



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

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. PROJECT PROPONENT INFORMATION

Agency / Organization	Maidu Summit Consortium
Name of Primary Contact	Trina Cunningham
Name of Secondary Contact	Lorena Gorbet
Mailing Address	289 Main Street, Chester, CA 96020
E-mail	maidudance@yahoo.com
Phone	530.228.2299
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	TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge
Project Category	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land Stewardship <input type="checkbox"/> Floodplains/Meadows/Waterbodies <input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Services <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Advisory Committee <input type="checkbox"/> Uplands/Forest
Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less)	<p>The Upper Feather River Tribal Review Project provides a mechanism for relevant Upper Feather River (UFR) Tribe(s), the Maidu Summit Consortium and/or Tribal Review Committee to evaluate and provide recommendations to each project submitted to the UFR RWMG to incorporate Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK). Project reviewers will be comprised of Tribal Environmental Directors, Tribal Elders, and other persons with knowledge of Traditional Practices and sustainability. Projects list, counties, and locations will be distributed by UFR RWM staff to all contacts on the UFR Tribal Engagement contact list with review deadline and invitation to provide review and comment. Particular emphasis including follow-up phone calls will be made to include relevant Upper Feather River Tribe(s); meaning those Tribes within whose traditional territories of the proposed project.</p> <p>TEK refers to a cumulative body of knowledge, belief, and practice and handed down through generations through</p>

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

	<p>“stories, songs, foods, medicines, and language” that have been shaped by ecological interactions spanning thousands of years. This relationship of living beings (including human) with their traditional groups and with their environment enables consistent best practice decision making in regards to current land management planning by traditional native practitioners.</p> <p>This review process is important to ensure that each proposed project is given the opportunity to hold significant value to Upper Feather River Native Peoples, which each can benefit from Tribal historical knowledge and will be part of a self-sustaining healthy Upper Feather River ecosystem.</p>
Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address):	Integration of Maidu TEK into each project
Latitude:	Upper Feather IRWM region
Longitude:	Upper Feather IRWM region

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The base of TEK is to achieve optimum health and balance of ecosystems. Integration of TEK into proposals will enable a diverse range of optimal hydrologic function.	The TEK proposal encompasses UFR IRWM projects.
Reduce potential for catastrophic wildland fires in the Region.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The overall goal of applied TEK is to restore fire on a landscape scale. A beginning step to meet this goal is through forest thinning and burning projects on a limited scale in forest, meadow, and riparian areas.	The TEK proposal encompasses UFR IRWM projects in forest, meadow, riparian, and areas of human residence.

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

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)
Build communication and collaboration among water resources stakeholders in the Region.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	This project is based on communication and collaboration with each of the stakeholders in the region to effectively address cultural and ecological benefit to each proposal.	
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TEK reaches every aspect of water use. TEK can guide decisions regarding the management, operation, and control of SWP facilities affecting aspects of water quality and quantity.	
Encourage municipal service providers to participate in regional water management actions that improve water supply and water quality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Municipal service water use can be guided by TEK. Improved function of municipal services is vital to improvements in water supply and function from intake and outflow.	
Continue to actively engage in FERC relicensing of hydroelectric facilities in the Region.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Tribal people have and plan to continue to be active in FERC relicensing activities.	
Address economic challenges of municipal service providers to serve customers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Tribal partnership projects may leverage funding as well as seek further funding for municipal projects.	
Protect, restore, and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources for all beneficial uses, consistent with the RWQC Basin Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Continue to clarify TEK as beneficial uses of water consistent with the Basin Plan	
Address water resources and wastewater needs of DACs and Native Americans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Integrating TEK into regional planning of UFR projects addresses specific needs of DACs as well as the hydrologic vitality of the ancestral	

