A- We understand not wanting to type information twice, and we will take your suggestion into consideration. Our intent: 1) making this process easy for all applicants, regardless of their resources and whether they have a database system that can generate this kind of info or not, 2) getting consistent information in the applications across the board that addresses all the criteria, and 3) keeping grant applicants from submitting more than is necessary/will be used by DWR.

Q- I heard you suggest that some of the questions that are on the initial paperwork may not be on the final and that there may be new questions on the final and I think that's really problematic. We need to know ahead of time all the way through the full application what you're going to ask us about, so we can collect it now in one full-swoop and have it when we need it.
A – Clarification; there will not be new questions on the final Project Information Form. It will be a slight expansion on the work plan, budget, and schedule.

Q – What information will be required in the application, compared to the Project Information Form?
A – Most project-related information needed for the application will be in the project information form, which gets uploaded into GRanTS with the on-line application. The rest of the GRanTS application information will be of a more general nature. We don't want to create double-work for anyone.

Proposal and Project Eligibility Requirements and Scoring Criteria

Suggested questions for discussion:

- ***Are there any comments about the eligibility and evaluation criteria outlined in Table 1 of the PSP Concepts?***

Q – Re eligibility criteria, will AB 1249 compliance be among them?
A – Yes.

Q – Does the 10% administration limit just apply to state funds? For example, if admin costs were higher than 10%, but the overage was covered on the local cost share side, would that be that OK?
A – Yes.

Comment– RE: criteria that at least one project should address climate change: It's going to be easy, probably, for any project that you propose to say it addresses climate change, particularly since the goal here is to build regional self-reliance. I would propose why not say for each project, identify how it could potentially respond to climate change, how is it resilient, how will it operate in the future in a climate change world? In other words, will these projects still work when snowpack is reduced, sea levels have risen, etc.

Comment – the Water Code states that money is for "projects that …..respond to climate change and contribute to regional water security as provided in this chapter". For this reason, shouldn't all projects meet this requirement? Please reconsider the criteria accordingly.

Comment – Do you want to limit it to water infrastructure systems adapting to climate change impacts? Because, from a watershed perspective, the natural system also could be impacted.

Comment – Agree on the need to allow for environmental projects related to climate change; may affect beneficial use resources for Tribes.

Comment - With regard to CEQA eligibility criterion, it goes back to earlier statement about R&D and how important that is. We need to make sure we are not just funding projects that are already fully baked and would have been implemented anyway. Is the State really giving credit, really sponsoring that next thinking of what comes next, that which could be really impactful? Or are we just trying to get money out the door and show that as our accomplishment.

Comment – The waiver on applying the CEQA criterion should apply not just to DAC-benefit projects, but to those projects (e.g., R&D, conservation) which have no construction element and would be exempt from CEQA anyway.

Q – A clarifying question on CEQA, do we have a sense for the duration of the grant agreement for this first round of funding?
A – Assume 4 years max from execution date (relates to encumbrance period for the grant funds)

Q – For some of us it might be hard to meet the requirement to have all CEQA wrapped up within 6 months after the final funding award. Can we submit comments after this call?
A– Yes, please submit your comment in writing to this address: DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov .

Comment: The timeline needs to account for state and federal delays in permit processing, which is out of the control of the grantee or Local Project Sponsor. Most projects take longer to process NEPA than CEQA, for example. FEMA could also be a problem.

Comment: Mandating a timeframe for CEQA goes against CEQA itself which requires public and agency input. If you want to follow the CEQA spirit, you should not put a mandatory date on the process.

Comment - Need to clarify if we are to present on the critical water needs of the funding area, or the IRWM region, or both. The IRWM regions have established their critical water needs within their regions, but those may differ across the Funding Area.

Q – Why does leveraging of other funding sources get scored, if the total cost share is already met with local sources, why does this make a difference to the State?
A – Leveraging of sources is a priority of Prop 1, but we will take this into consideration when refining the criteria.

Q – Updated IRWM plans have to be submitted prior to submitting the application. Need clarification: is that submitted for review or submitted and accepted by DWR?
A – Submitted for review. DWR's formal acceptance of your IRWMP update is not required at the time of application. Depending on our backlog, it could take 2-3 months to get this acceptance after you

submit your plan.

Comment – RE: CEQA criterion, we get projects from relatively low budget organizations, usually NGOs or representing DACs or Tribes, and they have requested funds for doing CEQA. It can take a couple years to get permits, even for public agencies, and so if we have that requirement of six months we're going to end up just funding "off the shelf" ready projects that are already going to happen whether IRWM funding is there or not.
A – Clarification: the six-month requirement for CEQA would not apply to projects that benefit DAC, EDA, and Tribes.

Comment – CEQA is costly and time consuming. It is the biggest barrier to projects and many proponents need the most help with this aspect.

Q – Please consider moving the "multiple benefit" and "benefit to more than one IRWM region or Funding Area" criteria from the project part of the evaluation table to "proposal" level. We don't want to disincentivize projects like water recycling, for example, that are single benefit projects, by lowering the score on those projects.
Comment – Water recycling has multiple benefits (general agreement with attendees in the room). Need to describe it that way in your proposal.

Comment – There may be cases where there are two or more projects from different entities, when taken together, create multiple benefits and they are intended to be integrated, but each on its own isn't considered "multi benefit". We need to make sure we allow for that.

Comment – Be cautious about some big nebulous multiple benefit claimed on the proposal level that may not be adequate.

Comment - I understand we don't know the amount of points available for each criterion yet, but for criterion like building regional self-reliance, how do projects/proposals with benefits across multiple regions or funding areas fare? Those two criteria potentially could be not fully aligned. I don't think any region or the program has ever focused on multi-regional projects to this extent before. There's been some funding dedicated to interregional benefit activities in the past, but with every proposition the rules change. So, all these really depend on how many points do each of these have.

