STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SIERRA NEVADA CONSERVANCY

Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Program Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84)

Applicant:	**Fall River Resource Conservation District**
Project Title:	**Burney Gardens Restoration Planning Project**
Subregion:	**North**
County:	**Shasta**
SNC Funding:	**$ 75,000**
Total Project Cost:	**$202,500**
Application Number:	**553**
Final Score:	**83.83**

PROJECT SCOPE

The project will assess, design, and prepare permits and compliance information to restore 2,000 acres of mostly encroached meadows and thin 1,000 acres of dense forest adjacent to the meadow so that future thinning and burning may be used to maintain the restoration. The meadow complex is co-owned by four landowners and consists of forested (e.g. encroached lodgepole) and non-forested meadow habitat. Lodgepole pine has colonized most of the meadow area, resulting in the loss of relic aspen stands or degradation of still existing stands. In the non-forested meadow area (approximately 100 acres), past management practices have resulted in entrenchment of the stream channel.

Within the forested areas in the floodplain, nearly all conifer trees will be identified for removal. The aspen stands are expected to increase in size after conifer treatment. Snags and other trees known to be important for wildlife will be left. These remaining "wildlife" trees, and aspen trees, along with a few willows, will provide important structural habitat for migratory and resident birds and foraging habitat and cover for other vertebrates (e.g. elk, black-tailed deer, Douglas squirrel).

A plan will be developed to restore the open degraded meadow habitat (20 acres) in a south meadow and 10 acres in a north meadow. The restoration goal within the open meadow areas will be to reconnect the stream channel to the floodplain. If possible, channel(s) that are greatly larger than historical dimensions will be filled, while those that are close to historical dimensions will be reveted with trees and gravel/rock material (referred to as riffle augmentation/revetment) so they mimic a natural shape. Surface flow will be re-directed into stable existing remnant channels within the floodplain so that water and sediment can be transported from the meadow and from the upper watershed

in a natural manner. Planned restoration of the channels will improve water quality, stop degradation of adjacent open meadow habitat (90 acres), and provide wet conditions suitable for a variety of vertebrate (e.g. greater sandhill crane), invertebrate (e.g. cryptic tadpole shrimp), and plant species (long-bearded star-tulip).

Much assessment and design planning has already been conducted using partner funds in the southern meadow area. However, the project has grown in scope and nature and requires additional funds, and no assessment and design plan has yet been developed for channel work in the northern meadow. This project has $279,142 in secured or pending match from Shasta Resource Advisory Committee, Pacific Gas and Electric, Department of Conservation, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Partners for Fish and Wildlife, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, and private timber companies/land owners.

A Timber Harvest Plan will be developed for four landowners, and Cal Fire has agreed to allow the open meadow restoration plan to be included in this document so the landowners do not have to go through a separate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) permitting process (e.g. Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration). This approach is unique and novel, and has the potential to streamline permitting and compliance processes. It is also consistent with CEQA law in that the project is not segmented solely to meet the existing conflicting processes (i.e. THP and non-timber restoration planning). Finally, both the timber and water quality divisions with Department of Fish and Game and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) has agreed to this approach and are providing guidance on how to meet their permit requirements.

The eventual implementation cost associated with the proposed removal of lodgepole is expected to pay for itself through the sale of chip material.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

DETAILED PROJECT DELIVERABLES	**TIMELINE**
Project Management/Coordination	November 2012 – September 2014
Grazing Management Plan	November 2012 – May 2013
Forest Management Plan	November 2012 – October 2013
North Meadow Assessment and Design	November 2012 – May 2013
THP Amendment	September 2013 – May 2014
Performance Measure Monitoring	November 2012 – September 2014
Outreach	November 2012 – September 2014
Six-Month Progress Reports	April 30, 2013; October 31, 2013; April 30, 2014
Final Report	October 31, 2014
FINAL PAYMENT/FINAL PAYMENT REQUEST	**June 30, 2015**

PROJECT COSTS

PROJECT BUDGET CATEGORIES	TOTAL SNC FUNDING
Direct*	$49,000
Indirect**	$16,400
Administrative***	$9,600
GRAND TOTAL	**$75,000**

* Direct: Direct costs are expenses necessary to acquire, construct, or to adapt property to a new or different use, or to improve property including land, buildings and equipment. The property/expense must have a useful life longer than one year.

** Indirect: Expenses involve ongoing operations, repair or maintenance costs, regardless of whether the repair or maintenance may last more than one year.

*** Administrative: Expenses associated with the administration of a project and may not exceed 15 percent of the total SNC grant request for direct and indirect costs

PROJECT LETTERS SUPPORT/OPPOSITION

- Support
    - USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region
    - Shasta County Resource Advisory Committee
    - Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
    - Sierra Institute for Community and Environment

PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

There are four Performance Measures common to all grants. In addition, grantees are required to include between one and three project-specific measures. Performance Measures listed here represent those proposed by applicants and may be modified through further discussion with SNC staff.

- Percent of pre-project planning efforts resulting in project implementation
- Number of collaboratively developed plans and assessments