UPPER FEATHER RIVER
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
July 18, 2019 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 Regional Water Management Group (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.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/REPORTS

1. Roundtable of Regions Letter Regarding the Water Resilience Portfolio

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) REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GROUP BUSINESS

1. RWMG Meeting Summary for the regular meeting held on May 3, 2019.
2. Support Services budget report.

ACTION AGENDA

1. DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES CLIMATE PROGRAM
Department of Water Resources staff will present information about climate impacts on water resources in the Upper Feather River Region and introduce a survey about water management issues. Informational.

2. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY AND TRIBAL INVOLVEMENT PROJECT
The RWMG will receive an update on the Mountain Counties Funding Area Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project.

a. Community Capacity Assessment and Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment. Informational.
b. Technical assistance opportunity. Direction to staff.

3. PROPOSITION 1 IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ROUND 1 SOLICITATION AND SELECTION OF UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PROJECT(S)

a. Presentation of the Proposition 1 Implementation Round 1 Project Solicitation Package and overview of Mountain Counties Funding Area coordination and schedule of deadlines.
b. Project review and selection for the Prop 1 Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant application.

4. PROCESS FOR FUTURE TIME SENSITIVE GRANT OPPORTUNITIES
Discussion of 1) support staff's role in identifying grant opportunities for UFR IRWM Plan implementation projects, and 2) a process for project selection and development for time sensitive grant opportunities. Direction to staff.

5. COORDINATOR'S REPORT

ADJOURNMENT

To: Roundtable of Regions Members

From: Lynn Rodriguez, Co-Chair
Mark Stadler, Co-Chair

Re: Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative

We previously sent you the Governor's Executive Order N-10-19 directing the Resources Agency, Cal/EPA, and CDFA, in consultation with the Dept. of Finance, to prepare a Water Resilience Portfolio to "meet the needs of California's communities, economy, and environment through the 21st century." Nancy Vogel, Resources Agency, has been appointed as the Director of the Water Resilience Portfolio Program. More information can be found at the Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative website. We want to bring you up to date on the activities your Roundtable Steering Committee has engaged in regarding this topic.

The Roundtable Steering Committee sees an opportunity for IRWM regions to assist in the development and implementation of the Portfolio. IRWM regional water management groups (RWMGs) embody many of the principles that the Portfolio seeks to implement – regional integration, multi-benefit use, leveraging funding, and collaborative strategies to build partnerships involving all stakeholders including non-profits, disadvantaged and under-represented communities, tribes, the broad spectrum of public agencies involved with water management, and the public.

We met recently with DWR to discuss how best to support the development of the portfolio. As a result, we sent letter to Ms. Vogel on June 5 (copy attached), explaining that a foundational principle of IRWM is regional collaboration and that stakeholder-driven RWMGs are established organizations engaged in regional water management. We subsequently had a conference call with Ms. Vogel to explore opportunities to help shape the Portfolio. The Roundtable is in a strategic position to collaborate with stakeholders and implement the Portfolio.

We encourage you to participate in the myriad of outreach opportunities to voice your opinion on how California should move forward to address water management issues. A calendar of event is posted on the Portfolio's website (http://waterresilience.ca.gov/). You may also email your ideas on how to meet the water needs of California's communities, economy, and environment for generations to come to: input@waterresilience.ca.gov. We would appreciate your support in recommending IRWM as a model

for the foundation of the Portfolio and RWMGs as the appropriate regional agents to implement the Portfolio when it is finalized.

We also encourage you to participate in listening sessions, Board meetings and other gatherings. We have been communicating with Joe Yun, Executive Director of the California Water Commission (CWC), about how the Roundtable may be involved in a panel at the CWC's August 21 listening session. A summary of the recent Water Commission Listening Session held June 26th can be found on the Mavens Notebook website at: https://mavensnotebook.com/2019/06/26/ca-water-commission-governor-newsoms-water-resilience-portfolio-initiative-listening-session/. You may also find Jay Lund's California WaterBlog (https://californiawaterblog.com/tag/jay-lund/) to be interesting. His June 23 post offers a "modest proposal" for development of the Water Plan Update that involves the potential participation of IRWM planning regions

We will be convening a subcommittee of the Planning Committee to further discuss the Roundtable's response to the Portfolio Initiative. We're also considering holding our own listening session in Sacramento, perhaps in cooperation with one or more other organizations. This Initiative is moving at the speed of light – the Resources Agency plans to have a draft Portfolio ready for public comment by September. We'll keep you posted on the activities of both the Steering Committee and the Planning Subcommittee.

Thanks!

Mark and Lynn

E-transmitted to: Nancy.Vogel@resources.ca.gov

June 5, 2019
Nancy Vogel
Director, Governor's Water Portfolio Program
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: IRWM Roundtable of Regions support for Water Resilience Portfolio

Dear Ms. Vogel:

The Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Roundtable of Regions is excited and ready to work in close partnership with the State to support development of Gov. Newsom's Water Resilience Portfolio, as described in Executive Order N-10-19. The Roundtable comprises representatives of California's 48 IRWM planning regions established and operated over the past 15 years in coordination with the State. The IRWM regions, which represent 97 percent of the State's population and almost all of its land mass, have developed detailed regional water management plans and implemented hundreds of diverse multiple-benefit projects with the help of more than $1 billion in state grant funding. As such, Roundtable members are well positioned to help implement the Governor's Executive Order.

Roundtable members embody many of the principles that will form the foundation of the Water Resilience Portfolio – among them, use of a regional, multi-benefit approach; integration of investments and leveraging of funds; and employment of collaborative strategies built on partnerships involving government at all levels, including tribes, disadvantaged and under-represented communities and the broad spectrum of public agencies involved with water management.

Stakeholder-driven IRWM regional plans provide much valuable information that will be essential to the inventory and assessment of water-related conditions in California. Given their experience with integrated regional planning, Roundtable members also can assist in the identification of strategies necessary to address water management challenges; many of these strategies may be found in *Stakeholder Perspectives – Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening Integrated Regional Water Management.*

In addition, Roundtable members can share many excellent venues and extensive stakeholder contacts within their regions to help with the substantial outreach effort planned for development of the Portfolio.

We respectfully request to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss engagement of Roundtable members in development of the Water Resilience Portfolio. You may contact Mark at either 858-522-6735 or mstadler@sdcwa.org.

Sincerely,

Lynn Rodriguez	Mark Stadler
Co-Chair	Co-Chair

cc via email:
Cindy Messer, DWR Chief Deputy Director, (Cindy.Messer@water.ca.gov)
Kristopher Tjernell, Deputy Director of DWR Integrated Watershed Management Program (Kristopher.Tjernell@water.ca.gov)
Arthur Hinojosa, Chief of DWR Integrated Regional Water Management Division (Arthur.Hinojosa@water.ca.gov)
Erik Eckdahl, SWRCB Deputy Director (Erik.Ekdahl@waterboards.ca.gov)
Jenny Lester Moffitt, CDFA Undersecretary (Jenny.LesterMoffitt@cdfa.ca.gov)

Upper Feather River IRWM
Regional Water Management Group

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

May 3, 2019

Recordings of the meeting are available here:
Video #1 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MjQ4Vw5_bqQ&feature=youtu.be
Video #2 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A1W3N2431-8&feature=youtu.be
Video #3 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9S9Rad1WVw&feature=youtu.be
Video #4 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-xr2jaV6dAc&feature=youtu.be
Video #5 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xwatJrlnMgw&feature=youtu.be
Video #6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rAb9EdqmbGI

Call to Order and Roll Call **(Video#1 0:30)**
Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on May 3, 2019 at 1:03 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
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
Kurt Sable, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

Members Absent:
Paul Roen, Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Doug Teeter, Butte County Board of Supervisors
Jim Roberti, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
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 and Associates Consulting, Inc.

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda **(Video#1 0:59)**
None noted

Public Comment Opportunity **(Video#1-1:10)**
None noted

Announcements / Reports **(Video#1-1:40)**
There will be an opportunity to meet Sierra Nevada Conservancy's new Executive Officer, Angela Avery, on May 8th from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the County Planning conference room in Quincy.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Regional Water Management Group Business (Video#1-2:15)

Upon motion by Trina Cunningham and seconded by Jeff Engel, the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved as presented.

1. RWMG Meeting Summary for the regular meeting held on November 2, 2018.
2. Support Services budget report.
3. Support Letter for Sierra Institute's Watershed Coordinator Grant Application.
4. Plumas Resource Advisory Committee Letter of Support for the James Lee School Project

ACTION AGENDA

1. Integrated Regional Water Management Roudtable of Regions (Video#1-2:50)

Uma Hinman provided a summary of the Roundtable of Regions (RToR) members and purpose. The planning committee of the Roundtable of Regions (RToR) worked last year to address the need to enhance effectiveness as a group and seek assistance in conducting the work to support the IRWM Program. In the past, the RToR has been an all-volunteer organization with the bulk of the work falling on the co-chairs. As the RToR increases its efforts and outreach, an increased level of coordination was deemed necessary. Through a Request for Proposals solicitation process, the RToR has selected Sierra Water Work Group to serve as the Network Coordinator, led by Liz Mansfield and Jodie Monaghan, to assist the Roundtable of Regions (RToR) in enhancing its efforts. At the completion of the first year, the RToR will assess the level of effort needed in subsequent years, but it is the intent to continue this effort into the future.

Over the next few months the RToR will be working to create a more formal presence and accessible information for and about the RToR (such as an updated membership list, a website, a data sharing platform, a calendar, plans for meetings, conference calls, summits, regular communication with members, and other activities). In the near future they will be considering a modified leadership – or governance -structure for the RToR. The RToR will continue to rely on the volunteer efforts of its members for guidance and engagement in the RToR, but are expecting to accomplish much more as a group with the Network Coordinator.

