

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP

Attachment #1

Authorization and Eligibility Requirements

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP

Attachment 1: Authorization and Eligibility Requirements

Authorizing Documentation

South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) is acting as the authorized lead agency for the Tahoe Sierra Proposition 84 IRWMP Implementation grand application. Included in this Attachment is an original signed resolution adopted by the STPUD Board of Supervisors.

Eligible Applicant Documentation

The South Tahoe Public Utility District is a publicly-held corporation authorized to operate pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of the "Public Utility District Act", as amended, (Act 6391 of Deering's General Laws) in the State of California. It has the legal authority under this provision to enter into any funding contracts with the State of California.

As lead agency, STPUD would hold an Intergovernmental Agreement with each subcontracting agency that is a legally binding document entered into and adopted by the governing entity of each agency. The Intergovernmental Agreement describes the programmatic and fiscal responsibilities of each partner and the consequences of failure to meet them.

GWMP Compliance

Project 6 from the project list below, Squaw Valley Public Service District Olympic Valley Aquifer Study, has the potential for future impacts on groundwater.

The Olympic Valley Creek/Aquifer Interaction Project was initiated in response to the State Water Resources Control Board's Resolution No. 2007-0008, which resolved to direct the Lahontan Water Board to continue to support the efforts of entities pumping groundwater as well as other stakeholders in Olympic Valley to: (1) minimize effects on the creek, (2) develop a groundwater management plan that recognizes potential effects of pumping on the creek and seeks to minimize or eliminate adverse effects on Squaw Creek, and (3) conduct a study of potential interaction between groundwater pumping and flows in Squaw Creek.

The proposed project will quantify the impact of groundwater pumping on flows in Squaw Creek, and increases the amount of water that could be stored in local aquifers by developing and implementing different creek and/or pumping management strategies. It advances water supply reliability, promotes groundwater storage, promotes fisheries restoration and protection, and addresses impacts from anticipated climate change.

The final product will be a document that implements objectives of both the Tahoe Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and the Olympic Valley Groundwater Management Plan. Pumping and stream management guidelines for different climate and hydrologic conditions will be developed with the overall goal of maximizing aquifer storage and minimizing stream impacts.

The project being instrumental in implementing portions of the IRWM and Groundwater Management Plan is also consistent with the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region, North and South Basins.

The Squaw Valley Public Service District has prepared and implemented a GWMP that is in compliance with CWC §10753.7 and is included with this attachment for review.

Compliance with CWC83002.(b) (3) (B)

The Tahoe Sierra IRWM Plan was adopted prior to September 30, 2008 and will not need to be submitted for this application.

Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan

The suite of 10 projects that have been proposed in this application were added to the Tahoe Sierra IRWMP (adopted 2007) in accordance with the procedures of the plan.

List of projects and consistency with goals/objectives of TS IRWMP:

1. Tahoe Resource Conservation District Community Watershed Planning

Environmental Improvement Plan Best Management Practices retrofit:

Water Quality

- WQ1 Develop TMDL standards.
- WQ2 Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies.
- WQ3 Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff.
- WQ5 Restore degraded streams and wetlands to re-establish natural water filtering processes.
- WQ6 Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies.

Water Supply

- WS3 Implement and promote water conservation measures and practices.

Ecosystem Restoration

- ER2 Restore wetlands and natural biogeochemical cycles.
- ER3 Educate public about ecosystem services provided by healthy wetlands and SEZs.
- ER4 Manage forest health and wildfire risks.
- ER5 Minimize disturbance caused by urban development.

2. Town of Truckee Water Quality Monitoring

- WQ2. Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies. By identifying high priority locations, source, and constituent, improvements or changes can be installed appropriately to reduce the pollutant of concern.
- o WQ3. Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff. A TMDL was recently adopted for the Truckee River. The information obtained would provide information to meet TMDL goals.
- o WQ6. Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies. Information would be made public.
- o IWM1. Ensure sound planning that is based on watershed science. The data obtained from the monitoring would be used to evaluate existing guidelines and standards to ensure future projects reduce pollutants more effectively and efficiently.
- o IWM2. Encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within a watershed. Development of the TRWQMP included collaboration as well as the use of existing data, stations, and experience.
- o IWM3. Form partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information. The Town and Placer have partnered in the creation of the TRWQMP and have started implementation and sharing of resources for outreach and education for both the TRWQMP and SWMP.

3. Sierra County Little Truckee River Bridge Replacement

Water Quality

- o WQ2 Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies.
Bridge replacement will remove main constriction on this section of the river. Will end the scouring presently caused by the constriction.
- o WQ3 Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff.
Removing the constriction and allowing floodwaters to pass without serious constriction should reduce sedimentation.
- o WQ5 Restore degraded streams and wetlands to re-establish natural water filtering processes.
The purpose and objective of the project is to aid the restoration of a severely degraded river and aid in the development of meadows to re-establish natural processes.
- o WQ6 Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies.
Efforts are being made to increase the public awareness of the restoration project going on in the Little Truckee River watershed. Volunteers are being used in the overall project as are middle and high school students.

Water Supply

- WS1 Provide adequate water supply for a 20-year management window.
The meadow restoration portion of the overall project will aid in providing water supply over a longer period of time annually.

