



**NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP (NCRP)
TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (TPRC) MEETING:
NCRP PROPOSITION 1 IRWM ROUND 2 PROJECT REVIEW, DECEMBER 1 & 2, 2022
PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY**

NCRP PROPOSITION 1 IRWM ROUND 2 PROPOSALS

[Big Lagoon Community Services District, Water Storage Improvements](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y

Total Project Budget: \$947,950 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$947,950

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 100.18

Project Abstract: The proposed water storage improvements project will replace the two 5,000-gallon HDPE water tanks with a new steel 60,000-gallon water tank to improve water self-reliance and community health by ensuring the District has enough water to cover the maximum daily water usage, extended water outages due to a short-term or extended well failure, natural disasters, and/or other emergencies.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Multiple TPRC members thought the cost of the steel tank seemed too high and are unsure how the project sponsor came up with such a large number.
- Multiple TPRC members felt the overall project budget seemed too high for the activities they plan to implement, was not thoroughly explained, and did not seem to be well thought through.
- Cost for foundation (\$80k) seems very high.
- Environmental analysis seems too expensive.
- It was not clear why such a small system needed SCADA (although the cost seemed about right, \$100k). There are plenty of lower cost alternatives.
- Cost is about \$15k per connection served which is very high.
- The economy of scale does not seem to be present here. (Project would be similar size if it served a larger community.)
- Memo from GHD identified need and developed proposed budget. Important to note that the construction budget also includes related infrastructure beyond the tank
- Budget seems to be a conservative (not super exact or detailed) projection. Project could likely be accomplished with a reduced budget.
- Project is not ready to go. Do not currently have the project designed (design costs are included in the project budget).

- About \$400k allocated for consultants and \$500k for construction. Even the \$500k for construction seems high.
- The need for the project is clear.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #1 Big Lagoon Community Services District, Water Storage Improvements project due to the high cost of the project and lack of project readiness.

[Blue Lake Rancheria, Smart Water Grid 2.0](#)

Location: Tribal, Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = Y DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y

Total Project Budget: \$570,000 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$570,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 101.84

Project Abstract: BLR desires to expand its ability to provide access to stored water and supports for its Tribal Members along with supporting regional emergency response efforts in the event of a large-scale disaster. BLR's facilities have been deemed ideal due to its location, air visibility and size to support local agencies such as the CHP, Cal Fire, OES, Humboldt County Sheriff's Dept., United States Coast Guard (USCG), Blue Lake School, PG&E, American Red Cross and more.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Multiple reviewers appreciated the regional approach and multiagency interaction and support.
- Reviewers appreciated the Rancheria's importance as an emergency center- it has filled this role in the past.
- Need for water during fires is critical and Tribes are paramount in providing water supply during emergencies.
- Proposal lacked some detail on the tank, pipes, and pumphouse and well improvements.
- Reviewers would like more justification for the size of the system (250k gallons) and additional detail on what the project proponent intends to do.
- The narrative lacked detail, but the budget was detailed and the prices for individual budget items seemed to be realistic.
- NCRP has funded the bulk of the first 250k gallon tank in Round 1 of IRWM funding, so the need did not seem quite as compelling for this project. Some reviewers had concerns about the equitable distribution of NCRP funds. Another reviewer noted that the Rancheria has planned to add the second tank for quite some time.
- One reviewer noted that the Rancheria will likely not go through all 500k gallons in day-to-day use so the stored water will go stale and need to be replaced. Another reviewer noted that there are ways to manage this, and the key is to have the fire water in reserve in case of emergency.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #2 Blue Lake Rancheria, Smart Water Grid 2.0 at \$130,500.

[City of Crescent City, Area Regional Water Supply Augmentation](#)

Location: Del Norte

Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = Y Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$1,331,443.30

NCRP Budget Request: \$1,331,443.30

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 100.76

Project Abstract: Crescent City supplies water to an economically disadvantaged region from a single well near the Smith River. The shallow nature and proximity to the River make it vulnerable to surface water impacts (including hazardous materials spills) and drawdown during drought conditions. Crescent City is requesting funding for planning, design and installation of 2 new 12" municipal well(s) in the Smith River Groundwater Basin on property owned by the City adjacent to the main transmission line.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Jon Olson recused himself.
- Some reviewers found the proposal and budget hard to follow. It was not clear exactly what the project proponent is proposing to do and materials were not specified.
- One reviewer was unsure why the two wells would be sited in close proximity to each other.
- Reviewers recognize the need to augment the existing system, but felt the benefits to salmonid habitat were exaggerated.
- The demonstrated need for both wells was not clarified.
- Clarification: Did not see a reference to storage capacity.
- Multiple reviewers felt the proposal lacked considerations for water conservation and did not seem to fully embrace NCRP goals.
- Budget seemed very high for the scope of work. It was unclear how the project sponsor came up with the numbers.
- It was not clear if the project included drilling test wells or production wells.
- The community served has a high water accessibility score (4) and vulnerability to outages score (4) which may speak to the need for the project.
- Not clear what they intend to use the increased water production for. One reviewer felt the project proponent should have first assessed their need for the water.
- Cost per person served is <\$100 per person which is lower than many other projects

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #3 City of Crescent City, Area Regional Water Supply Augmentation project at \$500,000.

