



[featherriver.org](http://featherriver.org)

## UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

### UPPER FEATHER RIVER IRWM

### PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

Please submit by 5:00 p.m. on August 3, 2015, to [UFR.contact@gmail.com](mailto:UFR.contact@gmail.com)

Please provide information in the tables below:

#### I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

<b>Agency / Organization</b>	Plumas Eureka Community Services District
<b>Name of Primary Contact</b>	Frank Motzkus, General Manager
<b>Name of Secondary Contact</b>	Heather Kotrc, Administrative Manager
<b>Mailing Address</b>	200 Lundy Lane, Blairsden, CA 96103
<b>E-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:frmotzkus@digitalpath.net">frmotzkus@digitalpath.net</a>
<b>Phone</b>	(530) 836-1953
<b>Other Cooperating Agencies / Organizations / Stakeholders</b>	
<b>Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain</b>	Yes. The Project is dependent on funding.

#### II. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>Project Title</b>	MS-26: Municipal Well #3
<b>Project Category</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Agricultural Land Stewardship</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Municipal Services</b> <b>Water Supply/Water Quality</b> <b>Community Water/Wastewater</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Tribal Advisory Committee</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Uplands/Forest</b>
<b>Project Description</b> (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	The Plumas Eureka CSD "Preliminary Engineering Report for the 2015 Water System Improvements" identifies the need to increase the water supply volume for future use. The new 500 gallon per minute well would also have an arsenic removal system.
<b>Project Location Description</b> (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	New municipal well will be located within the Plumas Eureka CSD service area.
<b>Latitude:</b>	39° 47' 31.7322"
<b>Longitude:</b>	120° 38' 59.7588"

### III. APPLICABLE IRWM PLAN OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED

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

<b>Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:</b>	<b>Will the project address the objective?</b>	<b>Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective</b>	<b>Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)</b>
Restore natural hydrologic functions.	N/A		
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	Yes	New well will increase available water volume in a wild fire event.	Volume increase could be up to 500 gallons per minute.
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	N/A		
Work with DWR to develop strategies and actions for the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities in the Upper Feather River Watershed in order to increase water supply, recreational, and environmental benefits to the Region.	N/A		
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	Yes	PECSD is a municipal service provider. This project will improve water supply and drinking water quality (arsenic removal) for the local community.	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	N/A		
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	Yes	This project is dependent on grant funding to increase reliability of present and future water supplies and assuring the delivered water meets all federal and State water standards.	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all	Yes	Through careful hydrologic studies and planning the most suitable water source would be	

<b>Upper Feather River IRWM Objectives:</b>	<b>Will the project address the objective?</b>	<b>Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective</b>	<b>Quantification</b> (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced)
beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.		determined. The new water source would provide direct benefit to the community through enhanced quality and sustainability.	
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	N/A		
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	N/A		
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	N/A		
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	N/A		
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	N/A		
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	Yes	Increase reliability of present and future water supplies and the new well will be equipped with an arsenic removal system to meet State and Federal drinking water standards.	Insures the water quantity and quality for future buildout of the Plumas Eureka CSD service area.
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	N/A		
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	N/A		
Work with counties/communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	Yes	PECSO is prepared to work with the IRWM and the County to administer any resultant grant and see this project through to completion. We are prepared to resource accordingly.	

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

--

#### IV. PROJECT IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

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

If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to:		
<b>a. Native American Tribal Communities</b>	N/A	
<b>b. Disadvantaged Communities<sup>1</sup></b>	N/A	
<b>c. Environmental Justice<sup>2</sup></b>		PECSO ensures fair and equal services regardless of race, culture, income, or any other cultural factors.
<b>d. Drought Preparedness</b>	N/A	
<b>e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change<sup>3</sup></b>		The new well will increase available water volume for emergency fire protection/suppression.
<b>f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)</b>	N/A	
<b>g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere</b>	N/A	
<p><sup>1</sup> 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 (<a href="http://featherriver.org/maps/">http://featherriver.org/maps/</a>).</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Environmental Justice is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. An example of environmental justice benefit would be to improve conditions (e.g. water supply, flooding, sanitation) in an area of racial minorities.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Climate change effects are likely to include increased flooding, extended drought, and associated secondary effects such as increased wildfire risk, erosion, and sedimentation.</p>		

