



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP (NCRP)

TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (TPRC) MEETING:

NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Regional Grant Proposal, Submission 1

PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY

[Briceland Community Services District, Water Supply Enhancement](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = no; DAC = yes; Severely DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$548,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$548,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 47.59

Project Abstract: The BCSD is a rural CSD that serves the drinking and fire suppression water needs of a vulnerable SDAC comprised of a day care, school, community center, and 25 households. The proposed water supply enhancement project, includes improvements to the water storage, transmission, & fire suppression systems, to enhance Briceland's drought resiliency & autonomy. The project increases water storage and fire-fighting capabilities as well as reduces water losses in a sustainable manner.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This project did get some technical support from our technical assistance consultants, GHD.
- Q: if the project was submitted to NCRP a few years ago, and do they have a project completion report?
- A: the Project was funded with Prop 1 Round 1, which was awarded by DWR on April 8, 2020. The project is currently underway. The project was initially funded for less than the original request in the Prop 1 solicitation selection, so this grant would help get them back to originally requested amount for the project and the proposed tank size. Since the project is not completed, they do not have a Project Completion Report on file.
- It was noted that on page 2 of the proposal describes the past history of Prop 1 Round 1 funding and implementation.
- Some TPRC members used the amount of budget and how many people are affected/served by the system to get a per person total amount. Looking for the biggest bang of the buck.
- Liked that it was approved for past funding, and the NCRP can give them funds to get back to where they wanted to be, it's a good thing to upgrade them and ranked this project high.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding the #1 Briceland Community Services District, Water Supply Enhancement project as it is a multi-benefit project that addresses both NCRP water and fire objectives and continues a previously funded project though the budget is high for the number served. All selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board needed

[Brooktrails Township Community Services District, Brooktrails Township Clarifier Project](#)

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$110,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$110,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 46.48

Project Abstract: During the 2021 drought, the 45-year old clarifier required emergency maintenance. To ensure safe drinking water during drought conditions when the 130,000 gal clarifier fails or has to be taken offline for maintenance, a second clarifier is needed at the drinking water treatment plant. Brooktrails Township strictly enforces a usage cap of 9,000gal/month/connection to conserve community water supplies.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Question: how does that price look for what they want to build, to buy the clarifier, is it high?
- Answer: it was noted that the cost reflects the installed cost and one for 130K gallons is pretty reasonable.
- This CSD is about 3,800 people, which is a lowest ask for a big benefit.
- Having the infrastructure and redundancy is helpful.
- Liked that they demonstrated they are already practicing a conservation cap on water. TPRC members looked at the average household size, they gave 9,000 gallons per month per connect. Looking at the average household size allows them to look at what kind of conservation is going on and the effort the community is making. Other applications did not do this analysis and it was appreciated. More information about water conservation would help the application.
- Made a statement that water quality is lower in drought conditions due to warmer water temperatures but would have liked a little more explanation for the need for drought relief.
- Redundancy seems important, and the need for the value is good. The project was rated relatively high.
- It is unclear how they are fixing magnesium issue by chlorinating water and would like to have seen more information.
- Noted that this was a good example of a big-bang-for-the-buck project.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding the #2 Brooktrails Township Community Services District, Brooktrails Township Clarifier Project. All selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: The project application needs much more detail throughout and a better connection to the drought conditions in the area, including a description about the curtailments and district water conservation efforts. Compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board needed.

Point Cabrillo Highlands, Water Security Enhancement

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$107,532 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$91,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 41.87

Project Abstract: Upgrade single well/tank serving 25-30 residents to provide additional storage and water source security. Separate agricultural usage from personal consumption. Create larger water supply for wildfire suppression.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The application talked about the groundwater wells being affected by shallow wells, though they didn't state how adding a new well is not going to compound the problem, also sees an issue with the septic system being located upgrade from where they propose a new well.
- Concerns were expressed about the new well being located 200 feet from the new one. There was not a mention of problems with water scarcity and not meeting needs of the existing community.
- Questioned if the new well will be drawing from same aquifer?
- Other concerns included that the about the project being more about new development instead of existing need.
- The element of using a pond for storage seemed a bit odd, and it was hard to follow.
- This project is for a well that never goes dry, but they are proposing a back up well. This project didn't rank very high.
- Observed that it seemed clear there was a need for improvements - they are a Special District and mobile home park.
- There were concerns about the feasibility or effectiveness of the proposal. The budget did not seem to match the scope, the construction was only \$50K and very low.
- This project might be a good candidate for tech assistant, since there might be more compliance issues they will need to look into and they might not be able to do the work on their own.
- They want standby power, but batteries are not cost effective yet.
- This Project may also trigger groundwater management compliance requirements and potentially will need to develop a Groundwater Management Plan and monitoring program? The project sponsor should be contacted about whether they have the capacity for that work.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #3 Point Cabrillo Highlands, Water Security Enhancement not recommended for funding.