[City of Montague, Water Supply Reliability and Lead Abatement Project](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$2,728,975

NCRP Budget Request: \$2,728,975

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 97.25

Project Abstract: The proposed mitigation project, the City of Montague Water Supply Reliability and Lead Abatement Project (Project) will remove and replace the current red lead-linseed oil coated 500,000-gallon water tank, and remove the current red lead-linseed oil coated 30,000-gallon water storage tank and two pressure tanks formerly used in the sand filtration process. The project will address insufficient water storage and the lack of redundancy in the storage system.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Question about the material of the tank and whether the lead-linseed oil coating is on the interior or exterior of the tank. It is presumed that the coating is on the outside of the tank, but the current tank is collapsing and thus was deemed a hazard to workers and the environment
- Multiple reviewers felt the proposal lacked quantification of the lead problem- how bad is it?
- Multiple members understand the need, but are not sure the project is fully aligned with the intentions of this funding source.
- Proposal does not address maximum daily water use and the overall context of the system, which made it difficult to understand the need for the project.
- Budget seemed high for the project activities, especially the grant administration hourly cost.
- The system already has a 1 million gallon tank and seems to be replacing tanks with same size tank. One reviewer would have preferred a justification of what size of tank is actually needed to meet the community needs.
- When budget was scaled, budget was focused on hazardous waste rehabilitation of existing tanks, which was confusing.
- If lead is on the exterior, painting over it is one way to abate this. The lead itself is not a problem, the problem is the mobilization of the lead into the water system.
- Proposal requests over 30% of total round 2 budget, which is a lot.
- The costs for design and erosion control in particular seemed exorbitant and unreasonable.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #4 City of Montague, Water Supply Reliability and Lead Abatement Project due to the lack of clear alignment with IRWM program goals and the high cost of the project.

[City of Weed, Mill Fire Water System Recovery Project](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y

Total Project Budget: \$997,500

NCRP Budget Request: \$997,500

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 107.26

Project Abstract: Replacement of existing water mains with new and larger water main, along with new services and water meters. The project will install 1,100 feet of 6-inch PVC pipe, 19 water services and water meters, a fire hydrant, 950 feet of curb and gutter, and a storm drain drop inlet. The proposed project will replace the existing 2- and 4-inch steel water lines that have reached the end of their useful life, have a history of leaking, and run underneath homes on private property. The fire burned hot enough to melt the City's recently installed composite water meters, some of them melting over the adjacent valves inhibiting the City's ability to shut the water services. These meters and water services will have to be replaced prior to reconstruction of the homes.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Rick Dean recused himself.
- Reviewer expressed concern about the curb and gutter approach for stormwater. Would prefer to see Low Impact Development (LID) included in this project.

- Some felt the budget and scope of work seem reasonable, but some felt construction administration and construction costs were high and not fully explained.
- The need for the project is clear.
- Project lacks match funding, and reviewers felt that proponent could seek other funding sources that proponent could use to offset project costs. Proponent did reach out to FEMA and CalOES but did not receive funding.
- One reviewer questioned the necessity of the curb and gutters and would not be comfortable providing funding for that component of the project.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #5 City of Weed, Mill Fire Water System Recovery Project at \$748,125.

[City of Willits, Centennial Reservoir Inflatable Spillway Project](#)

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = Y Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$695,000 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$641,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 98.79

Project Abstract: The Willits Centennial Dam currently uses seasonal, fixed flashboards to prevent overtopping and impound additional water during the dry season. These flashboards require manual removal when storms are forecast and significant water releases for annual installation. The proposed project seeks to build resiliency to climate change by improving water supply resilience and providing a safer, quicker response to floods through installing inflatable, mechanized flashboards.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- The need for the project was unclear. How often does this type of flooding (and possible water savings) happen? It does not seem critical.
- It seemed like there was a viable alternative in the form of upgraded flashboards paid for by the city.
- Reviewers appreciate the proponent’s effort to identify funds of their own to contribute to the project.
- Some budget items seemed high e.g. CEQA and construction costs.
- Reviewers appreciate that the project is scalable and can be split into two phases.
- Some found the project description hard to follow.
- Project addresses health and safety concerns.
- 130 AF of water savings is higher than many other proposed projects, but this water is currently captured by the reservoir downstream, and therefore it does not appear this project would result in any significant water savings.
- Project did not include any discussion of increased streamflow for environmental benefit.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #6 City of Willits, Centennial Reservoir Inflatable Spillway Project due to the dubious need and project benefits.