Ground Water

- GWM2 Protect groundwater quality.
Removing the constriction on the river and allowing the downstream development of meadows now being scoured out should aid infiltration of surface water and ground water recharge in the higher areas of the Truckee River system.

Ecosystem Restoration

- ER1 Enhance and restore degraded stream environment zones (SEZs) to support healthy and viable native fish populations.
The Little Truckee River restoration project is directed at restoring severely degraded SEZs and the secondary principal objective of the project is to reintroduce and support a self-sustaining population of Lahontan Cutthroat trout. Removing the constricting bridge is one of the main efforts to restore the stream environment downstream that is severely degraded.
- ER2 Restore wetlands and natural biogeochemical cycles.
The LTR project is specifically aimed at these goals as is the bridge replacement part of the overall project.
- ER3 Educate public about ecosystem services provided by healthy wetlands and SEZs.
The project implementation entities are including the public, particularly middle and high school students, in this endeavor and provide education on-site with hands-on tasks.
- ER5 Minimize disturbance caused by urban development.
Much is being done in the Little Truckee River watershed to limit the urban development of the watershed.

Integrated Watershed Management

- IWM1 Ensure sound planning that is based on watershed science.
Presently Feather River Chapter and Sagebrush Chapter of Trout Unlimited are funding watershed assessments of the headwaters of the LTR and its tributaries in an effort to develop the data necessary to move on to the proper mitigation tasks.
- IWM2 Encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within a watershed.
Approximately ten different federal, state, local agencies and seven conservation groups form the Little Truckee River working group carrying out the effort to restore this watershed and, perhaps reintroduce the native trout. There are three principal proponents of the immediate project--federal and local government and a local grassroots conservation organization.

- IWM3 Form partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information.
The Little Truckee River working group is a partnership spanning the range from the large federal agencies to the local governmental organizations and the, even smaller, local grassroots conservation groups.

4. Truckee River Watershed Council Negro Canyon Restoration

- Protecting water quality
- Restoring ecosystems
- Integrating watershed management

Project Goals and Objectives:

- Decrease flood flows through Negro Canyon (to receive water of Donner Lake)
- Improve water quality through decreased erosion/sedimentation
- Increase riparian and wetland habitat through re-alignment of the creek channel

Project Benefits:

- Nonpoint source pollution: sedimentation/erosion
- Historic land-use: Addresses 100-year history of trails, roads, and stream re-alignments in the canyon
- Climate change: increased health and resiliency of stream means it can better adapt to Climate Change and the longer it can support the fishery
- Watershed benefits: radically decreases sediment and peak flood flows to Donner Lake and through downstream residential neighborhoods
- Human benefits: reduces risk of property damage in downstream residential neighborhoods
- Water quality/Truckee River TMDL benefits

5. Regional Water Conservation Program (Four urban water suppliers: South Tahoe Public Utility District; Tahoe City Public Utility District; North Tahoe Public Utility District and Truckee Donner Public Utility District)

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed:

- Water Supply Objectives – WS1 (Provide water supply for a 20 year management window), WS3 (Implement and promote water conservation measures and practices)
- Groundwater Management Objectives – GWM1 (create groundwater supply), GWM2 (protect groundwater quality)
- Ecosystem Restoration Objectives – ER5 (minimize disturbance caused by urban development)
- Integrated Watershed Management Objectives – IWM2 (encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions in the watershed), IWM3 (Form

partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information.)

Project Goals:

- Continue the success of the water conservation program through rebates, outreach, and education.

Project Objectives:

- Reduce water consumption by implementing a water savings appliance program, a water upon request program for local restaurants, a turf buy-back program, and community outreach through events and schools. This program will assist in meeting the state mandate that individual water use be reduced by 20%.

6. Squaw Valley Public Service District Olympic Valley Aquifer Study

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed:

- Protect and improve water quality in Squaw Creek.
- Protect the community water supply by understanding the relationship between groundwater pumping and stream flow.
- Manage groundwater for sustainable yield in the Olympic Valley Groundwater Basin.
- Contribute to ecosystem restoration; Squaw Creek Stream Restoration.

Project Goals: The goals of the Study are to define relationships between pumping of groundwater and the flows in Squaw Creek. It is believed the manmade trapezoidal channel in Squaw Creek drains shallow groundwater from the well field. It is also believed that pumping of the wells may impact flows in the creek. This project will quantify the impacts of each of these theories. Once this understanding is developed, the water resource in Olympic Valley may be managed to serve the community and improve the environmental quality of Olympic Valley and the Truckee River Watershed.

Project Objectives: Specific Objectives of Phase II of the Study include:

- Quantify the impact of pumping municipal wells on Squaw Creek
- Quantify the amount of water be drained from the well field by the trapezoidal channel in a Squaw Creek
- Integrate with Phase I of Study.
- Integrate with Squaw Creek restoration being undertaken by Friends of Squaw Creek and Truckee River Watershed Counsel.
- Developing water level data in the meadow that show seasonal fluctuations and responses to recharge and pumping stresses.
- Develop data that can be shared with other Stakeholders.