Organizations that have not yet pledged to support the network coordinator, but would like to, contributions are still welcome.

Sherrie Thrall questioned the potential benefit of supporting this initiative moving forward and exactly how much funds would be requested. Uma replied that it will be beneficial as they are very involved on the state level and the funding is contributions so it is the discretion of the IRWM and there is no requirement at this time. Although Sherrie agrees that this program should be supported, Plumas County cannot be responsible for all the contributions. She suggested that contributions be considered by each county.

2. Department of water Resources Climate Action Plan (Video#1-13:04)

Uma Hinman introduced Peter Coombe with DWR Red Bluff to discuss their Climate Action Plan.

The California Department of Water Resources' Climate Action Plan is the Department's guide to addressing climate change in the programs, projects, and activities over which it has authority. The Climate Action Plan is divided into three phases to address mitigation, adaptation, and consistency in the analysis of climate change:

One of the main reasons for his visit today is to gather an inventory of watershed projects currently going on with the IRWM, Forest Service Management projects, and RCD projects. Leah Wills suggested that the DWR take the opportunity to look at the IRWM Plan as there is a huge amount of information on the Region. Peter stated they are still developing the best approaches for outreach and would like to gather the RWMG's contact information and any ideas they would like to offer. Uma was directed to work with Peter to provide the information requested.

3. Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project (Video#2- 4:27)

Jonathan Kusel from the Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement (DACTI) Project provided an update to the RWMG on the Community Capacity Assessment. A major element of this project is to identify the disadvantaged communities because there is a prioritization of funding for them. Within the next week or two they will have all the data for the socioeconomic factors and capacity. The next step is to assess how they will be able to fund technical support, disadvantaged communities and moving forward.

Trina Cunningham added that workshops have been conducted with the Tribal communities in the mountain counties area. Jonathan discussed the challenges associated with a population-based system for funding. There is an opportunity for the Mountain Counties Funding Area to propose a new methodology that would include beneficiaries. They have also communicated with the state regarding how the money is allocated within the state.

4. Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Round 1 Solicitation (Video#3 – 14:40)

Coordination for Round 1 Implementation projects will be a topic at the next meeting of the Coordinating Committee.

5. IRWM Plan Implementation Project Proposal (Video#3 – 19:55)

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.

One new application was submitted to be considered for inclusion in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan as an implementation project. The Concow All-Lands Fire- and Climate-resilient Oak Woodlands Project – Butte County Resource Conservation District (UF-18) is a multi-partnership project looking to replant an open, grassy oak woodland with scattered "founder stands" of low-elevation conifers after the Camp Fire instead of the traditional timber plantations. It will cover 4,000-12,000 acres and is designed to be a strategic fireshed buffer. The benefits will be fire fuels forest management, ecosystem restoration, and large area protection. The overall project budget is ten million dollars. The project is in the design phase and does affect disadvantage communities.

The one item they are currently lacking is the adoption of the Upper Feather River Plan. The project can be accepted into the plan but they will need to formally adopt the plan as a group.

Upon motion by Jeff Engel and seconded by Trina Cunningham, the RWMG approved Draft Resolution No, 18-19-01

6. IRWM Plan Implementation Project Updates (Video#5 – 00:01)

Earlier this year the Department of Water Resources amended their agreements with grantees of Proposition 50 and 84 projects to reduce the required number of years for Post Performance Reports (PPR) from 10 years to 3 years. The amendment also served as a reminder to grantees of the status of PPRs for

their projects. Staff worked with Proposition 50 Local Project Sponsors to prepare and submit their PPRs to DWR. All but one PPR was submitted to DWR on April 26, 2019; the USFS roads project is delayed to a temporary reassignment of key staff.

Staff identified several projects that meet the Mountain County Funding Area priority for fire and emergency water supply projects. Per RWMG direction, staff has been coordinating with project sponsors and the Plumas County Community Development Commission to identify funding sources and assist with preparation of grant applications. Roger Diefendorf commented that many of the projects submitted their applications over three years ago and they are finding the lack of information (or lack of updated information) is hindering the ability to apply for additional grants.

7. Request for Regional Water Management Group Membership (Video #6 – 1:22)

The Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group membership currently includes the agencies and representatives listed in the table below. The RWMG meets quarterly on average and representative attendance is important both for a comprehensive understanding of the ongoing issues and efforts, and for ensuring a quorum for decision-making purposes. At its November 2018 meeting, the RWMG directed staff to solicit member feedback regarding 1) confirmation of member agencies' interest in remaining on the RWMG, and 2) confirmation of assigned representative. Additionally, a copy of the letter (attached) was sent to the Plumas County Special District Association, as directed by the RWMG.

Three responses were received confirming interest in remaining on the RWMG as well as the continuation of the current representative. Additionally, one request for membership was received from the Chester Public Utilities District. The proposed representative, Frank Motzkus, has been involved in the UFR IRWM planning efforts since 2014 and was the chair of the Municipal Workgroup during Plan development. Frank has consistently attended RWMG meetings and workshops since 2014.

Sherrie Thrall advocated to add a seat for a special district representative from the municipal service as many of the project involve drinking water and sewage management which these services provide. However, because it was unclear whether the seat was to be held by a representative of the Chester PUD or was selected by the Plumas County Special Districts Association, Sherrie recommended holding the item until next meeting for clarification.

8. Support Services for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (Video #6 – 7:50)

To continue the IRWM Program for the Upper Feather River, the County of Plumas allocated funding in the amount of $25,000 for RWMG support services for fiscal year 2018-19. The County of Plumas has contracted with Hinman & Associates Consulting, Inc., to continue to provide those services. The current support contract with Hinman & Associates Consulting expires June 30, 2019 and has roughly $9,000 left.

The 2019-2020 contract with Hinman & Associates Consulting is estimated to be the same as the year before. Sherrie Thrall made note that Lassen County does not contribute to the administrative costs of the RWMG although projects within the Lassen County are included in the Plan. The contribution budget should be recalculated to include them to reduce Plumas Counties overall contribution before the fiscal year ends. All agree to use Hinman & Associates Consulting for fiscal year 2019-20.

9. Next Steps (Video#6 – 18:38)

Next meeting will be scheduled as needed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 pm.

ATTENDEES:
Kelly Peterson, Butte County
Larry Terrill, Grizzly Lakes CSD
Kurt Sable, USFS Plumas
Chris Gallagher, Indian Valley CSD
Frank Motzkus, Chester PUD
Paul Rose, Rose Water Systems
Rob Thorman, Plumas County Public Works
Pat Vellines, DWR
Evan Hasse, Plumas County Public Works
Brad G, Feather River RCD
Judy Clot, Gold Mountain CSD
Willo Vieira, Plumas County Ag Dept
Gabriel H., Plumas County
Jonathan Kusel, Sierra Institute
Peter Coombe, DWR

CONSENT A.2

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
July 18, 2019

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Support Services Budget Report

INTRODUCTION

The County of Plumas entered into a contract with Hinman & Associates Consulting, Inc. to provide support services to the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group for fiscal year 2018-19. Billing summarized in the following table reflect the full fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. Tasks have included the following:

- Coordination and review of new implementation projects
- Participation in Roundtable of Regions meetings
- Coordination with Sierra Institute and Sierra Water Workgroup regarding the Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project
- Coordination with Plumas County staff regarding IRWM, SGMA and RWMG efforts
- Review and identification of implementation projects that are ready to proceed; coordinate with Plumas County Community Development Commission and project sponsors
- Coordination with Sierra Nevada Conservancy staff, Butte Fire Safe Council, and Sacramento River Watershed Program
- Review of grant opportunities and distribution to stakeholders
- Assist with development and submittal of Proposition 50 Post Performance Reports
- Participation in proposal development team for the Sierra Valley Groundwater Sustainability Planning grant.
- Participation in Mountain Counties Funding Area Coordinating Committee meetings regarding Prop 1 Round 1 Implementation PSP meetings and coordination efforts.
- Review implementation projects for Prop 1 Round 1 eligibility, selection criteria, and status for presentation to RWMG for consideration.

FY 2018-19 Budget Summary		
Contributions	**Contribution Totals**	**Notes**
County of Butte	$ 3,975	Received
County of Lassen	--	--
County of Plumas	19,025	Received
County of Sierra	2,000	Received

Contract Budget	***$ 25,000***	
Final Expenditures FY 2018-19	**Invoice Totals**	**Notes**
UFR RWMG Support Services	$24,709	Labor
Website hosting	276	Annual fee
Website domain registration	15	Annual fee
Total Expenditures	**$ 25,000**	

The contract with Hinman & Associates Consulting, Inc. has been extended through June 30, 2020. During the May 3, 2019 meeting of the RWMG, staff was directed to prepare and send out letters to each of the participating counties (Butte, Lassen and Sierra) requesting contributions to offset Plumas County's funding of the RWMG Support Services Contract. Lassen was included in the request this year because the Westwood Community Services District, which is located in Lassen County, has a project in the list of implementation projects for the region and has been active in the RWMG meetings.

The following table summarizes the results of the contribution requests. The letters are attached for information.

County	Acreage in Plan Area	Percentage of Plan Area	Budget Contribution	Status
Butte	345,850	15.1	$ 3,775	Funds received
Lassen	119,394	5.2	$ 1,300	No response
Plumas	1,653,456	72.2	$ 18,050	Funded in Budget
Sierra	172,367	7.5	$ 1,875	Funded in Budget
Totals		100	$ 25,000	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Informational.