[Covelo Community Services District, Collection System & WWTP Improvements, Phase 2](#)

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y

Total Project Budget: \$1,632,100 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$869,383

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 106.03

Project Abstract: Reducing I&I into the collection system will ease the burden of extremely high flows through the WWTP during winter/rainy periods. When flows are high, not only is the treatment often insufficient, but the plant may be forced to surface water discharge effluent into the nearby Grist Creek, as happened in 2017 (failed toxicity test), reducing water quality. Another part of this project is to add power resiliency through a new PV power source and Ozone equipment protection to improve operations.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Funded in Round 1 of IRWM, so would be great to help to finish a project that NCRP has funded in the past.
- The project appears to be shovel ready, which reviewers appreciated.
- Reviewers feel the need for project is clear.
- There is a good amount of match funding.
- One reviewer felt the project was aligned with NCRP region goals.
- Comment applies to all projects: Budget lacks line items for tribal engagement, unexpected discoveries of historical artifacts. Other reviewers clarified that this is often rolled into the environmental compliance line item and taken into account during construction.
- Proposal did not identify benefits to a Tribe, but will improve water systems in the valley where a Tribe is located (Staff clarified that the Round Valley Tribe has its own wastewater system). Staff clarified that if proponent were to claim benefits to Tribe, they would need a letter of support from the Tribe.
- One reviewer found the proposal a little hard to follow.
- One reviewer felt unclear on the necessity for the canopy over ozone treatment (if one was required, why wouldn't they have put it in before?) and the necessity for solar panels.
- Some members felt the canopy was warranted for extending the life of equipment and making servicing easier and safer in inclement weather, but not an absolute necessity.
- Phased budget was not clear how they would scale project, and some budget items seemed high.
- Uses Round 1 IRWM money as match; Staff clarified that Round 1 funding cannot be used as match but this is included for informational purposes.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #7 Covelo Community Services District, Collection System and WWTP Improvements, Phase 2 at \$652,037.

[Del Norte County Service Area No. 1, Onsite Emergency Power Supply for Sanitary Sewer Lift Stations Phase 2](#)

Location: Del Norte

Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = Y Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$1,453,323 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$645,682

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 98.19

Project Abstract: The proposed Phase 2 project will provide onsite emergency power at 4 lift station locations throughout the CSA protecting public health and safety, and avoiding impacts to water quality and sensitive habitat by substantially decreasing the potential for sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs). The project also includes upgrades to the CSA's storage building, which will house the mobile generator.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Jon Olson and Rosanna Bower recused themselves.
- Prop 1 Round 1 funded 7 of 11 lift stations. This project would complete that work and is shovel ready, which multiple reviewers appreciated.
- Reviewers appreciate the significant match funding.
- Proposal seems to dismiss the option of portable generators. One reviewer would like to hear more about the need for the project (foundations, housing, transfer switches) given the project proponents are not considering portable generators.
- Tension between having new grantees and finishing projects warrants more discussion about tradeoffs among TPRC members.
- Project would be relatively easy to scale by doing fewer lift stations.
- Project benefits a larger population than other proposed projects.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #8 Del Norte County Service Area No. 1, Onsite Emergency Power Supply for Sanitary Sewer Lift Stations Phase 2 lack of consideration of lower cost alternatives.

[Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Rainwater Catchment Rebate and Streamflow Enhancement Project – Phase II](#)

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = P Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$1,199,615.95 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$599,649.50

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 95.88

Project Abstract: Building on their Phase I pilot project grant, the partnership seeks to continue its successful rainwater catchment rebate program to promote water security, foster water use awareness, and protect summer streamflow, while restructuring the program to pull in more economically disadvantaged households, expand adoption in community spaces, and include other water management practices.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Dale Roberts recused himself.
- Reviewers like the water conservation for fire and water supply.
- Proposal lacks detail about how the project will increase streamflow and the impact that will have. Reviewers do not think streamflow will be a significant benefit.
- Multiple TPRC members voiced support for rainwater capture.
- One reviewer appreciates that this is an additional phase of a project funded in Round 1.
- One member thinks this project should be funded in full.

