5, Recommendations and Funding Sources

5.1 RESTORATION STRATEGIES AND NEXT STEPS

Many of the restoration projects identified have common needs for additional studies: river hydrology and hydraulic analysis, property boundary verification, aerial photographs, topographic surveys, traffic studies, biological surveys, cultural resource surveys, and environmental compliance. Recommendations and potential strategies for these additional studies are discussed below. Table 5-1 Summarizes proposed potential projects discussed in Chapter 4 and the level of difficulty, complexity, and cost for implementation. Table 5-2 describes potential funding sources for the projects identified.

MAPPING AND PROPERTY BOUNDARY VERIFICATION

All projects, restoration and access, will need high resolution rectified aerial photographs for use as base maps during detailed design. In addition, property boundaries will need to be verified and surveyed in the field by a registered surveyor. Once project locations are clearly identified, a registered surveyor will also need to prepare a topographic survey of the project site. For greatest efficiency the study area should have color aerial photographs taken of the entire corridor at one time. These aerials should be both rectified and georeferenced.

RIVER HYDROLOGY/HYDRAULICS AND GEOMORPHOLOGY

The USGS has published hydrologic data for water years from 1933 – 1997 for use in river and reservoirs operations model for the Truckee River Basin (Berris et al 2001). The hydrologic data consists of time series of streamflow, lake/reservoir elevation and storage, precipitation, evaporation, evapotranspiration, M&I demand, and forecasts of streamflow and lake/reservoir levels. Although this information is useful for water management it does not provide the necessary hydraulic or geomorphic understanding required to plan for in-stream and floodplain habitat restoration projects.

Typically geomorphologists will prepare a background study of channel history – how it has moved and developed over time and how this may affect future movement and change. The geomorphic analysis is then correlated with hydraulic and hydrologic data. Frequently additional data essential to understanding the 1, 2, and 5-year flood events need to be collected and added to the existing river models, if one already exists. Typically flood models only study the 50, 100, and 200 year flood event to develop Federal Emergency Management Act mapping and flood management protocol. The frequent flood events (1, 2, and 5-year) are vital to riparian habitat development and recruitment. Understanding when and how these flows occur is essential to the design of in-stream and floodplain habitat restoration projects, therefore a hydrologic, hydraulic, and geomorphic analysis of the river corridor should be conducted to further refine the location and type of habitat restoration projects proposed.

TRAFFIC STUDY

New parking areas or trailheads and the recommendations to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety at River Ranch and the Squaw Valley intersection may require an analysis of traffic to prepare detail designs and environmental compliance. A traffic study looking at several projects at one time may be more cost effective than individual studies.

TABLE 5-1 Proposed Projects and Ease of Implementation Summary

	Gross Estimated Cost	Complexity	Environmental Compliance				
RESTORATION PROJECTS							
Restore Low Floodplain Terrace	\$\$\$	High	Yes				
Protect and Restore River Bank and Improve River Access	\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$	High	Yes				
Create Riparian Wet Meadow Habitat	\$\$ - \$\$\$	Meduim - High	Yes				
Stabilize Steep River banks	\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$	High	Yes				
Revegetate Over-wide Highway Shoulders	\$ - \$\$	Low	Yes				
Improve Water Quality at Toe of Slope	\$\$	Medium	Yes				
Improve Water Quality within Trail Projects	\$\$	Medium	Yes				
PUBLIC ACCESS - TRAILHEAD PROJECTS							
Type "A" Trail Access – Trailhead / Parking Lot with amenities	\$\$\$\$	Medium	Yes				
Type "B" Trail Access – Limited amenities	\$\$\$	Medium	Yes				
EXISTING BIKE PATH ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	CTS						
River Ranch Paved Parking Lot Improvement	\$\$	Medium	Yes				
River Ranch Unpaved Parking Area Improvement	\$\$	Medium	Yes				
Squaw Valley Road Crossing Improvements	\$\$	Medium	Yes				
ROADWAY SHOULDER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	CTS		,				
Silver Creek Campground Improvement	\$	Low	No				
INFORMATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL SIGNS	AND MATERIALS		,				
Interpretive Signs	\$	Low	No				
Fishing, Boating, and Trail Access Signs	\$	Low	No				
River Access Brochure	\$	Low	No				
River Heritage Interpretive Trail	\$	Low	No				
MULTIPLE-USE TRAIL PROJECTS							
Class I Trail – Typical Cross-Section	\$\$ per mile	Medium	Yes				
Class I Trail on Steep Cross-Slope	\$\$\$\$ per mile	High	Yes				
Type "A" Cross-section — Bike Path with Adjacent Parking	\$\$\$ per location	Medium	Yes				
Type "B" Cross-Section – Bike Path with Setback	\$\$\$ per location	Medium	Yes				
Type "C" Cross-section – Bike Path on Steep Slope	\$\$\$\$ per location	High	Yes				