[City of Montague, Water Tank](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$1,755,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$1,755,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 41.70

Project Abstract: Remove 2 old collapsing water tanks and replace with a new 500,000 gallon tank with aeration.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Question: Asked the engineers in the group what they think of the cost for what they are getting?
- Answer: Did score the budget low; the project budget seems high for what they are trying to do. A TPRC member just recently built a welded steel 1-million-gallon water tank for \$1 million. The budget did seem high and a bit off, so the project was ranked lower.
- Answer: Does have tank construction experience and the cost has been approximately \$1.00 per gallon to build and that it is good to know it holds true for larger tanks.
- It was noted that the costs also depend on the project site. There were no site-specific issues noted in the application to explain the costs, scored the project low.
- Noted that the budget for project administration is \$105,000, for two years which is over \$4,000 per month in administration, which seemed very high.
- The application did not describe their current tank capacity.
- Mentioned the application didn't describe the type of tank they are going to install.
- The need is plausible but it seems like this is a good candidate to sharpen the pencil on the budget, refine the scope.
- It seems like they are taking away the redundancy by taking away a tank.
- It does state that the existing tanks were collapsing, so they can't rebuild them.
- Recommends replace one at a time.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #4 City of Montague, Water Tank not recommended for inclusion into the regional proposal during this round. It is a very large budget though it might be worth reconsidering this project during the DACTI round. They need to expand the project and replace with redundancy, with the same dollar amount. Recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget.

[Fieldbrook Glendale Community Services District, Water Tank Retrofit Project](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$1,901,370

NCRP Budget Request: \$642,400

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 45.52

Project Abstract: The proposed retrofit is to install a new 400,000 gallon bolted steel water tank to replace an existing leaking redwood tank, that does not meet current seismic standards. The current tank was lined in the 1990's. While this addressed short term issues the redwood staves have degraded, and replacement is necessary to reduce water losses and improve drought resilience and seismic stability.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Noted this was one of the higher scoring projects, and was impressed with the 200% match. There was general support for the matching funds.
- Noted that the CSD has \$314,744 from Prop 1 Round 1 and \$940,000 from a Cal OES FEMA grant and is requesting 1/3 of the cost for this grant opportunity.
- This adds up to be roughly a \$350 per person served for the project.
- There was concern that there wasn't a token match from the community.
- The application doesn't mention plumbing to existing system, which assumes is happening, but the application did not tell us they are going to do that. The price seems high.
- Overall the TPRC thought the project was worthy.
- Would like to see drought impacts better explained.
- The application did mention there was an option to downscale the project.
- The application did say the tank will be designed to a 9-magnitude earthquake, which makes it expensive. Committee not sure that is needed - CAL OES would not require them to build to that magnitude - they would require them to build to the current building code requirements.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #5 – The Fieldbrook Glendale Community Services District, Water Tank Retrofit Project project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The TPRC was appreciative of the large match for the project but found the budget and SOW lacking detail and justification; they suggest providing more detail for the next round or for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 solicitation. Alternative funding sources, such as Infrastructure Act, or Build Back Better may be another option.

[Gasquet Community Services District, North Fork Water Line Extension](#)

Location: Del Norte

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$2,010,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$2,010,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 42.28

Project Abstract: The GCSD service area includes homes not served by the potable water system. The proposed project is to extend the distribution system to the North Fork Loop, which is currently served by wells experiencing water shortages. The project proposes extending water mains to the northwest of the existing water tanks to provide potable drinking water and firefighting capabilities from the existing system.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- They are extending the water distribution system; do they have the capacity to do that? The application does not indicate.
- Drought impact was described well.
- It was good to expand access to potable water, which is clearly a priority
- There is no indication of how many of the 30 parcels had people living there. Is seem this project it only benefiting 18 parcels with 44 residents? If it's a scarcity issue, should they develop if there isn't sufficient water?
- The project budget seemed high.
- This project cost per person is very high.
- It might be appropriate to do a feasibility study to see if they do need to purchase land.
- The DAC status of the larger community is understood but there are not specifics about the beneficiaries of the proposal; does the 30 parcels reflect the DAC of the community?
- It would be nice to have a match from the community, even a small contribution. For example, the local volunteer fire department might volunteer labor or equipment or contribute a token amount to show their commitment.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #6, Gasquet Community Services District, North Fork Water Line Extension was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget and identify other potential funding sources. It is recommended that this project sponsor apply for DWR drought resiliency funding on their own after the budget and proposal are further refined. The community served and water source need to be clearly identified.

[Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Sonoma County Household Drought Resiliency Project](#)

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: TRIBE = partial; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$185,548

NCRP Budget Request: \$185,548

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 49.20

Project Abstract: This multi-partner project seeks to promote water conservation, provide alternatives to extractive water sources, protect streamflow, and foster water use awareness among Sonoma County's urban and rural residents by rapidly expanding a cost-effective rainwater rebate program to serve more residents in water-scarce areas and to develop the program include a wider range of other household-level strategies, such as raingarden construction and greywater system installation.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This RCD's Rain Water Harvest Rebate Program has been successful, though some statistics about its success should be provided in the application
- It would have been beneficial to know the number of people helped and more about how the pilot program that evolved to become this project.