7. City of South Lake Tahoe Bijou Environmental Improvement Project

Water Quality

- WQ2 Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies
 - The Project will treat storm water runoff discharged at the Bijou Creek outfall to Lake Tahoe. As noted above, the Bijou Creek outfall is a high priority outfall for treatment as identified by the regulatory agencies.
- WQ3 Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff.
 - The Project will treat storm water runoff discharged at the Bijou Creek outfall to Lake Tahoe.
- WQ5 Restore degraded streams and wetlands to re-establish natural water filtering processes.
 - The Project will increase SEZ acreage to provide additional capacity for storm water treatment.
- WQ6 Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies.
 - Through public outreach associated with the Project, there will be increased public awareness of water quality issues in the Lake Tahoe basin.

Ground Water

- GWM1 Create reliable groundwater supply.
 - Project implementation will include beneficial use of storm water for infiltration and recharge of groundwater.
- GWM2 Protect groundwater quality.
 - Pre-project monitoring is being conducted to establish baseline groundwater conditions in the project area and to confirm that Project implementation will not negatively affect groundwater quality.

Ecosystem Restoration

- ER1 Enhance and restore degraded stream environment zones (SEZs) to support healthy and viable native fish populations.
 - The Project will rewet existing SEZ in the Project area through spreading and infiltration of storm water.
- ER3 Educate public about ecosystem services provided by healthy wetlands and SEZs.
 - Through public outreach associated with the Project, there will be increased public awareness of SEZ restoration issues.
- ER5 Minimize disturbance caused by urban development.
 - Through public outreach associated with the Project, there will be increased public awareness of SEZ restoration issues.

Integrated Watershed Management

- IWM1 Ensure sound planning that is based on watershed science.

- The project proposes to treat a high priority pollutant load watershed, as determined through Lake Tahoe TMDL research.
- IWM2 Encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within a watershed.
 - The Project proposes a regional treatment solution for comingled storm water runoff from City, State, and private property; it provides an example of a multi-jurisdictional collaborative solution to a complex storm water watershed issue.
- IWM3 Form partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information.
 - The Project encourages the pooling of resources and funding (both public and private) to solve a complex multi-jurisdictional watershed issue.

8. El Dorado County Montgomery Estates Environmental Improvement Project

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed:

WQ2 Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies.

WQ3 Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff.

WQ6 Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies.

WS3 Implement and promote water conservation measures and practices.

GWM2 Protect groundwater quality.

ER1 Enhance and restore SEZ's

ER3 Educate Public about ecosystem

ER5 Minimize disturbance caused by urban development.

IWM1 Ensure sound planning that is based on watershed science.

IWM2 Encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within a watershed.

IWM3 Form partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information.

Project Goals:

- Remove/reduce 12%, or to the maximum extent practicable, of the fine sediment originating from the Urban area within the County Right of Way prior to reaching Lake Tahoe or any of its tributaries.
- Remove/reduce 25%, or to the maximum extent practicable, of the coarse sediment originating from the Urban area within the County Right of Way prior to reaching Lake Tahoe or any of its tributaries.
- Reduce the storm water runoff volume from the 25-year, 1-hour storm event within County Right of Way by 12%, or to the maximum extent practicable, of the existing site conditions prior to reaching Lake Tahoe or any of its tributaries

9. Placer County Griff Creek Stream Environment Zone Improvement

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed:

- WQ2 (Reduce nutrient and sediment loads to receiving water bodies);

- WQ3 (Meet nutrient and sediment standards for tributary streams and stormwater runoff);
- WQ5 (Restore degraded streams and wetlands to re-establish water filtering processes);
- WQ6 (Increase public awareness of regional water quality issues and their role in improving the quality of local water bodies);
- ER1 (Enhance and restore degraded stream environmental zones (SEZs) to support healthy and viable native fish populations);
- ER2 (Restore wetlands and natural biogeochemical cycles);
- ER3 (Educate public about ecosystem services provided by healthy wetlands and SEZs);
- ER5 (Minimize disturbance caused by urban development);
- IWM1 (Ensure sound planning that is based on watershed science);
- IWM2 (Encourage collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within a watershed); and
- IWM3 (Form partnerships to share resources, take advantage of cost sharing opportunities, and exchange information).

Project Goals:

- Improve water quality from storm water runoff of the project area entering Lake Tahoe;
- Improve SEZ Function within Griff Creek watershed;
- Improve fisheries habitat and passage;
- Prevent further stream degradation.

Project Objectives:

Restore approximately 1.75 acres of SEZ which contributes to the Kings Beach Community Plan SEZ Restoration requirement for Griff Creek of 2 acres. This also contributes towards Tahoe Regional Planning Association's (TRPA's) goal of restoration of 25% of disturbed SEZ in the Tahoe Basin within the twenty year life of the region.

10. Tahoe City Public Utility District Replacement of Bunker Water Tank

Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Objectives Addressed:

Water Quality Objectives –

WQ4 Ensure that drinking water continues to meet the standards of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Water Supply Objectives –

WS1, Provide adequate water supply for a 20-year management window.

WS2 Build reliable infrastructure to supply water.

Groundwater Management Objectives –

GWM1, Create reliable groundwater supply.

GWM2 Protect groundwater quality.

Project Goals:

- Provide an appropriately sized supply of potable water to approximately 2,700 connections.

- Increase available water storage from .5 million gallons to 1.2 million gallons to meet growth and critical fire suppression needs.

Project Objectives:

- Design and construct a new 1.2 million gallon water tank to replace the existing 500,000 gallon Bunker redwood tank.

