

## Tahoe Sierra IRWM Project Template

**Project Title:**

**Implementation Entity:**

**Contact Name:**

**Project Location:**

**Disadvantaged community?**

**Environmental Justice Issues?**

**Estimated Total Project Cost: \$**

**Funding and Sources: \$**

- Committed/Secured funding amounts and sources--\$
- Additional planned amount needed to complete project --\$

**Estimated Remaining Project Cost: \$**

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed** (What Objectives will this project address? This is where climate change/greenhouse gases, flooding, nonpoint source, land-use planning, etc should be spelled out.):

**Project Goals and Objectives:**

**Schedule and Readiness to Proceed:**

**Project Benefits (Including Cost/Benefit Analysis):**

- Who will benefit and why?
- Address qualitative and quantitative benefits.
- Are there watershed, human, obtaining information, wildlife, water quality, TMDL, or other benefits?

**Stakeholders:**

- regulatory agency, community participant, in-kind provider
- Local citizens – in-kind provider, community participant

**Larger Project to which this Project Contributes:**

**Description of Larger Project:**

- Describe the larger project listed above.

**Political Support:**

- Related formal MOU's, agreements, or TACs that are currently in place.

**Performance Measures:**

**Scientific Basis of Project:**

**Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan  
Restoration Projects - Ranked**

<b>Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan Restoration Projects - Ranked</b>													
<i>see ranking criteria agreed to via email 4/23/2010</i>													
<b>Agency/Org</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Cmmnty Benefit</b>	<b>Scientific Backing</b>	<b>Cost (Investment) / Benefit Analysis</b>	<b>Readiness to Proceed</b>	<b>Rlnvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan</b>	<b>Avail of Other Funds</b>	<b>Impact if Not Funded</b>	<b>Partners</b>	<b>Green Tech</b>	<b>Equity</b>	<b>Other items of integration</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Alpine Watershed Group	Floodplain Restoration at Markleeville Guard Stator	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	16
California Tahoe Conservancy	Ward Creek	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	1	n/a	n/a	17
California Tahoe Conservancy	Elks Club	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	10
California Tahoe Conservancy	Erie Circle	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	n/a	n/a	16
California Tahoe Conservancy	Fremont Overlook	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	15
California Tahoe Conservancy	Lower Blackwood Creek Restoration Project	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	22
California Tahoe Conservancy	Tahoe Pines	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	17
California Tahoe Conservancy	Upper Truckee Marsh	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	17
California Tahoe Conservancy	Upper Truckee River – Sunset Stables Restoration	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
California Tahoe Conservancy	Van Sickle	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	15
California Tahoe Conservancy	Elks Club Site Restoration/Recreation Access Project	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	15
California Tahoe Conservancy	Ward Creek Watershed Restoration Projec	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
California Trout	Meeks Creek Restorator	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	22
Friends of Squaw Creek	Lower Squaw Creek Restoration	2	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	18
North Tahoe Public Utility District	Kingswood Tank Removal and Stream Restorator	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	16
Placer County	Griff Creek SEZ Improvement Project	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	20
Placer County	Snow Creek SEZ Restoration Project	2	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	19
Placer County	Truckee River Bike Trail Extension Project; Squaw Valley to Truckee	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	12

**Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan  
Restoration Projects - Ranked**

Agency/Org	Project Title	Community Benefit	Scientific Backing	Cost (Investment) / Benefit Analysis	Readiness to Proceed	Relevance to Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan	Availability of Other Funds	Impact if Not Funded	Partners	Green Tech	Equity	Other items of integration	TOTAL
Sierra County	Little Truckee River Restoration & Bridge Replacement	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	22
Squaw Valley Public Service District	Olympic Valley Creek-Aquifer Interaction Study Phase II Data Analysis	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	15
Tahoe City Public Utility District	West Shore Bike Trail Extension and Improvements – Sugar Pine to Meeks Bay	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	12
Tahoe Resource Conservation District	Invasive Species	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	24
Tahoe Resource Conservation District	Tahoe Paradise Resort Improvement and Upper Truckee River Restoration Project	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	21
Town of Truckee	Trout Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	21
Town of Truckee	Truckee River Legacy Trail	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	14
Truckee River Watershed Council	Negro Canyon Restoration	2	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	21
Truckee River Watershed Council	Prosser Creek Restoration	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
Truckee River Watershed Council	TROA – Biological Resources Monitoring Program	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	20

