



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP (NCRP)

TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (TPRC) MEETING:

NCRP URBAN & MULTIBENEFIT DROUGHT RELIEF REGIONAL GRANT PROPOSAL, SUBMISSION 2

TRIBAL & UNDERREPRESENTED COMMUNITY SET-ASIDE PROJECTS

PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY

[Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, BRBRR Well Replacement Project](#)

Location: Tribal - Central Region

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

Total Project Budget: \$168,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$168,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 47.14

Project Abstract: The proposed project is to improve Tribal water resiliency, through replacement of existing infrastructure and adding a second water source for Tribal homes. The project includes replacement of an existing well with a new 800 foot well and pump as well as connecting additional Tribal homes to the more resilient domestic water supply through a series of pipes and service laterals.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This project received technical support from GHD, NCRP Consultant.
- Reviewers noted the project is well suited for drought relief funding and for this set aside for Tribal communities.
- Clarification, is this a new well or a deepening of an existing well? Number 4 says it's a new well. Number 10 says "extended". Some contradiction. (Sherri Norris later confirmed that it's a new well; contractor recommended they drill deeper).
- One reviewer recommended having a 3-year timeline before decommissioning any other wells on property.
- Reviewers expressed wanting to see more information about why the well needs to be replaced, what's wrong with the other one? Didn't make a good case as of the need for project; hard to decipher. More information about location and full scope of project. (Sherri Norris later added that Bear River has an existing storage tank; the yield from their existing well is not filling it).
- One reviewer questioned whether the well would produce only 1,000 gallons per day, is this a misprint? Another spot says or 50 AFD. (Sherri Norris later noted that the new well would produce 1,400-1,500 gallons per day.)
- 550 people served means the project cost equates to \$350 per person or 2.5 gallons per person. Project may only serve a portion of the community; needs clarification.

- Cost includes several hundred feet of water line – is this price sufficient for a new well and waterline? Expressed some concern that prices have gone up significantly in the last 6+ months; feeling the cost bid is low. Since this is based on a driller bid, unsure whether planning/design and construction costs were factored in. At the end of the day, have to trust they are asking for what they need. If it is low, they will have to come up with the additional funds.
- Is this in a GSA? Tribal projects are exempt from SGMA and do not require a letter of support.
- Did not see reference to any water conservation activities.
- Generally, very favorable of this project for improving water source for a tribal community. Generally ranked high.
- Discussed if TPRC revisits the set aside proposals, this one could possibly come back to include water conservation, water use efficiency program, and adding these costs to the proposal. Any drop in demand means more water.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #1 Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, BRBRR Well Replacement Project.

[Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, BRBRR Reclaimed Water Fire and Drought Project](#)

Location: Tribal – Central Region

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

Total Project Budget: \$ 1,278,558 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$ 1,278,558

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 45.46

Project Abstract: Water will be stored in a 40,000 gallon tank and pressure pumps will allow irrigation and fire suppression with reclaimed water hydrants situated throughout the developed area of the Rancheria. The remote, rural half of the Rancheria and the nearby homes on Singley Road can be irrigated with the four-wheel drive tanker truck which will be purchased and can also be used for fire suppression activities. Irrigation of the greenbelt will restore the natural environment and allow wildlife to find necessary resources in traditional habitat rather than encroaching on human habitation and risking predation and eradication.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- This project received technical support from GHD, NCRP Consultant.
- Reviewers expressed broad support for the project. There is a need for more of these projects throughout California to utilize reclaimed water and fight against drought effects. Overall, an effective tool for conservation.
- Saw this as an extension of the well replacement project to provide the water conservation component.
- More detail and information in the proposal would have been helpful to the reviewers.
- Need to clarify “benefits” portion of application and volumes of water.
- One reviewer asked whether 40,000 gallons is a significant amount of water for fire protection. Another responded that a typical water tender carries 5-8,000 gallons. Some discussion about whether a fire hydrant system is a good fit for drought funding and whether this should be

scaled back. However, it was recognized that there would be an offset using recycled water versus potable water.