Project Benefits:

- Provide an appropriate supply of water to over 2,700 water service connections by increasing the amount of water storage in excess of fifty percent thus increasing fire suppression capabilities.

Documentation for these projects that were added post-adoption and vetted by the IRWMP group is provided with this attachment in the form of meeting minutes describing the process of adding projects to the current plan and the process for evaluating and ranking these projects (evaluation ranking sheets are also included).

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
August 20, 2008**

Present:

**Steve Kooyman
Kansas McGahan
JoAnn Anders
Cindy Herbert
Pam Lefrancois
Richard Solbrig
Penny Stewart
Eben Swain
Eric Larson
Lynn Nolan
Tricia York
Alan Harry
Cindy Wise
Chris Katopothis
Bruce Roberts**

**El Dorado County Dept. of Transportation
Placer County Dept. of Public Works
Town of Truckee
Squaw Valley Public Service District
North Tahoe Public Utility District
South Tahoe Public Utility District
California Tahoe Conservancy
Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
STPUD
UC Davis TERC
Tahoe City Public Utility District
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Board
Alpine County Watershed Group
CalTrans**

1. A discussion of boundaries/partnerships for the Lahontan RWQCB regional meeting in Mammoth Lakes on August 25th (i.e. Alpine County, Little Truckee River Basin) was held with partners agreeing on expanding current boundaries to include all of Alpine County if necessary. After reviewing the maps that had been submitted in the Proposition 50 Round 2 application, the Little Truckee River was already included in the Tahoe Sierra IRWMP. Partners also agreed that we would take this information to the Lahontan regional meeting in Mammoth Lakes, but would be open to increasing/moving boundaries as necessary to providing IRWMP umbrella's for underrepresented communities.

2. A draft scope of work as prepared by Penny Stewart, CTC, with input from Eric Larson, TRPA, and Lynn Nolan, STPUD was distributed for review. Partners agreed to revisions and the revised draft is included with these minutes. Cost estimates at this time range from \$50,000 to \$100,000 but it was agreed that until the Prop 84 final guidelines were announced (tentative date set for September 21, 2008), an actual cost and more detailed scope of work would have to wait for a later date.

3. The group discussed what types of projects should be included in the revised IRWMP, timelines for project completion, and what kind of information on each project was necessary. It was determined that a five year term for project completion and a standardized project template (based on Prop 84 guideline requirements) would be useful for each agency to begin preparing and submitting this information.

Action Items for next meeting:

1. Penny Stewart will revise the generic scope of work template that could be used to prepare an RFP for TRPA's streamlined contracting process. Eric Larson would review. (Template attached to these minutes)
2. Lynn Nolan would prepare a project template that would be distributed to each agency for prioritizing and gathering information on a 5 year suite of projects.
3. Each agency that felt they knew consultants that could meet the generic scope of work requirements would e-mail this list to Eric Larson to clarson@trpa.org.
4. A working team would be established from among the group for evaluating the RFP's, both before they went out and the proposals received.
5. Group members with current consensus building information that would meet the IRWMP guidelines will bring this information to the next meeting.
6. Ongoing outreach and participation responsibilities for each partner include:
 - Utilizing public comment periods during meetings each partner attends to introduce the IRWMP process
 - Utilize staff reports at each agency to update on IRWMP process
 - Offer a point of contact for public ideas and feedback
 - Document all meetings that include updates and mentions of the IRWMP process and send written documentation via e-mail to Lynn Nolan, lnolan@stpud.dst.ca.us
 - All partners were reminded to "cast a wide net" at this stage of the process to ensure public participation and outreach

Next meeting date:

September 30, 2008

1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

North Tahoe Conference Center

8318 North Lake Blvd.

Kings Beach, CA 96143

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
October 30, 2008**

Present:

**Steve Kooyman
Kansas McGahan
JoAnn Anders
Cindy Herbert
Pam Lefrancois
Penny Stewart
Eben Swain
Erik Larson
Kathy Tomascak
Lynn Nolan
Sarah Hussong-Johnson**

**El Dorado County Dept. of Transportation
Placer County Dept. of Public Works
Town of Truckee
Squaw Valley Public Service District
North Tahoe Public Utility District
California Tahoe Conservancy
Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
STPUD
City of South Lake Tahoe**

1. Eric Larson reported on the regional meeting to discuss boundaries/partnerships for the Lahontan RWQCB region in Mammoth Lakes on August 25th. There are 4 definite and one potential IRWMP partnerships in the Lahontan region. Gaps in geography were identified with a small portion of Alpine County (western slope) currently being unrepresented by any IRWMP group. Penny Stewart volunteered to get information on status of Alpine County with other IRWMPs and whether an opportunity exists for the entire County to be included in the Tahoe Sierra IRWMP area.
2. Lynn Nolan distributed a draft project template that each partnership will utilize to provide a standardized project list within the revised IRWMP. Discussion centered on changes/additions to the template and Eric Larson agreed to make the template changes and redistribute electronically to the group prior to the next meeting. Each entity is going to bring a project to the next meeting for further discussion on the template. In addition, there was discussion on including a climate change project or component to the IRWMP. Eben Swain suggested that we invite the Fire Council to future meetings and he volunteered to make that contact.
3. Placer County and NTPUD have taken the existing IRWMP to their Boards and they have adopted them. El Dorado County has it at their County Counsel's office for review, but does not anticipate taking it for adoption until the revisions have been completed.
4. The discussion on consensus building was brief as no one brought any information to share. Penny is to check with Tricia York who had mentioned at the last meeting that she had some information.