- This project seemed to rank high on project readiness and reviewers liked the concept and strategy.
- Reviewers appreciate the focus on household income to capture economic need rather than DAC mapping.
- Reviewers appreciate the diversity of collaboration with landowners, agencies, and communities in need.
- It would be nice if the project targeted a higher number of low-income households.
- It was not clear what kind of uses and agreements for conservation are associated with the rebate.
- Multiple reviewers appreciate the multiple sources of match funding.
- Reviewers appreciate the clear quantification of project benefits.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #9 Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Rainwater Catchment Rebate and Streamflow Enhancement Project – Phase II due to lack of detail about streamflow benefits and how rebate would ensure water conservation.

[Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, Ranney Collector 2 Rehabilitation Project – Round 2](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = P Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$3,810,000

NCRP Budget Request: \$950,000

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 108.86

Project Abstract: Ranney Collector rehabilitation consists of replacing laterals that project out into the aquifer. Once the new flow rates are determined, then new energy-efficient pumps and motors are sized to efficiently and cost-effectively pump the water. Once the pump and motors are sized, then new electrical controls, circuitry, and station 12kV transformer are installed to efficiently operate the new system. Original pumps, motors, electrical circuitry and transformer were installed in 1960.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Reviewers appreciate the large match and large impact (90k people, 7 districts).
- Reviewers appreciate the groundwater recharge component from increased water efficiency.
- One member appreciates that this is a project the NCRP has funded before.
- Reviewers appreciate that the project proponent was thorough and precise in laying out their process and the steps they have taken. This helped to justify the need for the project.
- Staff expressed concern that project is the same one funded in Round 1. Proponent should be more clear that this project is a separate phase as opposed to a supplement to the previous award. Staff would need to talk with project sponsor and DWR about eligibility (as its written now, project would not be eligible). Possibly they could do two laterals under Round 1 and other the other two under Round 2 funding?
 - Update: Staff were able to confirm that HBMWD project would be approved by DWR.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #10 Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, Ranney Collector 2 Rehabilitation Project – Round 2 at \$712,500.

[Junction City Elementary School District, Potable Water Filtration System Replacement](#)

Location: Trinity
Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y
Total Project Budget: \$922,483 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$915,593
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 93.03

Project Abstract: JCESD's approximately 80 students and staff are served by a 1994 era water filtration system that is at the end of its useful service life and overdue for replacement. Water is supplied by a well and treated using a filtration and disinfection process. Treated water is stored in a clearwell and booster pumped to maintain pressure. DDW's 2019 inspection report recommended installation of an emergency generator, which supports JCESD's role as an emergency shelter in disasters and power outages. The project is for a water filtration system, including assessment, design, and build of the system.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Some members feel the need for project is clear.
- Proponent applied for SWRCB funding.
- TPRC member finds project narrative hard to follow and it is unclear what the project fully entails.
- Since proponent has not yet done the assessment, they do not really know what they need, which explains the high cost. It seems premature to roll everything into a design-build at this point.
- Budget lines for project management seem too high for the timeframe of the project.
- Proposal did not discuss alternatives, did not provide scaling options, and did not use technical assistance.
- Not clear if CEQA exemption noted in the proposal will cover this work or how it applies to the project.
- Seems like this project would be a good fit for other state funding (e.g. Dept of Education).
- Small proponents are beholden to the consultants (budget is ~1/3 soft costs).
- Proponents are also looking for SRF funding and this project would fit well under SRF.
- Staff clarified that grant management should not be >10% of project budget.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #11 Junction City Elementary School District, Potable Water Filtration System Replacement due to lack of project readiness and limited detail on project details.

[Lewiston Community Services District, Water System Resiliency Project](#)

Location: Trinity
Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y
Total Project Budget: \$233,990 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$233,990
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 101.78

Project Abstract: To improve water supply reliability, water-use efficiency, water self-reliance, and promote water conservation within the LCSD, the Proposed Project includes:

- Installation of automatic transfer switches (ATS) at the Raw Water Pump Station (RWPS) and at the

Water Treatment Plant (WTP).

- Upgrade siding and roofing on three existing well buildings to a fire-resistant material.
- Installation of approximately 70 advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) water meters and/or registers

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Reviewers appreciated the approach of putting fire resistant materials around wells.
- Multiple members felt the budget request was reasonable for the project scope.
- One reviewer noted that the proposal used 2020 MHI data for Lewiston but 2021 MHI data for state, which affects the percentage DAC. But DAC is a course metric, and the reviewer does not doubt the financial need of the community.
- Reviewers appreciate that the project is scalable.
- One member felt some budget items seemed high (e.g. construction administration is \$5k per month over the stated period; project close out and management costs are high).
- Unsure about the district's previous commitment to water conservation since it did not previously have information about it on their website.
- Some reviewers feel that there would be other funding sources for building hardening and automatic transfer switches (ATS).
- ATS is not a necessity.
- NCRP/TPRC is generally in favor of water flow meters.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TRPC does not recommend funding for Project #12 Lewiston Community Services District, Water System Resiliency Project due to limited alignment with IWRM program goals.