Attachments: Letters requesting contributions

Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

555 Main Street | Quincy, CA | 95971 | (530) 283-6214 | http://featherriver.org | ufr.contact@gmail.com

May 29, 2019

Paul Gosselin, Director
Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation
309 Nelson Avenue
Oroville, CA 95965

RE: Request for Contribution to Support the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

Dear Mr. Gosselin,

On behalf of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), we thank the Sierra County Supervisors for their continued support in participating in the implementation of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan.

Plumas County will again be fronting the costs for UFR IRWM Program support for fiscal year 2019-20 in the amount of $25,000. Similar to last year, the RWMG is requesting contributions from participating counties to offset those costs. The requested contributions have been calculated based on the geographic area included within the Upper Feather River IRWM Region, as follows.

County	Acreage in Plan Area	Percentage of Plan Area	Budget Contribution
Butte	345,850	15.1	$ 3,775
Lassen	119,394	5.2	$ 1,300
Plumas	1,653,456	72.2	$ 18,050
Sierra	172,367	7.5	$ 1,875
Totals		100	$ 25,000

The Upper Feather River RWMG is requesting a contribution of $3,775 from Butte County, made payable to Plumas County.

Should you have any questions, contact Randy Wilson at RandyWilson@countyofplumas.com or (530) 283-6214.

Sincerely,

Uma Hinman, Coordinator

ON BEHALF OF:
Sharon Thrall, Chair
Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

cc: Sharon Thrall, Chair, RWMG
Randy Wilson, Plumas County Planning Director

Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

555 Main Street | Quincy, CA | 95971 | (530) 283-6214 | http://featherriver.org | ufr.contact@gmail.com

May 28, 2019

Chris Gallagher
Lassen County Board of Supervisors
220 South Lassen St, Suite 5
Susanville, CA 96130

RE: Request for Contribution to Support the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

Dear Mr. Gallagher,

On behalf of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), we thank the Sierra County Supervisors for their continued support in participating in the implementation of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan.

Plumas County will again be fronting the costs for UFR IRWM Program support for fiscal year 2019-20 in the amount of $25,000. Similar to last year, the RWMG is requesting contributions from participating counties to offset those costs. The requested contributions have been calculated based on the geographic area included within the Upper Feather River IRWM Region, as follows.

County	Acreage in Plan Area	Percentage of Plan Area	Budget Contribution
Butte	345,850	15.1	$ 3,775
Lassen	119,394	5.2	$ 1,300
Plumas	1,653,456	72.2	$ 18,050
Sierra	172,367	7.5	$ 1,875
Totals		100	$ 25,000

The Upper Feather River RWMG is requesting a contribution of $1,300 from Lassen County, made payable to Plumas County.

Should you have any questions, contact Randy Wilson at RandyWilson@countyofplumas.com or (530) 283-6214.

Sincerely,

Uma Hinman, Coordinator

ON BEHALF OF:
Sharon Thrall, Chair
Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

cc: Sharon Thrall, Chair, RWMG
Randy Wilson, Plumas County Planning Director

Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

555 Main Street | Quincy, CA | 95971 | (530) 283-6214 | http://featherriver.org | ufr.contact@gmail.com

May 28, 2019

Paul Roen, Chair
Sierra County Board of Supervisors
100 Courthouse Square, Room 11
Downieville, CA 95936

RE: Request for Contribution to Support the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

Dear Mr. Roen,

On behalf of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), we thank the Sierra County Supervisors for their continued support in participating in the implementation of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan.

Plumas County will again be fronting the costs for UFR IRWM Program support for fiscal year 2019-20 in the amount of $25,000. Similar to last year, the RWMG is requesting contributions from participating counties to offset those costs. The requested contributions have been calculated based on the geographic area included within the Upper Feather River IRWM Region, as follows.

County	Acreage in Plan Area	Percentage of Plan Area	Budget Contribution
Butte	345,850	15.1	$ 3,775
Lassen	119,394	5.2	$ 1,300
Plumas	1,653,456	72.2	$ 18,050
Sierra	172,367	7.5	$ 1,875
Totals		100	$ 25,000

The Upper Feather River RWMG is requesting a contribution of $1,875 from Sierra County, made payable to Plumas County.

Should you have any questions, contact Randy Wilson at RandyWilson@countyofplumas.com or (530) 283-6214.

Sincerely,

Uma Hinman, Coordinator

ON BEHALF OF:
Sharon Thrall, Chair
Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

cc: Sharon Thrall, Chair, RWMG
Randy Wilson, Plumas County Planning Director

ITEM NO. 2

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
July 18, 2019

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Project

---

DISCUSSION

A verbal update on the Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement (DACTI) Project and Coordinating Committee meetings will be provided during the meeting.

A. Community Capacity Assessment and Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment

A verbal update will be provided.

B. Technical Assistance Opportunity

The Technical Assistance task of the DACTI Project was discussed during the June 20th meeting of the MCFA Coordinating Committee, with intention of the group to split the remaining task allocation between the nine IRWM Regions, a portion set aside for Tribes, and a portion to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to update and maintain their grants database.

Although there are still uncertainties in the division of funds, Sierra Institute is recommending proposals for no more than $40,000, with the understanding that the final amount available could be a bit more or less than that.

The estimated funding to each IRWM Region is $40,000. Each IRWM will submit one form reflecting how they would like to use Technical Assistance funds from the DACI grant. The proposals will be shared with the whole Committee for purposes of coordination among the Regions and to look for ways that multiple IRWMs' programs may combine efforts to provide cost savings and improve collaboration.

The technical assistance proposals are due by July 26th so as to review the proposals during the next Coordinating Committee meeting.

Due to the tight turn around, staff proposes that the technical assistance funds be used to support the selected projects for the Round 1 Application submittals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

a) Direct staff to prepare and submit a Technical Assistance proposal to support the development of application materials for the selected project(s) for the Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Round 1 opportunity; or
b) Provide direction to staff.

Attachment: Technical Assistance Proposal Form

Proposals for Providing Capacity Building and Technical Assistance
- Disadvantaged Community Involvement Award -

Instructions: Please complete the following questionnaire in Word. Type the answer beginning on the line below the question; do not use **bold** or *italics* for your answers. Most answers require only a sentence or two. If there are multiple activities, number them and the relevant responses for clarity. Leave one or two blank lines between the end of your answer and the following question. Save the file with the same name but with your IRWM name or abbreviation added to the beginning, and email to: thruska@sierrainstitute.us

Name of IRWM:

Name of proposed project (for internal referencing purposes):

Location of proposed activities (county/community name(s)):

Name of the organization actually conducting the proposed activities (fiscal and managerial responsibility):

Are the beneficiaries DACs, EDAs, or Tribes? How was this (or will this be) determined?

How did the IRWM identify and select this project to put forward for funding?

What is the purpose of the proposed activities?

Please describe the proposed activities (1-3 paragraphs):

Please provide a rough budget (no more than 5 line items):

How do the proposed activities build long-term capacity within the identified communities, and whose technical capacity will have been improved (position and/or organization)?

Do the proposed activities directly address a need identified through the DAC water/wastewater needs assessment process? How so?

How could the proposed activities be scaled up to include more communities over a wider area?

Will there be any outside funds leveraged to contribute to these activities?

Are the proposed activities based on an existing model in use elsewhere? If so, please describe in a couple of sentences.

ITEM NO. 3

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
July 18, 2019

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Coordinator

Subject: Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Round 1 Solicitation and Selection of Upper Feather River IRWM Project(s)

INTRODUCTION

The Final Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Prop 1 IRWM Implementation consists of two funding categories: DAC and general implementation projects. The PSP identifies available funding for the Mountain Counties Funding Area of approximately 50% of the funding allocated for implementation projects.

A. SOLICITATION GUIDELINES AND OVERVIEW OF MOUNTAIN COUNTIES FUNDING AREA COORDINATION

Round 1 Funding

The Table below summarizes funding allocations, which will be split equally between two rounds of implementation projects. Each Round will have a 10% set-aside for DACs. On June 20th, the MCFA Coordinating Committee agreed to a non-competitive 1/9th split of the implementation funding for Round 1, which allocates $551,450 to each participating IRWM Region. A minimum of 10% ($50,556) must be used for a project that benefits a DAC/EDA.

Table 1. Mountain Counties Funding Area Prop 1 Funding Allocations

	Total Allocations	Round 1 Implementation	1/9th Split Amongst MCFA IRWM Regions*
DWR Administration Reserve	$1,300,000		
Planning Grant Awards	84,906		
DAC Involvement Award	1,300,000		
DAC Implementation Projects	1,300,000	$455,000	**$50,556**
General Implementation Projects	9,015,094	4,508,047	**500,894**
Totals	$13,000,000	$4,963,047	**$551,450**

*The nine IRWM Regions participating in the MCFA Prop 1 funding opportunities are: Upper Feather River, North Sacramento Valley IRWM, CABY, Yuba County, Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras, Madera, Yosemite-Mariposa, Tuolumne-Stanislaus, and Southern Sierra.

Round 2 of the implementation funding, anticipated in 2021, will be the same amount. However, the MCFA Coordinating Committee has not yet agreed on how allocation amongst the Regions will be established.

Applicant Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility requirements (Attached) for applicants are summarized in the following table:

Table 2. Applicant Eligibility Criteria

Eligible Entities	Other Eligibility Requirements
• Public agencies • Non-profit organizations • Public utilities • Federally recognized Indian Tribes • California State Indian Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's California Tribal Consultation List • Mutual Water Companies	• Adopted the UFR IRWM Plan • Pre-Application materials submitted by deadline • Compliance with Urban Water Management regulations, Agricultural Water Management regulations, Groundwater Management regulations, Surface Water Diverter regulations, CASGEM monitoring requirements

Project Eligibility Criteria

For the purposes of the PSP, "project" means all planning, design, engineering, acquisition of real property interests, construction and related activities undertaken to implement a discrete action to be funded under the Program.