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

Projects approved by the County or another public agency that are constructed in response to the plan and that may cause adverse effects on the physical environment would need to be reviewed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Projects receiving federal funding or proposed on federal land would also need to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Projects within the jurisdiction of TRPA would need to comply with TRPA environmental regulatory guidelines.

Some recommended actions would be exempt from CEQA/ NEPA/TRPA, based on qualification for a categorical or statutory exemption (e.g., outreach programs that do not involve physical changes or very minor improvements, like signage). Smaller projects may be exempt from NEPA. Bike lanes and paths normally fall under a categorical exclusion from NEPA; however, in cases with high environmental values a greater level of environmental review may be necessary. This would need to be verified with the Federal funding agency by the project proponent.

Two approaches are available to achieve CEQA compliance for non-exempt projects in this situation. The first approach would be for the County to prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addressing the environmental effects of the plan as a whole and approve the Truckee River Corridor Access Plan for implementation following public review of the EIR. After certification of the Program EIR and approval of the plan, when subsequent construction projects are funded and ready for consideration, they would be reviewed in light of the Program EIR for their CEQA compliance. This subsequent review may or may not require preparation of another environmental document (i.e., another more focused EIR, a negative declaration [ND] or mitigated negative declaration [MND]), depending on whether the impacts of the construction projects were in the scope of and adequately addressed in the Program EIR. The advantage of this approach is the preparation of a comprehensive initial environmental document (the Program EIR) that addresses the potential impacts of the entire plan, including cumulative impacts. The disadvantage is that the EIR would take additional time to complete (12 or more months) before initial construction projects could be considered for implementation.

The second approach would involve the County or other public agencies identifying logically associated sets of construction projects from the recommendations in the plan, such as a set of signage improvements or a group of habitat restoration actions, and approve projects in stages as funding becomes available for them. In the case of very minor actions, like signage, the project may be exempt from CEQA. For other non-exempt projects, individual, project-level environmental documents (EIR, MND, or ND) would need to be prepared and circulated for public review. The advantage of this approach is that the first sets of physical projects could be implemented relatively quickly, subject to available funding, if they just require an exemption or ND or MND. The disadvantage is that consideration of cumulative effects would need to be discussed within each environmental document, making the overall CEQA review process less efficient over time.

The County will need to consider these approaches based on expectations about the funding available for and priority of different construction projects.

REGULATORY PERMITTING

Certain construction projects may require approval of environmental permits by agencies responsible for sensitive resources, such as wetlands (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers), streambed alteration (California Department of Fish and Game), water quality (Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board), and SR 89 highway operation (Caltrans). Necessary permits would be secured by the County or other agencies implementing projects as part of the individual project design and approval review processes. Regulatory permits can require a lengthy time period and so the application processes for them should be initiated as soon as possible.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES AND CULTURAL SURVEYS

Special status species (plant and wildlife) and cultural resource surveys will need to be conducted for all sites as part of both environmental compliance and regulatory permitting. It is strongly recommended these surveys be conducted early in the site selection or conceptual design phase to avoid potential impacts or incorporate mitigation into the design. The earlier the design team is aware of potential site constraints the more efficient the design, environmental compliance and permitting process.

