CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY
and
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT

SOIL EROSION CONTROL GRANTS PROGRAM

PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT AND GUIDELINES

MODIFIED SEPTEMBER 2008

California Tahoe Conservancy
State of California, The Resources Agency

Patrick Wright, Executive Officer

United States Forest Service
Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

Terri Marceron, Forest Supervisor

For further information contact:

California Tahoe Conservancy
Erosion Control Grants Program
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 542-5580

Conservancy Program Staff:
Tricia York
Penny Stewart
Scott Cecchi
John Kleinfelter
Mark Sedlock

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
Erosion Control Grants Program
35 College Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 543-2600

Forest Service Staff:
Barbara Shanley
Genevieve Villemaire

INTRODUCTION

Conservancy Program

The California Tahoe Conservancy was established in its present form by State law in 1984, with its jurisdiction extending throughout the California side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Conservancy was established to develop and implement programs through acquisitions and site improvements to improve water quality in Lake Tahoe, preserve the scenic beauty and recreational opportunities of the region, provide public access, preserve wildlife habitat areas, and manage and restore lands to protect the natural environment.

The soil erosion control program was established by the Conservancy in 1985 to address the problems associated with storm water runoff and its contribution to the decline in Lake clarity. On November 22, 1985, the Conservancy established an application program for annual soil erosion control grants to local governments to address these problems using methods such as infiltrating runoff, stabilizing drainageways, and vegetating bare soils. Since July 2001, eligible agencies have been able to apply for a mix of planning, acquisition, or site improvement grants that best address their Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) implementation needs. $104 million in grants have been approved for 105 projects under this program, including $15.5 million in planning grants, $71.3 million in site improvement grants, and $17.2 million in grants for land acquisitions.

The State's proposed 2008-2009 fiscal year budget includes an allocation for up to a total of $2,000,000 in grant funds for the Conservancy's soil erosion control program grants. The availability of these funds is dependent upon the approval of the State's 2008-2009 fiscal year budget. If there are changes to this amount, we will inform eligible grantees as soon as possible.

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Program

In November 2003, the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) was amended to direct a portion of its proceeds to Lake Tahoe for eight years for the Federal Environmental Improvement Program. This is the fifth year of the eight-year program.

Under the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA), P.L. 106-506, the U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) has authorization to fund the Lake Tahoe Erosion Control Grants Program. LTBMU anticipates receiving $10 million for

the program funded through Round 9 of SNPLMA in August 2008. Of this amount, $9,000,000 is expected to be available for grant award through the program during the calendar year 2009. The availability of these funds is dependent upon the approval of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and final approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. If there are changes to this amount, we will inform eligible grantees as soon as possible.

Combined Requests and Evaluation

The main erosion control EIP funding agencies are continuing the process of combining a portion of the application and evaluation process of their respective grants programs in an effort to minimize the number of submittals that local agencies must prepare, and to evaluate and provide funding in a more comprehensive fashion. Funding awards will continue to be processed independently by each agency. This may require the submittal of additional information or budget detail.

The executives of the funding agencies have endorsed the concepts and principles of the documents and process developed by the Storm Water Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC). The purpose of the SWQIC documents and process is to provide a consensus-based approach to project review, development, and implementation. It is hoped that this approach will lead to project designs that have the support of all agencies and meet the objectives of the Preferred Design Approach (PDA). More information about SWQIC and the PDA can be found in Appendix D.

Requests for funding under this announcement from California agencies shall be submitted to the California Tahoe Conservancy, regardless of the funding source. Nevada agencies requesting funding through the LTBMU program should submit their requests to LTBMU. Nevada agencies seeking funding for projects from the State of Nevada, Division of State Lands, should contact that agency directly for information regarding their 2008-2009 grants program.

FUNDING DISTRIBUTION

Conservancy Methodology

During the 2008/09 funding cycle, a combined amount of $2,000,000 is anticipated to be available to address planning, acquisition, and construction needs. The availability of these funds is dependent upon finalization of the 2008 Budget Act. If there are changes to this amount, we will inform eligible grantees as soon as possible. In addition to the funds from the 2008 Budget Act, the Conservancy expects to have approximately

$400,000 remaining from the 2007/08 erosion control grant funding cycle to be awarded with the 2008/2009 cycle; thereby providing a total anticipated funding amount of $2,400,000 for this funding cycle. Given the decrease in funding from previous years, the Conservancy will distribute funds through a jurisdictional allocation only during this funding cycle.

This allocation formula recognizes that the EIP contains high priority soil erosion control projects throughout the basin, and that the three primary jurisdictions, Placer and El Dorado Counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe, have a primary responsibility for implementing the EIP on the California side of the Lake. This allocation also provides for continuity and a degree of funding certainty for program planning and staffing.

A total of up to $2,400,000 will be made available to the primary jurisdictions in the following amounts to fund planning, acquisition, and site improvement costs:

El Dorado County	$800,000
Placer County	$800,000
City of South Lake Tahoe	$800,000
TOTAL	$2,400,000

It is anticipated that the jurisdictional award will be provided for acquisition and site improvement grants for the highest priority project that has been identified by the jurisdictions and the funding agencies. Should funding from sources other than LTBMU be secured for these priority projects, the Conservancy will work with the jurisdiction to determine what other project(s) the jurisdictional funding allocation will support.

LTBMU Methodology

Approximately $9,000,000 is expected to be available for grant award in calendar year 2009 for planning, construction, and monitoring needs. The expected source of these funds is from Round 9 of SNPLMA.

The availability of these funds is dependent upon the approval of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and Final Approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. If there are changes to this amount, eligible grantees will be informed as soon as possible. In

compliance with the LTRA, LTBMU looks to award grants so that they are appropriately distributed between the two States in the Tahoe Basin.

Grantees must demonstrate the availability of local and state matching funds that satisfy the LTBMU's erosion control grant program's one-to-one matching funds requirement. Matching funds may consist of any state and local funds utilized by the grantee to implement the urban storm water component of the EIP program, as long as these funds are spent during the same fiscal period as the federal award (unspent as of July 1, 2008 for Round 9) and are not being used as match for any other federal funding. Matching funds may be either on a project basis (matching funds to be expended on the same project) or a programmatic basis (matching funds to be expended on a different EIP erosion control project that may not be receiving LTBMU erosion control grant funds), or a combination of project and programmatic match. Documentation of the sources of matching funds should be limited to providing the total project budget in each project proposal and a simple spreadsheet identifying the funding source, EIP project(s), and amount of matching funds for all projects proposed for grant funding. The matching funds spreadsheet, found in Appendix C, should be provided with the funding requests.