Eligible projects must meet the requirements of Section II.C and Exhibit A of the 2019 Guidelines also be included in an adopted IRWM Plan that is consistent with the 2016 IRWM Plan Standards (IRWM Plan). Types of eligible projects include the following:

- Water reuse and recycling
- Water-use efficiency/water conservation
- Local/regional surface and underground water storage
- Regional water conveyance facilities that improve integration of separate water systems
- Watershed protection, restoration, and management projects, including those that reduce the risk of wildfire or improve water supply reliability
- Conjunctive use of surface/groundwater storage facilities
- Decision support tools to model regional water management strategies
- Improvement of water quality (drinking water treatment & distribution, water pollution prevention, management of urban & agricultural runoff)
- Regional projects or programs

Other eligibility requirements:

- Project adopted to implement the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan
- Assist water infrastructure systems adapt to climate change
- Provide incentives for collaboration on managing water resources and setting water infrastructure priorities
- Improve regional water self-reliance
- Address the most critical needs of the IRWM Region
- Be consistent with Statewide Priorities
- Have a useful life of at least 15 years, if applicable
- Have CEQA and completed and permits necessary within 1 year of grant award (waived for DACs/EDAs/Tribes)

Discussions of projects for the Round 1 funding opportunity have been focused on water storage and emergency water supply, which meets the eligibility requirements of the PSP and significant needs within the Region, particularly the Region's disadvantaged communities.

Schedule

The schedule was determined at a meeting of the MCFA Coordinating Committee in concert with DWR on June 20, 2019. The application process is in several steps as summarized below.

Table 3. Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grants Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule

Milestone/Activity	**Schedule**
DWR releases Final PSP	April 22, 2019
Pre-Applications Due	August 16, 2019
Pre-Application Workshops	September 4-5, 2019
DWR Feedback on Pre-Applications Due	September 27
Final Applications Due	November 22
Round 2 Grant solicitation process begins	2021

Pre-Applications are required and are due on August 16th. Several projects may be submitted in the Pre-Application for feedback at the Pre-Application Workshop. Based on the feedback received, the Region may narrow down the project selection for the application.

As part a new approach with this funding opportunity, DWR will conduct a pre-application workshop September 4-5 to receive presentations on the projects, provide initial feedback on the pre-applications and encourage collaboration amongst the Regions. 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 have the opportunity to provide feedback on projects. IRWM Regions will be asked to talk about all of their upcoming projects at the workshop, including when those projects will be ready to proceed, and when funding will be needed. Workshop participants will include representatives, project sponsors, and Tribes from all nine participating Regions.

DWR will have approximately six weeks to provide written feedback on the Pre-Applications to each Region. Applicants will then have about eight weeks to address the feedback and submit their Applications by November 22.

B. PROJECT SELECTION

Pre-Applications for the Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Round 1 Grant Solicitation are due August 16th. As agreed upon by the Mountain Counties Funding Area (MCFA) Coordinating Committee, each IRWM Region may submit one non-competitive application for an amount not to exceed $551,450, with at least 10% of that amount to benefit a DAC/EDA/Tribe. Each application may consist of one or more projects that meet the criteria set forth in the Project Solicitation Package and 2019 Guidelines.

Discussions of projects for the Round 1 funding opportunity have been focused on water storage and emergency water supply. In order to streamline the RWMG's selection of a project(s), staff performed an initial project vetting of the projects adopted under the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan. Projects were reviewed for the following:

- Applicant eligibility – per the Grant Eligibility Checklist (attached)
- Project eligibility – per the Grant Eligibility Checklist (attached)
- Readiness to proceed – projects that are shovel ready as indicated by the project sponsors or would be shovel ready with available technical assistance funds (DACTI)
- Budget – within the ballpark of the grant allocation (projects with budgets less than around $650,000)

Initial Project List

Outreach to project sponsors has had varying results. Because outreach to determine project status is ongoing, and that the Pre-Application process allows for multiple submittals per Region, it is recommended that the RWMG select up to three projects to include in the Pre-Application. Staff will continue to outreach to project sponsors and submit Pre-Applications for those selected projects that are ready to proceed to application. The short list and associated project information forms are included as Attachment 3.

Next Steps

1. Staff will work with the project sponsors to prepare and submit the Pre-Application forms.
2. Project sponsors will be encouraged to attend the Pre-Application Workshop on September 4-5 in Sacramento to present their projects to the DWR and funding agencies in attendance. Feedback from DWR will determine which project(s) to continue to Application.
3. Staff will work with the project sponsor to prepare the Application materials, utilizing DACTI technical assistance funds to achieve readiness, as needed.
4. Application submitted by deadline (approximately November 22).

Because the MCFA collaboration is a process in flux, staff will continue to update the RWMG as appropriate. Once feedback on the Pre-Applications is received from DWR, staff will work with the RWMG Chair to determine if an RWMG meeting is appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

a) Select three (3) projects with direction to staff to prepare Pre-Applications for those that are ready to proceed.
b) Direct staff to submit Pre-Applications for selected projects by the deadline for submission.

Attachment 1 Grant Eligibility Criteria
Attachment 2 Scoring Criteria
Attachment 3 Shortlist of Eligible Project for Consideration and Project Information Forms

TABLE 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist

Criteria Type	Eligibility Criteria	Required Documentation	Additional Details	Attachment	Criteria Met (Yes, No, or NA)
Applicant Eligibility	Has the IRWM region been accepted into the IRWM Grant Program through the Region Acceptance Process?	None. DWR to verify.	2019 Guidelines Section II.B.	NA	
	Did applicant submit Pre-Application Materials?	None. DWR to verify.	PSP Section V.A.1	NA	
	Has the region submitted an IRWM plan that meets 2016 IRWM Plan Standards to DWR for review prior to application submittal?	Provide proof (i.e., email confirmation) that plan has been submitted to DWR for review, including date of submission. DWR will also verify.	PSP Section V.A.2 & Section V.B.3	1	
	Is the applicant an Eligible Applicant for Proposition 1 funding?	Written statement describing how the applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant, legal authorities, agreements between applicant and Local Project Sponsors, etc. (Specific requirements vary based on eligible applicant type.)	2019 Guidelines Section II.A. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Urban Water Management Compliance[1)]	Agency name and contact information DWR verification documentation for Urban Water Management Plans DWR verification for validated water loss audit report(s) Water meter self-certification, if applicable	2019 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Agricultural Water Management and Measurement Compliance[1)]	Agency name and contact information DWR verification documentation for Agricultural Water Management Plan Enhanced Watershed Management Plan documentation Farm-gate delivery documentation	2019 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Surface Water Diverter Compliance[1)]	Agency name and contact information SWRCB verification documentation	2019 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Groundwater Management Compliance[1)]	Agency name and contact information Self-certification regarding Groundwater Management Plans OR Statement that projects do not affect groundwater	2019 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	CASGEM Compliance[1)]	Agency Name and contact information Service area boundary, including GIS Shape file Groundwater Basin Name, Number, and listed priority Name of Monitoring Entity (ME) OR If no ME, indicate whether applicant is an eligible ME	2019 Guidelines, Section II.B. & PSP, Section V.B.3	1	

TABLE 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist (cont.)

Criteria Type	Eligibility Criteria	Required Documentation	Additional Details	Attachment	Criteria Met (Yes, No, or NA)
Local Project Sponsor Eligibility	Does each Local Project Sponsor meet all applicant eligibility requirements (as applicable)?	Each Local Project Sponsor must meet the same eligibility requirements as the applicant. (Note: if a project was added to the proposal solely as a substitute for a project that was submitted as part of the Pre-Application Materials, requirement for the Local Project Sponsor to submit pre-application documentation is not applicable.)	See specific requirements above	1	**Utilize same checklist as above for each Local Project Sponsor**
Proposal Eligibility	Only one application per IRWM region	DWR to Verify.	PSP Section II.A	NA	
	Does the proposal respond to Climate Change?	Indicate which project(s) in proposal respond to Climate Change	2019 Guidelines Section II.C. & PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	2, 3	
	Does the proposal contribute to regional water self-reliance?	Indicate which project(s) in proposal contribute to regional water self-reliance OR Provide explanation why the proposal does not need to contribute to regional water self-reliance	2019 Guidelines Section II.C. & PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	2, 3	
	For regions where nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination (AB 1249 contaminants) has been identified, does the proposal include a project(s) to address contamination?	Indicate which projects in proposal address AB 1249 contaminants OR Provide explanation why the proposal does not include that kind of project(s)	2019 Guidelines, Section II.B	2, 3	
Project Eligibility	Is project an eligible project type?	Applicant to complete Question A.9 of Project Information Form (PIF), Attachment 3	2019 Guidelines, Section II.C & PSP Section II.B	3	
	Does the project meet the critical needs of the region?	Applicant to complete Question B.2 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	If applicable, does the project have a useful life consistent with Government Code 16727?	Applicant to complete Question B.3 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	Is the project consistent with Statewide Priorities?	Applicant to complete Question B.6 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	If the project is a stormwater and/or dry weather runoff capture project, is it included in a Stormwater Resource Plan (or functionally equivalent plan) that has been incorporated into an IRWM Plan, if applicable?	Applicant to provide documentation that the project is included in a Stormwater Resource Plan (or functionally equivalent plan) that has been incorporated into the IRWM Plan or provide evidence that the project is exempt from this requirement per Water Code §10563(c).	2019 Guidelines Section II.B, Section II.C & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	If the project affects Groundwater in a high or medium priority basin, does the project have the support of the local Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), or agency responsible for implementing an Alternative Plan.	Applicant to provide documentation that the project has support from the GSA or agency responsible for implementing an Alternative Plan.	2019 Guidelines Section II.B, PSP Section V.B.3	1	

TABLE 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist (cont.)