5.2 RESTORATION FUNDING

TABLE 5-2 Restoration Funding Sources

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Project Types	Comments
FEDERAL FUNDING							
Landowner Incentive Program	-	USFWS Division of Federal Assistance	\$22 million	25%	State fish and wildlife agencies	Designed to assist States by providing grants to establish or supplement landowner incentive programs that protect and restore habitats on private lands, to benefit Federally listed, proposed or candidate species or other species determined to be at-risk, and provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners for habitat protection and restoration.	From Land and Water Conservation Fund Contact The Division of Federal Assistance FederalAid@fws.gov
Targeted Watersheds Grants	-	EPA	\$15 million	25%	States, local governments and Indian tribal governments	Grants and cooperative agreements awarded to watershed organizations for watershed restoration and protection projects, such as implementing agricultural best practices, conducting streambank restoration, and implementing TMDLs.	Contact: Sam Ziegler, telephone 415-972-3399; e-mail iegler. sam@epa.gov
Rivers, Trails, And Conservation Assistance Program	N/A	NPS	N/A	N/A	Non-profit organizations, community groups, tribes or tribal governments, and local, State, or federal government agencies.	Rivers & Trails staff assistance includes help in building partnerships to achieve community-set goals, assessing resources, developing concept plans, engaging public participation, and identifying potential sources of funding.	This is a technical assistance program only.
STATE FUNDING							
Sierra Nevada Conservancy	New program	RESD	TBD	TBD	Local governments and non profit organizations	Environmental protection, resource conservation, recreational opportunities and economic growth.	
California River Parkways Program (Prop 50)	October	CA State Resources Agency	\$40.5 million total	NO	local, non-profit	Recreation, habitat, flood management, conversion to river parkways, conservation and interpretive enhancement. Must provide public access or be part of a larger Parkway Plan.	http://www.resources.ca.gov/bonds_prop50riverparkway.html
Sierra Nevada-Cascade Conservation Grant Program		CA State Resources Agency			Local public agencies, local water districts, non-profits	acquisition of land and water rights to protect water quality in lakes, reservoirs, rivers, streams and wetlands in the Sierra Nevada-Cascade Mountain Region. Working lands, water rights, adjacent lands, management practices	http://www.resources.ca.gov/bonds_prop50sncgrantsprogram.html
Sierra Nevada Cascade Grant Bond Act – Park Bond Act of 2000	Feb 2002	CA State Resources Agency	\$3.3 million total		Cities; counties; regional park or open-space districts nonprofit organizations Indian tribes	Rivers and Streams Projects; Trail Projects and educational or interpretive nature trails; Natural Resource-based Capital Improvements that provide park and recreational opportunities; and Acquisitions of parklands or recreational facilities.	http://resources.ca.gov/bond/CascadeGuideHighlights.pdf Probably expired
Urban Streams Restoration Program	January	Department of Water Resources	\$1 million per project; \$5 million total program funds		local public agency and citizen's group (both required)	reduce urban flooding/erosion, restore environmental values, and promote community stewardship of urban streams	Prop 40 Funds Sara Denzler (916) 651-9625 sdenzler@water.ca.gov
California Riparian Habitat Conservation Program	-	Wildlife Conservation Board	-	-	nonprofit organizations, local government agencies, state departments and federal agencies	Bank stabilization and revegetation, restoration of riparian vegetation on flood- prone land, modification of the existing land form to allow a stream to regain its historic connection with its floodplain, removal of nonnative invasive plant species and restoration.	Wildlife Conservation Board Riparian Program Manager, Scott Clemons (916) 445-1072 or by email at sclemons@dfg.ca.gov.
Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Program		WCB			nonprofit organizations, local government agencies, state departments and federal agencies	Restorations of fisheries, wetlands outside the Central Valley (Inland Wetlands), native grasslands and forests	Department of Fish and Game – Region 2 1701 Nimbus Road Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 Public Information: (916) 358-2900 Fax: (916) 358-2912