ELIGIBILITY

Eligible Grantees:

Conservancy:

Eligible grantees for Conservancy funding this year include El Dorado County, Placer County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Funding shall be distributed equally as described above.

LTBMU:

In accordance with the LTRA, payments shall be made to "the governing bodies of each of the political subdivisions (including any public utility, the service area of which includes any part of the Lake Tahoe Basin)." The Act further states that "to be eligible for payment…a political subdivision shall annually submit a priority list of proposed projects." As such, each of the six local governments (Placer County, El Dorado County, Washoe County, Douglas County, City of South Lake Tahoe, and Carson City Rural Area) and the three public utility districts (South Tahoe, Tahoe City, and North Tahoe) must submit a list of priority projects in order to be eligible for these funds.

In Douglas County, the County must work with their local General Improvement Districts (GIDs) to identify and prioritize projects for the annual list. If selected, the GIDs may receive the award directly, but pre-applications must be submitted and prioritized through Douglas County. Also, Douglas County may designate the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District to perform this requirement on behalf of Douglas County, as has been previously done.

Eligible Projects:

There are two basic eligibility criteria for planning, acquisition, and site improvement grants from the Conservancy and LTBMU:

1. Projects must be listed in the EIP, or be a portion of a project listed in the EIP. The Conservancy and LTBMU may also consider other projects that are consistent with the objectives of the EIP if the application is accompanied by documentation that Tahoe Regional Planning Agency supports inclusion of the project in the EIP; and
2. Each project must be supported with a request that clearly demonstrates how the project will meet program objectives. The Conservancy program objectives are explained in Appendix D.

Conservancy:

At this time, grants are anticipated to be awarded for activities associated with site improvement and acquisition of interests in real property necessary for each jurisdiction's previously identified highest priority project's implementation. Should funding from sources other than LTBMU be secured for these priority projects, the Conservancy will work with the jurisdiction to determine the activities and other project(s) the funding will support.

LTBMU:

Grants can be for activities associated with planning, site improvement, and monitoring, and the projects should appear on the priority list. (Do not prioritize projects within each category, but rather prepare one priority list that includes all these types of projects.)

Grantees are still encouraged to send their proposals for monitoring within their projects, if grantees feel such monitoring will fill critical data gaps regarding Best Management Practices or project effectiveness, and grantees demonstrate the capacity to

manage this type of monitoring project. The LTBMU is concurrently working with the Tahoe Science Consortium (TSC) and others regarding the implementation of a Regional Urban Stormwater Monitoring Program. Until this Regional program is established, some flexibility in how the LTBMU, in collaboration with their partners, chooses to allocate SNPLMA Erosion Control Grant Funds to continue to fill critical data gaps related to Urban Stormwater BMP/Project effectiveness as part of project monitoring will be maintained. Up to $900,000 is available for project level effectiveness monitoring from Round 9 grant funds. If project proposals are not received and/or approved to this amount, the remaining funds will be awarded to planning and implementation projects.

The Round 9 grant submittal can be for grant funding for one or more projects, as long as the projects are all related to planning design, implementation, or the monitoring of EIP erosion control, soil conservation, and SEZ restoration projects. Project descriptions are not needed for projects funded exclusively by state or local funds that are displayed as match for the federal grant.

Eligible Costs:

At this time, up to 100% of eligible project costs for planning, site improvements, and acquisitions of interests in land directly or substantially related to soil erosion control activities can be funded.

Planning Grants (Conservancy, LTBMU):

Eligible Costs for funding under the planning grant includes workplan preparation, completion of approved workplan products, public meeting costs, project design, administration, interagency coordination, pre-construction monitoring (Conservancy only), preparation of preliminary plans, specifications and cost estimates, site improvement and acquisition grant application preparation, pre-acquisition activities related to the acquisition of interests in land, project evaluation and environmental documentation, and preparation and processing of permit applications.

In addition to the above eligible costs, LTBMU planning grants can be used for costs associated with final (100%) plans, specifications, preparation and processing of permit applications, and the project bid process.

Site Improvement Grants (Conservancy):

Eligible costs under a Conservancy site improvement grant include project administration and interagency coordination; preparation and processing of permit applications; monitoring; grant application preparation for site improvement grant augmentation; preparation of contract documents including final plans, specifications and cost estimates; construction of erosion control and restoration measures and revegetation of disturbed areas; project inspection; and project evaluation and documentation.

Site Improvement Grants (LTBMU):

Eligible costs under an LTBMU site improvement grant include construction of erosion control and restoration measures, revegetation of disturbed areas, project inspection, project administration and interagency coordination, and project evaluation and documentation.

Acquisition Grants (Conservancy):

Eligible acquisition costs are limited to the current fair market value of the interest(s) being acquired, less the amount of any other State funds being applied to the purchase price. Acquisition funds may only be used for acquisition of property from willing sellers. Eligible acquisition costs also include related escrow, title, land coverage verification and banking for improved property acquired under the grant, other closing costs, and project administration costs. Under the terms of the standard acquisition grant agreement, acquisition documents are submitted to Conservancy staff for review and approval. Acquisitions valued at less than $10,000 can follow a streamlined approach. Additional information on this approach can be found in Appendix E.

Costs associated with pre-acquisition work should be included in a planning grant to minimize the potential for delay due to acquisitions. Pre-acquisition work includes landowner contacts, legal descriptions, maps, title reports, appraisals, and signed transaction documents that are contingent upon receiving acquisition funds.

Monitoring Grants (LTBMU):

LTBMU's monitoring grant is only for costs associated with project level BMP effectiveness monitoring. Costs associated with required compliance monitoring are not eligible under this grant.

Utility Relocation Costs (Conservancy, LTBMU):

Publicly-owned local utility districts are eligible for payments from federal grant funds for up to two-thirds of the costs associated with the most cost effective strategy for utility relocation in connection with EIP erosion control, soil conservation, and stream environment zone (SEZ) restoration projects. Counties and Cities must coordinate with their local publicly-owned utility district(s) to identify and coordinate these strategies. Requests for these utility relocation costs can be submitted for funding by the County, City, or the publicly-owned utility district.

Conservancy funding for the relocation of publicly-owned utilities is affected by Assembly Bill 270 (AB270). Costs associated with the relocation of publicly-owned utilities are usually not eligible for Conservancy funding since they are eligible for other funding, as stated above.

Costs associated with the relocation of privately-owned utilities may or may not be eligible for Conservancy funding depending on the status of superior rights.