Criteria Type	Eligibility Criteria	Required Documentation	Additional Details	Attachment	Criteria Met (Yes, No, or NA)
Post Final Award Eligibility / Agreement Requirements	Is each project included in an IRWM Plan that is consistent with the 2016 IRWM Plan Standards?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2019 Guidelines Section II.B & PSP Section II.B, Section VIII	NA	
	Has the IRWM Plan been deemed consistent with the 2016 IRWM Plan Standards by DWR?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2019 Guidelines Section II.B & PSP Section VIII	NA	
	Have Grantee and all Local Project Sponsors adopted the IRWM plan?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2019 Guidelines Section II.B; PSP Section VIII	NA	
	Has CEQA been completed and all permits necessary to begin construction acquired within 12 months of Final Award?	Provide documentation if complete. Otherwise, requirement shall be met before project is included in agreement.	PSP Section VIII, Exhibit A	NA	

NOTES
1) Eligibility Criteria compliance required only if applicable to the Grantee or Local Project Sponsor.

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation (Proposal includes all DAC and General Projects)					
Q#	**Questions**	**Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:**	**Leg Citation**	**Form / Question No.**	**Maximum Points Available**
1	Does the proposal support the intent of IRWM? Is coordination and /or collaboration within and between agencies, regions, and/or Funding Areas discussed? Are any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized discussed?	• A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal supports the intent of IRWM as discussed in the 2019 Guidelines and the IRWM Planning Act. (1 point) • A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal demonstrates coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies regions, and/or Funding Areas. (1 point) • A sufficient description of any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized. (1 point)	10531; 79741(b)	Proposal Summary/ 8	3
2	If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)?	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant's IRWM region(s), full points awarded.	10541(e)(14)	Proposal Summary /PIF/D.5	1
3	Does the proposal include one or more projects that provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. The applicant will receive one (1) point for each project, up to a maximum of two (2) points.	106.3 (AB 685)	PIF/D.6	2
				Maximum Possible Proposal Score	**6**

Scoring Criteria – Project Level Evaluation					
Q#	**Questions**	**Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:**	**Leg Citation**	**Form / Question No.**	**Maximum Points Available**
	Meeting Needs of the Region / Nexus to the IRWM Plan				
4	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	79707(a)	PIF/B.2	1
5	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1? Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.? Does the narrative include other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point) • The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A) • The narrative includes other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits. (1 point)	NA	PIF/D.1	3
6	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point) • A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	79741(a); 79742(e)	PIF/B.4	2
	Work Plan, Budget, Schedule, and Grant Agreement Readiness				
7	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. • The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points) • The Work Plan is generally complete and/or deliverables generally listed, but it appears pertinent information is missing or gaps in the scope of work are identified. (2 points) • The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point)	NA	Attachment 4	3

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

8	Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other? Considerations include: • Does the project description clearly and concisely address all required topics listed in section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project? • Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? • Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? • Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including: • A Project Description that clearly and concisely addresses all required topics listed in Section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project. (1 point) • Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) • Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) • A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point)	NA	PIF/C and Attachments 4-6	4
9	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points) • Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point) • Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points) • Full points awarded if not applicable.	NA	PIF/D.11	2
	Project Benefits and Program Preferences				
10	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	79707(b)	Attachment 5	1
11	Is the primary benefit* claimed in Table 3 of the Project Information Form logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? *For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.	A properly completed Table 3 for at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project. For physical (quantitative) benefit(s): • Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) • Is the benefit description and quantitative measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? Does the claimed benefit use industry standard units of measure (as described in D.2)? (1 point) For non-physical (qualitative) benefit(s): • Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) • Is the benefit description and qualitative measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point)	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	2
12	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 11? (1 point)	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	1
13	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	A sufficient description of the benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area. The description must include an explanation of the benefits to various IRWM regions and/or Funding Areas. (1 point)	79742(a)	PIF/D.3	1
14	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) • Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements.	10545	PIF/D.5	1
15	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to: Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. (1 point)	79707(e)	PIF/D.7	1
16	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	NA	PIF/D.8 and/or D.9 and/or D.10 & Attachments 7-9	1
	Cost Considerations				

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

17	Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?	A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below: • Were other projects evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project? • In terms of cost, is a justification provided as to why the project was selected? One of the cost considerations listed above is sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (1 point) Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)	NA	PIF/D.4	2
				Maximum Possible Individual Project Level Score	**24**

Average DAC Project Score		**Average General Project Score**	
(Sum of Individual DAC Project Scores/ Number of DAC Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)	**24**	**(Sum of Individual General Project Scores/ Number of General Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)**	**24**
DAC Application Score	**Maximum Possible Score**	**General Application Score**	**Maximum Possible Score**
Enter Proposal Score	**6**	**Enter Proposal Score**	**6**
Enter Average DAC Project Score	**24**	**Enter Average General Project Score**	**24**
Bonus Point: At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?	**1**	**Bonus Point:** At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?	1
DAC Application Score (Sum Above Three Rows)	**31**	**General Application Score** (Sum Above Three Rows)	**31**

Upper Feather River IRWM

Short list of potential emergency and water supply storage projects for Prop 1 Implementation Grant Round 1.

Project ID	Project Sponsor	Description	Estimated Budget ($)	Benefits a DAC	Readiness to Apply
MS-10 Crocker Welch Ground Tank Repair	Grizzly Lake CSD	Repair the Crocker/Welch 211,000 gallon community water tank and bring it up to meet OSHA, NFPA, AWWA and EPA codes. Project will retrofit the deteriorated water storage tank to provide a reliable water supply for the community.	200,000	Yes	Needs to establish contact
MS-12 Delleker Water Storage Tank Rehabilitation	Grizzly Lake CSD	The Delleker Tank requires repairs to bring it up to meet OSHA, NFPA, AWWA and EPA codes. It is estimated that approximately 4,200,000 gallons of water will be saved annually by repairing the leaks and refurbishing this tank.	200,000	Yes	Needs design; need to establish contact
MS-35 Alternative water source analysis and development	Sierraville PUD	Analyze options for required alternative water source and implement best option.	256,000	Yes	Needs analysis and design
MS-41 Community Water Storage Tank	Sierraville PUD	Construct a water storage tank to meet the combination of maximum daily demand and fire protection requirements for the community of Sierraville.	654,000	Yes	Needs final design and permitting
MS-44 Community Water Storage Tank	Indian Valley CSD	Construct a water storage tank to provide adequate water storage for communities of Crescent Mills and Greenville.	320,000	Yes	Needs final design and permitting

Attachments: IRWM Plan Project Information Forms for each project, in order

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Grizzly Lake CSD
Name of Primary Contact	Jared D. Recasens, Chief Operator
Name of Secondary Contact	Larry Terrill, Chairman, Board of Directors
Mailing Address	119 Delleker Road, Portola, CA 96122
E-mail	glrid@att.net; jrwastewater@gmail.com
Phone	530-832-5225 office; 530-927-8459 cell
Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain	Yes.

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	Crocker Welch Ground Tank Repair
Project Category	■ **Water Supply/Water Quality** ☐ **Environmental Protection/Restoration** ■ **Community Water/Wastewater** ☐ **Stakeholder/Public Collaboration and Education** ☐ **Working Landscape Viability**
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	This project includes repairing and bringing up to code the Crocker/Welch 211,000 water tank. Project will retrofit the deteriorated water storage tank to provide a reliable water supply to customers. The tank is rusting on the inside and needs to be made OSHA Compliant and meet NFPA and AWWA codes. Tank was built in 2002.
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	Project is located approximately 15 miles North of Portola, CA
Latitude:	39.870167 degrees N
Longitude:	120.452727 Degrees W

III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

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

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	**Will the project address the objective?**	**Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective**	**Quantification** (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Will improve water quality and supply by meeting water standards.	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	To be able to continue to provide drinkable water to approximately 120 households using existing water supply.	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Funding is urgently needed to provide a reliable water supply for both domestic use and emergency fire protection.	

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.			
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Project is located entirely within a greater Eastern Plumas County disadvantaged community.	
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	By reducing leakage more water will be available to users, which will in turn help protect groundwater resources.	
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	By saving approx 20% of current water used, efficiency of water is increased.	
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	■ Yes ☐ N/A		
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Maintaining infrastructures will allow system operation to improve efficiency of water supply.	
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		

If no objectives are addressed, describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity for the Region:

IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do no leave a blank cell.** Note that DWR encourages multi-benefit projects.