- Positive points: the continuation of a successful project, the self-help approach and the multi-benefit aspect.
- Rainwater is less ideal compared to potable water projects

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #7 Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Sonoma County Household Drought Resiliency Project; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: Project may need compliance documentation re. groundwater impacts (GSA letter of support), surface water diversion and stormwater management

[Mattole Restoration Council, Southern Humboldt Emergency Fire Suppression Water Supply](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = yes; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$384,293

NCRP Budget Request: \$345,793

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 49.26

Project Abstract: We will purchase and install rainwater catchment and storage tanks for local volunteer fire departments in the Mattole and Eel watersheds. Petrolia, Honeydew, Telegraph Ridge, Whale Gulch, Briceland and Whitethorn Fire Departments all serve as initial attack on many rural fires before CalFire can respond. We are seeking funding to purchase rain catchment tanks for these fire departments and to plan the most strategic locations for placement using our existing Fire Atlas for first responders.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The community associated with MRC continues to be active in watershed wide restoration efforts.
- MRC staff are excellent writers and excellent at putting the work on the ground.
- Impressed with the scope of work for the price.
- Multi-benefit: fish habitat and firefighting capacity, winter water capture.
- Questions regarding scope timeline with project administration lasting months after end of construction and planning overlapping with construction schedule

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #8 Mattole Restoration Council, Southern Humboldt Emergency Fire Suppression Water Supply; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: May need to get compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board for any Fire Districts surface water diverters that will receive funding from the proposed Project.

[Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Rainwater Harvest and Greywater Workshops and Demonstration Project](#)

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$48,485

NCRP Budget Request: \$48,485

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 48.97

Project Abstract: This project proposes to conduct up to three rainwater harvest and/or greywater reuse workshops and at least one demonstration project in the upper Russian River. Communities reliant on Lake Mendocino, including Calpella and Redwood Valley, were subject to severe water shortages in 2021 and Lake Mendocino is at risk of going completely dry in 2022. This project will provide how-to demonstrations and technical assistance for homeowners and small businesses.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This area has an urgent need in water resiliency and water security; project is a good value and empowers residents with self-help know-how.
- Would have liked to see a budget for the landowner to help build the tank. Success is higher when you can offer construction assistance, especially in a DAC.
- It is a small investment for potentially big impacts, but until the demonstrations proliferate throughout the community you never know what the impacts are.
- The gray water permitting might be a problem without a proper ordinance.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #9 Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Rainwater Harvest and Greywater Workshops and Demonstration Project; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: Project may need compliance documentation surface water diversion and stormwater management

[Montague Water Conservation District, Main Canal Lining for Instream Benefit](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: TRIBE = partial; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$970,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$970,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 52.13

Project Abstract: Montague Water Conservation District is an irrigation district that owns and operates Dwinnell Reservoir on the Shasta River, a critical tributary to the Klamath River. MWCD provides multiple beneficial uses including irrigation, municipal to the City of Montague and enhancement of streamflow for fish and wildlife benefits. MWCD proposes to line 6,000' of its main canal with shot-crete to improve delivery efficiency. In exchange, MWCD will the dedicate conserved water for instream benefit.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- To conserve and dedicate savings for instream flow is a great idea.
- The cost for the benefit is great for the proposal.
- The proposal did a good job for quantifying the benefits. It completes a project and puts more water in the creeks.
- Does not have a handle on pricing for this type of project but thought it was a good proposal.
- The benefit to the instream is a significant amount of water they are talking about.
- This will increase flow in Shasta River and assists with the water agreements in place with the Karuk Tribe.
- The application states the water in the canals is for agriculture and not getting a sense of what the other uses are for. Likes the amount of water being put back into the streams.
- Noticed that it's a lot of water 668 acre feet year. Liked the multiple benefits and the agricultural benefits.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #10 Montague Water Conservation District, Main Canal Lining for Instream Benefit; the selected projects can be found at

https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: a letter of support for the project from the Siskiyou County GSA would strengthen the proposal. The application materials indicate that your organization is a Surface Water Diverter; compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board will be needed. For Stormwater Management Plan requirements, a map or GIS data of the project area demonstrating that the project is located in and benefits a disadvantaged community with a population of less than 20,000.

[Orick Community Services District, Distribution Expansion & Water Storage](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$1,507,500

NCRP Budget Request: \$1,507,500

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 42.13

Project Abstract: Expand Orick's CSD water distribution system to outlying residences down Hufford Rd and north on Highway 101 to Bald Hills Road. Complete the design for a second water storage tank as part of the CSD distribution system. Expanding the distribution system and upgrading storage will eliminate the need for the outlying residences to rely on private surface water diversions, subsequently keeping the flows currently diverted instream.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- It was not clear in the application if northern branch would service undeveloped parcels, is there anyone living there now? Cautious about inducing growth in an area challenged with producing water.
- It's not clear if there are any current connections; the expansion is unclear.