Travel and Meal (Per Diem) Costs (Conservancy):

Travel and per diem expenses for grantee staff and Professional Services Contracts are eligible for reimbursement at the state rates in accordance with the current California Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) provisions related to DPA Rules for Excluded Employees. Out-of-state travel cannot be reimbursed without prior written authorization from the Conservancy. Per diem rates under construction contracts shall be eligible in accordance with the California Labor Code.

The Conservancy is developing guidelines to address eligible and ineligible administrative costs and will provide those to grantees once they are available.

Indirect Costs (LTBMU):

Indirect cost rates must meet the requirements of the federal approving agency.

Ineligible Erosion Control Grant Costs (Conservancy, LTBMU):

Applicants must commit to fund any project elements that are not substantially related to the purposes of erosion control or water quality protection or elements that do not fit within the State's definition of local assistance funding. This would include costs

associated with flood control features, road improvements or paving not associated with erosion control measures, recreational features, bike trails, etc.

Project maintenance costs are not eligible for funding. The grantee is responsible for operation and maintenance of funded improvements and the funding of the associated costs for a minimum 20-year period.

Required project compliance monitoring costs are not eligible for funding through the LTBMU grants. However, these are eligible costs for the Conservancy.

Matching Funds Requirement (LTBMU):

Grantees must demonstrate the availability of local and state matching funds that satisfy the LTBMU's erosion control grant program's one-to-one matching funds requirement. Matching funds may be either on a project basis, a programmatic basis, or a combination of project and programmatic basis. Further information on this requirement is provided in the funding distribution section above.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (LTBMU):

For projects anticipated to utilize Forest Service urban lots or LTBMU grant funds to construct erosion control projects, a NEPA decision by the LTBMU will be required. The grantee should budget accordingly on projects anticipated to complete a NEPA analysis/decision process. In most cases, the environmental analysis will be conducted by the LTBMU using information provided by the grantee and its contractors. If the NEPA decision is ONLY for issuing a special use permit (SUP) on Forest Service parcels associated with an erosion control project, the analysis required only applies to the Forest Service parcels to be permitted. If the NEPA decision is to allow the use of federal grants funds for construction of a project, analyses must be conducted for the entire project area.

Different levels of analysis and input from the grantee will be required for Forest Service land versus the non-Forest Service lands. Detailed direction regarding the NEPA process will be provided by LTBMU to the grantees separate from these guidelines.

FUNDING REQUEST PROCESS

Funding requests shall be submitted to the Conservancy by **Friday, November 14, 2008**. Two hard copies of the request and an electronic copy (pdf format) shall be provided.

The submittal shall include the following items:

- Prioritized list of projects required by LTBMU
- Matching funds spreadsheet, Appendix C, required by LTBMU
- Project Proposal Submittal Form, Appendix B, for each project. The supplemental information for the Conservancy is **only** required for projects requesting Conservancy funding.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Review by Technical Advisory Committee

Submittals will be reviewed and recommended for award through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process that has been utilized in previous years by LTBMU. Representatives from LTBMU, TRPA, California Tahoe Conservancy, Nevada Division of State Lands, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Nevada Department of Environmental Protection will be invited to review the project proposals for grant funding and participate on the selection TAC. In addition to representatives from the above agencies, experts in the erosion control field and from the science community may also be invited to participate in the TAC's review.

A field review may be conducted in order to further evaluate the project. This field review may occur at a time other than the TAC meeting. Applicants will be advised if a field meeting is scheduled and will be invited to attend this portion of the TAC review to explain the project and answer questions.

Evaluation Criteria

Final submittals will be evaluated for completeness and their consistency with the general eligibility criteria and objectives of the programs. In cases where the staff find that a submittal is either incomplete or does not meet eligibility criteria, staff may work with the applicant to complete or modify the submittal where it appears likely this will qualify it for further consideration.

Conservancy Criteria

At this time, the Conservancy is expecting to award funding only to the previously identified highest priority project for each jurisdiction. Should this project not require the total available jurisdictional allocation, Conservancy staff will meet with the jurisdiction staff to determine the next highest priority project for funding. Criteria used in the past for the Conservancy's evaluation of grant applications and current Pollutant

Load Reduction Strategy results will serve as guidance when evaluating other projects. The criteria used in the past includes:

a. Significant and documentable benefit to Lake Tahoe water quality - The project addresses a significant erosion and/or water quality problem and results in documentable watershed and water quality improvements. Generally, listing of the project in the EIP, consistency of the proposal with the program objectives (see Appendix D), inclusion of a sound (but not necessarily intensive) monitoring program, and proposed use of proven methods or approaches based on sound principles will adequately fulfill the documentation requirement.

   Preference will be given to projects with the greatest potential benefit to Lake Tahoe's water quality (projects listed in the EIP which address a severe water quality problem with proven technology). A high project ranking under this criterion will be given to the following types of projects: projects that are consistent with the program objectives; projects in watersheds with a high potential to deliver sediment and nutrients to Lake Tahoe; and projects involving the restoration of disturbed SEZs and/or water quality treatment in meadow-like areas or SEZs.

b. Adequacy of design - The project uses proven, cost-effective techniques to address soil erosion control and/or water quality problems. The project design emphasizes, to the extent feasible, source control and hydrologic design, and targets the trapping of fine sediment and phosphorus. The project proposes a strategic approach, which clearly identifies the water quality problems and proposes effective BMPs to address these problems. Projects that have a component relating to a natural drainage channel should include in the design process an analysis of the stream's characteristics for use in the design. Designs that give appropriate consideration to other resource objectives, such as EIP SEZ restoration objectives, wildlife habitat enhancement, defensible space, private property BMP interface, and recreation and public access, will be rated more favorably.

   Innovative approaches are encouraged in cases where proven, cost-effective techniques are not feasible or available (see subsection "f" below).

c. Comprehensiveness - The project considers and addresses all aspects of soil erosion control and water quality problems in the project area. Preference will be given to comprehensive, integrated project proposals that are well coordinated with other related EIP projects and which consider the context of the whole

watershed. Projects that include elements related to SEZ restoration, wildlife habitat enhancement, defensible space, private property BMP interface, and recreation and public access will be ranked higher.

d. Cost-effectiveness - The project meets program objectives in a cost-effective manner. Preference will be given to projects that use the California Conservation Corps (CCC). Local or other funding may be applied to a project to increase its cost-effectiveness.

e. Implementability - The applicant demonstrates their ability and commitment to implement the project in a timely manner. For example, for site improvement grant applications: 1) the planning grant process has been completed, environmental documentation appeal periods have expired, and the project will be ready to go to construction soon; 2) the applicant (and/or other public agencies) already owns or controls the land needed to construct the project, or has signed agreements to acquire needed lands; and/or 3) no major issues are known to exist that could slow implementation (e.g., property owner opposition, or lack of adequate treatment opportunities). If a project is large and complex, and depends on other funding sources, including future grants, then the portion of the project proposed for funding by the Conservancy must be able to be implemented by itself in a manner consistent with the objectives of the program. Preference will be given to projects which meet the three items above, can be implemented quickly, and provide substantial water quality benefits in 2009.

f. Model project - The project is useful as a model for future soil erosion control and water quality improvement projects. In situations where proven techniques to solve particular problems do not yet exist, projects incorporating innovative, cost-effective approaches to improving water quality will receive preference for funding.

g. Cooperation and support - The applicant shows that they have support for the project by other public agencies, owners of property to be acquired, and/or other parties. This criterion is included to encourage early contact with stakeholders and can be related to implementability.