[McKinleyville Community Services District, 4.5MG Water Storage Tank Construction](#)

Location: Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$13,346,941 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$2,524,272

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 103.35

Project Abstract: Project is construction of 4.5MG water tank to help ensure continued water service to the communities of McKinleyville & Arcata. The watermain from HBMWD to MCSD passes under the Mad River, is over 50-years old, & is vulnerable to an earthquake or flood. A grant from the NCRP would leverage \$7,748,857 in Hazard Mitigation Grant funding & \$3,073,812 in MCSD matching funding, to cover the est. \$2.5M in increased costs associated with inflation, and allow for completion of this critical Project.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Pat Kaspari recused himself.
- One reviewer approves of plan for tank and intertie, but needs more information to evaluate type of tank, site selection, and how it connects to the rest of the system.
- Another member was not concerned about the tank material or siting because FEMA does not seem to have concerns (FEMA supplied most of the match funds).
- Multiple reviewers were confused about the scope of the project. The terms tank and reservoir seem to be used interchangeably.

- Budget ask seems high for the project scope, especially high construction admin costs and high erosion control costs.
- Reviewers appreciate discussion of alternatives to a water tank (additional water main) to justify the project.
- It seems like the proponent is asking for as much as the NCRP is willing to give.
- Reviewers appreciate disclosure about available funds.
- Project proponents chose concrete over steel to save money.
- It would deplete the district's catastrophic reserves if they are not awarded any funding, which for one reviewer suggests they don't really need the funding. Others feel it is understandable to want to not deplete their reserves.
- One member would have expected preliminary geotechnical report given the project is proposed for a hillside location in a highly seismically active. Other members noted this investigation was in the 60% design plans.
- Water storage seems to buy time in case either MCSD or Arcata loses its tie to HBMWD.
- One reviewer is not sure about funding the gap in funding as a result of inflation. Not sure this is the goal of this program.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #13 McKinleyville Community Services District, 4.5MG Water Storage Tank Construction project at \$879,209.

[Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Rural Tank Program for Water Security and Fire Preparedness in Mendocino County Disadvantaged Communities](#)

Location: Mendocino

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y

Total Project Budget: \$563,855.43 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$499,955.43

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 103.57

Project Abstract: The Rural Tank Program for Underserved Communities in Mendocino County will install rainwater harvest tanks at fire stations and residences to conserve streamflow in the summer, increase water self-reliance, reduce the risk of catastrophic fires, and protect endangered salmonids. The project aligns with Prop 1 priorities to assist with water infrastructure to adapt to climate change and improve regional water self-reliance, as well as encouraging collaborative water use.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Joe Scriven recuses himself.
- Multiple reviewers appreciate the concept in the proposal and recognize the need for the project.
- Multiple reviewers appreciate that the project seems to be cost effective. The budget is mostly for implementation.
- Project seems strong on readiness and proponent has done the pre-work to identify appropriate sites.
- Reviewers appreciate that the budget is scalable by changing the number of tanks.
- Reviewers appreciate the level of community commitment to the project that has been shown.
- One reviewer would have liked to see more information about the landowner agreements.
- Time frame seems more extended than some of the other projects.

- One reviewer would like more information about how the rainwater captured will be used and how it will benefit the community.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #14 Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Rural Tank Program for Water Security and Fire Preparedness in Mendocino County Disadvantaged Communities project at \$374,967.

[Orick Community Services District, Water Meter Replacement Project](#)

Location: Humboldt
Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y
Total Project Budget: \$237,950 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$237,950
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 106.57

Project Abstract: The Orick CSD will replace all its 142 water meters, meter boxes, and curb stops in the district with smart water meters, new boxes, and new curb stops. Major components of the project will include planning and design, community outreach and notification, bidding and implementation, and evaluation. The goals of the project are to reduce water use and water loss due to leaks or breaks.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Seems like a cost-effective project.
- Project doesn't address 80% of the water loss. Reviewer would recommend starting with addressing leaks.
- Community definitely needs assistance, but project lacks clarity about where the leaks in their system are.
- One reviewer is not sure why new meter boxes are necessary and would have appreciated justification for this or a way to scale.
- Proposal has budget line items for design plans, which seem too high for such a simple project.
- Reviewers express support for the meter portion of the project. Districts need to have information about the problem to know how to design the solution.
- Reviewers appreciate focus on water conservation and leak detection.
- Are customers currently paying a flat fee or per unit water? Seems like they are paying per unit.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends fully funding Project #15 Orick Community Services District, Water Meter Replacement Project at \$237,950.