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	■ N/A	
b. Disadvantaged Communities[1]	☐ N/A	Will address water needs of a dis-advantaged community which is located within a greater Eastern Plumas County DAC
c. Environmental Justice[2]	■ N/A	
d. Drought Preparedness	☐ N/A	Repairing this water storage tank will save approximately 20% of water currently used.
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change[3]	☐ N/A	We need to be aware and take action to conserve water whenever we can.
f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	■ N/A	
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	■ N/A	

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

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

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

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

a. Water supply reliability, water conservation, water use efficiency	■ Yes ☐ N/A	g. Drinking water treatment and distribution	■ Yes ☐ N/A

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

V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

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

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	☐ Yes ■ No	
Urban water use efficiency	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	■ Yes ☐ No	Repair and improve infrastructure
System reoperation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water transfers	■ Yes ☐ No	Repair and improve infrastructure
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Precipitation Enhancement	☐ Yes ■ No	
Municipal recycled water	☐ Yes ■ No	
Surface storage – regional/local	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	■ Yes ☐ No	Maintain and upgrade infrastructure facilities.
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Matching water quality to water use	■ Yes ☐ No	Allow system operation to improve water quality
Pollution prevention	☐ Yes ■ No	
Salt and salinity management	☐ Yes ■ No	

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Urban storm water runoff management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	☐ Yes ■ No	
Ecosystem restoration	☐ Yes ■ No	
Forest management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Land use planning and management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Recharge area protection	☐ Yes ■ No	
Sediment management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Watershed management	☐ Yes ■ No	
People and Water		
Economic incentives	■ Yes ☐ No	Will reduce wear and tear on well pump
Outreach and engagement	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water and culture	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water-dependent recreation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Wastewater/NPDES	☐ Yes ■ No	

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

VI. PROJECT COST AND FINANCING

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

PROJECT BUDGET

Project serves a need of a DAC?: ■ Yes ☐ No
Funding Match Waiver request?: ■ Yes ☐ No

	Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	**Direct Project Administration**	1,000			1,000

b.	**Land Purchase/Easement**	0.00			0.00
c.	**Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental**	22,000			22,000
d.	**Construction/Implementation**	165,000			165,000
e.	**Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement**	0.00			0.00
f.	**Construction Administration**	2,000			2,000
g.	**Other Costs**	0.00			0.00
h.	**Construction/Implementation Contingency**	10,000			10,000
i.	**Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)**	200,000			200,000

j.	**Can the Project be phased?** ☐ **Yes** ■ **No** If **yes**, provide cost breakdown by phases			
		Project Cost	**O&M Cost**	**Description of Phase**
	Phase 1			
	Phase 2			
	Phase 3			
	Phase 4			

k.	**Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).**	Operation and maintenance costs will be absorbed by our existing employees.
l.	**Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?**	☐ **Yes** ■ **No**
m.	**Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)**	System upkeep will increase. Reliability will decrease. Unable to meet CA water reductions.

*List all sources of funding.
Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).

VIII. PROJECT STATUS AND SCHEDULE

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

Project Stage	Check the Current Project Stage	Completed?	Description of Activities in Each Project Stage	Planned/ Actual Start Date (mm/yr)	Planned/ Actual Completion Date (mm/yr)
a. Assessment and Evaluation	■	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	Evaluated by district staff. Will need experts evaluation	TBD - Pending funding	
b. Final Design	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Create final design & engineering for project.	TBD	
c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Anticipate negative declaration for CEQA	TBD	

d. Permitting	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Project engineer will prepare & submit necessary permits	TBD	
e. Construction Contracting	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Request for proposal thru notice to proceed	TBD	
f. Construction Implementation	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Complete project and sign off	TBD	
Provide explanation if more than one project stage is checked as current status					

IX. PROJECT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

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

a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	
b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) **of the proposed project in 300 words or less.**	
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A If yes, please describe.
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier[1]?	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A
f. Are you are an Agricultural Water Supplier[2]?	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	■ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A If yes, please indicate which groundwater basin. Grizzly Valley GWB

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

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

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Grizzly Lake CSD
Name of Primary Contact	Jared D. Recasens, Chief Operators
Name of Secondary Contact	Larry Terrill, Chairman, Board of Directors
Mailing Address	119 Delleker Drive, Portola, CA 96122
E-mail	glrid@att.net; jrwastewater@gmail.com
Phone	530-832-5225 Office; 530-927-8459 Cell
Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain	Yes

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	Delleker Water Tank Rehab
Project Category	■ **Water Supply/Water Quality** ☐ **Environmental Protection/Restoration** ■ **Community Water/Wastewater** ☐ **Stakeholder/Public Collaboration and Education** ☐ **Working Landscape Viability**
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	Grizzly Lake CSD in Portola, CA, stores water in a 300,000 gallon storage tank that was built in 2000. It provides approximately 400 households in this severely disadvantaged community with essential domestic water supply and water for emergency fire protection. The Delleker Tank requires repairs to bring it up to meet OSHA, NFPA, AWWA and EPA codes. It is estimated that approximately 4,200,000 gallons of water will be saved annually by repairing the leaks and refurbishing this tank.
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	Project is located 3 miles west of Portola, CA
Latitude:	39.8114Degrees N
Longitude:	120.4978DegreesW

III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

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

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	**Will the project address the objective?**	**Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective**	**Quantification** (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	The project will repair an existing aging water supply tank. Will help meet fire flow requirements for the local area. Increase system flexibility and resiliency to adapt to climate variability. Located in a DAC.	Save approx 4 million gallons of water annually by repairing/refurbishing Ground storage water tank.
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Project will support regulatory compliance with current and future state and federal water quality standards. Project will allow system operator to improve water quality.	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Project would improve overall system-wide energy efficiency by reducing leaks/water losses and therefore, reduce energy use by pumping and treating	Project will save approx 4 Million gallons of water annually

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
		less water to meet needs of this rural DAC	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Project serves a community that is classified as Severely Disadvantaged.	
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Be repairing this tank less water will be lost which will in turn protect the groundwater resource.	Save approx 4,200,000 gallons of water annually
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	Will help district achieve the mandatory state reductions in water usage.	Will save approx 4.2 million gallons of water annually
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	■ Yes ☐ N/A	By saving approx 4,200,000 gallons of water efficiency of water is increased.	Repair/rehab existing infrastructure
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		
Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	☐ Yes ■ N/A		

If no objectives are addressed, describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity for the Region:

IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do no leave a blank cell.** Note that DWR encourages multi-benefit projects.

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	■ N/A	
b. Disadvantaged Communities[1]	☐ N/A	This project will benefit Delleker area residents which is classified as a Severely Disadvantaged community.
c. Environmental Justice[2]	☐ N/A	A large majority of water users that live in this DAC are racial minorities.
d. Drought Preparedness	☐ N/A	Will be able to take action to conserve water and meet state mandated water reductions.
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change[3]	☐ N/A	Fixing the leak in this tank will result in approximately 4.2 million gallons of water saved each year.
f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	■ N/A	
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	■ N/A	

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

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

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

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

a. Water supply reliability, water conservation, water use efficiency	■ Yes ☐ N/A	g. Drinking water treatment and distribution	■ Yes ☐ N/A
b. Stormwater capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, management	☐ Yes ■ N/A	h. Watershed protection and management	☐ Yes ■ N/A

c. Removal of invasive non-native species, creation/enhancement of wetlands, acquisition/protection/restoration of open space and watershed lands	☐ Yes ■ N/A	i. Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation/desalting, other treatment technologies and conveyance of recycled water for distribution to users	☐ Yes ■ N/A
d. Non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring	■ Yes ☐ N/A	j. Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs	☐ Yes ■ N/A
e. Groundwater recharge and management projects	☐ Yes ■ N/A	k. Ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection	☐ Yes ■ N/A
f. Water banking, exchange, reclamation, and improvement of water quality	☐ Yes ■ N/A		

V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

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

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	☐ Yes ■ No	
Urban water use efficiency	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	■ Yes ☐ No	Repair and improve infrastructure
System reoperation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water transfers	☐ Yes ■ No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Precipitation Enhancement	☐ Yes ■ No	
Municipal recycled water	☐ Yes ■ No	
Surface storage – regional/local	☐ Yes ■ No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	■ Yes ☐ No	Maintain and upgrade infrastructure facilities
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Matching water quality to water use	■ Yes ☐ No	Allow system operation to improve water quality
Pollution prevention	☐ Yes ■ No	
Salt and salinity management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Urban storm water runoff management	☐ Yes ■ No	

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	☐ Yes ■ No	
Ecosystem restoration	☐ Yes ■ No	
Forest management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Land use planning and management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Recharge area protection	☐ Yes ■ No	
Sediment management	☐ Yes ■ No	
Watershed management	☐ Yes ■ No	
People and Water		
Economic incentives	■ Yes ☐ No	Be able to provide quality water to users
Outreach and engagement	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water and culture	☐ Yes ■ No	
Water-dependent recreation	☐ Yes ■ No	
Wastewater/NPDES	☐ Yes ■ No	

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

VI. PROJECT COST AND FINANCING

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

PROJECT BUDGET

Project serves a need of a DAC?: ■ Yes ☐ No
Funding Match Waiver request?: ■ Yes ☐ No

	Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	**Direct Project Administration**	1,000			1,000
b.	**Land Purchase/Easement**				
c.	**Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental**	22,000			22,000
d.	**Construction/Implementation**	165,000			165,000
e.	**Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement**				
f.	**Construction Administration**	2,000			2,000
g.	**Other Costs**				

h.	**Construction/Implementation Contingency**	10,000			10,000
i.	**Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)**	200,000			200,000

j.	**Can the Project be phased?** ☐ **Yes** ■ **No** If **yes**, provide cost breakdown by phases			
		Project Cost	**O&M Cost**	**Description of Phase**
	Phase 1			
	Phase 2			
	Phase 3			
	Phase 4			

k.	**Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).**	Operation and maintenance costs will be absorbed by our existing employees using O&M funds.
l.	**Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?**	☐ **Yes** ■ **No**
m.	**Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)**	District will continue to lose over 4 million gallons of water due to leaks in tank. Will have difficulty meeting state mandated water use reductions.

*List all sources of funding.
Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).