   Where utility relocations are or may be involved, the applicant should demonstrate that they have worked with the affected public utility district(s) to minimize overall erosion control project costs. This process should include design consultation and consideration of coordinated construction scheduling. Preference will be given to projects that include a strong interface and

coordination with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District (TRCD) and private property BMPs. Projects that follow the preferred design approach and demonstrate cost savings from coordinated planning will be given a priority. Notwithstanding the above requirement, the grantee shall retain all existing rights under State or Federal law/regulations, the terms of permit, franchise agreements and/or other adopted agreements.

LTBMU Criteria

Submittals will be reviewed based on the relative need for and merits of projects. The allocation of Round 9 SNPLMA erosion control grant funds will be based on the merit of the submittals received. In general, the determination of merit for projects in California will be based on the criteria established by the California Tahoe Conservancy Grant Program, and in Nevada, criteria established by the State of Nevada, Division of State Lands Grant Program.

IMPLEMENTATION

The goal is to have a TAC-recommended list of projects for funding award by the end of December 2008.

Conservancy

Conservancy staff anticipate taking funding recommendations to their board between March 2009 and September 2009, to best fit the project's needs and schedule. Once funding recommendations are approved and a grant is awarded by the Conservancy board, implementation of the project will be governed by a standard grant agreement entered into by both the Conservancy and the implementing agency. Timely execution of this agreement by the jurisdictions is expected.

Grant agreements have numerous requirements in them, including but not limited to workplan development, project deliverables, progress reporting, record keeping, financial audits, insurance, payment criteria, and monitoring reporting.

A sample grant agreement can be provided upon request.

The draft project plan must be reviewed by a Technical Advisory Committee that includes Conservancy and regulatory agency staff, and at the discretion of Conservancy staff, other technical experts retained by the Conservancy. Detailed project review at this time ensures thorough compliance with the full range of project requirements, both

technical and regulatory. In addition to Conservancy staff, such review may be conducted by representatives from the Department of General Services, Real Estate Services Division.

During a project's development and implementation, grantees will be asked to provide products in hard copy format and an acceptable electronic format for the Conservancy's use in project tracking and reporting.

LTBMU

LTBMU staff will notify project proponents of the pre-award selections for SNPLMA funding. Upon notification of pre-award selection, the project proponents shall complete and submit final federal grant applications directly to LTBMU. These applications may require additional information and budget detail. It is anticipated that these grant funds will become available in January 2009 and that funds for grant awards can be obligated at that time.

When LTBMU either issues (or amends) a special use permit or provides funding for the construction of an erosion control project, the Forest Supervisor must make a documented decision and that decision must be supported by appropriate NEPA analysis and documentation. For projects anticipated to utilize Forest Service urban lots or LTBMU grant funds to construct erosion control projects, a NEPA decision by the LTBMU will be required. The grantee should budget accordingly on projects anticipated to complete a NEPA analysis/decision process. In most cases, the environmental analysis will be conducted by LTBMU using information provided by the grantee and its contractors. If the NEPA decision is ONLY for issuing a special use permit (SUP) on Forest Service parcels associated with an erosion control project, the analysis required only applies to the Forest Service parcels to be permitted. If the NEPA decision is to allow the use of federal grants funds for construction of a project, analyses must be conducted for the entire project area.

Different levels of analysis and input from the grantee will be required for Forest Service land versus the non-Forest Service lands. Detailed direction regarding the NEPA process will be provided by LTBMU to the grantees separate from these guidelines. The LTBMU will continue to award grants for implementation prior to the completion of NEPA. However, any reimbursement for implementation will not be provided until the NEPA analysis is complete, and the Forest Supervisor has made a project specific decision. NEPA does not apply when grant funding is awarded for the development of plans, designs, studies, or monitoring, because they do not constitute a specific decision to implement a project.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Timeline
Appendix B	Erosion Control Funding Request Project Proposal Submittal Form
Appendix C	Match Documentation Spreadsheet for SNPLMA Round 9 Awards
Appendix D	Conservancy Program Objectives and Preferred Design Approach
Appendix E	Land Acquisition Information and Submittal Form
Appendix F	California Propositions Funding Requirements

Appendix A

Timeline

CTC and LTBMU Erosion Control Grant Submittal, Review, and Award Processes

Activity	Date
• Conservancy Board Adoption of Conservancy and LTBMU Soil Erosion Control Grants Program Announcement and Guidelines	July 18, 2008
• Final grant funding request submittals	November 14, 2008
• TAC Review of funding requests	Completed by end of December, 2008
• Certified CEQA document and NOD from the State Clearinghouse stamped within 5 days of document certification for Site Improvement and Acquisition submittals	Six weeks prior to anticipated board meeting
• Award of Conservancy funds	March 2009 – September 2009
• LTBMU award and grant completion	After receipt of funds

Appendix B

Erosion Control Funding Request Project Proposal Submittal Form

Applicant Name and Address:_____

_____

_____

Project Title:_____

EIP Number(s):_____

Statement of Need: *Briefly describe existing condition and identify issues/problems that the proposed project will address. Identify the regulatory threshold that will be addressed by this proposed project.*

Goals and Objectives: *Describe the project goals and objectives. Describe the course of action to accomplish each goal. Explain how actions are consistent with the grant program guidelines and direction for the use of funds.*

Project Description: *Identify activities that are to be accomplished, and the methods by which the activities will be accomplished. Identify what the products and/or outcomes of the project are.*

Evaluation and Monitoring: *Describe how progress and successful achievement of the objectives will be measured.*

Project Budget and Schedule: *Clearly identify all costs associated with the proposed project including costs and funding to date, project budget, grant budget, and matching fund information. Identify major project milestones for project funding, design, permitting and construction activities. Provide a work plan and timetable. Provide details to reflect costs needed to complete the activities identified. Provide enough detail to determine if costs are reasonable and allowable, including an engineer's estimate for construction costs. Project grant budgets must be supported by narrative statement that supports the application budget forms that will be required by the LTBMU application process.*

Key Personnel: *Identify project coordinators: project manager/engineer, NEPA/CEQA document coordinator, and contracted consultants.*

Project Location: *Provide project location and project area maps.*

Special Considerations: *Note any special considerations relevant to the project, such as special permission requirements or clearances and certifications.*

Bibliography: *Provide citations to any literature pertinent to the project or cited in the application.*

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUIRED ONLY FOR PROJECTS REQUESTING CONSERVANCY FUNDING

Please provide on separate sheets.