- \$50,000 for the environmental budget to expand the existing system with a CEQA Exemption seems high.
- There is no match, not even a token match.
- This project seems like it needs a feasibility study to tease out the details and budget more.
- For the new connections for existing landowners, will they be forbearing their water rights in exchange for this?
- Serving people that are running out of water is important.
- They would benefit from further refinement of scope.
- Having trouble determining the current capacity.
- The application did not state what the water supply is and if there is enough to go around.
- For the new tank, the application does not clarify if they are designing and building the tank; it only mentions they are designing.
- It was challenging to follow their quantification and hard to follow their numbers.
- The total project cost in the budget is incorrect, the total should be \$1,557,500.
- The project would cost approximately \$12,500 per person who benefits from it.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #11 Orick Community Services District, Distribution Expansion & Water Storage was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The application needs to include water source, possibility for capacity expansion, number of wells, existing conservation efforts, future growth of Northern branch. Connection to drought unclear. Since it is an infrastructure project, it may be a better fit for other funding programs. Sponsor encouraged to refine the proposal with forbearance to end or decrease surface water diversion to complement the service extension. Encouraged some funding match from property owners or the Park Service if they become involved in the old mill site location.

[Resighini Rancheria, Conservation Measures to Address Drought](#)

Location: Tribal land

Benefit: TRIBE = yes; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$492,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$342,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 53.69

Project Abstract: The proposed project seeks to implement several water conservation measures for the Resighini Rancheria tribal community to address drought conditions and protect precious groundwater associated with the lower Klamath River. Resighini Rancheria is served by a Tribal community water system (EPA PWS# 0605057) that includes two pumps that draw from the same groundwater aquifer, a 40,000-gallon storage tank, and distribution system. The project would include a secondary water storage tank of at least 60,000 gallons and associated piping; water meters and gate valves; a telemetry system; and leak detector equipment to efficiently identify and resolve leaks in the system. The improvements would ensure the uninterrupted delivery of water to the Resighini Rancheria community during drought conditions, reduce the impact to precious groundwater and improve public health conditions.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Worthwhile project. The benefit and need of project are good.
- Tank bids are currently only good for a few days because of increased price of steel. The costs for materials might exceed the costs between now and when the contract is executed. The steel price could double from now.
- Liked the water storage combined with developing access to potable water to community members.
- Budget seemed appropriate.
- Leak detection was a big plus, liked the effort to work to conserve water.
- There is no indication of volume of water savings.
- Would like to have known what conservation measures they are practicing now.
- the current use for the number of gallons of water per person seemed high.
- Noted there is a discrepancy in size of tanks in the application. They have different tank sizes mentioned and that will need to be changed before the application is submitted to DWR.
- Likes the benefit metrics of \$2,000 cost per person for the project; that is not too bad of a price and reasonable for the community.
- Big advocate for meters and measuring to understanding how to save a lot of water and likes that component.
- A little confused how the tank sizing was determined.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #12 Resighini Rancheria, Conservation Measures to Address Drought; the selected projects can be found at

https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: More detail, needs to be provided to strengthen the project. Map or GIS data of Sponsor’s service area is needed to demonstrate that the project serves a DAC, as the project will be considered eligible for grant funding notwithstanding CASGEM compliance.

[Resort Improvement District No.1, Shelter Cove Well Site Improvements](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$134,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$95,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 47.47

Project Abstract: To further develop unused District well site for a cost of \$95,000. Well site produces a high quantity of water (over 55 gpm), but currently with poor water quality due to elevated levels of magnesium chloride & discolor. Project funds requested would cover engineering, permitting, & construction costs to construct/install water tank, pumps, controls, 10'x10' protective building, improved vehicle access & rock/slope protection for adjacent drainage to improve water quality & safe access.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Thought the project has good value and thought it was good to have flexibility to use groundwater and surface water.
- This agency does good projects.
- They discuss having magnesium chloride contamination, are they just putting in a magnesium chloride device and can that take care of the contamination? There wasn't a lot of detail on the magnesium chloride issue and would have liked to see more on that.
- A couple reviewers questioned using a rock slope protection, would like to see more engineering and design for spending money on the engineering task.
- It seems the project is more for water security than addressing drought needs.
- Would like to see more information on how far from the creek is the proposed well
- It's a low investment and a good project.
- Not sure if in-kind labor is allowable by DWR.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #13 Resort Improvement District No.1, Shelter Cove Well Site Improvements; the selected projects can be found at

https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: More detail overall, needs to be provided to strengthen the project. Map or GIS data of Sponsor's service area is needed to demonstrate that the project serves a DAC, as the project will be considered eligible for grant funding notwithstanding CASGEM compliance.

[Salmonid Restoration Federation, Redwood Creek, South Fork Eel River Storage and Forbearance Program](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$650,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$500,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 50.71

Project Abstract: SRF will identify and design strategic storage and forbearance opportunities along Redwood Creek within the vicinity of the town of Briceland and downstream. SRF will develop a Storage and Forbearance Program to manage future implementation: landowner coordination, permit compliance support, and ongoing community outreach. Approximately five sites with ~250,000 gallons of total storage would be designed and permitted to ensure that flow augmentation remains instream to benefit salmonids.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The concept of storage and forbearance is good and expanding it in this area is critical if we want coho salmon in the Eel River.
- There has already been a lot of feasibility and work gone into designing this project
- Thought it was a really good project.
- Storage and forbearance fan and likes these types of projects.

