

Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan  
 Restoration Projects - Ranked

Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan Restoration Projects - Ranked														
ID No.	Agency/Org	Project Title	Cmmnty Benefit	Scientific Backing	Cost (Investment) / Benefit Analysis	Readiness to Proceed	Rlnvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan	Avail of Other Funds	Impact if Not Funded	Partners	Green Tech	Equity	Other items of integration	TOTAL
R1	Alpine Watershed Group	Floodplain Restoration at Markleeville Guard Station	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	16
R2	California Tahoe Conservancy	Ward Creek	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	1	n/a	n/a	17
R3	California Tahoe Conservancy	Elks Club	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	10
R4	California Tahoe Conservancy	Erie Circle	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	n/a	n/a	16
R5	California Tahoe Conservancy	Fremont Overlook	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	15
R6	California Tahoe Conservancy	Lower Blackwood Creek Restoration Project	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	22
R7	California Tahoe Conservancy	Tahoe Pines	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	17
R8	California Tahoe Conservancy	Upper Truckee Marsh	2	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	17
R9	California Tahoe Conservancy	Upper Truckee River – Sunset Stables Restoration	2	3	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
R10	California Tahoe Conservancy	Van Sickle	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	15
R11	California Tahoe Conservancy	Elks Club Site Restoration/Recreation Access Project	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	15
R12	California Tahoe Conservancy	Ward Creek Watershed Restoration Project	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
R13	California Trout	Meeks Creek Restoration	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	22
R14	Friends of Squaw Creek	Lower Squaw Creek Restoration	2	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	18
R15	North Tahoe Public Utility District	Kingswood Tank Removal and Stream Restoration	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	1	n/a	n/a	16
R16	Placer County	Griff Creek SEZ Improvement Project	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	20
R17	Placer County	Snow Creek SEZ Restoration Project	2	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	n/a	n/a	19
R18	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
R19	Sierra County	Little Truckee River Restoration & Bridge Replacement	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	22
R20	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 Sierra IRWM Plan  
Restoration Projects - Ranked**

ID No.	Agency/Org	Project Title	Cmmnty Benefit	Scientific Backing	Cost (Investment) / Benefit Analysis	Readiness to Proceed	Rlnvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan	Avail of Other Funds	Impact if Not Funded	Partners	Green Tech	Equity	Other items of integrati on	TOTAL
R21	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
R22	Tahoe Resource Conservation District	Invasive Species	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	24
R23	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
R24	Town of Truckee	Trout Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	21
R25	Town of Truckee	Truckee River Legacy Trail	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	14
R26	Truckee River Watershed Council	Negro Canyon Restoration	2	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	21
R27	Truckee River Watershed Council	Prosser Creek Restoration	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	19
R28	Truckee River Watershed Council	TROA – Biological Resources Monitoring Program	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	n/a	n/a	20

Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan Stormwater Projects Ranked																	
Organization and Project	ID No.	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	Rlinc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	Rlinc 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, TRCA, 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
					Points												
Town of Truckee - Storm Water Management and Legacy Retrofit Drainage	SW1	\$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	SW2	\$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 relationships 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	SW3	\$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	SW4	\$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	SW5	\$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 (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 minimum.	1: Nothing noted	2: DAC, TMDL	Many projects within geographic area - no points awarded	3: One project	
CSLT - ALTahoe	SW6	\$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	SW7	\$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	SW8	\$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	SW9	\$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	SW10	\$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 - remaining funding requested geared towards 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	SW11	\$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	SW12	\$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 cultural resource protection and DAC area (CSLT), water quality, public use.	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
NTPUD - Roads and Trails Erosion Control Implementation	SW13	\$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	SW14	\$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	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 through 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	SW15	\$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	SW16	\$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	SW17	\$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	
El Dorado - Montgomery Estates	SW18	\$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.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
El Dorado - Tahoe Hills Stormwater Management Project	SW19	\$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	SW20	\$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	