PLANNING GRANT

Amount of Funding Requested from CTC:_____

Other Funding Sources, Year Received or Anticipated to be Received, and Amount:

Coordination with Public Utility Districts: *Discuss how coordination will occur and what efforts will be made to reduce or minimize the overall erosion control project costs, including utility relocation costs. State whether the project implementer or the public utility district will be applying for grant funding.*

Resolution from Governing Body demonstrating commitment to the project:

Revised Workplan, if planning grant augmentation request:

SITE IMPROVEMENT GRANT

Amount of Funding Requested from CTC:_____

Other Funding Sources, Year Received or Anticipated to be Received, and Amount:

8 ½" x 11" maps showing the proposed improvements:

Coordination with Public Utility Districts: *Discuss how coordination will occur and what efforts will be made to reduce or minimize the overall erosion control project costs, including*

ACQUISTION GRANT

Amount of Funding Requested from CTC:_____

Other Funding Sources, Year Received or Anticipated to be Received, and Amount:

8 ½" x 11" maps showing the proposed improvements and acquisitions:

Resolution from Governing Body: *Resolution shall be from the governing body and demonstrate its commitment to implement the project in a manner consistent with the program objectives, to fund costs associated with management and maintenance of the project, and to actively manage and maintain the project over a 20-year term.*

Detailed Property Information: *Complete the form in Appendix E for each proposed acquisition and attach the required map(s).*

CEQA documentation: *Provide documentation demonstrating compliance with CEQA. See the CEQA section under the site improvement grant for more information.*

If funding from other Conservancy program areas (Public Access and Recreation, SEZ Restoration, Wildlife) is being sought, Conservancy staff shall be consulted to determine if the project is on the project priority lists for the other program areas. Conservancy staff will advise the applicant if additional information should be submitted with this funding request or separately.

Appendix C

Match Documentation Spreadsheet for SNPLMA Round 9 Awards

(Grantee Agency Name Here)

USFS/SNPLMA ROUND 9 Funding Request	EIP NO.	[1] Project Name	Match Source	Match Grant No.	Match Award Date*	Match Award Amount
[2] Additional Projects Utilized as Match						
TOTAL USFS REQUESTED						TOTAL MATCH FUNDS

*Amount remaining in prior year grants unspent as of July 1, 2008 (state fiscal year), and not matched with other federal funds. Amount of match does not necessarily reflect total amount awarded by match agency for this project, as only funding necessary to match current federal award is identified.

[1] CTC, NDSL, TRPA

[2] Projects in same Program but not necessarily same Round

Appendix D

Conservancy Program Objectives And Preferred Design Approach

The Conservancy's goal under the Soil Erosion Control Program is the funding and implementation of projects that meet the following three objectives:

1. Address high priority soil erosion control and water quality improvement needs. This grants program is intended to fund and implement projects in areas with critical problems and to design projects which maximize, to the extent feasible, water quality benefits. Projects, under this program, will focus on preventing the mobilization of fine sediment and nutrients by erosion (source control), reducing surface water volumes (hydrologic design considerations), and removing fine sediment and nutrients from stormwater (treatment). This design objective can be met using the Preferred Design Approach as a guiding principle, or by the use of other approaches which have been shown, by either qualitative or quantitative analysis, to have significant water quality benefit. This Preferred Design Approach is described in detail below.

2. Address soil erosion control needs effectively. This is achieved through the implementation of thorough, comprehensive projects at the lowest necessary cost.

3. Fund projects that can be readily implemented (i.e., so that on-the-ground site improvements may be completed as quickly as possible).

In addition to these primary objectives, projects must be monitored to assess their effectiveness and maintenance needs, and to improve the design of future projects.

Other Resource Objectives

In addition to meeting water quality objectives, applicants are requested to design projects that are compatible with other Conservancy resource objectives and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) environmental thresholds. Therefore, grantees are encouraged, when feasible, to develop project designs which also preserve or enhance wildlife habitat, forest and riparian habitat, public access, recreation, defensible space, and private property Best Management Practices interface opportunities.

Preferred Design Approach (PDA)

This section presents a guiding principle to consider when designing projects. It is intended to apply not only to grant submittal preparation, but also to the more detailed planning and design work that occurs after a grant is awarded.

The PDA reflects the current assessment of state-of-the-art technology and experience in implementing erosion control projects at Lake Tahoe. The Preferred Design Approach emphasizes project elements that prevent the mobilization of fine sediment and nutrients by erosion (source control), and that reduce the volume of runoff reaching natural surface waters (hydrologic design considerations). Source control measures and hydrologic design considerations, primarily infiltration, are the most cost-effective and efficient means to improve water quality. These two elements should be considered together, not separately, when looking for opportunities. Water quality treatment measures to remove pollutants from runoff are to be considered only after source control and hydrologic design.

In cases where applicants find it difficult to apply a specific portion of the PDA to a project or element of a project, the applicant should consult with Conservancy and other agency staff on specific barriers to implementation of the PDA. If project designs are not based on the PDA, grantees will be required to explain the specific barriers to the application of the PDA and provide documentation to support how the proposed alternative approach meets program objectives (e.g., maximizes water quality benefit).

The Conservancy recognizes that this approach must be applied within the context of professional engineering practices to avoid impacts on public health and safety and damage to public and private property. It also recognizes that there are legal and regulatory limitations to the application of these principles, such as applicable drainage law.

Specific elements of the Preferred Design Approach are:

Source Control

1. Place higher priority on source controls than on treatment. Source controls are measures that prevent erosion. Treatment facilities remove pollutants from runoff.
2. Emphasize reduction in bare, erodible surfaces (e.g., steep cut slopes, dirt roads) and impervious area.

3. Emphasize stabilization of gullies, unstable channels, and other sources that contribute especially high sediment loads.
4. Maximize self-sustaining source control methods, such as revegetation with native plants, pine needle mulching, and adding soil amendments such as mycorrhizal inoculum to soils when appropriate.