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

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

## 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
<b>Reduce Water Demand</b>		
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	No	
Urban water use efficiency	No	
<b>Improve Flood Management</b>		
Flood management	No	
<b>Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers</b>		
Conveyance – regional/local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Improve conveyance of water from locally developed sources to the end users located within the same watershed.
System reoperation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Improvement of operations and management procedures of water facilities to meet needs more efficiently and reliably.
Water transfers	No	
<b>Increase Water Supply</b>		
Conjunctive management	No	
Precipitation Enhancement	No	
Municipal recycled water	No	

<b>Resource Management Strategy</b>	<b>Will the Project incorporate RMS?</b>	<b>Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable</b>
Surface storage – regional/local	No	
<b>Improve Water Quality</b>		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	Yes	Increases reliability of present and future water supplies and the new well will be equipped with an arsenic removal system to meet State and Federal drinking water standards.
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	No	
Matching water quality to water use	No	
Pollution prevention	No	
Salt and salinity management	No	
Urban storm water runoff management	No	
<b>Practice Resource Stewardship</b>		
Agricultural land stewardship	No	
Ecosystem restoration	No	
Forest management	No	
Land use planning and management	No	
Recharge area protection	No	
Sediment management	No	
Watershed management	No	
<b>People and Water</b>		
Economic incentives	No	
Outreach and engagement	No	
Water and culture	No	
Water-dependent recreation	No	
Wastewater/NPDES	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.

<b>PROJECT BUDGET</b>					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
<b>Category</b>		<b>Requested Grant Amount</b>	<b>Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)</b>	<b>Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
a.	<b>Direct Project Administration</b>	\$356,100	\$356,100		\$712,200
b.	<b>Land Purchase/Easement</b>				
c.	<b>Planning/Design/Engineering / Environmental</b>	\$108,500	\$108,500		\$217,000
d.	<b>Construction/Implementation</b>	\$585,400	\$585,400		\$1,170,800
e.	<b>Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement</b>				
f.	<b>Construction Administration</b>				
g.	<b>Other Costs</b>				
h.	<b>Construction/Implementation Contingency</b>				
i.	<b>Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)</b>	\$1,050,000	\$1,050,000		\$2,100,000
j.	<b>Can the Project be phased? No</b> If yes, provide cost breakdown by phases				
		<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>O&amp;M Cost</b>	<b>Description of Phase</b>	
	<b>Phase 1</b>				
	<b>Phase 2</b>				
	<b>Phase 3</b>				
	<b>Phase 4</b>				
k.	<b>Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).</b>		Service rates would be increased to meet O&M costs when needed.		
l.	<b>Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?</b>		<b>No</b>		
m.	<b>Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)</b>		Possible building moratorium within the Plumas Eureka CSD service area.		
*List all sources of funding.					
Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table ( <a href="http://featherriver.org/documents/">http://featherriver.org/documents/</a> ).					

**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**.

<b>Project Stage</b>	<b>Check the Current Project Stage</b>	<b>Completed?</b>	<b>Description of Activities in Each Project Stage</b>	<b>Planned/ Actual Start Date (mm/yr)</b>	<b>Planned/ Actual Completion Date (mm/yr)</b>
<b>a. Assessment and Evaluation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Well necessity identified via 2015 Preliminary Engineering Report Well location needs to be assessed.	2015	4 months after funding agreement
<b>b. Final Design</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Engineering and design	4 months after funding secured	7 months after funding secured
<b>c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		7 months after funding secured	10 months after funding secured
<b>d. Permitting</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		10 months after funding secured	12 months after funding secured
<b>e. Construction Contracting</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		12 months after funding secured	13 months after funding secured
<b>f. Construction Implementation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Drill well and install necessary pumping and filtration equipment	13 months after funding secured	15 months after funding secured



**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](http://www.featherriver.org/catalog/index.php) for documents gathered on the UFR Region.

