FRCRM

FORUM FULL PROPOSAL

SPANISH CREEK IN AMERICAN VALLEY

Terry Benoit

4/1/2009

1. **Project Name**: Spanish Creek in American Valley
2. **County**: Plumas
3. **Project Number**:
4. **Project Sponsor**: Plumas Corporation (contact Terry Benoit)
5. **Date**: 04-01-09
6. **Sponsor's Phone Number**: 530-283-3739
   Applicant Capability: Plumas Corporation is the fiscal agent for the Feather River Coordinated Resource Management Group (FR-CRM). The FR-CRM is highly qualified to complete the project, having completed 24 projects of this type, totaling 22 miles of restoration, throughout the Feather River watershed.
7. **Sponsor's Email**: *terry@plumascounty.org*
8. **Project Location**: See Project Location Map.

9a. **National Forest**: Plumas

9b. **Forest Service District**: Mount Hough

9c. **State/Private/Other Lands Involved?** Located on lands owned by John and Beth Mcmorrow, Dave Sims, Danny Leonhardt, and the Feather River College.

9d. **Legal Location**: Sections 15, 16, and 17, T24N, R9E, MDB&M

9e. **Justification, Goals and Objectives**: The project area, located in the upstream reach of Spanish Creek in the American Valley (aka the Gravel Management Reach), receives large quantities of coarse sediment (bedload), primarily old hydraulic mine waste. Much of this bedload deposits as large gravel bars and islands within the project reach before being transported downstream, where much of the damage from this load is occurring.

The project was identified during the assessment of Spanish Creek in 2006 as meeting the goals of the "*Spanish Creek Assessment, Rehabilitation and Gravel Management Strategy*," conducted by the Feather River CRM and funded by CalFed Proposition 13. These goals include a (1) stable, healthy channelway, (2) a community with the capacity to collaborate and implement sound stream rehabilitation and watershed management practices and (3) sustainable gravel transport and extraction technology that can be transferred to similar drainages.

The project objective is to reduce the amount of bedload transported downstream by regulating the amount stored within this upper, gravel management, reach and to reduce erosion of the entrenchment banks through American Valley. Where possible, Spanish Creek would be reconnected to the available floodplain within the entrenchment. This project is justified because it reduces the transport of bedload downstream, thereby improving stream conditions by natural processes and because it improves aquatic and riparian habitats and water quality.

11. Project Description: This proposal includes two phases of work. The first phase is for project development, both field and office work. Working with the landowners, we would identify specific project sites, conduct the necessary cross-section and longitudinal profile surveys, design the treatment for each site and develop implementation cost estimates. The second phase is to conduct the

necessary CEQA analysis, including resource surveys, and apply for the required permits.

Coordination with other related projects on adjacent lands? The Soil Conservation Service (now the NRCS) determined that the Upper Spanish Creek watershed contributes a high sediment load to the North Fork Feather River, ranking it 5th overall (SCS, *East Branch North Fork Feather River Erosion Inventory Report*, February 1989, p. 22). The FR-CRM conducted an assessment of the Upper Spanish Creek watershed and developed a restoration strategy in 2006 (referred to in 9e, above). The project area was determined through the assessment and strategy as the most important project for American Valley. The Dyrr Bank was constructed in 2006 as a demonstration of the bank treatment technology proposed in the assessment and strategy. Other projects in the watershed include the recently accomplished Meadow Valley Projects, Little Schneider meadow restoration, Schneider meadow restoration, Rock Creek stabilization at Deans Valley and the planned Bean Hill Mine sediment retention project. All projects were coordinated with the USDA Forest Service and meet the goals of the strategy and further demonstrate different treatment alternatives.

12. How does project meet purposes of the Monterey Settlement?

1) **Improve retention of water for augmented base flow in streams:** The project is expected to improve local aquifer water retention, but because the project would not obliterate the entrenchment, additional groundwater retention with improved base flows is not expected to be significant.
2) **Improve water quality and streambank protection:** The project would develop specific projects to reduce downstream bedload transport and to treat eroding, vertical streambanks, eliminating these sources of sediment and reducing solar heating. The project would reconnect the active channel with its floodplain, effectively reducing pressure on channel banks, filtering and capturing incoming fine grained sediment, and improving riparian vegetation cover and shading. Livestock grazing occurs on Dan Leonhardt's and Feather River College lands, both adjacent to the project area.
3) **Improve upland vegetation management:** Management within the project area would include active gravel management that would periodically removing gravel that is surplus to proper channel and floodplain morphometric requirements. Vegetation plantings would take place along treated bank sections, treated floodplains and all other areas made bare during project construction. Additional vegetation plantings may be necessary to meet project objectives and improve riparian plant diversity and structure.
4) **Improve groundwater retention in major aquifers:** Since the entrenchment would not be eliminated, limited improvements to groundwater retention would be expected.