# WATER SUB-COMMITTEE RANKING SHEET

Project Title	Agency	Agency Priority	Grant Amount	Equity	Disadv. Comm.	Community Benefit	Cost (Investment) Benefit Analysis	Shovel Ready	Rlvc to TS IRWMP	Other Funding	Partners	Green Tech	Total	Total w/o Equity	IRWM Ranked Priority
Dollar Cove Intake	NTPUD	No. 1	\$6,225,000		0	3	0	1	3	2	2	0	11		4
Brockway Vista/Secline Sewer Line and Pump Station Relocation Planning	NTPUD	No. 2	\$7,000,000		2	1	0	1	3	1	2	1	11		4
Fire Hydrants on Six Inch Lines	STPUD	No. 2	\$368,000		1	1	0	3	1	2	2	0	10		5
Grizzly Mountain Booster Station (	STPUD	No. 3	\$1,901,000		0	3	0	2	3	2	0	1	11		4
Solar panel installation on water infrastructure	STPUD	No. 5	\$180,000		2	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	12		3
Tank Coating	STPUD	No. 6	\$618,000		1	1	0	3	2	2	0	0	9		6
Waterline Replacements	STPUD	No. 1	\$12,500,000		1	3	0	2	3	2	1	0	12		3
Airport Well Arsenic Treatment	STPUD		\$1,901,000		0	2	0	2	3	2	0	0	9		6
Keller Tank Replacement	STPUD		\$800,000		0	2	0	2	3	2	0	0	9		6
Olympic Valley Creek-Aquifer Interaction Study Phase II Data Analysis	SVPSD	No. 1	\$300,000		0	2	0	3	3	2	2	0	12		3
Squaw Valley Alternative/Supplemental Water Supply Design and CEQA	SVPSD	No. 2	\$1,000,000		0	3	0	2	3	1	2	0	11		4
McKinney/Quail Secondary Water Source	TCPUD	No. 4	\$2,585,375		0	3	0	2	3	2	2	0	12		3
Water Supply Line Replacements	TCPUD	No. 3	\$2,884,125		0	3	0	2	3	2	2	0	12		3
Replacement of Bunker Water Tank	TCPUD	No. 2	\$2,173,500		1	4	0	2	3	2	2	0	14		2
Woodfords Community Improvement and Pipe Replacement Project	Washoe Tribe	No.1	\$1,500,000		2	4	0	2	3	1	2	1	15		1
Sierra Gardens Stormwater Harvest and BMP Demonstration	St. Joseph's Comm. Land Trust	No. 1	\$450,000		2	1	0	3	3	2	2	2	15		1
Water Conservation Program	TCPUD, NTPUD, STPUD, Basinwide		\$800,000		1	2	0	3	3	2	2	2	15		1

Equity		TBD following Ranking
Disadvantaged Community	State Determination	2=Yes, 1=Partial, 0=No
Community Benefit		1 Point for Each - Water Conservation, Water Supply/Reliability, Fire Protection, Consolidation
Cost Benefit Analysis	Determine Cost per person served. Cost/# Served. Include other cost/benefit analysis not captured e.g. energy saving	1 = Have done Cost/Benefit Analysis, 0 = No Cost/Benefit Analysis
Shovel Ready		3=Implement/Construct in 2011, 2=Implement/Construct in 2012/2013, 1=Implement in 2014 or after
Relevance to Plan		3=Meets 3 goals or strategies, 2=Meets 2 goals or strategies, 1=Meets 1 goal or strategy
Other Funds		2=25% match, 1=10% match, 0=no match
Partners		2=Formal partners/Regional Plan inclusion, 1=Informal partners, 0=no partners
Green Technology		2=Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems 1=Uses some forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, & some energy efficient systems 0= Uses nothing

Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan Stormwater Projects Ranked															
Organization and Project	Total Project Cost	Total Funds Requested From Prop 84	Points	Scientific Backing (National or local)	Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis (pollutants being addressed)	Readiness to Proceed	Rlvc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	Rlvc to State Water Plan, Other Plans	Other Funds	If Not Funded	Partners	Green Tech	Other items of integration to be noted in priority list	Geographical Area	Number of Projects Submitted
			3	Assessment AND equivalent proj	Targets defined & comparable to baseline	Certain Implement begins this year	Meets 3 goals or strategies	Yes, and also describes how the project is relevant.	25% + match	Safety, public health, impaired WB, Flood, or T&E risk	Formal partners (funding, letter of agreement, letter of intention, MOU, contract, etc.)	Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, hand crews, local sources for labor and/or materials	3 or more: DAC, FP, FC, Drought, Bi-State value, TROA, Fire Suppression, TMDL	no pts	Only one project submitted
			2	Assessment OR equivalent proj	Targets defined but not comparable to baseline	Good chance to implement this year, definitely implement next year	Meets 2 goals or strategies	Yes, but only lists.	10 to 25% match	Lose matching funds	Informal partners (letters of support, etc.)	uses some alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, small amount of hand crew work, some local materials and labor	2 items	One project in the geographic watershed.	Only two projects submitted
			1	No assessment or equivalent proj	No targets	Implementation is two or more years out	Meets 1 goals or strategies	No relevant plans listed	No match	Missed oppy	no partners	Uses nothing	1item	Two projects in the geographic watershed	Only three projects submitted
			0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Town of Truckee - Storm Water Management and Legacy Retrofit Drainage	\$28,655,500	\$20,139,000	28	3: Assessments cited with an equivalent project	2: Specific targets not defined, yet baseline monitoring has taken place.	3: Implementation can begin when funding becomes available.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan and well described.	2: Lists relevance with no description.	1: No match described.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	3: LID, bicycle lanes, native and adapted plants.	3: Historic, cultural, tourism, water quality	1: Only two projects in area.	3: Only one project submitted.
TRCD - Community Planning, Natural Resource Management and BMP Retrofit for the Lake Tahoe Region	\$9,000,000	\$450,000	28	2: Assessments cited, but no equivalent project identified.	3: Targets defined and comparable to a baseline.	2: Definitely can implement next year, while planning efforts are currently underway.	3: Meets at least 3 goals and relationship well described.	3: Lists and describes relevance.	3: Match described and greater than 25%.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	2: LID and native/adapted plants.	3: Fire Defensible Space, DAC, TMDL, Water Quality	0: Many projects in area.	3: Only one project submitted.
Town of Truckee - Water Quality Monitoring	\$833,794	\$623,000	28	3: Assessments cited and known equivalent projects (such as Truckee River monitoring efforts)	2: Assumed baseline data is collected, but quantified targets not listed.	3: Ongoing work and can implement this year.	3: Meets 4 goals/strategies and describes relvce.	3: Listed and described.	3: over 30% match assumed through town funds	1: Missed oppy.	3: Formal partners listed.	1: None mentioned.	3: TMDL, public education and recreation	1: Two projects in the area	2: Two projects submitted.
TRPA - BMP Retrofit	\$4,077,413	\$1,333,413	27	2: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - no equivalent projects noted or defined.	3: Baseline data is equal to current BMP implementation on private property - target of project objective is defined as a 20% increase over 5 year time frame with goal of doubling private property BMP implementation.	3: Implementation currently in progress, expected to continue/expand if funded by Prop 84.	3: good description of relevance of project components to Tahoe Sierra IRWM	3: Good description of State Water Plan and relevance to project objectives.	3: 67% matching funds is currently secured and committed to BMP Retrofit Program.	1: Missed opportunity to secure funding for continuation of project implementation.	3: Stakeholders mentioned, both formal and informal partnerships present.	2: Project potentially uses or researches LID techniques in development/implementation of BMPs and landscaping considerations.	2: DAC, TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	2: Two project submitted from TRPA