<b>a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by</b> (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plan, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.).	Plumas Eureka CSD “Preliminary Engineering Report for the 2015 Water System Improvements” completed by Stantec Engineering.
<b>b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.</b>	“Hydrologic Controls of Arsenic Occurrence in Plumas Eureka CSD Wells” completed by Plumas Geo-Hydrology
<b>c. Concisely describe the scientific basis</b> (e.g. how much research has been conducted) <b>of the proposed project in 300 words or less.</b>	Well flow data analysis from 2005 – 2015 demonstrates there will not be sufficient drinking for the Plumas Eureka CSD service area at full buildout.
<b>d. Does the project implement green technology</b> (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	No
<b>e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier<sup>1</sup>?</b>	No
<b>f. Are you an Agricultural Water Supplier<sup>2</sup>?</b>	No
<b>g. Is the project related to groundwater?</b>	Yes Mohawk Valley Groundwater basin
<sup>1</sup> 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. <sup>2</sup> 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.	

## Climate Change – Project Assessment Checklist

This climate change project assessment tool allows project applicants and the planning team to assess project consistency with Proposition 84 plan standards and RWMG plan assessment standards. The tool is a written checklist that asks GHG emissions and adaptation/resiliency questions.

Name of project: MS-26: Municipal Well No.3

Project applicant: Plumas Eureka Community Services District

## GHG Emissions Assessment

### Project Construction Emissions

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

- The project requires nonroad or off-road engines, equipment, or vehicles to complete.
- The project requires materials to be transported to the project site.
- The project requires workers to commute to the project site.
- The project is expected to generate GHG emissions for other reasons.
- The project does not have a construction phase and/or is not expected to generate GHG emissions during the construction phase.

### Operating Emissions

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

- The project requires energy to operate.
- The project will generate electricity.
- The project will proactively manage forests to reduce wildfire risk.
- The project will affect wetland acreage.
- The project will include new trees.
- Project operations are expected to generate or reduce GHG emissions for other reasons.

## Adaptation & Resiliency Assessment

### Water Supply

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

- Not applicable
- Reduced snowmelt
- Unmet local water needs (drought)
- Increased invasive species

### Water Demand

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

- Not applicable
- Increasing seasonal water use variability
- Unmet in-stream flow requirements
- Climate-sensitive crops
- Groundwater drought resiliency
- Water curtailment effectiveness

Project will provide the necessary amount of groundwater usage for drinking and landscape irrigation purposes as the Plumas Eureka community reaches build-out.

### Water Quality

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

- Not applicable
- Increasing catastrophic wildfires
- Eutrophication (excessive nutrient pollution in a waterbody, often followed by algae blooms and other related water quality issues)
- Seasonal low flows and limited abilities for waterbodies to assimilate pollution
- Water treatment facility operations
- Unmet beneficial uses (municipal and domestic water supply, water contact recreation, cold freshwater habitat, spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, etc.)

Project will include the operation of an arsenic removal plant. Project will assure the volume of drinking water and irrigation water at full build-out of the Plumas Eureka community.

### Flooding

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

- Not applicable
- Aging critical flood protection
- Wildfires
- Critical infrastructure in a floodplain
- Insufficient flood control facilities

### Ecosystem and Habitat

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

- Not applicable
- Climate-sensitive fauna or flora
- Recreation and economic activity
- Quantified environmental flow requirements
- Erosion and sedimentation
- Endangered or threatened species
- Fragmented habitat

### Hydropower

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

- Not applicable
- Reduced hydropower output

Upper Feather River IRWMP  
Project Assessment - GHG Emissions Analysis

MS-26: Municipal Well #3

**GHG Emissions Analysis**

**Project Construction Emissions**

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

Type of Equipment	Maximum Number Per Day	Total 8-Hour Days in Operation	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
Surfacing Equipment	1	5	4
Paving Equipment	2	1	1
Bore/Drill Rigs	1	7	7
Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	1	0
Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	1	4	1
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
<b>Total Emissions</b>			<b>12</b>

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
6	170	2

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

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
3	10	750	8

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

Completed project will require electricity to operate.

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

Upper Feather River IRWMP  
Project Assessment - GHG Emissions Analysis

MS-26: Municipal Well #3

**Project Operating Emissions**

The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
215,000	kWh (Electricity)	<b>42</b>
	Therm (Natural Gas)	<b>0</b>

The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
	<b>0</b>

\*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

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

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
	<b>0</b>

\*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
	<b>0</b>

\*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
0	<b>0</b>

\*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

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

**GHG Emissions Summary**

Construction and development will generate approximately:	22 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	42 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e