Comment – Since regional self-reliance is an eligibility item, why then if a regional project with excellent results not be scored as well as those within interregional or benefits to another Funding area?
Comment – Agree that each region will prioritize projects based upon their critical water needs and not other IRWM regions or the full funding area. The criteria as drafted would potentially detract points from great projects that benefit an IRWM region.
A – We will take these comments into consideration when refining the criteria.

Comment – On the same theme, due to the advocacy of some around the table, DAC have recently had more attention. But we've never given due credit to what counts as a benefit to a DAC. I think the DAC involvement program is going to give us a lot more insight into what are the hallmarks of good community-based projects. Some in the past, I would argue, were tangential or ancillary. When you set up an exemption from the CEQA timeframe, there's going to be an impetus for some applicants to shoe-horn projects into that category (DAC-benefit status) to get the exemption. We should give some thought into what that benefit nexus is and what it really looks like to be a really good community-based project.

Comment – Making use of proven, long-standing technologies should be weighed equally to new and innovative technologies based on project results.
A – Use of innovative technology is a priority stated in Prop 1, but we will take this into consideration when refining the criteria.

Comment –I would propose, and this may be controversial, to add another criterion to the selection process: that applicants must demonstrate that they've collaborated with the other planning regions in the Funding Area. In the San Diego region, we are big proponents of collaboration; we've figured out how to work with our other planning regions effectively and everyone gets a share of the money and it makes us all be each other's cheerleaders. I think the competition among the regions has been short-sighted.
A - We will take this into consideration when refining the criteria; welcome others' opinions on this idea.

Funding Available in Round 1

Suggested questions for discussion:

- ***Table 2 presents proposed funding available in Round 1 based on a percentage of Prop 1 allocation. These percentages (50% General, 30% DAC) were proposed as a starting point for discussion. Is the amount of funding proposed appropriate for your respective IRWM Region / Funding Area?***
- ***Do you have any thoughts or comments about the potential for a "planning" allowance to be made available? (see slide related to Prop 1, Water Code Sec. 79704)***

Comment – Consider using the 10% (Prop 1 Chapter 4 (Water Code Sec 79704)) planning allowance as a solution to the CEQA problem for DACs…encourage those applicants to apply for an early grant that just supports their CEQA process and then seek the implementation grant later when CEQA is done.

Q - How does the maximum DAC amount for round 1 affect regions (and projects) that are primarily DAC?

A – The amounts given are starting points, please discuss your case in your funding area and propose amounts that work better for your funding area, if applicable.

Q - Would like to know more specifics about what the planning funding could be used for. Just for DAC project planning? Or could some of it be used for designing other projects or plan updates to be used in Round 2?
A- Still open for discussion.

Comment: IRWM Plan updates – for those regions that already completed their plans and do not have more funds to do future updates when other DAC communities and Tribes are identified, these planning funds could be really useful.

Cost Share Requirements and Reimbursement Date

- **Any comments regarding the cost share requirements and/or reimbursement eligibility date?**

Q - On the slide with the last bullet regarding environmental costs. Could that be funded by the planning money?
A – It could, still open for discussion.

Q – RE: cost share, harkening back to a previous comment. Sometimes the best thing to do for a DAC is actually to put resources into a non-DAC benefit project in the drinking water system consolidation context. Especially in rural communities, often time you'll have a small just barely non-disadvantaged system that if you add capacity there, you can incorporate/benefit the adjacent small DAC systems. I'm curious if that scenario is contemplated within this cost share waiver. Questioning what "directly benefits" means.
A- We will clarify that better in the PSP. Our intention is to allow that kind of case, as long as the benefit is well justified. In terms of defining "direct", it's where the benefit goes, not where the money goes. It's where the benefit is felt and not the location of the project.

Final Questions & Comments

Comment – It would be helpful, if we do have a follow up meeting or call, to learn about the Water Board's stormwater program and how aligned these two programs are/can be. How much the process is similar, the content of the initial proposal, that kind of thing. We need to coordinate, now that there's a separate stormwater resource plan required to be incorporated into the IRWM Plan in order to be eligible for the State Board's funding.

Comment – Some of the most significant recommendations in the Stakeholders Perspectives

document were related to regulatory alignment. How does that factor into this process? Are there opportunities to encourage real integration, not just these different plans that are stapled together.

Comment –There was a need when this bond was originally written in 2009 and then it finally got on the ballot in 2014 and now it's nearly a decade later and we're finally talking about rolling out some of the money. I don't know how many rounds and how many more decades we want to wait until the money goes to building things.

Next meeting: May 23 or 23. Lynn and Tracy will send out announcement.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:45 PM

Department of Water Resources

Integrated Regional Water Management Program

Draft Concepts for Proposition 1 Implementation Grants, Round 1

April 30, 2018

Contents

1. Solicitation Process
2. Pre-Application Workshop Components
3. Proposal and Project Eligibility Requirements and Scoring Criteria
4. Funding Available in Round 1
5. Cost Share Requirements and Reimbursement Eligibility Date

ITEM NO. 6

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
June 22, 2018

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Next Meeting

INTRODUCTION

Following are suggested meeting topics for the next meeting of the RWMG:

1. Update on the Mountain Counties Funding Area Disadvantaged Community Coordinating Committee and Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project.
2. Review and comment on Proposition 1 IRWM Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP).
3. Review and select projects for DWR Prop 1 implementation round of funding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Discussion and direction to staff regarding:

a. Next RWMG meeting date/time – August 24, September 7 or 21?
b. Meeting topics