STPUD - BMP Implementation on District Owned Facilities	\$520,000	\$200,000	26	2: Assessment of facilities assumed, no equivalent project described	1: Mention of 57 sites to have BMPs implemented, but no further numerical targets related to pollutants addressed (ie sediment reduction).	3: Some planning documents are complete, project implementation currently underway... environmental documentation on hold?	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan.	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, minimal description	3: 61% matching funds available	2: Missed opportunity. (Does not state loss of matching funds???)	3: Formal partners listed. It is assumed that STPUD have an MOU w/ TRPA and CTC at a minium.	1: Nothing noted	2: DAC, TMDL	Many projects within geographic area - no points awarded	3: One project
CSLT - ALTahoe	\$7,750,000	\$3,256,000	26	3: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - equivalent projects known to have been implemented.	3: Baseline data is estimated pollutant loading however no specific quantities targets defined.	3: Implementation ready to occur once funding is provided.	3: Project components related back to many Tahoe Sierra IRWM objectives.	2: Lists, but does not relate relevance back to project objectives/implementation.	3: ~ 40% matching funds present - portion for planning and portion for construction - remaining funding requested geared towards construction.	1: Missed opportunity implement remainder of project components.	3: Stakeholders mentioned - assumed MOU between funding/regulatory agencies and City of SLT.	3: good description of utilization of recycled materials and local employees/contractors.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: Four project submitted from TRPA
Alpine Watershed Group: Water Quality Monitoring	\$300,000	\$240,000	25	3: Assessments completed and known equivalent projects (such as Truckee River monitoring efforts)	3: Targets for monitoring defined and a baseline targeted for establishment.	3: Ready to implement this year.	2: Meets more than 3 goals, but no description is included.	2: Two listed, but not described as to relevance.	2: 20% match	1: Missed oppy.	3: Formal partners established (MOU)	1: None mentioned.	2: TMDL, volunteers	1: Only two project in geographic watershed	2: Only two project submitted.
CalTrout - Bridge Removal and Replacement	\$1,863,030	\$252,155	25	2: Preliminary Assessment near completion, but no equivalent projects noted	1: Neither targets nor baseline data was provided regarding current flow conditions, expected channel length etc. mention of large amounts of USGS data available and that new gage would assist in monitoring flow data	2: Implementation dependent on securing match funding requested through Prop84	3: good description of relevance of project components to Tahoe Sierra IRWM	1: did not specifically describe or list relevance to state water plan	3: Majority of funding is already secured - 255, 000 requested for - \$1.8 million project	2: Stated that the majority of the funding is secured, but project is still on hold and waiting for Prop 84 funding.	3: Stakeholders mentioned, both formal and informal partnerships present.	1: Only green technology mentioned is potential recycling of bridge.	2: DAC, flood	2: One projects submitted within geographical area	3: One project submitted from CalTrout
CSLT - Bijou	\$13,200,000	\$2,000,000	25	3: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - equivalent projects known to have been implemented.	3: Appears baseline data is currently being collected - no specific quantities targets defined.	2: Implementation has potential to occur by 2011 depending on ability to secure funding.	3: Project components related back to many Tahoe Sierra IRWM objectives.	2: Lists, but does not relate relevance back to project objectives/implementation.	3: ~ 85% matching funds present - portion for planning and portion for construction - remaining funding requested geared towards construction.	1: Missed opportunity implement remainder of project components.	3: Stakeholders mentioned - assumed MOU between funding/regulatory agencies and City of SLT.	3: good description of utilization of recycled materials and local employees/contractors.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: Four project submitted from TRPA
CSLT - Sierra Tract	\$14,750,000	\$3,500,000	24	3: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - equivalent projects known to have been implemented.	2: Target defined through cost/benefit analysis stating reduction of fine sediments by ~ 43% - no baseline information provided .	2: Implementation of project components is broken up into 5 distinct phases - is ongoing, however unclear as to when implementation related to requested funding through Prop 84 would occur -assumed to begin once funding is secured.	3: Project components related back to many Tahoe Sierra IRWM objectives.	2: Lists, but does not relate relevance back to project objectives/implementation.	3: ~ 75% matching funds present - portion for planning and portion for construction - .	1: Missed opportunity for continuation of project implementation.	3: Stakeholders mentioned - assumed MOU between funding/regulatory agencies and City of SLT.	3: good description of utilization of recycled materials and local employees/contractors.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: Four project submitted from TRPA