Hydrologic Design

5. Maintain or create distributed flow patterns (e.g., flows which discharge from the right-of-way frequently, or from shoulders by unconcentrated "sheet flow") and avoid concentration or increases of flows where feasible.
6. Maximize infiltration of runoff from impervious surfaces. In some cases this can be accomplished by techniques described in number 5 above or also by the construction of leach fields, dry wells, or detention basins, for example.
7. Keep runoff from non-urban areas separate from urban runoff until urban runoff is treated. Treatment efficiency is much greater when flow volumes are smaller.
8. Keep treated urban runoff separate from untreated urban runoff to avoid resuspension of sediments and decreased treatment efficiency in downstream facilities.
9. Apply geomorphologic principles to natural channel design and mimic natural processes when stabilizing, restoring, or recreating natural drainage channels. For example, channels with floodplains tend to be more stable than those without. Channels with steps and pools are a frequent natural stream form and have better habitat values than those with continuous slopes. Avoid adding to or decreasing natural stream flows or changing watershed boundaries.

Treatment

10. Emphasize removal of fine sediments and phosphorous. For the purposes of the PDA, fine sediment is considered to be those particles that pass the number 200 sieve (less than 75 microns). Examples of improvements that are likely to achieve this objective are properly-sized, flat or gently-sloping, well-vegetated, detention areas (meadow-like areas).
11. Use natural treatment systems, such as meadows, where feasible. Because of the critical importance of wetland plants in removing pollutants from runoff, projects located in Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) should generally preserve the existing vegetation and function of the SEZs to the maximum extent practicable.

The Basin 208 Plan calls for the restoration of 1,100 acres of disturbed SEZs in the Tahoe Basin. The program objectives continue to place a priority on SEZ restoration work to support attainment of this threshold. Such restoration work is cost-effective and beneficial for removing nutrients and fine sediment from runoff. Preference will be given to qualified projects that provide for infiltration of runoff and absorption of nutrients by plants and soil. This concept will continue to be promoted throughout the project design and plan review process.

Grantees are encouraged to collaborate and cooperate with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District (TRCD) at the beginning of a project to determine methods of collecting and sharing information between them that can assist in promoting private property compliance with the TRPA's BMP Retrofit Ordinance within project areas. The goal of these efforts is to reduce pollutant loads entering public rights-of-way, ground water, and surface waters to improve the effectiveness of County and City erosion control projects as well as assist TRCD in obtaining information that would assist them in providing more efficient BMP designs. When funding submittals are evaluated, preference will be given to qualified projects that include this component.

Coordination with Storm Water Master Planning and Management Planning Efforts

Where feasible and appropriate, grantees shall incorporate jurisdictional storm water master plan drainage efforts and storm water management activities with Conservancy project design objectives. Development of regional treatment systems, where appropriate, should be considered to address water quality treatment. While regional treatment systems may also address the potential for flooding, the primary objective must be water quality improvement to be eligible under the soil erosion control grant program.

Storm Water Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC) Procedures

The California Tahoe Conservancy board and the Lake Tahoe Basin Executives have endorsed the concepts and principles described in the documents developed by the Storm Water Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC). The SWQIC documents describe a process to provide a consensus-based approach to project review, development, and implementation. It is hoped that this approach will lead to project designs that have the support of all agencies and meet the objectives of the PDA.

When implementing erosion control projects, the procedures described in the SWQIC documents should be followed to the extent practical and feasible. A complete set of

these documents can be downloaded by clicking on the "Stormwater Planning" link on the TRPA website (http://www.trpa.org/).

Pursuant to the Formulating and Evaluating Alternatives portion of the SWQIC process, applicants are requested to develop and analyze a variety of design alternatives to determine the best elements to include in a particular project. Consistent with the PDA, the alternatives should first consider source control measures and hydrologic design measures, and, finally, treatment systems.

Conservancy Monitoring Objectives and Requirements

Pursuant to the intent of the budgetary requirements, all projects must be monitored to document their effectiveness at reducing discharge of sediment and other pollutants to the waters of the Lake Tahoe region. Prior to initiating a monitoring program, the questions that will be answered or addressed through monitoring should be defined and agreed upon in a monitoring plan approved by the Conservancy.

More intensive water quality monitoring is encouraged only on projects that provide the best opportunities to more comprehensively address the Conservancy's monitoring program objectives. These objectives are to improve the effectiveness of future projects and document the water quality benefits of constructed BMPs and projects. Since funding for this task tends to be limited, applicants must work closely with Conservancy staff in the early planning phases of project development to determine the level of monitoring for each project.

Minimum Monitoring Requirements

Photographs and visual observations are required for all projects. These must be recorded at each site during the year preceding construction and for at least two years following construction. Semi-annual reporting and annual reports documenting photo monitoring and visual observation must be prepared and submitted to the Conservancy.

1. Photo points - On a map of the site, show the locations where the camera will be positioned, and the direction(s) it will be pointing. Photographs should be taken from the same locations each time and pointing in the same directions. The photographs should contain landmarks or reference points so that the viewer can discern that the before and after pictures were taken from the same location. Note the frequency and dates when photographs will be taken. Digital photographs must be taken at all sites, at various times of the year both before improvements are installed, and after the

project is constructed. Photos must be taken twice a year, once during spring melt and once in the fall prior to snowfall, so that a sequence of photos can be prepared and evaluated for seasonal variability. Photos should always be taken at the same time of day (i.e., morning, afternoon, etc.).

In addition to seasonal photos taken each year, pictures should be taken during and/or after major storm events (i.e., large runoff events) and after structural changes such as bank failure or gullying have occurred. These event-based photos may be taken at a different location than the established photo points if that is necessary to capture the impacts of the event. Under these circumstances, the locations for the new photo points and the reasons for selecting these new locations should be explained in annotations corresponding to each photo.

2. Field observations - Field observations should address the monitoring goals and should attempt to answer the questions defined for the photo monitoring. In addition to the existing conditions mentioned below, photo annotations should discuss antecedent conditions, such as the weather and soil moisture conditions, and/or the size and type (i.e., rain, snow, hail, etc.) of storm that is being observed.

   Conditions that are required to be observed in the field, and must be addressed with photo annotations are:
   - location, date and time;
   - precipitation (estimate where rain gauge data is not available);
   - temperature of the ambient air, and water if present;
   - depth, velocity, and cross-sectional area of flow (only where channels are impacted by project);
   - color and turbidity of water, if present (turbidity shall be determined by field analysis of a grab sample or submittal of a sample to a laboratory qualified to perform turbidity analysis in accordance with accepted protocol);
   - depth and area of accumulated sediment in channels, basins, or traps;
   - depth, length, and width of rills or gullies on slopes; and
   - percent plant cover (if using a transect evaluation method), or label discrete areas with one of the following categories: bare, sparsely vegetated, or moderately vegetated, densely vegetated.