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

Location: Humboldt
Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = N
Total Project Budget: \$1,187,450 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$867,450
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 101.90

Project Abstract: SRF will design, permit and construct three storage and forbearance projects along Lower Mainstem Sproul Creek with ~150,000 gallons of total storage for domestic use and wildfire

suppression and to maintain flows for salmonids. Additionally, this project provides cost share to the existing Redwood Creek project covering half of construction cost for 250,000 gallons of storage. Finally, SRF will administer/monitor the storage and forbearance projects during the first several years of operations.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Sandra recused herself.
- The number of people benefitting is very low.
- Reviewers are not clear how the forbearance would help fish. It seems like a very small amount of water.
- It seems like the project proponent is looking for match for Prop 84 money. Staff clarified that drought relief grant can be used to augment budget for this project, but will be classified as other state match.
- Project proposes to store 400k gallons of water, but does not budget enough for the required number of tanks.
- One member cannot crosswalk between the two budgets provided.
- One reviewer noted that although 400k gallons is a lot it does not support surface flow necessarily, but would help maintain the aquatic habitat in the pools which is very important.
- One reviewer notes the project may help with aquifer recharge.
- Some reviewers would like to see the benefits better explained and quantified.
- Multiple members support forbearance agreements.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #16 Salmonid Restoration Federation, Redwood and Sproul Creek, South Fork Eel River Storage and Forbearance Program due to insufficient explanation and quantification of project benefits.

[Scott River Watershed Council, East Fork Scott River Green Infrastructure Mountain Meadows Project](#)

Location: Siskiyou

Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = P Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$631,331 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$488,980

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 118.15

Project Abstract: The Project will implement innovative mountain meadow restoration methodologies in order to improve groundwater water storage and habitat value in the biodiverse East Fork Scott River headwater systems. The Project will offer watershed protection, restoration, and management including reduction of wildfire risk, carbon storage and improved water supply reliability and water quality. The Project is integrated into larger efforts and will accelerate upper watershed restoration across the region.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Sandra recuses herself.
- Reviewers appreciate process-based restoration approach and that the project addresses multiple issues.

- One reviewer has concerns about the low cost per acre for treatment. Work will likely be exempt from prevailing wage, but that exemption might be going away, which would likely double the per acre costs.
 - Staff will look into prevailing wage question; SRWC has done more acreage than proposed with the awarded Round 1 funding.
 - Proposal states that wages are already based on prevailing wage.
- More explanation about the decision support tool (what it would do, how it would be used, etc.) would be helpful. This is not listed in the budget.
- It is important that this project be well monitored.
- Project seeks to address ongoing water issues in the Scott Valley, where curtailments are in effect.
- Reviewers appreciate use of green infrastructure.
- Reviewers appreciate use of innovative techniques that seem to have a lot of potential.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #17 Scott River Watershed Council, East Fork Scott River Green Infrastructure Mountain Meadows Project at \$488,980.

[Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District, Irrigation Ditch Pipeline and Water Efficiency Improvement Project](#)

Location: Siskiyou
Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = P Severely DAC = P
Total Project Budget: \$2,741,965 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$2,540,430
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 103.43

Project Abstract: This project aims to increase the water efficiency for agricultural production, provide environmental benefits to threatened species, and strengthen the economic viability for landowners. This is achieved through 14,600 feet of pipe, irrigation valves, and soil moisture sensors. The result is a reduction in the diversion time and an increase in time a full water right of 11.9 cfs can be left instream. Resulting, in roughly 1,480 acre-feet a year of conserved water.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- \$2.5 million seems like a lot, so reviewers would like this to be scalable.
- Keeping water in the creek and still supplying water to ranchers and farmers seem like a win-win solution.
- Magnitude of water savings is very high, even if the estimate is high, but it is not clear if there are specific commitments to certain benefits.
- Proposal wasn't clear why all of the elements were needed (e.g. not enough justification for 24 inch pipe vs other alternatives).
- Multiple members think it is interesting that NRCS had a hand in design of project but did not contribute more funding. Project may not have qualified for NRCS implementation funds?
- Budget included overhead which is ineligible per DWR.
- Are the moisture sensors necessary?
- Tribal outreach appeared to be minimal.
- Reviewers like the buy in from GSA.
- Reviewers are not sure how much of the water saved will go to ecosystems.

- One member questions the benefit to DAC.
- Reviewers like that the project could be scalable based on pipe length.
- The area currently has curtailment order.
- Need for the project is clear- help keep the farmers afloat and support the fish- and project is a direct solution to multiple issues.
- Some members wish for more clarity in the budget and more cost-share.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #18 Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District, Irrigation Ditch Pipeline and Water Efficiency Improvement Project at \$760,009.

