

FRCRM

# FORUM FULL PROPOSAL

---

SPANISH CREEK IN MEADOW VALLEY

**Terry Benoit**

**4/1/2009**

1. **Project Name:** Spanish Creek in Meadow 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 Maps.
- 9a. **National Forest:** Plumas
- 9b. **Forest Service District:** Mount Hough
- 9c. **State/Private/Other Lands Involved?** Located on lands owned by 14 landowners, including the Soper-Wheeler Company. (see attached list of land owners)
- 9d. **Legal Location:** Sections 10, 14 & 15, T24N, R8E, MDB&M
- 9e. **Justification, Goals and Objectives:** The upstream section of Spanish Creek in the Meadow Valley project reach receives large quantities of coarse sediment (bedload) primarily from old hydraulic mine sites upstream. This bedload is quickly transported to Greens Flat, the upper section of the project reach where much of the material is stored, and the lower section of the project reach, 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 from Greens Flat by regulating the amount stored there and to reduce erosion of the entrenchment banks through the lower section. 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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). Tributaries to Spanish Creek at Meadow Valley and the valley itself have been identified for treatment as part of this long-term restoration strategy. The recently constructed Meadow Valley Projects, Silver Creek at Burney's and Spanish Creek at Kellett's, were identified as key projects to meet the goals of the strategy, also demonstrating treatment technologies. Other projects in the watershed include Little Schneider meadow restoration, Schneider meadow restoration, Rock Creek stabilization at Deans Valley and the planned Bean Hill Mine sediment retention project. All 4 are US Forest Service projects, coordinated with the FR-CRM, that 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 neither project would obliterate the entrenchments, 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 Soper-Wheeler land, adjacent to the project area.
- 3) **Improve upland vegetation management:** Management within the project area would be mostly hands-off, but vegetation plantings would take place along the treated bank sections 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. A limited amount of aggradation is expected through the lower section of the project area. This would improve groundwater retention locally and extending out into the adjoining meadow areas.

- 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 \$20,300 and the second at \$25,000 for a total of \$45,300 (see attached cost estimate)
- 20. Identify other sources of funding:** In-kind services would total \$1,000.
- 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 or otherwise desire 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:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Needs review
b. If no, give est. date of completion: 2010			
c. NMFS* Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
d. USFWS* Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
e. RWQCB/CDFG* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
f. RWQCB/COE* 401/404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
g. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
h. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
i. FEMA/NFIP Compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
j. Local/Regional Permits & Regulatory Compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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**

<b>Item</b>	<i>Column A</i> <b>Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution</b>	<i>Column B</i> <b>Requested Watershed Forum Funds</b>	<i>Column C</i> <b>Other Contributions</b>	<i>Column D</i> <b>Total Available Funds</b>
a. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$ 7,000	\$ 500	\$ 7,500
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		\$ 300		\$ 300
i. Monitoring				
j. Other (project coordination)		\$ 4,000		\$ 4,000
k. Indirect Costs				
<b>Total Cost Estimate</b>		\$19,300	\$ 1,000	\$20,300

**Project Cost Analysis: CEQA & Grant Application Phase**

<b>Item</b>	<i>Column A</i> <b>Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution</b>	<i>Column B</i> <b>Requested Watershed Forum Funds</b>	<i>Column C</i> <b>Other Contributions</b>	<i>Column D</i> <b>Total Available Funds</b>
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				
<b>Total Cost Estimate</b>		\$25,000		\$25,000

## **Attachment: Project Work Plan**

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

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



Attachment:

**SPANISH CREEK IN MEADOW VALLEY PROJECT AREA LANDOWNERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Lot No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
Soper-Wheeler Co.		19855 Barton Hill R., Strawberry Valley, CA 95919
Robert & Nancy Banfield*	113070035	45 Pebble Beach Dr., Novato, CA 94949
Michael & Terri Kerby	113070001	POB 255 Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Francis Collins	113070002	POB 164 Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Dolores Williams	113070003	POB 59 Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Anne Van Putten	113070038	POB 337 Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Welles Clarke	113070036	POB 1, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Robert Miller, Trustee	113070009	6445 Via Venado, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Jay Sutton et. al.	113081046	POB 22, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Walter Methner	113081014	POB 1962, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Michael & Diane Beatley	113081018	POB 176, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Erwin Soiset	113081019	POB 237, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Faye Cleo Flanery, Trustee	113081020	POB 1787, Meadow Valley, CA 95956
Larry & Glory Kellett	113081053	POB 389, Meadow Valley, CA 95956

\* c/o daughter, Jeanne Banfield Hawkins

# Spanish Creek in Meadow Valley Project Location (Sec 10, 14 & 15, T24N R8E)