14. Project Type: First Tier Type 1; Project construction would result in multiple benefits, reducing erosion and sedimentation, protecting streambanks, improving conditions of water flow and improving riparian vegetation in priority streams of upper watershed.

15. **Measure of project accomplishments/expected outcomes:** The first phase would result in landowner approved projects that are located and fully designed, ready for assessment during the second phase of work. The second phase would result in resource survey reports (BA/BE for wildlife and plants, and cultural resources), submitted CEQA documents, and implementation grant applications.
16. **Estimated Start Date:** 05-04-2009
17. **Estimated Completion Date:** 12-31-09 (Phase 1); fall 2010 (Phase 2)
18. **Proposed Methods of Accomplishment:** Plumas Corporation staff will work directly with the landowners to develop the projects in the field and will perform all necessary office work, maps, and designs. The FRCRM will contract out and oversee the resource surveys, insuring that they meet the requirements necessary for the CEQA analysis. FRCRM staff will prepare the CEQA documents and submit to the county for analysis. FRCRM staff will prepare and submit implementation grant applications.
19. **Anticipated Project Costs:** The first phase is estimated at $21,000 and the second at $25,000 for a total of $46,000 (see attached cost estimate)
20. **Identify other sources of funding:** In-kind services would total $3,000.
21. **Monitoring Plan:** The CRM Coordinator would monitor the progress of the project, along with expenditures. No formal monitoring plan is required at this time.
22. **Failure to comply with the terms of the agreement.** If the project is partially or wholly incomplete, the remaining funds will be returned to the Watershed Forum. FR-CRM staff at Plumas Corporation has successfully completed over 50 watershed restoration projects, and are well qualified to complete this work.
23. **Landowner Agreement:** Landowners within the project area have requested the FRCRM to evaluate the stream and develop specific projects for implementation. They have requested FRCRM help in stabilizing the gully banks to reduce flood damages to their properties.

Status of Project Planning Worksheet:

a. NEPA* and/or CEQA* Complete:	☐ Yes	☒ No	Needs review
b. If no, give est. date of completion: 2010			
c. NMFS* Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ Not Applicable
d. USFWS* Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ Not Applicable
e. RWQCB/CDFG* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Not Applicable
f. RWQCB/COE* 401/404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Not Applicable
g. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Not Applicable
h. Project Design(s) Completed:	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Not Applicable
i. FEMA/NFIP Compliance	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ Not Applicable
j. Local/Regional Permits & Regulatory Compliance	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ Not Applicable

***** NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act, CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act, NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service, USFWS = United States Fish & Wildlife Service, RWRCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board, CDFG = CA Dept. of Fish & Game, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer, FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency; NFIP = National Flood Insurance Program

Project Cost Analysis: Project Development Phase

Item	*Column A* **Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution**	*Column B* **Requested Watershed Forum Funds**	*Column C* **Other Contributions**	*Column D* **Total Available Funds**
a. Field Work & Site Surveys		$ 7,800	$ 500	$ 7,800
b. NEPA/CEQA & Sec 7 ESA Consultation				
c. Permit Acquisition				
d. Project Design & Engineering		$ 8,000	$ 500	$ 8,500
e. Contract Preparation				
f. Contract Administration				
g. Contract Cost				
h. Workforce Cost				
Materials & Supplies		$ 200		$ 200
i. Monitoring				
j. Other (project coordination)		$ 4,000		$ 4,000
k. Indirect Costs				
Total Cost Estimate		$20,000	$ 1,000	$21,000

Project Cost Analysis: CEQA & Grant Application Phase

Item	*Column A* **Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution**	*Column B* **Requested Watershed Forum Funds**	*Column C* **Other Contributions**	*Column D* **Total Available Funds**
a. Field Work & Site Surveys				
b. NEPA/CEQA & Sec 7 ESA Consultation		$ 4,000		$ 4,000
c. Permit Acquisition				
d. Project Design & Engineering				
e. Contract Preparation (resource surveys)		$ 1,000		$ 1,000
f. Contract Administration (resource surveys)		$ 1,000		$ 1,000
g. Contract Cost (resource surveys)		$15,000		$15,000
h. Workforce Cost				
Materials & Supplies				
i. Monitoring				
j. Other (Grant Applications)		$ 4,000		$ 4,000
k. Indirect Costs				
Total Cost Estimate		$25,000		$25,000

Attachment: Project Work Plan

FR-CRM staff at Plumas Corporation will be responsible for completion of all work:

Milestone	Date	
Execute contract w/Plumas County	May	2009
Complete Field Surveys	September	2009
Complete Project Designs	December	2009
Advertise and award resource survey contracts	May	2010
Apply for Grants	February	2010
Complete resource surveys	August	2010
Complete NEPA/CEQA	September	2010

Spanish Creek in American Valley
Project Location
Sec 15, 16, & 17, T24N, R9E