[Shelterwood Collective, Water Infrastructure Renovations](#)

Location: Sonoma

Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = P Severely DAC = N

Total Project Budget: \$1,458,650 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$1,021,650

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 75.07

Project Abstract: The proposed project will create a resilient water system at Shelterwood, which will enable the restoration of endangered species habitat, strengthen community wildfire resilience, and improve watershed health. The project includes repairing an antiquated water distribution network, bringing a newly built well online, retiring use of a surface water collection system, expanding storage capacity, and establishing a fire protection system.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Low level of project readiness, no wide community benefit, doesn't serve DACs or SDACs or Tribes.
- Little discussion or quantification of how much water would be returned to instream use.
- Supports a small population.
- One reviewer liked the pumped hydro energy storage.
- One reviewer liked calculations of water needed.
- Not clear why the CalFire fuel reduction project is reliant on this community center.
- Proposal did not discuss any alternatives.
- Not clear why the community center needs such a large increase in water supply.
- Reviewers were not sure where the other 5 million of water supply benefits was coming from.
- Some benefit claims and claims of hazardous chemicals seem to be a stretch.
- There is not an existing permanent community, rather the site is mostly a retreat center/camp sort of place.
- Reviewers are not sure this project is well aligned with the goals of this grant.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #19 Shelterwood Collective, Water Infrastructure Renovations project due to lack of project readiness, lack of benefit to Tribes and disadvantaged communities, and dubious project need and benefits.

[Water Climate Trust, Water Accounting & Funding Decision Support Tools](#)

Location: Region
Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = P Severely DAC = P
Total Project Budget: \$555,000 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$350,000
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 75.86

Project Abstract: We will provide decision support tools to ensure that water related funding does not harm, and preferably benefits, environmental flows for ecosystems & river-dependent communities.

With these tools, funding agencies can:

1. Measure project impacts on environmental flows
2. Maximize environmental flow benefits from earmarked funding
3. Avoid or minimize harm to environmental flows from public water investments

Deliverables include environmental water:

1. Accounting Webinar & Video
2. Accounting Survey
3. Accounting Methodologies
4. Funding Tools
5. Transaction Case Studies

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Project does not seem to have an on-the-ground implementation component.
- Project seems mostly to help make funding decisions as opposed to helping to guide management decisions on the ground.
- Proposal did not include sufficient detail about what the tool would do or how it would work.
- Proposal includes an Oregon component that would need to be removed before NCRP could fund it.
- One reviewer feels there is value in the concept, but the narrative about where the tool is headed is unclear.
- Unclear what the benefits of the project are.
- Alternative methods were hard to follow.
- Authors of the original paper that was the basis for the project are not part of this project.
- Financial need was not clear.
- Reviewers were not sure if the project would be eligible for a cost share waiver.
- Project does not seem likely to be used by water board staff even if created.
- Reviewers feel the idea has value, but maybe applying it to statewide IRWMP would be more appropriate.
- Reviewers suggest the proponent find an agency partner and statewide funding source for this project.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #20 Water Climate Trust, Water Accounting & Funding Decision Support Tools project due to limited project detail, limited alignment with IRWM program goals and unclear project needs and benefits for the North Coast region.

[Weaverville Sanitary District, Sewer Lining Project](#)

Location: Trinity
Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y
Total Project Budget: \$1,529,988 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$1,529,988
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 108.30

Project Abstract: The District has identified 24,300 linear feet of existing sewer collection system that are the most problematic and require significant effort to maintain. These areas of concern increase the difficulty of treatment due to infiltration and inflow (I&I) and may decrease the groundwater quality by introducing raw sewage into the surrounding groundwater.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Sandra recused herself.
- Cost estimate seems reasonable. Most of the money goes to project implementation and construction and very little to overhead.
- Reviewers appreciate options for scaling the project.
- Reviewers feel this is a cost-effective project.
- Reviewers appreciate that proponent has already defined where the issues are.
- One reviewer has concern the project is focused on wastewater rather than water supply.
- Reviewers feel the project is well defined.
- Project serves a big community.
- Project reduces potential for sewer overflows, but proponent does not cite any actual sewer overflows that have occurred.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends funding Project #21 Weaverville Sanitary District, Sewer Lining Project at \$764,994.