- This is an excellent model to deal with the availability of water in the wet season and taking advantage of it for later use. Hopes this type of project is replicated throughout the west.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #14 Salmonid Restoration Federation, Redwood Creek, South Fork Eel River Storage and Forbearance Program; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/.

Staff Review: More detail overall, needs to be provided to strengthen the project. May need to get compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board for any property owner surface water diverters that will receive funding (in the form of tanks) from the proposed Project.

[Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Headwaters Drought Relief Project](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$4,560,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$4,560,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 45.75

Project Abstract: The project will address drought impacts on fish, wildlife and our local community. The project will also address the increased threat of wildfire due to drought and overly dense forests. Expected outcomes include 1) construction of off-channel ponds for direct flow augmentation during the driest months of the year; 2) installation of residential water storage and forbearance; 3) thinning of overly dense forests coupled with placement of instream wood for fish habitat.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This project has the biggest price tag of all the projects.
- It seemed there was a forest health element for fuels reduction, which doesn't seem to fit. Multiple reviewers recommended removing the forest health aspect from this application.
- Multiple reviewers would have liked to see the budget broken down for each element instead of the totals.
- Liked the benefits the project proposed.
- Noted that it appears they are banking on CEQA exemptions, but if it doesn't come through, it could cost significantly more.
- Noted that for the tank arrays, there was no in kind or match from landowners, for a fair amount of storage. It's nice to see some match; even a small amount to show some commitment.
- Conservation wasn't discussed should be fleshed out. Its' quite a large ask, it's the biggest.
- It seems it would have been good to go as a standalone. But could be good for recommending that the project be scaled.
- The concept of forest thinning for more water discharge to streams is important and so good to see someone proposing, but that seems more of a demonstration project.
- The benefit outcome of .01 cfs seemed little low.

- Did have questions on off channel ponds and references to metered flow augmentation, and it is unclear what the reference to the meter was related to.
- Liked the multiple components but wanted to see costs of the forbearance component and wanting to make sure it is good cost.
- We do need more of these projects but not sure it is the right fit under this program with all the components.
- Recommends they could apply on their own at the next date, or date current with some of their concerns taken into account.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #15 - Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Headwaters Drought Relief Project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget if the project sponsor is interested. TPRC recommends applying to DWR on their own, with proposal improvements. The hang up was the forest thinning and it was hard to tell where the money is going. Strongly recommend more detail in the budget to help the elements get funded.

[Scotia Community Services District, River Pumps Backup Generator Project](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$722,875

NCRP Budget Request: \$722,875

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 42.64

Project Abstract: The Scotia Community Services District (SCSD) serves a severely disadvantaged community. The pumps that supply the water to the town do not have any backup power source, leaving the community prone to supply restrictions due to power outages and other emergencies. This project includes installation of a new diesel-powered backup power generator and diesel storage tank for the District’s river water intake pumps that supply drinking water, fire water, and industrial water to customers.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The match is confusing, they have match from Cal OES, it said “if” awarded in the application and then said they have the funding; then no match is listed on the budget table. It mentions they can fund the planning using that match money, but it implied only certain elements can be funded with that money.
- Did provide for lower river levels from drought but used old levels and didn’t factor in drought costs for severe drought.
- 1 million gallons per day, seems high, but there is Humboldt Redwood Company located there, which is a big user.
- The application stated there were over 222 hours or approximately 9 days of power outages, but it didn’t clarify if it was a continuous outage or if they were out of water to meet the demand.
- It wasn’t clear if the raw water is located in the proximity of where it was pumped.

- Multiple reviewers noted there was no mention of what conservation measures they were doing now.
- The lower Eel River dried up this year, so there should have been mention of what effect that had on the community.
- Had a question about if the price includes the generator, it doesn't say if they are buying one or already have one.
- The application left a lot of questions on the money side and technical side.
- As related to drought relief funding, backup generators do not address drought relief. There are other sources that can address power outages, it scored low in the drought scoring category.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #16, Scotia Community Services District River Pumps Backup Generator project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget.

[Scotia Community Services District, Water Storage Tank Project](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$4,122,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$4,122,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 42.29

Project Abstract: The Scotia Community Services District (SCSD) serves a severely disadvantaged community. The SCSD surface water treatment and storage facility include a single 0.488 million gallon (MG) finished water storage tank to supply drinking water and fire protection water to the community. SCSD needs a second finished water storage tank to provide redundancy and additional storage capacity for the community to increase resiliency during drought and emergency conditions.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- No mention of water conservation measures, only mentioned drought.
- The average daily water use is really high.
- The project administration budget is really high over \$6,500 per month based on the schedule.
- The planning and design scheduled for 17 months seemed to be high for planning a water tank. It seems that they are just increasing backup.
- There was general agreement that over \$4 million for the tank size does not correspond with known tank prices; that is many folds above what you would expect.
- It's hard to see a water storage tank resolving a seasonal drought issue.
- They may be better off apply alone since this is over the \$2 Million minimum.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #17, Scotia Community Services District, Water Storage Tank Project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The TPRC recommends applying to the DWR on their

own; they fit into the overall DWR plan, but need to clean up the proposal and get a handle on the budget.