   Field observations must be recorded whenever photographs are taken.

3. Semi-annual reporting - The grantee should report to the Conservancy staff semi-annually with a brief letter or verbal communication, and provide digital photos on a disk or email attachment, in order to allow Conservancy staff to comment prior to the

completion of each year of monitoring. If problems are encountered with the monitoring, a brief summary of the problems should be provided to the Conservancy during this communication.

4. Annual reports - The first annual report must include annotated photographs of the site before construction. Each subsequent annual report shall include a sequence of annotated photographs from each photo point showing the site, at least twice a year, once during spring snowmelt and once in the fall prior to snowmelt, before construction, one year after construction, and two years after construction. As noted above, the photographs should contain landmarks or reference points so that the viewer can discern that the before and after pictures were taken from the same location. The annotations should include the photo point location, a description of what each photograph shows, and the field observations detailed above. The report should include a project map or maps showing the locations of the photo points.

   Annual reports must present the water quality data collected during the past year (if any), and an analysis of the data's significance in regard to the effectiveness of the control measures at improving water quality. Variations in the data, if any, and possible reasons for them should also be discussed. Annual reports should also identify the conclusions that can be drawn from monitoring, and should answer questions like – What did we learn about these designs regarding their effectiveness, limitations associated with them, problems that may have occurred, any suggested solutions/modifications to the designs, any recommendations regarding effectiveness of monitoring techniques?

More Intensive Monitoring

The following guidance should be followed for projects approved for more intensive monitoring, including water quality sampling.

1. Monitoring Proposal Review - The Lake Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program group (LTIMP), a water quality working group, continues to meet monthly. This working group includes representatives from various Federal, regional, State, and local agencies, plus university staff, consultants, and private individuals with monitoring expertise. One function of the working group is to provide an informal review of monitoring proposals and sampling and analysis plans. This review process does not apply to basic monitoring programs involving only photographs and visual observations, and should be primarily utilized for complex monitoring projects that incorporate new technology or include treatment BMPs that pose problems for monitoring efforts. Applicants are encouraged to present their

monitoring proposals for intensive monitoring projects to the LTIMP working group for review when complex designs are proposed or there is a lack of convenient sampling locations. However, this procedure is optional and at the discretion of the grantee. The recommended process for this informal review is a short presentation by the monitoring project proponent to the LTIMP group, followed by a session of feedback and questions. The purpose of the presentation and feedback session is to coordinate efforts, prevent duplications, and strengthen the monitoring proposal's methods. To schedule a presentation, applicants should contact the current LTIMP chair.

2. Locations of water quality sampling points - At least one sampling point should be immediately above and below the proposed improvements. The station above the project should be designed to provide data on background pollutant levels. If a sampling point immediately above the project is not feasible, a control station as close as possible to the site should be selected. The watershed above the control station must be similar to the project site and there should be no land use changes in this watershed during the period of monitoring. The sampling point below the proposed improvements should be designed to measure the effectiveness of the improvements. If possible, water quality sampling points should be chosen that would allow for flow measurements (or estimates) to be taken (i.e., a location with well defined, concentrated flow).

3. Constituents to be analyzed - The constituents analyzed for in each project should be mutually agreed upon between Conservancy staff and grantees prior to the onset of intensive monitoring efforts. The units of measurement must be the same as those used by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. Laboratory methods approved by the US Environmental Protection Agency must also be used.

   Where feasible, flow measurements should be taken at each water quality sampling point, during each sampling event, in order to more accurately estimate pollutant loading associated with the project components.

4. Frequency of sampling - Frequency of sampling will vary depending on the question that is being answered through the monitoring. However, at a minimum, samples should be collected at the beginning, peak, and end of each storm that is sampled. At least three storm events and one snowmelt runoff event should be sampled each year for one year preceding construction and at least two years following construction. Consensus on statistical methods and sampling frequency should be reached before data collection begins.

Appendix E

Land Acquisition Information and Submittal Form

Acquisition Information Form

The form found at the end of this appendix shall be submitted with the funding request for all interests in privately-owned parcels proposed for consideration of Conservancy funding.

Nominal and Low-Value Acquisitions

Grantees may use an abbreviated and faster value determination process for nominal value ($2,500 or less) and low-value ($2,501 to $10,000) acquisitions. Grantees are eligible for this streamlined appraisal process when there is no serious question as to the highest and best use, when adequate market data is available to make an administrative determination of value, when substantial damages or benefits are not involved, and when there is no reason to believe hazardous materials/waste is present.

Grantees shall indicate in their requests which easements they believe will be eligible for the streamlined valuation process. A final determination on which easements are eligible for this process will be made in consultation with Conservancy staff, who will continue to review and approve all valuation determinations as provided for in the standard grant agreement.

For nominal value ($2,500 or less) acquisitions, title insurance is not required. However, a preliminary title report (PTR) is required in all instances, including donations. In order to compensate for the lack of title insurance, an indemnification clause must be added to the purchase and sale agreement between the grantee and the seller. This clause must require the seller to indemnify the grantee against loss resulting from defects in the title in an amount sufficient to allow the project to be fully implemented.

Grantees may take title subject to a deed of trust or mortgage under the following conditions:

1) where a partial acquisition is a relatively small portion of a parcel, or of nominal value ($2,500 or less), and
2) the easement is for improvements that are not essential to the overall functioning of the project, such as curb and gutter and pavement along the perimeter of a parcel. An indemnity clause will be required in the purchase agreement for loss resulting from defects in title.

INFORMATION FORM FOR LAND ACQUISITION FOR EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS

(Use one form for each parcel)

Project Title:

_____

1. Assessor's Parcel Number:_____

2. Parcel Street Address:_____

3. Owner's Name: _____
   Owner's Mailing Address: _____

_____

4. Subdivision Name: _____

5. IPES Score: _____

6. a. Assessed Value: Land $_____Improvements $_____
   b. Approximate % of parcel needed:_____
   c. Current fair market value of portion of parcel needed:_____

   _____

   (circle one: fee easement)

7. Existing improvements, if any: _____

   _____

8. Reason for acquisition: _____

   _____

9. a. Owner Contacts Made:_____

   _____

   b. Owner's Response (if the owner is willing but with conditions, list those conditions):_____

   _____

   c. Alternatives to acquisition (such as permit or right-of-entry):_____

   _____

   _____

10. Attach annotated Assessor's Plat showing proposed acquisition and approximate location of project improvements that will affect the lot. If a creek or other drainageway crosses the property, sketch its approximate location.