Eldorado County - Boulder Mountain	\$1,199,326	\$647,000	24	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	3: Targets defined	1: Implementation 2012	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	3: Impaired WB, public health	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	2: LID techniques, recycled materials.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County
CTC: Upper Truckee River Reaches 1 and 2 SEZ and Wildlife Enhancement Project	\$3,000,000	\$2,500,000	23	3: Assessments completed, and equivalent projects assumed (ie. cold creek)	2: Targets defined but not comparable to a baseline.	1: Implementation possibly 2012.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan and well described.	3: Lists, identifies and describes NPS measures.	2: Assumed SNPLMA is match. Closer to 10%.	1: Not addressed	2: Partners not explicitly defined in terms of formal agreements, only as funders or permittees.	2: On-site materials used and hand crews.	3: Floodplain management and DAC area (CSLT), water quality, public use.	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects
NTPUD - Roads and Trails Erosion Control Implementation	\$650,000	\$500,000	23	2: Assessments completed.	2: Targets not well defined or quantified.	2: Can implement in 2011	2: Lists, but relationship is not well described	3: Lists and describes relevance.	1: No match noted	1: Missed oppy.	3: TAC members cited	1: Nothing noted	3: Habitat, recreation, water quality	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	3: Only one project submitted
Placer County - Lake Forest	\$16,367,129	\$500,000	22	2: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - no equivalent project noted.	2: Targets defined relative # of acres restored - no baseline data provided expected to be implemented through Prop 84.	2: Implementation is currently in progress - not sure exactly what components of project are expected to be implemented through Prop 84.	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components - though minimal description provided.	3: 25% matching funds noted, total project cost and remaining funds needed are confusing	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned	2: Flood control, TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County
TRPA - TIIMS Website	\$510,675	\$510,675	22	2: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - no equivalent projects noted or defined.	3: Baseline data is current information provided on TIIMS - Increase in information and services provided is target to achieve through Prop 84 funding source.	3: Implementation ready to occur once funding is provided.	3: Project components related back to 3 Tahoe Sierra IRWM objectives, however not described in great detail.	3: Good description of State Water Plan and relevance to project objectives.	1: No matching funds present.	1: Missed opportunity to secure funding for continuation of project implementation.	1: Stakeholders mentioned fall more into category of community participants, no formal partnerships defined.	1: none mentioned.	2: TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	2: Two project submitted from TRPA
CSLT - El Dorado Beach at Lakeview Commons Project	\$14,938,334	\$7,439,584	22	1: No assessment or equivalent project presented.	2: Targets defined, but not comparable to baseline.	3: Implementation has started.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan and well described.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: Other funds noted, but match not discussed.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Partners described and formal partners identified.	3: LEED design followed.	2: Water quality, recreation	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects
El Dorado - Lake Tahoe Blvd	\$2,296,865	\$1,500,000	22	3: TMDL information cited and assumed equivalent stormwater projects	3: Targets defined as percentages, and monitoring for baseline is noted as taking place prior to project initiation.	1: Implementation 2013	2: Meets goals, but no description of how they are relevant.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: No match described	3: Impaired WB, public health	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	2: LID techniques, recycled materials.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects

Organization and Project	Total Project Cost	Total Funds Requested From Prop 84	Points	Scientific Backing (National or local)	Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis (pollutants being addressed)	Readiness to Proceed	Rlvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	Rlvnc to State Water Plan, Other Plans	Other Funds	If Not Funded	Partners	Green Tech	Other items of integration to be noted in priority list	Geographical Area	Number of Projects Submitted	
				3	Assessment AND equivalent proj	Targets defined & comparable to baseline	Certain implement begins this year	Meets 3 goals or strategies	Yes, and also describes how the project is relevant.	25% + match	Safety, public health, impaired WB, Flood, or T&E risk	Formal partners (funding, letter of agreement, letter of intention, MOU, contract, etc.)	Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, hand crews, local sources for labor and/or materials	3 or more: DAC, FP, FC, Drought, Bi-State value, TRQA, Fire Suppression, TMDL	no pts	Only one project submitted
				2	Assessment OR equivalent proj	Targets defined but not comparable to baseline	Good chance to implement this year, definitely implement next year	Meets 2 goals or strategies	Yes, but only lists.	10 to 25% match	Lose matching funds	Informal partners (letters of support, etc.)	uses some alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, small amount of hand crew work, some local materials and labor	2 items	One project in the geographic watershed	Only two projects submitted
				1	No assessment or equivalent proj	No targets	Implementation is two or more years out	Meets 1 goals or strategies	No relevant plans listed	No match	Missed oppy	no partners	Uses nothing	1 item	Two projects in the geographic watershed	Only three projects submitted
				0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
El Dorado - Montgomery Est	\$6,255,119	\$2,007,953	22	3: TMDL information cited and assumed equivalent stormwater projects	3: Targets defined as percentages, and monitoring for baseline is noted as taking place prior to project initiation.	1: Implementation 2012	2: Meets goals, but no description of how they are relevant.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: No match described	3: Impaired WB, public health	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	2: LID techniques, recycled materials.		0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
El Dorado - Tahoe Hills Stormwater Management Project	\$1,350,000	\$1,025,000	22	3: TMDL information cited and assumed equivalent stormwater projects	3: Targets defined as percentages, and monitoring for baseline is noted as taking place prior to project initiation.	1: Implementation 2013	2: Meets goals, but no description of how they are relevant.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: No match described	3: Impaired WB, public health	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	2: LID techniques, recycled materials.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
El Dorado - South Upper Truckee Stormwater Management Project	\$2,217,109	\$150,000	22	3: TMDL information cited and assumed equivalent stormwater projects	3: Targets defined as percentages, and monitoring for baseline is noted as taking place prior to project initiation.	1: No information regarding timelines for the project.	2: Meets goals, but no description of how they are relevant.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: No match described	3: Impaired WB, public health	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	2: LID techniques, recycled materials.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
St. Joseph Community - Sierra Gardens Storm Water Harvest and BMP Demonstration Project	\$445,000	\$430,000	22	2: Equivalent projects by EPA are cited, although not attached to the project proposal.	2: Targets minimally defined.	2: 2011 final plans and 2012 implementation	2: Two strategies mentioned and minimally described in project, but does not list which strategies.	2: Fairly good description of how the project is relevant, but does not list which management measures they are.	1: Match is shown, but equal to about 3 percent of project.	1: Missed oppy.	2: Informal partners established.	3: Uses LID, alternative water collection/distribution, energy savings.		0: many projects in geo	3: One project submitted.	
Alpine Watershed Group: Floodplain Restoration at Markleeville Guard Station	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	21	2: Assessment is completed, but no equivalent project described	1: No numerical targets defined.	1: Does not appear to be a plan for implementation at this point.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	1: No match noted.	3: Flooding is a safety/ public health issue.	3: Formal partners listed. It is assumed that Alpine County and perhaps others have an MOU or similar with the watershed group.	1: Nothing noted	1: Floodplain management	1: Two project	2: Two project	
CSLT - Keller Canon Bijou Creek	\$6,500,000	\$5,500,000	21	3: Assessment assumed to have taken place through both extensive EIP process and through compilation of baseline data - equivalent projects known to have been implemented.	1: No quantities data provided either for baseline conditions or for identified targets.	1: Implementation has potential to occur by 2012.	3: Project components related back to many Tahoe Sierra IRWM objectives.	2: Lists, but does not relate relevance back to project objectives/implementation.	2: ~ 16% matching funds present - portion for planning and portion for construction -	1: Missed opportunity.	3: Stakeholders mentioned - assumed MOU between funding/regulatory agencies and City of SLT.	3: good description of utilization of recycled materials and local employees/contractors.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: Four project submitted from TRPA	
Placer County - Griff Creek	\$2,500,000	\$1,000,000	21	2: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - no equivalent project noted.	3: Targets defined relative to meeting community plans and TRPA thresholds, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline conditions of project specific area - full points awarded	1: Implementation dependent on securing additional funding for project implementation.	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components - though minimal description provided.	3: 25% matching funds noted.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned	1: DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County	
REMOVED: CTC - Upper Truckee River - Sunset Stables Restoration	\$9,045,000	\$2,300,000	21	3: Assessments and equivalent projects presented.	3: Targets defined and comparable to the baseline.	2: Implementation can likely begin in 2011.	3: Meets over 3 goals and well described.	0: None identified.	1: No match identified separate to committed sources.	1: Not addressed.	3: Formal partners included (upper truckee watershed group).	2: Hand crews	3: Cultural, Floodplain, water quality, public use.	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