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

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)
		homelands of Native Americans in the UFR.	
Coordinate management of recharge areas and protect groundwater resources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Recharge areas and groundwater protection are essential to implementation of Traditional Cultural Knowledge. Tribal support and involvement in coordination can benefit the process using knowledge embedded in stories, gathering, and medicinal uses demonstrating water quality and quantity in these areas.	
Improve coordination of land use and water resources planning.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Tribal participation will broaden and contribute greatly to the overall planning process.	
Maximize agricultural, environmental and municipal water use efficiency.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Tribal interests and cultural use support water use efficiency in all aspects of water use.	
Effectively address climate change adaptation and/or mitigation in water resources management.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TEK aspects of resource management including fire reduction, wetland restoration,	
Improve efficiency and reliability of water supply and other water-related infrastructure.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Ecosystem restoration and integrating TEK values into water use will improve efficiency.	
Enhance public awareness and understanding of water management issues and needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Strong partnerships with stakeholders in the UFR will serve to raise public awareness by demonstrating strengths, problems, and solutions. Mechanisms for public outreach may be tours of projects, presentations, media, and K-12 outdoor classroom opportunities	
Address economic challenges of agricultural producers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Unknown	

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

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)
Work with counties/communities/groups to make sure staff capacity exists for actual administration and implementation of grant funding.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	MSC is comprised of multiple organizations, membership of Maidu community, as well as current and future partnerships to administer and implement funding.	

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:		
a. Native American Tribal Communities	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	This is a Native American led project.
b. Disadvantaged Communities¹	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Overlapping area, to be determined in project review partnership opportunities.
c. Environmental Justice²	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Access to cultural resources of beneficial use of water and the habitats that support them.
d. Drought Preparedness	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TEK applied to ecosystem restoration, forest management and water management will enhance drought preparedness. Initial emphasis is on fire management and floodplain management.
e. Assist the region in adapting to effects of climate change³	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TEK evolved with a variable climate over large spans of time.

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

f. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Unknown
g. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	To be determined after climate change workshop.
<p>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/) .</p> <p>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.</p> <p>³ 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	g. Drinking water treatment and distribution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
b. Stormwater capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	h. Watershed protection and management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
c. Removal of invasive non-native species, creation/enhancement of wetlands, acquisition/protection/restoration of open space and watershed lands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	i. Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation/desalting, other treatment technologies and conveyance of recycled water for distribution to users	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
d. Non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	j. Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
e. Groundwater recharge and management projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	k. Ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
f. Water banking, exchange, reclamation, and improvement of water quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Urban water use efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Improve Flood Management		
Flood management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	TEK projects will benefit outcomes and options for RMS projects implemented in the region.
Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers		
Conveyance – regional/local	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	TEK projects will benefit outcomes and options for RMS projects implemented in the region.
System reoperation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Water transfers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Increase Water Supply		
Conjunctive management	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Precipitation Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Municipal recycled water	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Surface storage – regional/local	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Improve Water Quality		
Drinking water treatment and distribution	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Groundwater remediation/aquifer remediation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Matching water quality to water use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	TEK projects will benefit outcomes and options for RMS projects implemented in the region.
Pollution prevention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	TEK projects will benefit outcomes and options for RMS projects implemented in the region.
Salt and salinity management	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Urban storm water runoff management	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Practice Resource Stewardship		
Agricultural land stewardship	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
Ecosystem restoration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
Forest management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
Land use planning and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

Resource Management Strategy	Will the Project incorporate RMS?	Description of how RMS to be employed, if applicable
management		
Recharge area protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
Sediment management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
Watershed management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Balanced health of regional ecosystems
People and Water		
Economic incentives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Potential matching funds
Outreach and engagement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Engagement of Tribes and communities
Water and culture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	UFR Tribes
Water-dependent recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	As it relates to cultural beneficial uses
Wastewater/NPDES	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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?: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Project specific TBD					
Funding Match Waiver request?: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Project specific TBD					
	Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
a.	Direct Project Administration	10,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
b.	Land Purchase/Easement	N/A	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
c.	Planning/Design/Engineering /Consultation	40,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
d.	Construction/Implementation/Cons	N/A	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
e.	Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement	60,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
f.	Construction/ Administration	N/A	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
g.	Other Costs	50,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
h.	Consultation/Implementation Contingency	40,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project
i.	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)	200,000	TBD/Project	TBD/Project	TBD/Project