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Project Types	Comments
Land Acquisition Program	-	WCB	-	-	nonprofit organizations, local government agencies	Land acquisition is a component of all Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) programs. All acquisitions are made on a "willing seller" basis pursuant to a fair market value appraisal as approved by the Department of General Services (DGS).	Department of Fish and Game – Region 2 1701 Nimbus Road Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 Public Information: (916) 358-2900 Fax: (916) 358-2912
2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program	February 9, 2006	State Water Board	\$143 Million	-	cities, counties and public districts or corporations	Implement measures (e.g., BMPs, LID, educational outreach materials) to reduce, improve or control stormwater quality in the Truckee River watershed.	Contact Lahontan Region 6
Land and Water Conservation Fund	May 1, 2006, for local agencies August 1, for state agencies	NPS via State Parks and Recreation	-	50% grant - 50% match requirement	Cities, counties and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate and maintain park and recreation areas.	Acquisition or development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Priority development projects include trails, campgrounds, picnic areas, natural areas and cultural areas for recreational use.	California State Parks Office of Grants & Local Services PO Box 942896 Sacramento, CA 94296-0001
Proposition 117 Funding					Public agencies only		TEL 916-653-7423
Habitat Conservation Fund	Oct 2, 2006	State Parks and Recreation	\$2 million	El	Local governments	Deer/Mountain Lion Habitat; Rare, Threatened, Endangered, or Fully Protected Species Habitat; Wetland Habitat; and Riparian Habitat	California Department of Parks and Recreation Office of Grants Local Services PO Box 942896 (street) 1416 9th Street, Room 918 Sacramento, California 94296-0001
Public Access Program	Every 3 months	WCB		N/A	cities, counties and public districts or corporations	fishing piers or floats, access roads, boat launching ramps, trails, boardwalks, interpretive facilities and lake or stream improvements	Engineering, costs estimates and contract administration are the responsibility of the local agency.
							Contact: Wildlife Conservation Board 1807 13th Street, Suite 103, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 445-8448 Fax (916) 323-0280
PRIVATE/NON-PROFIT FUND	ING						
General Matching Grants Program	September	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	\$10,000-\$150,000	2:1	Federal, State, local, university, tribal, non-profit organizations/agencies	Address priority actions promoting fish and wildlife conservation and the habitats on which they depend	http://www.nfwf.org/faq.cfm
Five-Star Restoration Matching Grants Program		EPA through the NFWF		funding, land, technical assistance, workforce support, and/or other in-kind services.	Any public or private entity	community-based wetland, riparian, and coastal habitat restoration projects that build diverse partnerships and foster local natural resource stewardship through education, outreach and training activities	http://www.nfwf.org/programs/5star-rfp.cfm
Bring Back the Natives	February 3, 2006	NFWF, in cooperation with the USFWS, BLM, U.S.D.A. Forest Service, and Trout Unlimited.	Average grant size is \$60,000	Requires 2:1 non-federal to federal match	Federal, State, local, university, tribal, non-profit organizations/agencies	The program seeks projects that initiate partnerships with private landowners, demonstrate successful collaborative efforts, address watershed health issues that would lead to restoring habitats and are key to restoring native aquatic species and their migration corridors, promote stewardship on private lands.	Special emphasis is placed on cutthroat trout restoration with specific preference given to projects that will protect or re-establish migration corridors between breeding populations such as Lahontan cutthroat trout and Yellowstone cutthroat trout.
							Contact: Corey Grace 415-778-0999 or corey.grace@nfwf.org
Acres for America	Varies	Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and NFWF	Approx. 5,000 acres per year	-	Federal, State, local, university, tribal, non-profit organizations/agencies	Conserve important habitat for fish, wildlife and plants through acquisition of interest in real property.	Goal is to offset the footprint of Wal-Mart stores. Contact Megan Oliver - megan.oliver@nfwf.org
Migratory Bird Conservancy	September	Migratory Bird Conservancy and NFWF	\$100,000	I:I in-kind or monetary	Federal, State, local, university, tribal, non-profit organizations/agencies	Projects that directly address conservation of priority bird habitats in the Western Hemisphere. Acquisition, restoration, and improved management of habitats are program priorities.	Peter Stangel 404-679-7099 or Stangel@nfwf.org
Native Plant Conservation Initiative	February 17 and August 25, 2006	NFWF	Average grant \$15,000	1:1	State, local, university, tribal, non-profit organizations/ agencies	"On-the-ground" projects that involve local communities and citizen volunteers in the restoration of native plant communities. Projects that include a pollinator conservation component are also encouraged.	Ellen Gabel 202-857-0166 or Gabel@nfwf.org

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS:

BLM Bureau of Land Management NPS National Park Service U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service TRPA Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

FPA Environmental Protection Agency RESD, DGS Real Estate Services Division, Department of General Services

NFWF National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Protection Agency

NFWF National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Posterior Agency

NFWF National Fish Agency

NFWF

5.3 RECREATION ACCESS STRATEGIES AND NEXT **STEPS**

Implementation of individual trail and access projects involves a number of next steps, as described below.