Eldorado County Christmas Valley SWMP	\$3,700,000	\$1,400,000	21	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	2: Targets defined, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline considerations.	3: CEQA finished, plans done, implementation is ready to begin.	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	1: Mentions use of LID techniques, but does not note how LID will be incorporated into project implementation.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County	
CTC - Greenway Bike Trail	\$8,700,000	\$7,300,000	20	2: Equivalent projects are noted but are not described in detail relative to proposed project - realization that CTC has implemented many similar projects, so 2 points awarded	2: Numerical targets provided as to miles of expected trail to be implemented and vehicle miles to be reduced, but no baseline data provided.	1: Draft EIR/EIS expected in 2010, implementation has potential to begin in 2012	3: 3 goals mentioned, however no description of relevance provided.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	2: ~ 20% of funds secured for planning and design work related to project implementation - did not meet the 25%, so only 2 points awarded.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of increased bike lanes/access in Tahoe Basin.	3: Key stakeholders listed, mention of JPA formed to manage tax financing for trail maintenance.	3: Reduction of vehicle miles is noted and considered use of green technology - total project is geared towards green technology - full points awarded.	1: Project to take place within DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from CTC	
REMOVED: CTC - Tahoe Pines	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	20	3: Assessments completed, equivalent projects assumed (EIP stormwater projects).	2: Targets defined but not comparable to a baseline.	1: Implementation possibly 2012.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan and well described.	3: NPS Measures are identified and relevance described.	1: No match noted.	1: Not addressed	3: Formal partners as part of technical advisory committees.	2: On-site materials including fill/veg, hand crews.	1: Floodplain management	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
REMOVED: CTC - Ward Creek	\$2,000,000	\$312,000	20	3: Assessments completed, and equivalent projects assumed (ie. cold creek)	1: No specific targets defined.	3: Implementation has started.	2: Listed but no description as to relevance.	2: Only lists.	1: Other funds noted, but match not discussed.	2: Missed opportunity. Touches on how this watershed is high priority in the TMDL.	2: Partners identified, but no formal agreements etc. mentioned.	1: Nothing mentioned.	3: Water quality, flood, habitat.	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
Placer County - Tahoe City	\$4,000,000	\$950,000	19	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - no equivalent project noted, but know that equivalent projects have been implemented by Placer County - full points awarded.	1: No quantities targets defined either for project objectives or for current baseline conditions.	1: Implementation is currently in progress - not sure exactly what components of project are expected to be implemented through Prop 84.	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components - though minimal description provided.	2: 17.5% matching funds noted.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned	1: TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County	
Eldorado County - Chiapa SWMP	\$1,600,000	\$640,000	19	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	2: Targets defined, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline considerations.	0: Implementation timeframe not noted	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	1: Mentions use of LID techniques, but does not note how LID will be incorporated into project implementation.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County	
Eldorado County - Country Club SWMP	\$6,000,000	\$2,500,000	19	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	2: Targets defined, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline considerations.	0: Implementation timeframe not noted	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	1: Mentions use of LID techniques, but does not note how LID will be incorporated into project implementation.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County	
Eldorado County - Echo View SWMP	\$1,700,000	\$700,000	19	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	2: Targets defined, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline considerations.	0: Implementation timeframe not noted	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	1: Mentions use of LID techniques, but does not note how LID will be incorporated into project implementation.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County	
Eldorado County - Golden Bear SWMP	\$3,000,000	\$1,200,000	19	3: Assessment assumed to have been conducted based on comprehensive EIP study - equivalent projects known to have taken place, but not noted in proposal - full points awarded	2: Targets defined, but no definition or numbers are noted related to baseline considerations.	0: Implementation timeframe not noted	3: States relevance to many IRWMP objectives	3: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, and related back to project components.	1: None noted, though not clear based on total project cost if project will be implemented in phases or if there is actually match dollars available to cover remainder of project cost beyond what is requested.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and El Dorado County.	1: Mentions use of LID techniques, but does not note how LID will be incorporated into project implementation.	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from El Dorado County	
REMOVED: CTC - Upper Tru	\$22,850,000	\$20,000,000	19	3: Assessments completed, and equivalent projects assumed (ie. cold creek)	2: Targets defined but not comparable to a baseline.	1: Implementation possibly 2012.	3: Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan and well described.	1: NPS measures not identified	1: No match noted.	1: Not addressed	3: Formal partners as part of technical advisory committees.	1: Nothing mentioned.	3: Floodplain management and DAC area (CSLT), water quality, public use.	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
REMOVED: CTC - Van Sickle	\$6,550,000	\$2,150,000	19	1: No assessments or equivalent projects mentioned.	2: Targets defined, not comparable to baseline.	3: Implementation has started.	2: Meets over 3 goals, but does not describe how they are relevant.	3: Lists, and also describes how the project is relevant.	1: Other funds noted, but match not discussed.	1: Missed oppy.	2: Partners identified, but no formal agreements etc. mentioned.	1: Nothing mentioned.	3: Cultural, water quality, recreation	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	