- Discussed whether project fits the drought need since it's for irrigation. Discussed benefit of groundwater recharge. One reviewer asked whether these areas are currently irrigated or are new irrigated areas? How much will be used for irrigation? Regardless of whether they are irrigating now or not, there is recharge potential of this greenbelt.
- Hard to follow budget. Portions seem high and other items seem low. Some question as to whether the budget numbers and those stated in the narrative are consistent. Overall, the budget seems in line for the extent of piping and other project components.
- There was much discussion about the headworks component and whether the full cost for this component is necessary; discussed role of headworks and its importance to get tertiary treatment. Definition of headworks may be broader than what some consider "headworks". The application says a "packaged headworks".
- Discussed possibility of removing or reducing the headworks cost from budget. While cost of headworks seems high, the cost of filtration is only \$15,000 which seems extremely low. Ultimately it was recognized that as proposed, there will be sufficient funds to make this project feasible.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #2 Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, Reclaimed Water Fire and Drought Project.

[Fieldbrook Glendale Community Services District, FGCSO 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: 42.84

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:

- This is a resubmission from round 1; project application was refined and improved, via technical assistance from GHD, NCRP Consultant.
- Pretty basic project. Overall, doesn't rank high for directly addressing drought needs; more of a seismic and maintenance related project. Small amount of water saved (18,000 gallons per year) due to current overflow. Noted the nexus of water loss from existing tank and drought is present but weak.
- Ability to scale down the budget going from glass lined to epoxy coated (a bit more maintenance cost but not much).
- While it was recognized that the overall cost for the tank is high, they are receiving a huge match from other funding sources.

- One reviewer asked whether designing to “current seismic standards” instead of “a magnitude of 9” should be used in the application instead. Other reviewers noted that the application is using the correct code of ASCE 7 for critical facilities.
- Some of the comments from the previous round still are relevant.
- Project does not include water conservation measures.
- The HR2W information says a different population than what other parts of the application relative to how many people would be served.
- Comfortable at funding the tank at a reduced rate since it’s a large ask for a tank.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #3 Fieldbrook Glendale Community Services District, FGCS Water Tank Retrofit Project at a scaled back amount of \$303,400.

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

Location: Humboldt

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

Total Project Budget: \$ 2,531,913

NCRP Budget Request: \$ 2,592,633

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 41.04

Project Abstract: Expand Orick CSD’s 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:

- This is a resubmission from round 1; project application was refined and improved, via technical assistance from GHD, NCRP Consultant.
- Project proposal form is different than what’s included in the NCRP eligibility form (wasn’t updated from submission 1).
- Reviewers noted that the project budget has increased but it is scalable. A flow study has been included that would drive the forbearance. Don’t know what the flow study would consist of and timeline for this.
- Project includes 12 properties which would equate to \$210,000 per house. How many people would be benefitted? Discussed cost justification compared to the number of people served.
- They did not get letters of support from all properties. One letter of support is for a bed and breakfast. Others are for second homes.
- Redwood Creek is a jewel for steelhead; project includes water conservation plan and forbearance.
- Notable increase in cost (adding \$1M to price tag but not much scope added); is the planning costs just for the water conservation plan? Hard to understand increase in cost with justification from application.
- Discussed other approaches to forbearance, such as installing a tank storage for each property, which would cost less. Reviewers questioned this approach for forbearance.

- Does this project keep water in the streams? Rediverting stream flow is not quantified. Would like to know the metrics. If the problem is that streams are drying up, they will not be providing much back to the river.
- Recognized that Orick CSD is a severely disadvantaged community and they need all the help they can get; however, this is expanding their system when funding for ongoing maintenance of the existing system is a challenge.
- The application doesn't speak to source capacity of Orick CSD's current water supply. Do they have the water to provide to these properties?
- Similar comments from last time that still apply. Concern about growth inducement.
- Discussed scaling back project. Ultimately, reviewers noted that the project may not be a good fit for the drought relief funding. May be other ways to get water to these homes for a fraction of the cost. Not sure if this is the correct solution for extended drought resiliency. Discussed rainwater catchment or other forbearance approaches.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #4 Orick Community Services District, Orick CSD Water Distribution Expansion project due to the high cost of the project and other viable approaches for forbearance.