[Westhaven Community Services District, Water System Resilience and Watershed Enhancement Project](#)

Location: Humboldt
Benefit: Tribe = P DAC = Y Severely DAC = N
Total Project Budget: \$688,440 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$685,940
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 102.91

Project Abstract: WBSD has identified (3) large legacy road "Humboldt" crossings on watercourses that pose a significant risk to natural resources and water system infrastructure. Humboldt crossing means a stream crossing constructed with logs set parallel to the stream channel and covered with fill. The project will provide multiple benefits including improved water quality, better flood management, restored and enhanced ecosystems, and more reliable surface and groundwater supplies. The project builds resilience for this rural water systems to ensure avoidance of service disruption.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- One reviewer notes that Humboldt crossings are dangerous for humans and environment and removing them is important.
- Tribes are involved and supportive.

- The budget is scalable.
- Reviewers feel the project plan is well defined.
- Is proposal building new water lines? Is it upstream of a community water supply? Reviewer is confused about water supply resilience benefits.
- Project has high per person costs (~\$1400 per capita).
- Map doesn't show where water intakes are relative to crossings.
- Project has no match funding and proponent does not seem to be pursuing funding from CDFW or others.
- One reviewer is confused why project can't be paid for with ratepayer funds if it is truly needed for water supply.
- Proposal does not reference much detail about project benefits.
- Reviewer is not clear on how the project would benefit cutthroat trout or 303d bacteria listing.
- Reviewer would like if sediment input numbers were broken down or discussed in detail.
- Westhaven CSD does draw water from below the crossings and is a community in need of financial assistance.
- If crossings were to blow out, some pipes would fail and some community members would lose service.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC does not recommend funding Project #22 Westhaven Community Services District, Water System Resilience and Watershed Enhancement Project due to limited explanation of project benefits and need.

[Willow County Water District, Water Main Replacement Project](#)

Location: Mendocino
Benefit: Tribe = N DAC = Y Severely DAC = Y
Total Project Budget: \$1,244,780 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$1,244,780
TPRC Project Review Final Score: 103.09

Project Abstract: This project supports the design and implementation of water main replacements in the Willow County Water District in Ukiah. Existing steel water mains proposed for replacement have reached end of life and pose consistent system maintenance issues. The project will replace approximately 1,000 linear feet of 8-inch steel water main on Laws Ave, approximately 1,000 linear feet of 4-inch steel water main on nearby Canyon Dr, and approximately 550 linear feet of 4-inch steel water main on Pomo Ln.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Reviewers think this looks like a good project.
- Reviewers would have liked if the proponent had quantified the water loss and cost savings that would result in more detail.
- Budget didn't seem to match the scaling, but it appears to be easy to scale.
- Project costs about \$328 per person served, so it is fairly cost effective.
- Project seems to align with NCRP and Prop 1 goals.
- Reviewers feel the need for the project is clear.
- Reviewers feel that a few of the line items seemed high.
- Reviewer noted the community water affordability score was 2/4.

- Project is located in a medium priority groundwater basin so water conservation is very important.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

TPRC recommends funding Project #23 Willow County Water District, Water Main Replacement Project at \$503,039.

[Yurok Tribe, McKinney Fire Restoration Project](#)

Location: Tribal, Humboldt

Benefit: Tribe = Y DAC = P Severely DAC = P

Total Project Budget: \$1,218,890.87 **NCRP Budget Request:** \$1,218,890.87

TPRC Project Review Final Score: 119.55

Project Abstract: The McKinney Fire Restoration Project intends to identify short- and long-term remedial measures to reduce impacts to water quality, salmonid and other aquatic species' habitat, water supply reliability, public safety and infrastructure affected by the fire through a process of data acquisition, assessment of the data to initiate an effective, collaborative restoration strategy, and implementation at a series of sites utilizing numerous restoration techniques within damaged or threatened areas.

TPRC Project Proposal Review:

- Sandra recused herself.
- Project seems to be well defined and well thought through.
- The immediacy of the need is strong and project is replicable and highly relevant.
- Budget seemed appropriate and in line with the scope of work.
- Lots of sediment deposited into the river after the McKinney fire and resulted in significant fish kill. Reviewers feel the need for the project is strong.
- One member would like to see more of the budget dedicated to erosion control measures.
- Reviewers would like to see collaboration between multiple parties to maximize efforts.
- One reviewer felt the decision support tool was not well fleshed out, but might be referring to analysis of imagery.
- Project seems well aligned with NCRP and Prop 1 goals.
- Reviewers feel this is a very strong proposal.
- The analysis and planning are pretty comprehensive – One reviewer thinks this is worthwhile to fund and that outputs will be useful for on-the-ground work.
- Reviewers feel the partnerships are impressive and it is a high-quality application.
- Labor rates are very affordable. Reviewers feel this is a very cost-effective project.

TPRC Recommendation Discussion:

The TPRC recommends fully funding Project #24 Yurok Tribe, McKinney Fire Restoration Project at \$1,218,891.