Appendix F

California Propositions Funding Requirements

California Environmental Information Catalog Requirements

Grantees shall prepare and submit an on-line catalog entry form to the California Environmental Information Catalog for information products and reports relating to California's natural environment for projects that have been designed with proposition funds. Of particular interest are those products that characterize site-specific conditions with regard to vegetation, wildlife populations, species occurrences, and other measures of biological diversity, environmental and ecological condition. The Conservancy shall determine whether, for public policy reasons, a catalog description of any information product or report should be withheld from disclosure in the California Environmental Information Catalog.

Accounting Requirements

Departments receiving proposition funds are required to report annually to the Department of Finance on the progress of proposition expenditures. Using these reports, the Department of Finance is required to audit and report annually on the expenditure of these funds. Accordingly, the Conservancy and individual grantees receiving proposition funds are subject to annual audits.

The Conservancy's standard grant language for site improvement, acquisition and planning grants has always contained language requiring that the grantees maintain (for three years following final payment) satisfactory financial accounts, documents, and records relating to the projects and make them available for audit by the Conservancy and the State's Auditor General.

The Conservancy's standard grant agreement audit language requires that the grantees establish separate accounting records for each project and maintain their records sufficient to reflect the amount and disposition of all project funds, including State funds, interest earned, and any matching funds. Therefore, in accordance with this audit language, grantees must establish separate accounting records for each project, which keep track of the receipt date, deposit, and disbursement of all project funds, including interest.

Signing Requirements

In addition, for projects funded under propositions, there are specific sign requirements. The sign guidelines require a specific sign or signs at the project site identifying the proposition funding received for the project. They also require that the sign(s) contain a logo specific to the proposition.

PROPOSITION 50 REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with the provisions of proposition 50, the following principles apply to the implementation of proposition 50 to the maximum extent possible, and where appropriate:

a. Integrated, Multiple Benefit Projects: Where appropriate and feasible, applicants are encouraged to submit grants that have multiple program benefits as related to other Conservancy program objectives and authorities. Projects submitted for funding that have well-developed, integrated, cross-program benefits, and/or which demonstrate compatibility with other Conservancy program objectives, shall receive funding preference. Applicants are encouraged to develop project designs that, in addition to meeting water quality objectives, preserve or enhance wildlife habitat, forest and riparian habitat, and/or which provide public access and recreation opportunities.

   Projects having multiple environmental cross-program benefits often have other public benefits, such as: social and economic benefits through job creation; enhanced scenic and aesthetic values through the creation of open space; lakeside recreational amenities including, but not limited to, parks and public access ways; and enhanced alternative transportation through the creation of public footpaths and bicycle paths.

b. Disadvantaged Communities: Proposition 50 contains provisions related to favoring disadvantaged communities in making funding decisions for projects. Staff believe it is appropriate to consider the Lake Tahoe Basin as a single community for the purposes of the erosion control grant program (i.e., not to differentiate areas within the basin based on socioeconomic criteria), for the following reasons: 1) The intent of the grant program and a mission of the Conservancy is to protect Lake Tahoe and "the waters of the Lake Tahoe Region"; 2) The Conservancy has been charged with implementing its portion of the Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) for Lake Tahoe; 3) The EIP is a basinwide plan that does not differentiate areas or priorities based on socioeconomic factors. It contains projects in all the urbanized portions of the region, and all areas require treatment.

Conservancy staff will continue to evaluate the disadvantaged community criteria to determine whether it should be modified in the future to address changing conditions or needs.

c. Water Supply Reliability: Where appropriate and feasible, programs shall support projects that improve local and regional water supply reliability. This item is fundamentally within the jurisdiction of local and/or regional water providing agencies. Applicants are encouraged to contact their local and regional water supply agencies when considering projects that may affect local and regional water supply reliability.

d. Water Quality Standards: Where appropriate and feasible, preference shall be given to projects that are expected to contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.

Applicants are encouraged to review existing regulatory documents pertaining to local and regional water quality, including but not limited to the following: the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Basin 208 Plan; Chapter 2 of TRPA's Goals and Policies; Chapter 81 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances; the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region; and the Preferred Design Approach within the Conservancy's Soil Erosion Control Program Guidelines. Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate how projects meet and/or exceed the standards outlined in the above-mentioned documents when addressing projects that contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.

e. Impaired Waters and Sensitive Habitat Areas: Where appropriate and feasible, preference shall be given to funding projects that will eliminate or significantly reduce pollution into impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance. Impaired water bodies on the California side of the Lake Tahoe basin include: Blackwood Creek, Ward Creek, and Heavenly Valley Creek.

Applicants are encouraged to review all applicable local and regional documents that make reference to sensitive habitat areas and areas of special biological significance, including but not limited to the following documents: Chapters 75, 78, and 79 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances; Chapter IV (Conservation Element) of the Goals and Policies of the TRPA Regional Plan; Chapter 4.9 of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region; and Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan.

f. Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP): Where appropriate and feasible, projects shall include a monitoring component that allows the integration of data into statewide monitoring efforts, including but not limited to the SWAMP. SWAMP is a statewide monitoring effort designed to assess the conditions of surface waters throughout the State of California and is administrated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Responsibility for coordination of grant-funded monitoring activities under the SWAMP in the Lake Tahoe Basin resides with the State Water Board's SWAMP unit. Grantees are encouraged to implement these SWAMP requirements where applicable, specifically the SWAMP Quality Assurance Template listing 24 required elements and the Quality Assurance Program Plan checklist. For more information on SWAMP, grantees should contact the State Water Board.

Staff will continue to evaluate the SWAMP requirements as they are developed by the State Water Board, and determine whether modifications to these grant program guidelines are appropriate or necessary.

g. Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001: Where appropriate and feasible, projects that affect groundwater shall include groundwater monitoring requirements consistent with the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 [Part 2.76 (commencing with Section 10780) of division 6 of the Water Code]. Applicants are also encouraged to coordinate with appropriate State Water Board staff, to address Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 requirements that may be applicable to Proposition 50-funded projects, and to ensure that projects including a groundwater monitoring component allow the integration of data into statewide monitoring efforts, including but not limited to the State Water Board's Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program.

Grantees are encouraged to access the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 requirements; grantees should contact GAMA staff at the State Water Board when seeking answers to any questions pertaining to the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 requirements.