BIKE TRAIL ALIGNMENT

An overall potential trail alignment stretching from Squaw Valley Road to the Truckee town limits has been generally identified in this Master Plan. In some areas, potential alignments on both the east and west sides of the river have been identified. The next step in the trail development process will involve more detailed work, including additional fieldwork and precise property boundary surveys, to determine alignment feasibility and identify a single preferred alignment. This preferred alignment would need to avoid private parcels or identify realistic easements through parcels with willing owners. Specific locations for bridge crossings, engineering needs, and potential environmental issues will also need to be identified at this time. Once a preferred alignment has been identified, a phasing plan should be developed for the trail, identifying logical incremental trail segments for development. The initial segments need to connect to an existing facility at either end—either the existing trail at Squaw Valley, or a future trail segment into the Town of Truckee. The segments should take into account logical stopping points—not just stopping at a private property line, but instead ending the segment at a location that has facilities, such as one of the existing USFS campgrounds. By tackling the trail development in discrete segments, initial funding can be focused on the less expensive and more feasible segments. Once these segments are in use, they can help build momentum for the more challenging and expensive segments needed to complete the corridor, and help to leverage further funding.

TRAILHEAD/RIVER ACCESS PROJECTS

The first step will be to identify more precise locations of Type A and Type B trail access points along the alignment. For the Type A access points (full trailhead/parking), locations are envisioned for larger areas within existing public parcels, such as within the existing U.S. Forest Service parcels. Consideration will need to be given to the proximity of these trailheads to other parking opportunities (e.g., the Squaw Valley parking area), and potential future parking/access areas within Truckee at the north end. If creation of any Type A access point requires constructing a new access driveway off SR 89, a traffic study will be required with consideration to the sight distances for vehicles pulling out. For the Type B access (improved roadside pullout), more precise locations will also need to be identified, taking into consideration factors such as demand for access at a specific location (e.g., a known fishing spot); adjacent private property/private driveways; and potential impacts on a future trail alignment.

SPECIFIC BIKE PATH IMPROVEMENT **LOCATIONS**

The specific bike path improvements identified—River Ranch and Squaw Valley—will all need additional feasibility, traffic, and design work before moving ahead. For the River Ranch projects it will be crucial to get the owners of River Ranch involved in the planning for the bike path modification because it would directly affect two of their parking areas. If it is demonstrated that the improvements will help to improve safety and circulation for everybody—trail users, River Ranch patrons, and River Ranch employees—support for the proposed modifications will be more likely. Both the River Ranch and Squaw Valley Road improvements, which involve some modifications within the SR 89 right-of-way, will require close coordination with Caltrans.

5.4 ACCESS AND TRAIL FUNDING

There are a variety of potential funding sources including federal, state, regional, and local programs that can be used to construct the proposed bicycle improvements (Table 5-3). Most of the federal, state, and regional programs are competitive and involve the completion of extensive applications with clear documentation of the project need, costs, and benefits. Regional funding for bicycle projects typically comes from Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding, which is prorated to each county based on the return of gasoline taxes. Many of the projects and programs would need to be funded by either TDA funds, the general fund (for staff time), or federal, state, and regional sources. The primary funding sources are described below.

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA) is the third iteration of the transportation vision established by Congress in 1991 with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and renewed in 1998 through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Also known as the federal transportation bill, the \$286.5 million SAFETEA bill was passed in 2005.

SAFETEA funding will be administered through the state (Caltrans or Resources Agency) and regional planning agencies. Most, but not all, of the funding programs are oriented toward transportation versus recreation, with an emphasis on reducing auto trips and providing intermodal connections. Funding criteria often include completion and adoption of a pedestrian master plan, quantification of the costs and benefits of the system (such as saved vehicle trips and reduced air pollution), proof of public involvement and support, CEQA compliance, and commitment of some local resources. In most cases, SAFETEA provides matching grants of 80% to 90% but prefers to leverage other monies at a lower rate. SAFETEA continues to support many of the nonmotorized programs that were contained in TEA-21, with the following new and existing nonmotorized programs (dollar amounts listed are totals for the entire federal transportation bill):

- Recreational Trails Program—\$110 million over 5 years, to be dedicated to nonmotorized trail projects
- Safe Routes to School Program—A new program with \$612 million over 5 years
- Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program—\$270 million over 5 years reserved for bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Alternative Transportation in Parks and Public Lands—\$96 million over the next 4 years reserved for promoting nonmotorized transportation in national parks and other public lands