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

j.	Can the Project be phased? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, provide cost breakdown by phases			
		Project Cost	O&M Cost	Description of Phase
	Phase 1	150,000	N/A	Assessment
	Phase 2	300,000	TBD	Full partnership
	Phase 3	TBD	TBD	Integration of long term TEK into long term management in the Feather River basin
	Phase 4	TBD	TBD	Integration of long term TEK into long term management in the Feather River basin
k.	Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 20-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded).		Unknown, TBD	
l.	Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
m.	Describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded (300 words or less)		Current trends of resource management that is not sustainable will continue without the benefit of time tested applications of TEK. Unique partnerships will not be formed for the benefit of the region.	
<p>*List all sources of funding. Note: See Project Development Manual, Exhibit B, for assistance in completing this table (http://featherriver.org/documents/).</p>				

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific
b. Final Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific
c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA / NEPA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific
d. Permitting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

e. Construction Contracting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific
f. Construction Implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific	TBD/Project specific
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.).	TBD/Project specific, National Environmental Justice Advisory Council A Federal Advisory Committee to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Water Plan, Plumas National Forest (in development)
b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.	TBD/Project specific
c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) of the proposed project in 300 words or less.	TBD/Project specific
d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A If yes, please describe.
e. Are you an Urban Water Supplier¹?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
f. Are you are an Agricultural Water Supplier²?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
g. Is the project related to groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A If yes, please indicate which groundwater basin. All DWR B-118 groundwater basins in the region.
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.	

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: TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

Project applicant: Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC)

GHG Emissions Assessment

Project Construction Emissions

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

- The project requires non-road 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

More resilient to invasive species by utilizing Traditional Ecological Knowledge to eradicate such species and implement a plan to replace those with native species that improve the water supply by more efficient use of the land's natural water cycle.

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

More resilient by creating more availability of groundwater by reducing water stress for water dependent vegetation, thereby allowing water to sink into groundwater reserves more readily.

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.)

More resilient by reductions in catastrophic wildfires as TEK offers viable solutions to the prevention of wildfires with prescribed burnings and other seasonal brush clearing methods.

More resilient by making more water available for beneficial uses through the use of a TEK review process of each proposed project. Each project will have different needs and will therefore require different resolutions.

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

More resilient by reductions in wildfires as TEK offers viable solutions to the prevention of wildfires with prescribed burnings and other seasonal brush clearing methods. Flooding would be reduced because of this prevention of soil erosion and excessive buildup of soil due to uncontrollable wildfires.

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

More resilient from less erosion and sedimentation caused by wildfires. More resilient to habitat fragmentation by wildfire that is so extensive that large areas of habitats are transformed into non-forest conditions, thereby reducing the natural habitat for native fish and wildlife species that depend on a stable environment to thrive.

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

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

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 ₂ e
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
			0
Total Emissions			0

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

Total Number of Round Trips	Average Trip Distance (Miles)	Total MTCO ₂ e
		0

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

Average Number of Workers	Total Number of Workdays	Average Round Trip Distance Traveled (Miles)	Total MTCO ₂ e
5	24	400	16

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

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

Upper Feather River IRWMP
Project Assessment - GHG Emissions Analysis

TAC-6: Traditional Ecological Knowledge

Project Operating Emissions

The project requires energy to operate. If yes:

Annual Energy Needed	Unit	Total MTCO ₂ e
	kWh (Electricity)	0
	Therm (Natural Gas)	0

The project will generate electricity. If yes:

Annual kWh Generated	Total MTCO ₂ e
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

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

Acres Protected from Wildfire	Total MTCO ₂ e
375	-2,363

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will affect wetland acreage. If yes:

Acres of Protected Wetlands	Total MTCO ₂ e
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

The project will include new trees. If yes:

Acres of Trees Planted	Total MTCO ₂ e
	0

*A negative value indicates GHG reductions

GHG Emissions Summary

Construction and development will generate approximately:	16 MTCO ₂ e
In a given year, operation of the project will result in:	-2,363 MTCO ₂ e