Organization and Project	ID No.	Total Project Cost	Total Funds Requested From Prop 84		Scientific Backing (National or local)	Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis (pollutants being addressed)	Readiness to Proceed	Rivnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	Rivnc 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	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			
Points																	
St. Joseph Community - Sierra Gardens Storm Water Harvest and BMP Demonstration Project	SW21	\$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.	2: DAC, TMDL	0: many projects in geographic area.	3: One project submitted.	
Alpine Watershed Group: Floodplain Restoration at Markleville Guard Station	SW22	\$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	SW23	\$6,500,000	\$5,500,000	21	3: Assessment assumed to have taken place through 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 IRWMP 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	SW24	\$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	SW25	\$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	SW26	\$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	SW27	\$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	SW28	\$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	SW29	\$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	SW30	\$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	SW31	\$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	SW32	\$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	SW33	\$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	SW34	\$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 Truckee Marsh	SW35	\$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	SW36	\$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	
El Dorado - Sawmill Road Stormwater Management Project	SW37	\$3,300,000	\$1,300,000	19	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	1: Missed oppy.	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	1: None mentioned.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
El Dorado - Tahoe Cedars-Westlake Stormwater Management Project	SW38	\$2,200,000	\$900,000	19	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	1: Missed oppy.	3: Partners described and formal relationships described.	1: None mentioned.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects	
CTC - Tahoe City Road	SW39	\$34,900	\$14,216	18	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: Defined targets will be based on Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity report, but not on specific project - will be difficult to compare to "baseline data" - numerical targets of road restoration and improvements	2: States expected implementation 2010.	1: 1 goals mentioned, however no description of relevance provided.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	3: 40% funding match stated, includes in-kind services of \$7100.	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of project implementation.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between CTC and Placer County.	NA	1: TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from CTC	
REMOVE: CTC - Erie Circle	SW40	\$400,000 - \$600,000	\$350,000 - \$550,000	18	1: Equivalent projects are noted but are not described in detail relative to proposed project	1: Mentions capture of 50 year event storm - otherwise no numerical targets defined - no baseline data provided.	2: Project implementation is noted to potentially begin 2010 or 2011, however funding not secured for project implementation??	3: 3 goals mentioned, however no description of relevance provided.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	2: - 10% of funds secured for planning and design work related to project implementation	3: Takes into account erosion control and potential to reduce property damage on private properties located below project site	1: No formal partners listed, regulatory agencies as stakeholders - project to take place on CTC lands with CTC management.	1: Nothing noted	2: Floodplain management - TMDL standards	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from CTC	
Placer County - WEST SUNNYSIDE ECP	SW41	\$3,449,644	\$2,000,000	18	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	2: Some percentage targets defined, no baseline.	3: Ready to implement	2: 2 goals mentioned, but no description	1: None mentioned	1: No match mentioned.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects in area.	

Organization and Project	ID No.	Total Project Cost	Total Funds Requested From Prop 84		Scientific Backing (National or local)	Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis (pollutants being addressed)	Readiness to Proceed	Rivnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	Rivnc 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		1 item	Two projects in the geographic watershed	Only three projects submitted
				0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Points																	
Placer County - Kings Beach	SW42	\$30,000,000	\$15,000,000	17	3: Assessment assumed through EIP process - equivalent projects known to exist, but not stated in proposal - full points awarded.	2: Target minimally defined through expected SEZ restoration in acres - no baseline conditions provided.	1: Implementation is ongoing for some aspects of project, entire project construction expected to begin some years out??	0: says yes, but none defined - no points awarded	2: listed, but not described with relevance to project implementation.	2: States - 16% secured in matching funds.	1: Missed opportunity for project implementation - project will likely need to be broken down into separate phases to be able to secure funding through Prop 84.	3: Stakeholders mentioned, assumed MOU & other formal agreements - full points awarded.	1: None mentioned	2: TMDL, DAC	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County	
CTC - Regional Storm Water Monitoring (RSWMP)	SW43	\$1,000,000 (States 1 million per year)	\$245,000	16	3: Intensive project to complete monitoring efforts within Tahoe Basin - LTIMP has been developed in past and could be considered equivalent project - assessment currently in progress - assessment currently in progress	2: Baseline data has been collected by RSWAMP since 2007 and prior through many agencies in basin, however full suite of monitoring components/parameters is not complete	2: States expected implementation of "Phase 3" by mid 2010 - where is project funding coming from for implementation???	1: 1 goals mentioned, however no description of relevance provided.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	1: Funding provided for development of initial protocol @ 245,000 however project is noted at 1 million per year - expectation of submission application for min of 3 years	1: Potentially missed opportunity for funding of comprehensive monitoring program.	3: Key stakeholders listed, formation of RSWAMP committee formed.	NA	1: TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from CTC	
Placer County - Homewood	SW44	\$13,910,000	\$10,000,000	15	3: Assessment assumed through EIP process - equivalent projects known to exist, but not stated in proposal - full points awarded.	1: No quantities targets defined either for project objectives or for current baseline conditions.	1: Expected to be implemented in 2011 or 2012	2: States relevance to two IRWMP objectives	0: none noted - no points awarded.	2: 7% match noted for planning - 2 points awarded.	1: Missed opportunity for project implementation.	3: Stakeholders mentioned, assumed MOU & other formal agreements - full points awarded.	1: None mentioned	1: TMDL	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County	
Placer County - Tamarack Erosion Control Project	SW45	\$3,000,000	\$2,600,000	15	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 not until 2015 earliest.	2: 2 goals mentioned, but no description	1: None mentioned	1: No match mentioned.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned.	1: TMDL	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects submitted	
Placer County - Truckee River Bike Trail Extension Project; Squaw Valley to Truckee	SW46	\$9,000,000	\$2,000,000	15	1: No assessments or equivalent project mentioned.	1: No quantities targets defined either for project objectives or for current baseline conditions.	1: Implementation not until 2016 earliest.	2: 5 goals mentioned, but no description	1: None mentioned	1: No match mentioned.	1: Missed oppy.	3: Key stakeholders listed, assumed MOU between stakeholders (funders) and Placer County.	1: None mentioned.	3: Bike transport, air quality, stormwater, wetlands	0: Many projects in area	0: Many projects submitted	
REMOVED: CTC - Elks Club	SW47	\$250,000	\$250,000	10	1: Equivalent projects are noted but are not described in detail relative to proposed project	1: No numerical targets defined. Qualitative only at this point - mentions benefits of floodplain restoration & wetland habitat	1: Plan for potential implementation and restoration activities is noted at 3-5 years out.	1: No mention of relevance of goals to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP.	2: Nonpoint Source Management Measures are identified, but no description.	1: No match noted. - Proposed project funds are for planning & design only (Would this even be applicable for implementation grant funds??)	NA	1: No formal partners listed, only potential stakeholders - project to take place on CTC lands with CTC management.	1: Nothing noted	1: Floodplain management	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from CTC	
Placer County - Donner Summit	SW48	\$500,000	\$50,000	8	2: Assessment assumed to have been conducted due to timeframe of expected project implementation, no equivalent project noted.	1: No quantities targets defined either for project objectives or for current baseline conditions.	0: States project completion expected by mid 2012 unclear what might be funded or what funds are requested through prop 84 - no points awarded.	2: States relevance to two IRWMP objectives	1: Nonpoint Source Management Measures not specifically identified or defined.	0: Unclear definition of total project cost (stated at 500,000) and remaining project cost (stated at 400,000) with funds secured (stated at 500,000) - no points awarded.	0: Unclear - no points awarded.	1: Notes funding agency only, mentions no formal agreements are known, though would assume established contract between funding agency and Placer County.	1: None mentioned	0: Many projects submitted within geographical area	0: six projects submitted from Placer County		
Placer County - Brockway WQIP	SW49	?	\$1,300,000	0	no template provided												
CTC - Freemont Overlook	SW50	\$200,000	Full funding anticipated - no funding requested through submitted proposal	NA	Comments - Project is noted as being entirely funded, not sure why a template has been provided to IRWM team if project funding has already been secured.												