[Scott River Watershed Council, Etna Creek Real Time StreamFlow Monitoring Project](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: TRIBE = partial; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$269,416

NCRP Budget Request: \$134,708

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 44.00

Project Abstract: Etna Creek stream flow is a critical stream system to the Scott River watershed and the sole water supply for the City of Etna. For Etna to evaluate its water supply, there is a critical need to establish a flow station on Etna Creek. Real time streamflow data would provide Etna the ability to implement water conservation efforts and comply with recent curtailment orders issued by the State. As snowpacks and precipitation decline, it is becoming increasingly important to have data that allows for effective water use management for both human and wildlife benefits.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Noted questions about the budget, it shows for “All Other Cost” category, an equivalent amount as the Grant amount and sums it up to get the total cost. Was that an error and the total cost should have been \$135,000 rather than \$270,000?
- On item 13, for the land purchase row, the totals do not add up, indicating something is not correct with the budget table.
- Multiple reviewers were confused about whether the project has a match
- It is a lot of money to install a stream gauge for the time and they are already monitoring this stream, so is the need valid?
- \$54,000 in the Project Administration budget to administer the project seems out of line.
- The drought relief connection seems tenuous.
- It does appear that the City of Etna has applied for funding separately and SRWC is applying to help fund the project, so it does appear there is cost share planned but it is still unclear.
- An advocate for stream flow monitoring, and they are also getting topographical surveys and a power source. It is more than just a stream flow gauge, but the costs are high.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #18, Scott River Watershed Council, Etna Creek Real Time Stream Flow Monitoring Project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The project lacks bang for the buck and it is hard to make a drought connection.

[Scott River Watershed Council, Scott River Tailings Restoration, Long Pond Implementation, Phase 1](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$813,524

NCRP Budget Request: \$698,236

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 50.71

Project Abstract: The Project will create 1 acre of complex, cold water refugia habitat for Coho Salmon with a science-based engineered design. The Technical Advisory Committee (CDFW, NMFS, NCRWQCB, UCD, SRWC, Stillwater Sciences) selected the 80-percent exceedance water surface elevation to provide a minimum inundation depth of 0.5 feet even during drought. This will offer suitable summer rearing habitat for Coho when most other Scott River summer habitat is dry or has lethal conditions.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- There is much needed for coho salmon rearing in this watershed that has been heavily impacted by drought.
- This is a project that is benefiting fish habitat only, the human element and community was not addressed.
- The one thing DWR talked about regarding this area is that it is being administered by a GSA and didn't see any recommendation letters.
- Multiple reviewers questioned if the budget is appropriate for 1 acre of fish habitat restoration?
- The application should better articulate the connection to drought relief. One reviewer had to reach for the drought implications, but inundation does help with water tables.
- Liked the scientific bases but appreciates the costs conversations and concerns of the group.
- There is a good technical basis, there are a lot of nuances and a habitat element that may seem high for 1 acre, but there is good technical support to justify the costs.
- It is a good watershed to put money on the ground given the current curtailment orders; we need more projects like this.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #19 Scott River Watershed Council, Scott River Tailings Restoration, Long Pond Implementation, Phase 1, and recommends that the proposal better articulate the drought relief connection; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/.

Staff Review: More detail overall and a letter of support from the Siskiyou GSA showing support for the project and reference the Scott Groundwater Sustainability Plan should be provided to strengthen the project.

[Sonoma County Regional Parks, Sonoma County Regional Parks Rainwater Catchment and Water Conservation Project](#)

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$616,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$536,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 44.29

Project Abstract: Due to drought conditions, Regional Parks has identified an urgent need to develop new water sources at multiple parks to support park operations, grazing for fuel load reduction, and fire response. Regional Parks will partner with local RCDs to design and install 3 rainwater catchment and distribution systems to reduce trucking water, well water, and municipal water use at multiple parks. This project will conserve water for other uses and provide a demonstration of rainwater catchment systems.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- It's unfortunate the water cannot be used for drinking water. It is a good project for firefighting benefits.
- It is a good project for this amount of money and the match is a positive.
- Likes all rainwater projects. Any time you can use rainwater for landscape or other needs it leaves water in the system for other uses, essentially creating a new water source and offsetting the existing use.
- Likes the partnership element and ensuring they would have additional wildfire response.
- The details in the application indicate the project has been well planned.
- The application cites the project will support grazing and fire suppression, how much more grazing it would allow or support?
- The cost seems high, 150 gallons of supplemental water didn't jive with the price tag of the project; even with prevailing wage.
- It's not clear why they need geotechnical testing and reporting, it would be good to get more information on that.
- Multiple reviewers stated the project doesn't really show that we are meeting potable water needs to address drought.
- A project like this is only good when scale is there.
- Reservations about recommending a recreational facility for funding with the drought funding.
- Two reviewers commented that the total cost of engineering seemed high for something this simple.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #20 Sonoma County Regional Parks, Sonoma County Regional Parks Rainwater Catchment and Water Conservation Project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The weakness for this project was that water was not for people, but for livestock and irrigation. Whether potable water is currently used was not stated. It's not increasing supply of potable water; it's just reducing the amount needed for those uses. If they are getting water from groundwater, it could be a municipal supply, but they did not make that pitch? It's a great idea to store rainwater, it's not offsetting any ecosystem or human supply, or the proposal didn't make that case. The application states that they trucked in water or just did without having water to irrigate. It's not a clear need and the price tag is steep. The project can be explained better and reapply through the NCRP or other funding sources.

Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Freestone Backwash System and Generator

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = no; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$255,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$255,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 37.03

Project Abstract: Freestone currently has no backup relative to planned power shutoffs, which is required not only for operation during an outage, but also ongoing fire protection. In addition, the current system requires manual backwashing of filters several times a week. If replaced with an automatic system, it could continue to function in times of emergency. The County is proposing to address this through the installation of a generator for the water system and automatic backwash system.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Providing water to a community under a power outage is relevant, but it addresses a power outage issue not a drought issue.
- Residents were asked to reduce usage by 40%, which is a significant reduction.
- The area is in a high fire danger zone and is left without water during outages.
- Some questions on the schedule, it was hard to follow planning and design ending after construction began, and construction for 14 months seems like a long time for the project.
- Another reviewer responded that the extended duration of construction could be due to supply chain issues, they could be ordering early with the expectation of it not arriving for half a year, that might be the issue, but it wasn't mentioned.
- Financial need is hard to address, this is not a DAC and there is no match.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project #21, Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Freestone Backwash System and Generator project was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round.

Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Jenner Smart Meters

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = no; SEVERELY DAC = no

Total Project Budget: \$74,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$74,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 45.35

Project Abstract: CSA-41 is a small water system that serves approximately 128 connections. With meters over 20 years old, the system has been plagued by significant water loss (upwards of 50%). We propose installing Badger smart meters to accurately record water usage and encouraging conservation efforts.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- It's a simple fix at a reasonable price.
- Great potential for saving water for this community.
- Didn't see the nexus with drought resiliency; that will need to be strengthened in the proposal
- Multiple reviewers thought 20 years seems relatively young for meter life. Although, does not know if smart meters were available 20 years ago?
- It was challenging to understand how much water is being lost per month. They have an equivalent to 80 gallons per day per connection of lost water.
- If the problem isn't the usage, is there another way to determine if there are leaks in the distribution system?
- For the project administration, it looks like there is match that they are not showing in the budget table.
- Construction isn't set to start in the schedule until January, but stating they are starting this spring. Maybe the delay is a supply issue?
- Community was asked to reduce water usage by 40%, which is nice to see in the application.
- It was hard to tease out the information.
- It seems a good price for the project, all staff labor would be absorbed and that might be a part of the match, although it's not listed on the budget table.
- Resolving 50% of water waste for the Russian River would be a good thing.
- You can't improve upon what you aren't measuring. It might not be the meters, that are the problem, it might be the piping, and this would get them to the source of the problem.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #22 Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Jenner Smart Meters. It provides good bang for the buck for what it going to achieve and underrepresented region. The sponsor is covering the labor costs themselves, just buying the meters, justifying moving the project up the list. Adding this project increases regional distribution.

Staff Review: Will need clarification for the TPRC points made above, especially for how the project improves on drought conditions. More detail needed throughout to improve the application.

[The Watershed Research and Training Center, Browns and Tule Creeks Drought Resiliency Storage and Forbearance Project](#)

Location: Trinity

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = partial; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$328,527

NCRP Budget Request: \$283,264

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 52.71

Project Abstract: Residents in the Browns and Tule Creek watersheds rely on the creeks for all of their water needs. The WRTC will build off of earlier outreach to private landowners to implement storage and forbearance projects improving domestic water resiliency during drought, while also conserving instream flow in these priority watersheds for anadromous fisheries. Each project will provide 30,000

gallons of domestic water storage per parcel and secure forbearance from diversion during the low-flow season.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Hooray for this team, for the community and the fish benefits. This project addressed the key factors, it delivers water for fish and water for people.
- The price is good when you amortize the gallons per year over time, this is a good bang for the buck.
- It is a great project on how to use water wisely and how to take during high flows to use for low flows.
- It is ultimately a lot of money for the number of homes, but it's a good benefit for the community and good shift for the timing to take water.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #23 The Watershed Research and Training Center, Browns and Tule Creeks Drought Resiliency Storage and Forbearance Project; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/

Staff Review: More detail overall, needs to be provided to strengthen the project. May need to get compliance documentation for annual and monthly surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board for any property owner surface water diverters that will receive funding (in the form of tanks) from the proposed Project.