5. There was brief discussion on the other grant programs that have been released for application. TRCD, Placer County and the City indicated they might be applying for USS grants, and TRCD, Placer County and CTC indicated that they were planning to apply for River Parkways funding. El Dorado County and Placer County indicated that they plan to submit applications for CW 319 funds.

Action Items for next meeting:

1. Penny Stewart will contact Alpine County stakeholders to gain input on devising final boundary lines for inclusion in the IRWMP.
2. Project template revisions are going to be distributed to each partner by Eric Larson and will need to have final approval at the October 30, 2008 meeting.
3. A working team will still need to be established from among the group for evaluating the RFP's, both before they go out and the proposals received.
4. Consensus building information for group decision making will still need to be reviewed. Bring this information to the next meeting.
5. Eben Swain will invite the Fire Council to future meetings.
6. Ongoing outreach and participation responsibilities for each partner include:
 - Utilizing public comment periods during meetings each partner attends to introduce the IRWMP process
 - Utilize staff reports at each agency to update on IRWMP process
 - Offer a point of contact for public ideas and feedback
 - Document all meetings that include updates and mentions of the IRWMP process and send written documentation via e-mail to Lynn Nolan, lnolan@stpud.dst.ca.us
 - All partners were reminded to continue to "cast a wide net" at this stage of the process to ensure public participation and outreach

Next meeting date:

October 30, 2008
11:00 am to 1:00 p.m.
Turtle Rock Park Community Center
17300 State Route 89
Markleeville, CA 96120

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
November 20, 2008
South Tahoe Public Utility District**

Present:

Alfred Knotts	El Dorado County Dept. of Transportation
Kansas McGahan	Placer County Dept. of Public Works
JoAnn Anders	Town of Truckee
Cindy Herbert	Squaw Valley Public Service District
Penny Stewart	California Tahoe Conservancy
Eben Swain	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Erik Larson	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Lynn Nolan	STPUD
Sarah Hussong-Johnson	City of South Lake Tahoe
Lisa Wallace	Truckee River Watershed Council
Heather Segale	UC Davis TERC
Marion Gee	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Ed Heneveld	Friends of Squaw Creek
John LeRoy	Tahoe City Public Utility District
Chris Katopothis	Alpine County Watershed Group

1. Reviewed Information from DWR Prop 84 Expedited Grant Round Workshop on November 19, 2008, Sacramento:

- Total IRWMP grant award available cannot exceed \$3 Million per IRWMP region
- A region acceptance process must be completed and region accepted prior to grant application (a small group committee was formed to provide the necessary information to complete this process. Committee members are: Lynn Nolan, STPUD; Penny Stewart, CTC; Lisa Wallace, TRWG; Eric Larsen, TRPA; and Eben Swain, TRCD. In addition, Lisa Wallace will prepare a letter designating the reasons for boundary lines for the Little Truckee River and Chris Katopothis will help designate boundary rationale for Alpine County.)
- Current IRWMP can/will be utilized for the expedited grant funding round as the revised guidelines will not be completed prior to grant announcement
- Drought is the state's priority for this expedited round, however, there is a 10 million set-aside for projects in disadvantaged communities and a \$20 million set aside for water conservation projects (these are still a part of the \$3 Million limit, they just help an application to be more competitive)
- There is only \$5.5 Million available state-wide for the Prop 84 IE Flood control grant package as the remaining available \$100 M is for flood control programs that have a seismic retrofit component.

2. Future steps for expedited grant round discussion resulted in a group consensus to utilize Table G.1 in the current IRWMP to describe new projects. This table will be submitted to Lynn Nolan by December 5, 2008. The more complete project template distributed earlier will not be due until January 16, 2009 with a tentative complete revision of the IRWMP to be completed by February 13, 2009 to allow for adequate time for all agencies to adopt/readopt prior to grant submission sometime in May/June 2009.

3. Proposition 84 State Water Resources Control Board Stormwater Funding public workshop will be held December 3, 2008 in Sacramento. As this workshop will be webcast, many partners planned on viewing the webcast and discussion on this grant opportunity will be held at the December 8 meeting.

4. Other grant opportunities announced included the Sierra Nevada Conservancy funding round in February 2009. SNC was allocated funds from Proposition 84 for water project distribution in the Sierra Nevada's but outside the boundaries of the California Tahoe Conservancy.

5. Marion Gee of the Sierra Nevada Alliance distributed information about an upcoming Sierra Watershed Workshop in Auburn in January 2009. Kansas McGahan, Placer County, agreed to represent the Tahoe Sierra IRWMP at this workshop.