VIII. PROJECT STATUS AND SCHEDULE

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

Project Stage	Check the Current Project Stage	Completed?	Description of Activities in Each Project Stage	Planned/ Actual Start Date (mm/yr)	Planned/ Actual Completion Date (mm/yr)
a. Assessment and Evaluation	■	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Project has been evaluated by staff. Will need experts evaluation.	TBD	
b. Final Design	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Create final design & engineering for project.	TBD	
c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Anticipate a CEQA negative declaration. Approve/file	TBD	
d. Permitting	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Project engineer will prepare & submit necessary permits	TBD	

e. Construction Contracting	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Request for proposal thru notice to proceed	TBD	
f. Construction Implementation	☐	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A	Complete repair of tank and sign off on project	TBD	
Provide explanation if more than one project stage is checked as current status					

IX. PROJECT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

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

a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	
b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) **of the proposed project in 300 words or less.**	
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	☐ Yes ☐ No ■ N/A If yes, please describe.
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier[1]?	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A
f. Are you are an Agricultural Water Supplier[2]?	☐ Yes ■ No ☐ N/A
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	■ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A If yes, please indicate which groundwater basin. Humbug Valley

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

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

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Sierraville Public Utility District
Name of Primary Contact	Nanci Davis
Name of Secondary Contact	Laura Read
Mailing Address	PO Box 325, Sierraville, CA 96126
E-mail	nancidavis212@gmail.com readwriteshoot@gmail.com
Phone	530-574-8331
Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain	Yes, providing adequate funding is ensured

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	MS-35 Alternative Water Source Analysis and Development
Project Category	☐ **Agricultural Land Stewardship** ☐ **Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies** ☒ **Municipal Services** ☐ **Tribal Advisory Committee** ☐ **Uplands/Forest**
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	Currently the community of Sierraville is served by one spring located on National Forest Land. SPUD would not be able to meet health and safety needs of the community if the single source of water was contaminated, ran dry, lost due to curtailment or water rights issues or damaged or destroyed in a natural disaster. SPUD has been directed to research and develop an alternative water source. We know we have adjudicated rights to Webber Creek water, but no means to filter, pump and deliver the water. There may also be potential for development of a well somewhere in the vicinity. Phase 1. Hire a consultant to research options and requirements for development of each option. The consultant will identify and explore potential sources including an assessment of volume of water to be produced, quality of water, water rights implications and infrastructure requirements. The study will focus on using adjudicated water rights held by the district referenced in the Sierra

	Valley Decree of 1940 and developing wells in compliance with the local ground water district. Phase 2. Implement the best option recommended by the consultant. Design and construct. Initiate design, engineering, determine cost and schedule, select contractors and construct the facilities. Development of alternative or complementary sources of domestic water will ensure that service would not be interrupted if there is curtailment of use from springs or if the springs stop producing adequate water or if there is damage or destruction of springs.
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	Within the Sierraville Public Utility District service area, Sierraville, Ca
Latitude:	
Longitude:	

III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

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

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	**Will the project address the objective?**	**Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective**	**Quantification** (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD provides fire suppression water to local fire fighting agencies	
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD is a collaboration of water resource stakeholders and improvements will serve all stakeholders in the district	
Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in the Upper Feather River	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	We are following direction from the DWR to research alternative water supply	

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
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.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Research of an alternative water supply is a regional water management action specifically orchestrated to improve water supply and ensure quality	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	We are a disadvantaged community and our ratepayers have been unable to fund a study without assistance	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	The study and implementation of alternative water supply would be designed to protect, restore and enhance the quality of water resources	
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Sierraville is a DAC	
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	A hydrogeologist base study and engineering analysis report would guarantee this objective	
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	This would be one of our objectives in the study	
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD would potentially become less dependent on seasonally impacted water sources if a well was developed	
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	The Alternative source study and implementation would be designed to improve efficiency and reliability of water supply	

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD would engage community outreach and strive for effective communication with all stakeholders	
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	If the study determines that a well is a viable source this could address downstream user economic challenges	
Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD Board of Directors is a volunteer organization committed to the completion of this project.	

If no objectives are addressed, describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity for the Region:

IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do no leave a blank cell.** Note that DWR encourages multi-benefit projects.

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	☒ N/A	
b. Disadvantaged Communities[1]	☐ N/A	Sierraville is a Disadvantaged Community
c. Environmental Justice[2]	☒ N/A	
d. Drought Preparedness	☐ N/A	An alternative water source would give the community more versatility in the event of continued drought

e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change[3]	☐ N/A	An alternative water source would give the community more versatility in the event of continued climate change
f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	☒ N/A	
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	☐ N/A	

[1] A Disadvantaged Community is defined as a community with an annual median household (MHI) income that is less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual MHI. DWR's DAC mapping is available on the UFR website (http://featherriver.org/maps/) .
[2] Environmental Justice is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. An example of environmental justice benefit would be to improve conditions (e.g. water supply, flooding, sanitation) in an area of racial minorities.
[3] Climate change effects are likely to include increased flooding, extended drought, and associated secondary effects such as increased wildfire risk, erosion, and sedimentation.

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

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

V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

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

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Urban water use efficiency	☒ Yes ☐ No	Rural water use efficiency
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	☐ Yes ☒ No	
System reoperation	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Water transfers	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Precipitation Enhancement	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Municipal recycled water	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Surface storage – regional/local	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	☒ Yes ☐ No	Developing an alternative water source helps insure distribution
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Matching water quality to water use	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Pollution prevention	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Salt and salinity management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Urban storm water runoff management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Ecosystem restoration	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Forest management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Land use planning and management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Recharge area protection	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Sediment management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Watershed management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
People and Water		
Economic incentives	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Outreach and engagement	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Water and culture	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Water-dependent recreation	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Wastewater/NPDES	☐ Yes ☒ No	

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

VI. PROJECT COST AND FINANCING

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

PROJECT BUDGET

Project serves a need of a DAC?: ☒ Yes ☐ No
Funding Match Waiver request?: ☒ Yes ☐ No

	Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	**Direct Project Administration**				
b.	**Land Purchase/Easement**				
c.	**Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental**	156,000			
d.	**Construction/Implementation**	100,000			
e.	**Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement**				
f.	**Construction Administration**				
g.	**Other Costs**				
h.	**Construction/Implementation Contingency**				
i.	**Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)**	256,000			256,000

j.	**Can the Project be phased?** ☒ Yes ☐ No If **yes**, provide cost breakdown by phases			
		Project Cost	**O&M Cost**	**Description of Phase**
	Phase 1	156,000		Analysis and design
	Phase 2	100,000		Implementation
	Phase 3			
	Phase 4			

k.	**Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).**	From monthly fees collected from rate payers and from reserve
l.	**Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?**	☐ Yes ☒ No

m.	**Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)**	Inability to meet the domestic water health and safety needs of the community of Sierraville

*List all sources of funding.
Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).

VIII. PROJECT STATUS AND SCHEDULE

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

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

IX. PROJECT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

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

a.	**List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by** (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	Curtailment order from DWS

b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	Preliminary Engineering Report from Walters Engineering
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) **of the proposed project in 300 words or less.**	
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A If yes, please describe.
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier[1]?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A
f. Are you are an Agricultural Water Supplier[2]?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A If yes, please indicate which groundwater basin.

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

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

UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Sierraville Public Utility Districk
Name of Primary Contact	Nanci Davis
Name of Secondary Contact	Laura Read
Mailing Address	PO Box 325
E-mail	nancidavis212@gmail.com
Phone	530-414-1257
Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders	
Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain	yes

II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title	MS-41 Tank replacement project
Project Category	☐ **Agricultural Land Stewardship** ☐ **Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies** ☒ **Municipal Services** ☐ **Tribal Advisory Committee** ☐ **Uplands/Forest**
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	SPUD has a storage tank that has been taken out of service due to its dilapidated condition leaving the district with a single 215,000 gallon tank to serve the entire system. The remaining tank is visibly leaking although it has a remaining life of 15 years. SPUD needs additional storage to meet the combination of maximum daily demand and fire protection requirements. Having 2 storage tanks allows operational flexibility by providing redundancy for maintenance or repairs.
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	Approximately ¼ mile SSW of the intersection of state Hwy 89 and Old Truckee Road
Latitude:	
Longitude:	

III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

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

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	**Will the project address the objective?**	**Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective**	**Quantification** (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Will provide more dependable source of fire suppression water to support initial attack activities	Potentially 300,000 gallons
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD is a collaboration of water resource stakeholders and improvements will serve all stakeholders in the district	134 hook-ups
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.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Increases water supply for service area	300,000 gallons
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	A new storage tank would allow us to service one tank without interruption of water delivery, providing better water quality to the district	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Sierraville is a Severely Disadvantaged Community and SPUD rate payers have said that an increase in rates to pay for infrastructure improvements would be a serious economic challenge	

Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:	Will the project address the objective?	Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective	Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	A new storage tank would allow us to better manage the source of our water at RR Springs	
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Sierraville is a DAC.	
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity allows us to improve management of water source	
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity allows us to improve management of water source	
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity allows us to improve management of water source and provides protection against potential diminishing source	
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity allows us to improve management of water source. This is our primary objective.	
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD would engage community outreach and strive for effective communication with all stakeholders	
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	☐ Yes ☒ N/A		
Work with counties/ communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	☒ Yes ☐ N/A	SPUD Board of Directors is a volunteer group committed to assuring responsible management of the district. We have no paid staff, only a contract water system operator and secretary	

If no objectives are addressed, describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity for the Region:

Sierraville is a hub for tourist and commercial traffic between Interstate 80 and the other communities in the Sierra Valley (the headwaters region for the Middle Fork of the Feather River). Most of the commercial and recreational traffic entering the headwaters area flows through Sierraville. Many visitors stop for food and travel related services in town. A failure of the domestic water supply for this community will hurt the economic viability of the balance of the communities in Sierra and Plumas Counties.

IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do no leave a blank cell.** Note that DWR encourages multi-benefit projects.