[Weaverville Community Services District, Drought Resiliency & Water Reliability Project](#)

Location: Trinity

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = partial

Total Project Budget: \$676,700

NCRP Budget Request: \$597,600

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 52.36

Project Abstract: Project has 3 components. E Branch E Weaver Ck water conservation project: construct a new water main & 2 fire hydrants to connect those in a critically underserved, high fire danger area in exchange for year-round forbearance of water rights. Proposed improvements to the WCSD Trinity River Diversion to enable increased withdrawals, reducing demand on tributary diversions. A feasibility study to expand WCSD service to Little Browns Ck watershed will assess design options & costs.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The cost breaks down for the project is \$168 per person served.
- Q: if the project elements of planning only would be eligible for this program since this is an implementation grant? Are we only then looking at the first component out of the 3?
- A: Confirmed that the project needs to end in implantation, it could be phased. You might phase it if there are elements that could be done now, and they could apply for future funding for the element not acceptable under this grant.

- Thinks the first two elements are implementation and third is the feasibility of a project. improvements to the creek mean it is improvement. They don't list the work items on this. Why do they talk about improvements if they are not doing them?
- Sees two feasibility studies being proposed. The first in component #1 is a construction project, component #2 is a feasibility, and component #3 is another feasibility study for Browns Creek. Out of the three components, only one is building something, which is described on page 1 of the PDF.
- The construction budget looks high.
- Noted the applicant's response seems to show that each component is well thought out, there is a need and strategy. Since this is an implementation grant, we would fund the first component. Because the budget is not broken down by element, the question is, how we would make a funding offer if we are just choosing the first component.
- Maybe we can look at the budget and try and figure it out or maybe they will answer in public comments? Maybe a recommendation would be less than what they have asked for, we can discuss how much we should fund in the afternoon session.
- It does appear they are shovel ready and CEQA is complete and have funding from the Fish and Wildlife Services. It seems that the construction budget is for phase 1, but it's not defined.
- Agrees that it would be great to fund number 1 and leave the other two out.
- Every project will need to be refined before submitting to DWR, and the TPRC can propose to offer less.
- The TPRC agreed to a reduced budget amount to \$500,000 with scope modifications to remove feasibility studies.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends partially funding Project #24 Weaverville Community Services District, Drought Resiliency & Water Reliability Project; the selected projects can be found at https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/ncrp_multibenefit_drought_grant/. The agreement was to fund the construction, element #1, of the project and recommend a reduced grant amount of \$500,000

Staff Review: The project information and budget will need to be adjusted based on TPRC comments. More detail, throughout would improve the project proposal.

[Weott Community Services District, System Improvements](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: TRIBE = no; DAC = yes; SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$1,950,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$1,950,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 47.66

Project Abstract: Repair or replacement of a bridge on State Parks property securing access to source water and points of diversion. Improvements to PODs to include: installing means to only divert water when water tanks need to be filled, installing water meters, and mitigating silting-in of detention dams. Upgrade existing transmission lines. Upgrade the WTP there are numerous deficiencies. Construction of

already designed tanks, on sites owned by the district. This phase of the proposed project is shovel ready.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Reviewers questioned the claimed benefit of 15 million gallons of water not being diverted. Is it on what they sell and deliver or how much they divert?
- It's not clear what the whole problem is, the sponsor should expand more on the current problems and the bridge.
- With the project being a one lump sum, it would be nice to see how much is being used to repair a bridge. It would be good to know what the costs are for the elements of the project. Separate the bridge and water-related aspects of the project (tanks and retention pond) in the budget.
- The application states they have approval from the State Parks to repair the bridge, but that seems like it should be worked out with the State before they decide it's ready to go. Working on a project belonging to the state can be challenging and time consuming to get contracts together and approval. Another reviewer pointed out the State Parks might not want to sign anything for the CSD until funding is secured.
- The application describes the bridge as rotting, but it is unclear how the project improves the speed of an emergency response.
- The schedule seems confusing, questioning why it takes so long for two tanks to be constructed.
- It is also unclear how they arrive at the \$2 million price tag.
- They opted not to pass a drought ordinance. They also didn't mention what they are doing to look into the waste or water conservation and did not mention requiring consumer conservation.
- This project could benefit from being fleshed out a bit more.
- Even heavy equipment used to construct the project could be an issue crossing the bridge. It is hard to tell how this is going to get done from the application.
- The water diversion goes continuously whether they have tanks or not. TPRC members supported fixing that problem and being in more control of when water gets diverted. Regulating the filling of tanks is very important.
- There were suggestions to remove the bridge element.
- This is a unique situation; the district relies on a spring located on the State Park's property and there may not be an agreement with terms and conditions and commitments right now. It seems that having access to the water source is an issue and it's on them to upgrade the crossing. State parks is not willing to fund that. Currently, believes that only ATVs can cross the bridge. It's a unique access and the bridge is an ancillary and legitimate need for the water system. More information is needed to better understand the limitations of the access.
- Referred to the mention of a fast response time, but they did not mention the bridge will collapse.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

Project # 25 Weott Community Services District, System Improvements was not recommended for being included in the regional proposal during this round. The TPRC does recommend technical assistance to improve the project and budget. The proposal needs to be fleshed out with more detail. The cost of the bridge and permitting may be more than budgeted, pushing this project over \$2M and making it a candidate to submit to DWR on its own with technical assistance or potentially apply for Prop 1 Round 2. The bridge component makes it a tricky project for drought and there may be other funding sources that are more suitable.