Action Items for next meeting:

1. Lynn Nolan will circulate Table G.1 to all partners for revisions due by December 5, 2008.
2. The Region Acceptance Process working group will need to set a meeting time and date.
3. Ongoing outreach and participation responsibilities for each partner still include:
 - Utilizing public comment periods during meetings each partner attends to introduce the IRWMP process
 - Utilize staff reports at each agency to update on IRWMP process
 - Offer a point of contact for public ideas and feedback
 - Document all meetings that include updates and mentions of the IRWMP process and send written documentation via e-mail to Lynn Nolan, lnolan@stpud.dst.ca.us
 - All partners were reminded to continue to "cast a wide net" at this stage of the process to ensure public participation and outreach

Next meeting date:

**December 8, 2008, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Truckee Town Hall
East Wing Conference Room (second floor)
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee**

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
December 8, 2008
Truckee Town Hall**

Present:

Kansas McGahan	Placer County Dept. of Public Works
JoAnn Anders	Town of Truckee
Cindy Herbert	Squaw Valley Public Service District
Penny Stewart	California Tahoe Conservancy
Eben Swain	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Erik Larson	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Lynn Nolan	STPUD
Sarah Hussong-Johnson	City of South Lake Tahoe
Heather Segale	UC Davis TERC
Ed Heneveld	Friends of Squaw Creek
Alan Harry	Tahoe City Public Utility District

1. Develop a timeline/process for IRWMP revision: The group decided to try to revise on our own using partner volunteers to take advantage of the expedited grant funding round. Date for draft revisions available for review was set for February 13, 2009. Revisions and volunteers included:

- Disadvantaged Communities/Outreach---Placer County
- Water Conservation/Drought---STPUD
- Flood Control---City of South Lake Tahoe
- Climate Change---CTC
- EIP and integration into IRMWP---TRPA
- Performance Measures/Monitoring---Truckee River Watershed Group

2. Discuss/develop future steps for choosing projects: The group decided to place projects into three distinct categories for evaluation and rating and ranking: Stormwater/Flood Management; Water Supply/Conservation; and Water Quality/Ecosystem Restoration. Lynn volunteered to take all the submitted Table G.1 projects from each agency and place them into the appropriate category. From there, volunteer groups would be responsible to meet individually and rate and rank the projects based on the criteria already established in the current IRWMP. Once each subgroup had placed the projects into a priority status, they would be rolled up into the revised IRWMP.

3. Proposition 84 State Water Resources Control Board Stormwater Funding: the group agreed to submit comments on this process, most especially that the match requirement be changed. At this time, SWRQCB is not allowing any other grant funds to be utilized as match for each project.

4. Regional Acceptance Process: The small task group formed to oversee this process was waiting for the draft guidelines notice from DWR. As soon as it is published, the group will begin putting the documents together.

Action Items for next meeting:

1. Lynn Nolan will take the Table G.1 submitted by all partners and distribute projects based on the categories as listed in #2 above. She will then send them back to each agency for small groups to consider.
2. The Region Acceptance Process working group will need to set a meeting time and date.
3. Ongoing outreach and participation responsibilities for each partner still include:
 - Utilizing public comment periods during meetings each partner attends to introduce the IRWMP process
 - Utilize staff reports at each agency to update on IRWMP process
 - Offer a point of contact for public ideas and feedback
 - Document all meetings that include updates and mentions of the IRWMP process and send written documentation via e-mail to Lynn Nolan, lnolan@stpud.dst.ca.us
 - All partners were reminded to continue to "cast a wide net" at this stage of the process to ensure public participation and outreach

Next meeting date:

**February 9, 2009
1:30 to 3:30 p.m.
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449**

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
October 6, 2009
California Tahoe Conservancy**

Present:

Kansas McGahan	Placer County Dept. of Public Works
JoAnn Anders	Town of Truckee
Rick Lierman	Squaw Valley Public Service District
Penny Stewart	California Tahoe Conservancy
Eben Swain	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Erik Larson	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Marie Bledsoe	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Rhonda McFarlane	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Lynn Nolan	STPUD
Sarah Hussong-Johnson	City of South Lake Tahoe
Ed Heneveld	Friends of Squaw Creek
Alan Harry	Tahoe City Public Utility District
Cindy Wise	Lahontan RWQCB
Cindy Nobu	Feather River
Cindy Hannah	St. Joseph Land Trust

1. Water Quality/Ecosystem Restoration Project Template Evaluations: Lisa Wallace, Chair:

Lisa utilized the draft criteria as distributed prior to the evaluation sessions to develop an excel spreadsheet in which all the restoration projects were given points based on each criteria. Members of the group in attendance agreed that the evaluation tool as designed by Lisa would be valuable for evaluating stormwater and water supply projects as well as restoration projects. In addition, the group expanded on the evaluation criteria as discussed below:

- Discuss utilizing some standard responses for each template as opposed to individual project responses on criteria which may be similar for each project. Examples: Water Quality Benefits/Management Measures.
- Amend Community Benefits to include all benefits of the projects. Examples included using the Sierra Nevada Conservancy Program Guidance Community Benefits; evaluating :
- In addition, priority under community benefits criteria will be given to "disadvantaged" community status.
- Relevance to plan criteria should be expanded to include relevance to any land use or water plan beyond our own IRWMP. Examples were SWAMP,

Lahontan Basin Plan, TMDL plans for the appropriate watershed, EIP List, etc.

- Each partner should look at expanding on the "green technology" portion of the template to include any use of recycled materials, Low Impact Development construction techniques, alternative energy sources, etc. that could be added to each project, if possible. All project templates had problems addressing this portion of the template so further discussion around this issue was tabled for the next meeting.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency also submitted a template for support of the Tiims Website: www.tiims.org. The Tahoe Sierra IRWMP partnership had previously agreed to utilize this website as the main website for posting the IRWMP, agendas and minutes, and use as a centralized data base for monitoring and reporting. Resources will be needed to ensure that the website is kept up-to-date with information and discussion revolved around what would be the most appropriate section for the placement of this project template.