[Round Valley County Water District, Groundwater Vulnerability Monitoring and Assessment Project](#)

Location: Tribal land

Benefit: TRIBE = partially DAC = yes SEVERELY DAC = yes

Total Project Budget: \$ 1,026,800 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$ 1,026,800

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 43.65

Project Abstract: This project aims to assess the water vulnerability of Round Valley. We are located in a remote location that relies entirely on groundwater. We have a unique closed system aquifer that has been historically fed by multiple tributaries. Unprecedented agricultural growth coupled with extreme drought has put stress on local wells. We need to gather information about our aquifer and the wells in our community so that we can plan for sustainable water use and future water development.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- As a monitoring program, the project doesn't directly benefit drought relief. However, "you can't improve upon what you aren't measuring" including where and why and how much groundwater loss is occurring.
- While there was broad support for the concept, a more detailed description and basic work plan would have been useful to the reviewers. It was recognized that a portion of the funding request is for planning in addition to engineering and implementation.
- There were questions regarding the unknowns of the project. Very minimal description about location of wells, how they would be protected (discussed use of small vaults to keep underground), and private property access. It is assumed these details would be worked out.
- There was concern expressed that 100 ft wells may not be deep enough for this area.

- The monitoring program would benefit from involvement/partnership with Tribe. While the Tribe submitted a letter of support, more outreach and coordination should occur.
- There should also be information sharing with current groundwater monitoring efforts.
- Multiple reviewers noted the price tag seems very high for monitoring. As proposed, the cost for drilling 8 wells, 100 ft each, equates to around \$900/foot. The going rate is around \$80/ft.
- Discussed scaling funding request based on cost of well; suggested reducing to \$150 ft for each well or \$120,000 for well drilling (this would bring the total funding request to \$426,800).
- One reviewer questioned whether construction implementation is only for the well drilling.
- There was discussion about ongoing monitoring of the aquifer to determine if there are detrimental activities.
- Discussed opportunity to ask for more information and clarify aspects of the application prior to submitting to DWR.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding the Round Valley County Water District, Groundwater Vulnerability Monitoring and Assessment Project, **at a reduced amount of \$500,000.**

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

Location: Humboldt

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

Total Project Budget: \$ 747,950 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$ 447,950

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 40.80

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:

- This is a resubmission from round 1; project application was refined and improved.
- Multiple reviewers recognized the importance of a backup generator for power outages but acknowledged it is not a good fit as a drought resiliency project.
- Maintaining water supply for power shutoff is different from maintaining water supply for drought purposes. Ultimately, a backup generator “doesn’t keep water in the river”.
- As for the application, the description of project and level of detail improved from the first submission. However, many of the prior TPRC comments still apply.
- As for the cost proposal, reviewers recognized there are significant matching funds available. Costs seem reasonable for what is being proposed. One reviewer noted that the average outages is low to justify the cost proposal.
- This project is not proposing conservation measures, apart from during emergencies.
- Matching funds from large industrial customer would make this more equitable.
- In summary, the drought connection is tenuous. Ranked low due to nature of project and that its loosely tied to drought relief. Ultimately may not be the best funding source for this type of project.

- One reviewer recommended the district go back to CALOES and request the remaining funds.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #6 Scotia Community Services District, River Pumps Backup Generator Project due to the tenuous drought connection.

[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: 47.33

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:

- This is a resubmission from round 1; project application was refined and improved.
- Overall, project is a good bang for the buck.
- Similar comments from first round related to cost. Cost seems high for a stream gauge. They are adding CEQA costs which is new.
- Unsure from the project materials whether the prior stream gauge still working. There was a large wildfire in this area two years ago. Not sure if the fire affected the existing stream gauge.
- While not directly tied to drought relief, monitoring is critical in identifying changes in conditions (“need to identify what the problem is before knowing how to address the problem”).
- Discussed whether DWR would fund this project. There was recognition that Scott River is a critically important watershed that has existing curtailment orders so it is expected that DWR would fund this project.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #7 Scott River Watershed Council, Etna Creek Real Time StreamFlow Monitoring Project.