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	☒ N/A	
b. Disadvantaged Communities[1]	☐ N/A	Sierraville is designated as a Severely Disadvantaged Community and SPUD serves the community
c. Environmental Justice[2]	☒ N/A	
d. Drought Preparedness	☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity guarantees longer service and allows for water collection at most beneficial times
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change[3]	☐ N/A	Greater storage capacity guarantees longer service and allows for water collection at most beneficial times
f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	☐ N/A	
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	☐ N/A	

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

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

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

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

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

V. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

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

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Reduce Water Demand		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Urban water use efficiency	☒ Yes ☐ No	Creates a more efficient delivery system
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	☐ Yes ☒ No	
System reoperation	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Water transfers	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Precipitation Enhancement	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Municipal recycled water	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Surface storage – regional/local	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	☒ Yes ☐ No	Better management of SPUD resources

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Matching water quality to water use	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Pollution prevention	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Salt and salinity management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Urban storm water runoff management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Ecosystem restoration	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Forest management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Land use planning and management	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Recharge area protection	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Sediment management	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Watershed management	☒ Yes ☐ No	
People and Water		
Economic incentives	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Outreach and engagement	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Water and culture	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Water-dependent recreation	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Wastewater/NPDES	☐ Yes ☐ No	

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

VI. PROJECT COST AND FINANCING

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

PROJECT BUDGET
Project serves a need of a DAC?: ☒ Yes ☐ No Funding Match Waiver request?: ☒ Yes ☐ No

	Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	**Direct Project Administration**	5,000			
b.	**Land Purchase/Easement**	1,000			
c.	**Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental**	51,050			
d.	**Construction/Implementation**	535,000			
e.	**Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement**	5,000			
f.	**Construction Administration**	10,000			
g.	**Other Costs**				
h.	**Construction/Implementation Contingency**	46,500			
i.	**Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)**	653,550			653,550

j.	**Can the Project be phased?** ☐ Yes ☒ No If **yes**, provide cost breakdown by phases			
		Project Cost	**O&M Cost**	**Description of Phase**
	Phase 1			
	Phase 2			
	Phase 3			
	Phase 4			

k.	**Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).**	From rate-payers monthly payments and reserve – maintenance costs should be reduced as compared to current operation because of increased efficiencies
l.	**Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?**	☒ Yes ☐ No
m.	**Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)**	SPUD will have less storage capacity, and no storage capacity at the end of the existing tank's life

*List all sources of funding.
Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).

VIII. PROJECT STATUS AND SCHEDULE

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

Project Stage	Check the Current Project Stage	Completed?	Description of Activities in Each Project Stage	Planned/ Actual Start Date (mm/yr)	Planned/ Actual Completion Date (mm/yr)
a. **Assessment and Evaluation**	☐	☒ Yes	SPUD hired Walters Engineering to	November 2011	

		☐ No ☐ N/A	create Preliminary Engineering Report		
b. Final Design	☒	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	We have recommendations from the engineers		
c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)	☐	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A			
d. Permitting	☐	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A			
e. Construction Contracting	☐	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A			
f. Construction Implementation	☐	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A			
Provide explanation if more than one project stage is checked as current status					

IX. PROJECT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

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

a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	
b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	Water System Upgrades Preliminary Engineering Report Walters Engineering
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) **of the proposed project in 300 words or less.**	
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A If yes, please describe.
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier[1]?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

f. Are you are an Agricultural Water Supplier[2]?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A If yes, please indicate which groundwater basin.

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

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

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: *MS-44 Community Water Tank 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 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 need 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. Inspections will include assessing the IVCSD's needs and capabilities for upgrading, replacing, or supplementing existing water tank storage. After the Camp fire it has become evident to the IVCSD that fire response from within Greenville is more critical than ever given that there may be a power outage and that USFS and CALFIRE response times may exceed 30-60 minutes, and that air tanker support may be unavailable in a high red flag situation. This was the perfect firestorm of conditions that destroyed Paradise. The IVCSD appreciates the opportunity to supplement and upgrade its emergency water and fires preparedness through the DWR DACTI program for the Mountain Counties Funding Area (MCFA). The IVCSD has prioritized water tank upgrade and expansion opportunities and is currently evaluating its back-up power preparedness for Greenville. The IVCSD's engineer is preparing design drawings and refined cost estimates. The new tank will be located on IVCSD property. The exact location will determine If a Mitigated Negative Declaration rather than a Categorical Exemption is required under CEQA. If our engineer needs to include costs for a Mitigated Negative Declaration he will provide those cost estimates as well. The IVCSD anticipates including the 10% administration cost and working with the Plumas County Community Development Commission to administer the grant for the IVCSD, should we be awarded the $320,000 that we are now seeking from the DWR MCFA DACT1 program.

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: Funding acquisition	6/1/2020	7/2/2020
Task 2: Bidding and contract award	8/1/2020	8/30/2020
Task 3: Construction	9/30/2019	11/30/2020
Task 4: Project Closeout	12/30/2020	6/30/2021

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

Potential Partners	**Confirmed Partners**
MOUNTAIN COUNTIES FUNDING AREA IRWMS	
PLUMAS COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	
DWR PROPOSITION 1 DACT1 ROUND ONE IMPLEMENTATION FUNDS	

PROJECT STATUS

Design complete	☐	Yes

	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Engineer Sig Hansen has completed the engineering and design for tank cleaning and refurbishment, Phase One. This phase of the project is shovel ready. Engineer Dean Marsh is finalizing designs, cost estimates and CEQA compliance costs for the tank upgrade and expansion (Phase Two), and including the back-up power evaluation. These Phase Two designs will be finalized before the grant application deadline and a conceptual grant application will be available for the meeting with DWR by mid-August. The IVCSD will be working with the PCCDC to draft the grant administration agreement prototype once the grant is submitted to DWR. As the IVCSD attempts to ensure fire and emergency water preparedness for Greenville a severely disadvantaged community with the largest tribal population in Plumas County, we appreciate the support of our project partners and their recognition that the Camp Fire and the PG&E bankruptcy has forever changed our understanding of emergency water and fire preparedness in Indian Valley.	
Engineering complete	☐	Yes
	☒	No (provide details below)
	Details: Engineer Sig Hansen has completed designs for Phase One and Dean Marsh is in the process of completing the engineering and designs for the Phase Two project.	
Project does not require technical design or engineering	*Provide details: This project includes a phase one maintenance project and fact finding mission to inspect our water storage systems in Greenville and a phase two to develop fire tank and emergency water supply expansion with enhanced back-up power capacity in Greenville.*	
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, lice3nsing, 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.	
Maybe CEQA required for Phase Two New Tank	*Provide details: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures (CEQA Guidelines §15303) Depending on the location of the new tank, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be required.*	
No NEPA required	*Provide details:* Click or tap here to enter text.	
	☒	Yes
	☐	No (provide details below)

Performance Measures identified[1]	*Details:* Click or tap here to enter text.
Monitoring Plan complete	☐ Yes ☐ No (provide details below)
	Details: The IVCSD will be exploring with the PCCDC what monitoring requirements are anticipated in addition to the grant reporting requirement so that they can be included in the Proposition 1 grant application.

BUDGET

Total Project Budget:	Budget: $30,000 for Phase One water tank refurbishment and $290,000 for tank upgrade and expansion.
Match	Amount: TBD
	Source: IVCSD Project Administration
Match	Amount: PCCDC Grant Administration
	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.	We supply water to a community of 1000 residences in Greenville. 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.	The lack of capacity for grant development by DACs across the MCFA is

[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
		being partially addressed by this Proposition 1 DASC funding opportunity.
☐	Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	The residents of Paradise are facing 300 million dollars in water quality clean up costs as a result of the Camp Fire. $320,000 in prevention costs is an ounce of prevention comparted with a pound of cure as the old saying goes. Emergency water with back-up power is a much needed water source throughout the IVCSD's service area. Such a project would pilot enhancing the reliability of high-quality water distributed to Greenville, the IV CSD's largest service area, during a fire emergency or a prolonged power outage.
☐	Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	Greenville is home to Maidu and other tribal residents. The Greenville Indian Rancheria has worked with the IVCSD in the past for the benefit to tribal members and the whole community of Greenville.
☐	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.	Refurbishing existing water tank infrastructure and upgrading and expanding emergency water preparedness assures the reliable transmission of water to all of the residences in an emergency situation.
☐	Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	IVCSD will be working with its customers to help increase awareness of the potential for prolonged power outages during red flag fire periods and the importance for back up water and power sources in and around the communities of Crescent Mills, Taylorsville, and Indian Falls.
☐	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.	The IVCSD looks forward to working with the PCCDC to enhance the IVCSD's capacity to obtain and administer grants for similar fire and emergency water system upgrades in other communities in its service area like North Arm and Genesee.
☐	*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

√	Resource Management Strategy
☐	Water and culture
☐	Water-dependent recreation
☐	Wastewater/NPDES

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

Water storage tanks inspected and cleaned to improve water quality. Fire Tank and Emergency Water upgrades and expansion.

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The IVCSD anticipates updating its facility plans as funding permits to undertake fire and emergency water and back-up power assessments for the other communities where the IVCSD provides water and wastewater or fire district services.

ITEM NO. 4

Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management

Regional Water Management Group Quarterly Meeting
July 18, 2019

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting

Subject: Process for Future Time Sensitive Grant Opportunities

---

DISCUSSION

Many of the grant opportunities that arise have very tight timelines which may not allow for scheduling a meeting that can achieve a quorum. Staff is requesting a discussion of the role we should play in identifying grant opportunities for our Region's implementation projects. Additionally, this is an opportunity to discuss establishing a process for selecting projects for such time sensitive grant opportunities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion and direction to staff.