TABLE 5-3 Trail and Access Funding Sources

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Project Types	Comments
FEDERAL FUNDING							•
Regional Surface Transportation Program	Varies by RPTA	RTPAs, Caltrans	\$320 million	I I.47% nonfederal match	Cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans, and MPOs	Bicycle/pedestrian transportation and trail projects	RSTP funds may be exchanged for local funds for nonfederally certified local agencies; no match may be required if project improves safety. Contact Cathy Gomes, Caltrans, (916) 654-3271
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program	December I yearly	RTPAs, Caltrans	\$400 million	II.47% nonfederal match	Federally certified jurisdictions	Bicycle/pedestrian transportation projects	Counties redesignated to attainment status for ozone may lose this source. Contact Cathy Gomes, Caltrans, (916) 654-3271
Transportation Enhancement Activities	Varies by RTPA	RTPAs, Caltrans	\$60 million	11.47% nonfederal match	Federally certified jurisdictions	Bicycle/pedestrian transportation and trail projects	Funds are dispersed through the four shares listed below
- Regional Share			\$45 million		Federal, state, or local, depending on category		Funding share to RTPAs
– Caltrans Share		Caltrans	\$6.6 million		Caltrans		Funding share to Caltrans. Available only if regional TEA funds are not used
- Statewide Transportation Enhancement Share		Caltrans, State Resources Agency	\$20-30 million		Federal, state (except Caltrans), regional, and local agencies with a state partner		Funding share for all 12 TEA categories except conservation lands
– Conservation Lands Share			\$11 million		RTPAs, counties, cities, and nonprofits		Funding share for conservation lands category—acquisition of scenic lands with high habitat conservation value
National Highway System	Varies by RTPA	RTPAs	\$500 million	20%	State and local agencies, MPOs	Bicycle/pedestrian transportation projects	Funding share to RTPAs
Recreational Trails Program	October I	State Parks	\$3 million	20% match	Jurisdictions, special districts, nonprofits with management responsibilities over the land	For recreational trails to benefit bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users	Contact State Parks, Statewide Trails Coordinator, (916) 653-8803
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program	Pending	FHWA	\$25 million nationwide		State and local agencies, MPOs	Projects that improve system efficiency, reduce environmental impacts of transportation, etc.	Contact K. Sue Kiser, Regional FHWA office, (916) 498-5009
Land & Water Conservation Fund	May I	State Parks	\$7.7 million statewide	50%, including in-kind	Federal and state agencies, cities, counties, eligible districts	Projects that acquire and develop outdoor recreation areas and facilities	Contact Odel King, State Parks, (916) 653-8758
STATE FUNDING							
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program	November	State Resources Agency, Caltrans	\$10 million statewide	Not required but favored	Local, state, and federal government nonprofit agencies	Projects that enhance or mitigate future transportation projects; can include acquisition or development of roadside recreational facilities	Contact Carolyn Dudley, State Resources Agency, (916) 653-5656
Bicycle Transportation Account	December	Caltrans	\$7.2 million	Minimum 10% local match on construction	Cities, counties	Projects that improve safety and convenience of bicycle commuters.	Contact Ken McGuire, Caltrans, (916) 653-2750
Regional Transportation Improvement Program	December 15, odd years	RTPA			Cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans	Bicycle/pedestrian transportation and safety/education projects	Part of State Transportation Improvement Program, the main state program for transportation project funding. For "improving transportation within the region." RTPA must program funds
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account	Ongoing	State Legislature	\$5 million		Cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans	Bicycle and trail facilities	Contact Caltrans Federal Resource Office, (916) 654-7287
Habitat Conservation Fund Grant Program	October	State Parks	\$500,000	50%	Local governments	Acquisition, enhancement, and restoration of wildlife areas	Contact State Parks, (916) 653-7423
Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program	November	Caltrans	\$3 million	20% local	MPOs, RPTAs, cities, counties	Projects that exemplify livable community concepts, including bicycle/pedestrian transportation and safety/education projects	Contact Leigh Levine, Caltrans, (916) 651-6012