2. Stormwater/Flood Control Project Template Evaluations: Penny Stewart, Chair:

Each partner with a project template in this category was given the opportunity to discuss the project briefly, and, if there were more than one project, to rank the projects in the order of priority as proposed by the partner agency. In addition, further discussion was held about developing a standard response to project criteria that may be similar for all stormwater/flood control projects. Partners discussed whether to pull such items as Integration of Non Point Source and other Management Measures and Scientific Basis of Project from the actual project templates and address them in a general overview of all projects in the revision of the IRWMP. Decisions were tabled for the next meeting.

Penny agreed to revise rating summary as developed by Lisa and begin the process of placing the templates from this category into the rating sheet.

3. Water Supply Project Template Evaluations: Alan Harry, Chair:

Each partner with a project template in this category was given the opportunity to discuss the project briefly, and, if there were more than one project, to rank the projects in the order of priority as proposed by the partner agency. Discussion centered on possibilities of regional projects (Water Conservation Programs) and how to assess community benefits from a water supply perspective. It was agreed partners should revise their templates to include such information as the number of total connections; any water needs assessments that had been performed for their communities, level of failure if project not completed, and future water demands.

Alan agreed to revise the rating summary with the comments made throughout the meeting and begin the process of ranking the projects.

Next meeting date:

January 25, 2010

1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

128 Market Street

Stateline, NV 89449

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
Minutes of Meeting of
March 23, 2010
Truckee Town Hall**

Present:

Kansas McGahan	Placer County Dept. of Public Works
JoAnn Anders	Town of Truckee
Cindy Herbert	Squaw Valley Public Service District
Eben Swain	Tahoe Resource Conservation District
Erik Larson	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Lynn Nolan	STPUD
Sarah Hussong-Johnson	City of South Lake Tahoe
Lori Marino	City of South Lake Tahoe
Ed Heneveld	Friends of Squaw Creek
Tony Laliotis	Tahoe City Public Utility District
Pam Lefrancois	North Tahoe Public Utility District
Marie Bledsoe	Tiims for TRPA
Marcia Beals	Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency
Anne Eldred	Sierra County Water Committee
Tim Beals	Sierra County
Andrew Winberry	Sierra County Planning
Bill Copren	Feather River Chapter, Trout Unlimited
David Willoughby	California Department of Water Resources
Lisa Wallace	Truckee River Watershed Council

1. IRWM Draft Guidelines and application guidelines discussion: SWRCB has published the current IRWMP guidelines for both the plan and the grant application. There are no deadlines for grant submission set as yet.
 - Only 3M allocated for this round for implementation grants—discussion centered on whether or not to submit a planning grant or an implementation grant with the consensus of the group being to do an implementation grant. Addition discussion on the status of the current IRWM plan and whether it should be adopted by new agencies as is, or wait for revision.
 - Agencies will decide on their own whether to adopt current plan or wait for revised plan. Lynn Nolan will send new partners a copy of the current plan as well as the MOU necessary for adoption.
 - As the funding amount is limited in this current round, it was suggested that partners review projects that require funding in excess of \$1M and, if possible, break them down into fundable phases.

- An aggressive revision process for the current IRWMP will be undertaken with a deadline to have plan revised by June 23, 2010. Members of the revision committee include:
 - i. Lynn Nolan, Eben Swain, Eric Larson, Marie Bledsoe and Joann Anders.
 - ii. A meeting of the above subgroup will be scheduled in April to begin the revision process.

2. Project Template Revisions: Much discussion by partners about the project template revision and evaluation process. It was agreed that each subgroup (Water Supply, Restoration, Stormwater) would meet and develop criteria to evaluate the subgroup projects. Criteria would be similar across subgroups, but would allow for additional criteria specific to each subgroup to be added for clarification. Eric Larson volunteered to begin the process of revising current draft template to ensure:

- i. The template includes the requirements as per the SWRCB published guidelines
- ii. The template incorporates the evaluation criteria as developed by each subgroup

As much time has already been spent on the template development, the partners set an aggressive schedule to complete the template revisions:

- April 23, 2010 is the deadline for subgroups to have a revised criteria for evaluation of templates
- May 23, 2010 is the deadline to submit any templates from partners wishing to revise to more fully incorporate the new evaluation criteria
- June 23, 2010 is the final date to submit the subgroups evaluation of templates

The Water Supply subgroup lost its leadership (Alan Harry, TCPUD), so Lynn Nolan, Tony Laliotis and Pam Lefrancois will step in to complete the template evaluation process as co-leaders.

3. Comments/Concerns/Next Steps:

- Marion Gee, Sierra Nevada Alliance, asked the group for comments on an op/ed piece to be presented to the California legislature as developed by the Sierra Water Group (of which the Tahoe Sierra IRWM is a member). Comments by the partnership included a request to include the Tahoe Sierra issues more clearly in future such efforts as the op/ed focused more on the western slope Sierra issues than on the eastern slope issues.
- Concerns were discussed about the process of selecting projects for inclusion in the current IRWMP grant request resulting in the following tasks:
 - i. An impartial facilitator will host the June meeting in which projects are selected for the application

- ii. Partners will evaluate current projects for the ability to select a partial phase or a lesser funding amount in order to balance the selection of projects that could be included.