# WATER PROJECTS RANKING

Project Title	ID No.	Agency	Agency Priority	Grant Amount	Equity	Disadv. Comm.	Community Benefit	Cost (Investment) Benefit Analysis	Shovel Ready	Rlnc to TS IRWMP	Other Funding	Partners	Green Tech	Total	Total w/o Equity	IRWM Ranked Priority
Dollar Cove Intake	W1	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	W2	NTPUD	No. 2	\$7,000,000		2	1	0	1	3	1	2	1	11		4
Fire Hydrants on Six Inch Lines	W3	STPUD	No. 2	\$368,000		1	1	0	3	1	2	2	0	10		5
Grizzly Mountain Booster Station (	W4	STPUD	No. 3	\$1,901,000		0	3	0	2	3	2	0	1	11		4
Solar panel installation on water infrastructure	W5	STPUD	No. 5	\$180,000		2	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	12		3
Tank Coating	W6	STPUD	No. 6	\$618,000		1	1	0	3	2	2	0	0	9		6
Waterline Replacements	W7	STPUD	No. 1	\$12,500,000		1	3	0	2	3	2	1	0	12		3
Airport Well Arsenic Treatment	W8	STPUD		\$1,901,000		0	2	0	2	3	2	0	0	9		6
Keller Tank Replacement	W9	STPUD		\$800,000		0	2	0	2	3	2	0	0	9		6
Olympic Valley Creek-Aquifer Interaction Study Phase II Data Analysis	W10	SVPSD	No. 1	\$300,000		0	2	0	3	3	2	2	0	12		3
Squaw Valley Alternative/Supplemental Water Supply Design and CEQA	W11	SVPSD	No. 2	\$1,000,000		0	3	0	2	3	1	2	0	11		4
McKinney/Quail Secondary Water Source	W12	TCPUD	No. 4	\$2,585,375		0	3	0	2	3	2	2	0	12		3
Water Supply Line Replacements	W13	TCPUD	No. 3	\$2,884,125		0	3	0	2	3	2	2	0	12		3
Replacement of Bunker Water Tank	W14	TCPUD	No. 2	\$2,173,500		1	4	0	2	3	2	2	0	14		2
Woodfords Community Improvement and Pipe Replacement Project	W15	Washoe Tribe	No.1	\$1,500,000		2	4	0	2	3	1	2	1	15		1
Sierra Gardens Stormwater Harvest and BMP Demonstration	W16	St. Joseph's Comm. Land Trust	No. 1	\$450,000		2	1	0	3	3	2	2	2	15		1
Water Conservation Program	W17	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	