TABLE 5-3 Trail and Access Funding Sources Continued

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Project Types	Comments
Office of Traffic Safety Grants	January 31	OTS			State agencies, cities, counties	Bicycle/pedestrian safety and education projects	Bicycle and pedestrian projects have been funded through this program. Contact OTS, (916) 262-0990
DFG Public Access Program	Quarterly	DFG	Not grants, but state projects developed with local governments. Funding up to \$250,000		Local units of eligible governments (must do EIR and engineering)	Acquisition or improvements that preserve wildlife habitat or provide recreational access for hunting, fishing or other wildlife-oriented activities	Includes interpretive trails, river access, parking areas. Contact Georgia Lipphardt, DFG, (916) 445-8448
LOCAL FUNDING							
Transportation Development Act Article 3 (2% of total TDA)	January	RPTA					
State Gas Tax (local share)		State Auditor Controller					Allocated by State Auditor Controller
Developer Fees or Exactions (developer fee for street improvements)		Cities or County					Mitigation required during land use approval process
PRIVATE FUNDING							
Bikes Belong Coalition	Ongoing	Private	Each project not to exceed \$10,000	NA	Nonprofit organizations and public agencies	Bicycle paths, trails, routes, lanes, parking, and transit	http://bikesbelong.org
American Greenways Kodak Awards	June	Private	Each project not to exceed \$2,500	NA	Local, regional, or statewide nonprofit organizations. Public agencies may apply but community organizations receive preference	Small grants for planning and design of greenways	http://www.conservationfund.org
Powerbar's Direct Impact on Rivers and Trails	June	Private	Project awards between \$1,000 and \$5,000	NA	Individuals and organizations	Small grants for improving trails and river access	http://www.powerbar.com

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS:

APCD	Air Pollution Control District	RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation	RTSP	Regional Surface Transportation Program
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality	SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
CTC	California Transportation Commission	TDA	Transportation Development Act
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game	TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	SAFETEA	Safe Accountable Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
MPO	[need definition]	State Parks	California Department of Parks and Recreation (under the State Resources Agency)
OTS	Office of Traffic Safety		

JURISDICTIONS FOR PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA:

Caltrans — Caltrans District 3

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

SACOG

TRPA (portions of Placer County within Tahoe Basin)

RESOURCES:

Caltrans SAFETEA website - http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/TransEnhAct/ FHWA-SAFETEA-LU website - http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/reauthorization/

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funds are allocated by the federal transportation bill to projects that are likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard, and to congestion mitigation. These funds can be used for a broad variety of bicycle and pedestrian projects, particularly those that are developed primarily for transportation purposes. The funds can be used either for construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways or for nonconstruction projects related to bicycle and pedestrian safety (maps, brochures, etc.). The projects must be tied to a plan adopted by the state and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program administered by the National Park Service, allocates money to state and local governments to acquire new land for recreational purposes, including bicycle paths and support facilities such as bike racks. Funding allocated to California is administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Eligible applicants include cities, counties, and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate, and maintain park and recreation areas. For local agencies, funds are provided through a competitive selection process. There is a 50% local match requirement.

STATE FUNDING SOURCES BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNT

The State Bicycle Transportation Account is an annual statewide discretionary program that is available through the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit for funding bicycle projects. Funds are available as grants to local jurisdictions; the emphasis is on projects that benefit bicycling for commuting purposes. As a result of the passage of Assembly Bill 1772 in the year 2000, the Bicycle Transportation Account has had \$7.2 million available each year through 2005. Following the year 2005, the fund will drop to \$5 million per year unless new legislation is passed. The local match must be a minimum of 10% of the total project cost.

NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS FUND

The Recreational Trails Program provides funds for developing and maintaining recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail uses include hiking, bicycling, in-line skating, equestrian use, and other nonmotorized as well as motorized uses. Recreational Trails Program funds may be used for:

- maintenance and restoration of existing trails (including bike paths),
- development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages,
- purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment,
- construction of new trails (with restrictions for new trails on federal lands),
- acquisition of easements or property for trails,
- state administrative costs related to this program (limited to 7% of a state's funds), and
- operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails (limited to 5% of a state's funds).

ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION PROGRAM

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program funds are allocated to projects that offset the environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities. Bike paths, bike lanes, and other facilities that encourage alternative transportation are eligible. State gasoline tax monies fund this program.

LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE III

Transportation Development Act Article III (Senate Bill 821) funds are state block grants awarded annually to local jurisdictions for bicycle projects in California. These funds originate from the state gasoline tax and are distributed to local jurisdictions based on population. These funds should be used as leveraging monies for competitive state and federal sources.

MELLO-ROOS COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT

Bike paths and bike lanes can be funded as part of a local assessment or benefit district. Defining the boundaries of the benefit district may be difficult unless the facility is part of a larger parks and recreation or public infrastructure program with broad community benefits and support.

IMPACT FEES

Another potential local source of funding is developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a proposed project. A developer may reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site bikeway improvements that will encourage residents to bicycle rather than drive. Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical in avoiding a potential lawsuit.

Other opportunities for implementation will appear over time that may be used to implement the project.