Next meeting date:

**June 30, 2010
10 a.m to 12 p.m.
North Tahoe Public Utility District
8318 N. Lake Tahoe Blvd.
Kings Beach, CA 96143**

Criteria for evaluation process: Tahoe Sierra IRWM projects
(This listing will be evaluated annually and will also be dependent upon funding criteria from a variety of funding sources)

Equity: as much as possible make sure that all participating partners are able to get one project in for submittal. Equity regarding distribution amongst IRWM region should also be considered.

Community Benefit: Overall, how large a population or areas will the proposed project serve to benefit once implemented? These aspects should be taken into consideration when prioritizing projects. Also is there large opposition or support within community for proposed project? If opposition is strong, we should be asking why. Identify if in a Disadvantaged community.

Scientific Backing: How much research has been conducted related to proposed project? Does the project have the scientific backing necessary to justify project in application and submittal to funding agencies?

Cost/Benefit Analysis: What are the specific targets that proposed project will achieve once implemented? Should there be some kind of cost/benefit analysis for project proposals? (ie how much benefit will be achieved per \$ cost requested from funding agency) Cost/Benefit may be measured by # of people benefiting, # of acres restored, # of gallons of water conserved, etc.

Readiness to Proceed: Is the project ready to move forward, or is implementation of project components still a number of years off? Projects ready to move forward by estimated application date should receive priority. Environmental status (CEQA?), phased projects, should all be described. What is the expected timeline and estimated completion date of project? Current projects should be ready to be implemented within a 5 year timeframe.

Relevance to Plan: Relevance to currently adopted Tahoe Sierra plan and regional goals, objectives and management strategies should be considered. Project prioritization should be considered based on the # of management strategies that the proposed project meets as well as the # of short and long term priorities under each established objective. Given the understanding that future funding guidelines may change, our current plan is what we have to go on.

Other Funds: Are there other funds available for project implementation? How much of the project is expected to be funded through grant monies? Projects with higher amounts of matching dollar funds may be given a higher priority where funders require it. Identify where other funds are coming from and the total amount of other funds.

Repercussions if Project not Funded: What will the repercussions be to local community, organization or environment if project is not funded through Prop 84 monies? If the group agrees that this should be a component of the decision making process, this may be a consideration for project prioritization.

Partnering: Is there a possibility to partner with other participating agencies and potentially combine projects into one proposal submittal? If so, this may be a consideration for prioritization.

Green Technology: Does the project implement any green technology, energy savings, use alternate energy sources, etc. Describe any of these components.

Organization and Project	Total Project Cost	Total Funds Requested From Prop. 84	Scientific Backing (National or local)	Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis (Pollutants being addressed)	Readiness to Proceed	Risks to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP
			3. Assessment AND equivalent proj	Costs defined & comparable to baseline	Certain implementation begins this year	Meets 3 goals or strategies
			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
			1. No assessment or equivalent proj	No targets	Implementations two or more years out	Meets 1 goal or strategies
			0. N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			0. Permit			
Town of Truckee - Storm Water Management and Legacy Retrofit Drainage	\$28,655,500	\$20,139,000	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
TRCD - Community Planning, Natural Resource Management and BMP Retrofit for the Lake Tahoe Region	\$9,000,000	\$450,000	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	2. Meets at least 3 goals and relationship well described
Town of Truckee - Water Quality Monitoring	\$833,794	\$623,000	3. Assessments cited and lowest equivalent projects (such as Truckee River monitoring debris)	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 reduce
TRPA - BMP Retrofit	\$4,077,413	\$1,333,413	2. Assessment returned to have been done through both extensive EIP process and through completion 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 & funded by Prop 84	3. Good description of relevance of project components to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP
STPUD - BMP Implementation on District Owned Facilities	\$520,000	\$200,000	2. Assessment of facilities assumed, no equivalent project described	1. Monitor of 57 goals to have BMPs implemented, but no further numerical targets related to pollutants addressed (at treatment resources)	5. Some planning documents are complete, project implementation currently underway, environmental implementation of hold?	2. Meets over 3 goals for the Tahoe Sierra Plan
CSLT - ALTahoe	\$7,791,000	\$3,856,000	3. Assessment returned to have been done through both extensive EIP process and through completion of baseline data - equivalent projects (known to have been implemented)	3. Baseline data is estimated pollutant loading, however no specific quantities or targets defined	3. Implementation ready to occur once funding is provided	3. Project components related back to many Tahoe Sierra IRWMP objectives
Alpine Watershed Group: Water Quality Monitoring	\$300,000	\$240,000	3. Assessments completed and known equivalent projects (such as Truckee River monitoring efforts)	3. Targets for monitoring defined and a baseline sampled for establishment	3. Ready to implement this year	2. Meets more than 3 goals, but no description is included
Callout - Bridge Removal and Replacement	\$1,863,030	\$252,355	2. Preliminary Assessment near completion, but no equivalent project noted	1. Neither targets nor baseline data was provided regarding current flow, mention of large amounts of USGS data available and that new gage would assist in monitoring flow data	2. Implementation dependent on securing match, which is requested through Project	3. Good description of relevance of project components to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP