

**Land Stewardship Proposal
for the
Lake Spaulding, Bear River, & Fordyce Lake Planning Units of the Yuba Bear Watershed
by the
USDA Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest**

PART 1 - ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

Contact Information:

Primary Contact: Fran Herbst
Lands Program Manager
631 Coyote Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
(530) 478-6852
fherbst@fs.fed.us
Fax (530) 478-6109

Secondary Contact: Heather Newell (New Secondary Contact)
Yuba River Ranger District
Assistant Public Service Officer
15924 Highway 49
Camptonville, CA 95922
(530) 288-0727
hnewell@fs.fed.us
Fax (530) 478-6109

Executive Director: Tom Quinn
Forest Supervisor
631 Coyote Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
(530) 478-6200
tquinn01@fs.fed.us
Fax (530) 478-6109

2. Executive Summary

The Tahoe National Forest (TNF) is managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS) which is a federal agency in the Department of Agriculture. National Forest System (NFS) lands are generally managed with similar goals and objectives as the Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) identified for Stewardship lands. Some of the laws requiring the protection of these values include the National Forest Management Act, National Environmental Policy Act, Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

The Forest Service was established in 1905. The Forest Service manages 193 million acres of public lands, known collectively as the National Forest System. Currently, a critical emphasis of the USFS is to retain and restore ecological resilience of the NFS lands to achieve sustainable ecosystems that provide a broad range of services to humans and other organisms. Ecologically healthy and resilient landscapes, rich in biodiversity, will have greater capacity to adapt and thrive in the face of natural disturbances and large scale threats to sustainability, especially under changing and uncertain future environmental conditions such as those driven by climate change and increasing human use.

The Forest Service manages the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) in accordance with the *Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*, as amended (Forest Plan). The Forest Plan sets forth both Forest-wide and area-specific management direction for the TNF. Forest-wide management direction consists of Forest goals and desired future conditions, objectives, and Forest-wide standards and guidelines. The Forest Plan also establishes area-specific management direction for each of the Forest's 106 management areas. This direction specifies each area's management emphasis, selected standards and guidelines (in addition to Forest-wide standards and guidelines), and compatible available management practices. Forest-wide and area-specific management directions are used by resource managers to set priorities and develop site-specific management prescriptions on a project-by-project basis. Forest Plan direction has similar goals and objectives as those identified in the Land Conservation Plan and, in compliance with the proposed conservation covenant, would be amended if the Stewardship lands become NFS. Generally, the TNF proposes to manage these parcels consistently with the management emphasis as the surrounding or adjacent National Forest System lands.

The USFS is uniquely positioned to manage lands for the BPV's since these values can often be contradictory. Managing for all of the BPV's on all lands may not be possible. For instance, sustainable timber harvest can impact outdoor recreation; outdoor recreation can impact habitat and cultural resources etc. The USFS is keenly aware of these types of resource tradeoffs because NFS lands are managed under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1964. This Act declares that the purposes of the national forest include outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, fish and wildlife; and directs that the national forest renewable resources be administered for multiple use and sustained yield. For over a century, the USFS has sought to balance these (often conflicting) resource values to maximize the net benefits to the American public.

The Forest Service is interested in gaining fee title to all available parcels in the Fordyce and Spaulding Planning Units and some of the parcels in the Bear River Planning Unit. Acquisition

of the parcels (herein referred to as “Stewardship lands”) would allow for consolidated, consistent management of the ecological, recreational and cultural resources contained in the Yuba, American and Bear River watersheds. TNF ownership would enhance public access to the Stewardship lands as required by the Stipulation.

Specific objectives that would be achieved through this acquisition include:

- Protecting the semi-primitive non-motorized recreation in the Lindsey, Rock and Culbertson Lake area.
- Continuing to provide public access to the area surrounding many popular lakes and providing consistent management of recreation.
- Improving fire prevention efforts and reducing resource impacts (off road vehicle, cultural resource plundering etc.) by allowing USFS employees, who are already patrolling the surround area, to enforce laws and regulations on these lands.
- Improving wildlife connectivity. Most notably, the Bear River parcels provide the unique opportunity to improve north-south connectivity for the west-slope of the Sierra Nevada in the vicinity of Interstate 80. Providing a single ownership reduces the complexity involved in planning and implementing structures to facilitate movement of wildlife across I-80, which presently is a significant barrier to connectivity.
- Reducing habitat fragmentation of wide ranging species which results from the differing land management objectives of different land owners.
- Increasing efficiency and effectiveness of fuels treatment and watershed improvement projects which are more effective when applied at a landscape level.
- Protection of sensitive species habitat.

In the height of the field season, the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) typically employs over 400 people. In the middle of winter, this number drops to around 250 people. TNF employees include biologists, botanists, fuels planners, firefighters, foresters, archeologists, hydrologists, soils scientists, ecologists, range conservationists, recreation specialists, landscape architect, public affairs specialist, graphic artist, geographic information specialists, engineers and more. All of the program managers and line officers on the forest have professional degrees and average well over 20 years of experience managing natural resources. The TNF is also able to draw on the experience and expertise of over 500 Forest Service researchers nationwide. Finally, hundreds of individuals and many dozens of groups volunteer for various resource-management and enhancement projects on the TNF each year.

The Tahoe National Forest, with an annual budget of around \$29,000,000, receives funding from a variety of sources, including appropriated dollars from Congress, grants, public/private partnerships and certain resource receipts. The funding is allocated to projects based on Forest priorities, funding stipulations, and the availability of staff and partners to accomplish the work.

Organizational Information


3. The Tahoe National Forest is managed by the USDA Forest Service, a federal government agency in the Department of Agriculture.

4. As an agency of the Federal Government, the USFS is exempt from taxes.

5. USDA Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest

6. Tahoe National Forest

7.

	United States Department of Agriculture	Forest Service	Tahoe National Forest	631 Coyote Street Nevada City, CA 95959-2250 530-265-4531 530-478-6118 TDD 530-478-6109 FAX
---	---	-------------------	-----------------------------	--

File Code: 5420
Date: MAY 11 2017

Vanessa Parker-Geisman
Regional Land Conservation Manager
Pacific Forest & Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
1107 9th Street, Suite 501
Sacramento, CA 95814


Dear Ms. Parker-Geisman;

Attached is the Tahoe National Forest's Land Stewardship Proposal for land in the Bear River, Spaulding and Fordyce Planning Units. Thank you for the opportunity to apply for these lands and your advice and assistance in the preparation of this proposal.


To assist the Council in making recommendations of fee title holders and enhancement funding, I have prioritized our requests for both of these items.

If you have any questions, please contact Fran Herbst, Lands Program Manager at (530) 478-6852.


Sincerely,


TOM QUINN
Forest Supervisor

Enclosures (6)



Caring for the Land and Serving People

Printed on Recycled Paper 

8. Rationale for Applying

Inclusion of these lands into the TNF would ensure the perpetual enjoyment of these lands by the American public and consistent management of the ecological, recreational, and cultural resources contained in these watersheds. The desired parcels are wholly contained or adjacent to the boundary of the TNF. Key objectives in the Land Conservation Plan (LCP) that would be *specifically* supported by transferring this land to the TNF as the *neighboring* landowner include: promoting habitat continuity across the landscape; managing recreation that spans ownership boundaries; reducing potential land use conflicts and achieving consistency of management with adjacent lands. The TNF is keenly interested in protecting the semi-primitive non-motorized recreation in the Lindsey, Rock and Culbertson Lake area and public access to the other lakes.

The land ownership pattern of the Tahoe NF includes the highest percentage of privately owned headwater lands in the Sierras. The differing land management objectives between private and public lands have resulted in some of the most fragmented habitats in the Sierra Nevada, irregular access to recreation, and ineffective fuels and watershed management. Several bioregional assessments have identified the discontinuous land ownership in this area as problematic for managing key wildlife species, due to differing land management objectives which fragment habitats. Maintaining consistency in land management within forest areas is important in maintaining and re-establishing connectivity for wide ranging species. Acquisition of these parcels would enhance deer summer range, fawning habitat, and migration corridors and recreational fisheries; improve connectivity of late successional habitats for forest carnivores (e.g. marten, fisher, red fox, wolverine); improve the management of California spotted owl and northern goshawk Protected Activity Centers (PACs); and provide protection of sensitive species habitat such as Crenulated Moonwort (*Botrychium crenulatum*). The acquisition of these parcels into a single ownership under the National Forest System represents a vital step towards restoring north to south connectivity across Interstate-80 in the Bear River area, an area identified as a critical linkage in the Sierra Nevada. Acquisition would reduce the complexity involved in planning and constructing structures to facilitate movement of wildlife across I-80.

Most the lands sought are currently within the Forest Service Direct Protection Area (DPA) for emergency response. As such, the Forest Service is responsible for fire suppression, even on private property. The Forest Service currently patrols this area, educating and informing the public on fire prevention and suppressing unattended or abandoned campfires. However, the Forest Service does not have the authority to enforce fire restrictions or resource protection laws on *private* land. Acquisition of these lands would allow the Forest Service to enforce, and implement wildfire prevention and resource protection measures in the area.

The Tahoe National Forest is well suited to provide sustainable forest management and ecological restoration. The Forest employs foresters and silviculturists to evaluate timber stand conditions and gather appropriate data to develop and evaluate management activities guided by the best available science. An interdisciplinary team is consulted in the development of a site specific environmental analysis to ensure sustainable forestry practices are utilized. Management would also include monitoring and promotion of habitat and biological diversity, as guided by the *Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment* (2004). The natural resources on the TNF would benefit from acquiring these lands because treatments of NFS lands are designed with a goal of

improving resource conditions at the landscape level. Having a contiguous land base would increase efficiency and efficacy in treatment design and implementation.

9. Organization Mission

The mission of the Forest Service (USFS) is to sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. Congress directs the USFS to manage national forests for multiple uses and benefits and for the sustained yield of resources such as water, forage, wildlife, wood and recreation. The Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan), as amended, provides management direction for the TNF. The following are some of the Forest Plan goals that closely mirror the preservation and enhancement goals of the BPVs:

Habitat Protection: Manage fish and wildlife habitats to maintain viable populations of all vertebrate species. Devote particular attention to preserving habitats for plant and animal species that are associated with mature forest successional stages, riparian areas, hardwoods, and meadows. Provide enough quality habitats so that the Forest's sensitive species will not become threatened or endangered. Maintain and restore spatial and temporal connectivity for aquatic and riparian species within and between watersheds to provide physically, chemically and biologically unobstructed movement for their survival, migration and reproduction. Maintain and restore habitat to support viable populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate riparian-dependent species. Prevent new introductions of invasive species.

Preservation of Open Space & Outdoor Recreation: Provide a wide range of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities in accordance with identified needs and demands. Recognize the value of semi-primitive non-motorized areas in the forest (specifically applies to parcels 802-807) because of their scarcity and the demand for the few acres remaining. Maintain visual quality.

Sustainable Forestry & Agricultural Uses: Maintain or enhance the production of forage and wood fiber. Emphasize vegetative management systems that will stop downward trends in range vegetative conditions and improve those sites that may already be in a degraded state.

Cultural and Historic Resources: Inventory forest lands to provide a better understanding of the distribution of cultural resources within the TNF. Promote studies of inventoried cultural resources to determine the nature of the sites, relationships between sites, and the interaction between the natural and cultural systems. Promote understanding, appreciation, and protection of the TNF's diverse history by developing quality educational and interpretative experiences.

Provide quality, on-the-ground management of cultural resources and actively maintain the integrity of National Register sites. Minimize loss of cultural resource values due to theft, vandalism, and natural processes through active law enforcement and monitoring.

Strengthen relationships with contemporary cultural groups having heritage links to the TNF. Expand partnerships with local communities, Native American Indians, other agencies, and professionals interested in the cultural resources of the Forest.

10 Geographic Focus

The TNF encompasses over 1,100,000 acres in the central Sierra Nevada including the American, Bear and Yuba River headwaters. Within the TNF there is over 340,000 acres of private land, much of it in a checkerboard pattern. This discontinuous ownership pattern is problematic for management of landscape level resources. It is due primarily to the railroad grants of the 1860's when every other square mile of land was granted to the railroad and secondarily due to the high number of patented mining claims in this historic Mother Lode area. There are approximately 2400 of mining claims on the forest, however, unlike most NFS land, mining claims cannot be located on lands that are donated to the United States.

Due to the location on I-80 and proximity to Sacramento, Reno and the Bay Area, the TNF is one of the nation's most popular national forests, receiving an estimated 3.69 million recreation visits annually. The forest has 77 family campgrounds, 12 group campgrounds, 20 picnic areas, 16 boating sites and over 1000 miles of trails. Visitors enjoy hiking, boating, biking, camping, off road vehicle riding, hunting, fishing, skiing, snowshoeing, driving for pleasure and more.

Watershed improvement and meadow restoration work is conducted each year. The TNF has almost 400 species of animals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians; 25 of which are threatened, endangered or sensitive species. Typically around 1000-2000 acres of wildlife habitat improvement & noxious weed treatment is accomplished annually. Additionally, tens of thousands to over 100,000 acres of land are surveyed and monitored annually for threatened, endangered, sensitive and watchlist plants and animals; noxious weeds and migratory birds.

There are over 3,000 known and recorded cultural resource sites on the TNF that the Forest Service is responsible for managing and protecting. Eight of these sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Many sites are interpreted via a variety of mediums for public education. There are approximately 75 rock art sites on the TNF that are a distinct, recognized style. An active non-profit volunteer organization, Friends of Sierra Rock Art, works closely with the TNF to monitor a majority of these and other sites, annually. Professional archaeologists working for the TNF survey an average of 2,400 acres a year for various proposed projects, searching for archaeological sites to ensure cultural resource sites are protected.

The National Forest Management Act requires sustained yield of timber. The TNF typically offers 10,000-40,000 MBF of saw timber and thousands of cords of firewood for sale each year. Typically over 1000 acres of land are reforested annually. Major management emphases include ecological restoration and reducing the intensity of catastrophic fire through fuels reduction. Fuel reduction projects encompass approximately 6,000 – 8,000 acres annually and include thinning of brush and trees, mastication, and prescribed burning. The TNF has 26 active grazing allotments and grazes 12,000-21,000 Animal Use Months annually. Lands that are grazed within the Sierra Nevada landscape provide resources that ensure ranches within the Central Valley thrive and are ongoing. The interconnected relationship between valley and mountain grazing helps keep these valley landscapes open, thereby contributing to open space on a larger scale.

See questions 11, 18 and 30 for examples of the TNF's experience working with conservation partners.

Organizational Experience and Capacity

11. Relevant Experience

Eastside Meadow and Riparian Restoration

The Tahoe National Forest has had a very active watershed improvement program. Our program involves identification of watershed degradation, development and design of treatments to improve degraded areas; environmental assessments of proposed work to improve watershed health; identifying funding sources to pay for the work and implementation of the projects. The completed watershed improvement work ranges from drainage improvement of the forest road system to major stream and meadow restoration projects. Most of the projects include specific elements to protect and/or enhance riparian and aquatic habitats for wildlife either indirectly, such as reducing sediment delivery to these systems from the road network, or directly by physically improving the habitat.

In the past 10-15 years the TNF has collaborated with outside partners such as the **Truckee River Watershed Council, Sierra Valley Conservation District, Trout Unlimited, Sierra County Resource Advisory Committee** and the **Truckee Donner Land Trust** to develop, finance, and implement watershed improvement work. To date the TNF has secured over \$2,000,000 in grants from state, federal and philanthropic interests in addition to congressionally appropriated funding for watershed, stream and meadow improvement/restoration work. We have accomplished major stream and meadow improvement work in the Carman, Davies and Merrill Creek, and Little Truckee River watersheds. The completed work includes drainage improvements on hundreds of miles of roads to improve road/watershed interaction and reduce sediment movement to fisheries and aquatic habitats; several miles of stream improvements to restore or enhance fisheries and riparian habitats; and hundreds of acres of meadow restoration/enhancement improving the hydrologic function, riparian and aquatic habitats; and restoring riparian and aquatic vegetation regimes where stream degradation had caused a vegetation type shift to dryer plants.

Last Chance Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project (SNAMP)

The Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project was formed to develop, implement and test Adaptive Management processes through testing the efficacy of Strategically Placed Landscape Treatments (SPLATs) across four response variables including public participation; wildlife, (focusing on the California Spotted Owl); water quality and quantity; and fire/forest health. Each of the response variables has an associated science team. The SNAMP is made up of researchers from the USFS, **Universities of California and Minnesota, California Resources Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**, and the public. The science team is working with the agencies to develop an adaptive management and research program consistent with the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment. The USFS is responsible for the treatments. The science team researchers will function as an independent third party, and implement methodologies that focus on: (1) the specific response variables to make predictions; (2) analyzing response variables and results; (3) providing feedback to the USFS; and (4) supporting public interaction and participation.

The Last Chance Project Environmental Assessment (2010) identified the need to treat approximately 2,400 acres in the American River watershed. The project incorporates the SPLAT strategy to locate treatment areas that most effectively modify wildfire behavior and provide wildlife habitat improvements. This strategy is designed to: reduce the likelihood of severe wildland fire effects on vegetation, soils, water, and wildlife habitat; establish and maintain a pattern of area treatments that are effective in modifying wildland fire behavior; improve conifer and hardwood tree health, vigor, and resistance to fire, insects, drought and disease while enhancing stand structural diversity; enhance bear grass production for Native American weavers; and decommission unnecessary roads. A variety of management actions will be used to accomplish these restoration goals including: forest stand thinning; mechanical removal of surface and ladder fuels; prescribed burning; and road obliteration and erosion control. Forest Service Integrated Resource Stewardship Contracting (IRSC) authority will be used as a cost-effective means to remove small diameter forest biomass and pay for transport of this biomass to nearby cogeneration power facilities.

This partnership has secured funding for the SNAMP science teams to implement forest health, wildlife habitat and water quality/quantity monitoring strategies within the planning area. Past *annual* funding for these activities from the **California Department of Water Resources**, **California Department of Fish and Game** and the **Sierra Nevada Conservancy** has ranged from \$500,000 to \$700,000. A one-time grant from the **Packard Foundation** for \$150,000 was awarded to SNAMP to further scientific monitoring of fuels reduction treatments. SNAMP has also secured funding to increase the public participation processes and stakeholder involvement through regular public meetings, reporting, public outreach, and an interactive website. Funding through fiscal year 2015 in the amount of \$500,000 per year has been secured from partners for further monitoring and public outreach and to develop the adaptive management strategy.

Construction and maintenance of trails for mountain bikes and other users

In the late 1980's mountain biking became a popular activity on roads and trails within the TNF. Unfortunately, the single track trails on the TNF were not designed for these vehicles. Damage to the trail treads, erosion, inter-user conflict and bicycle use of closed areas (such as designated Wilderness areas) started to occur. The TNF responded by constructing (at least) 17 new trails totaling over 100 miles, constructing eight new trailheads and reconstructing many miles of existing trail specifically designed to accommodate bicyclists (as well as other users).

The TNF successfully competed for grant funds from a variety sources, including local, state, federal and business interests to accomplish this work. The TNF worked (and continues to work) with various user groups including bike groups (such as **Bicyclists of Nevada County (BONC)**, **Tahoe Area Mountain Biking Association (TAMBA)** and **Folsom Area Trail Riders Action Coalition (FATRAC)**, **Sierra Buttes Trail Stewardship (SBTS)**, and **Forest Trails Alliance**), non-bike interest groups (such as the **Backcountry Horseman**, **Gold Country Trails Council** and **Nevada County Woods Riders**) and conservation and service organizations (including **Truckee Donner Land Trust**, **Truckee Rotary** and **Truckee Trails Foundation**) on the design, location and management of these trails. Since appropriated trail maintenance funds are routinely insufficient, the TNF recruits, trains and works with hundreds of volunteers annually to

accomplish the trail maintenance, often recruiting groups to adopt the maintenance needs before the trail is even built. Many of the organizations named above have also constructed trails on NFS land under the USFS guidance. The Pioneer National Recreation Trail specifically received “National Trail” status due to the high degree of volunteerism and partnership involvement in construction and maintenance of this 25 mile-long trail.

12. Location, size, length of time held, uses, and current management practices

The Forest Service, established in 1905, manages 193 million acres of public lands, known collectively as the National Forest System and consisting of 155 National Forests and 20 National Grasslands, located in 44 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The lands comprise 8.5 percent of the total land area in the United States. These National Forests are supported by six forest and range experimental stations availing the agency with the best available land management science. Congress directs the Forest Service to manage national forests for multiple uses and benefits; and for the sustained yield of renewable resources such as water, forage, wildlife, wood and recreation.

With a national headquarters in Washington, D.C., the Forest Service operates through nine geographical regions around the country. The Pacific Southwest Region consists of the eighteen National Forests in California and manages 20 million acres. The TNF, established in 1906, consists of 838,748 acres of public land. Portions of Yuba, Sierra, Nevada, Plumas, and Placer counties lie within the TNF. The TNF contains the headwaters of the Yuba, Bear, North and Middle Forks of the American, Truckee and Middle Fork of the Feather Rivers.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 required the Secretary of Agriculture to assess forest lands and develop and implement a resource management plan for each unit of the National Forest System. The Forest Service manages the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) in accordance with the *Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan* (LRMP) as amended. This plan sets forth both Forest-wide and area-specific management direction for the TNF. The Forest-wide management direction was amended by the 2004 *Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision*, specifically to address old forest ecosystems; aquatic, riparian, and meadow ecosystems; fire and fuels management; lower westside hardwood ecosystems; and noxious weeds management. Collectively, these documents and other amendments are referred to in this write up as the Forest Plan.

Forest-wide management direction consists of Forest goals and desired future conditions, objectives, and Forest-wide standards and guidelines. The Forest Plan establishes area-specific management direction for each of the TNF’s 106 management areas (MAs). This direction specifies each area's management emphasis, selected standards and guidelines (in addition to Forest-wide standards and guidelines), and compatible available management practices. Forest-wide and area-specific management directions are used by resource managers to set priorities and develop site-specific management prescriptions on a project-by-project basis. Forest Plan direction for national forest land surrounding the Stewardship land in these planning units provides management direction and goals that are consistent with the Stewardship Council’s Beneficial Public Values (BPV). A complete copy of the Tahoe Forest Land and Resource Management Plan direction, as amended, can be found at:

http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5214243.pdf

Law, policy, and regulation governing the management of public lands by the Forest Service, along with the Forest Plan provide significant protection and assurances for the sustainability and enhancement of the ecological and socioeconomic values on Tahoe National Forest lands for the use and enjoyment of the American people for present and future generations. Please refer to question 9 for salient Forest Plan goals and management emphasis related to the BPVs, and question 10 for a summary of some of the uses of the TNF.

Organizational Finances

13. The Tahoe National Forest receives funding from a variety of sources, including appropriated dollars from Congress, grants, public/private partnerships and certain resource receipts. The funding is allocated to projects based on Forest priorities, funding stipulations, and the availability of staff and partners to accomplish the work.

Appendix C provides the following financial information:

- Tahoe National Forest Preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 (10/1/10-9/30/11) budget allocation (1 spreadsheet) Note: During most of the writing of this document, the US Government was operating under a continuing resolution. At this time the TNF does not have a final budget, consequently the Fiscal Year 2011 budget submitted is the Forest's preliminary budget.
- Tahoe National Forest balance sheet for fiscal years 2008-2010: (3 spreadsheets).

We are unable to provide audited statements. Audited statements are only available at the national level (for the entire USFS national budget).

14. NA

15. Grant Funds

The TNF does not have a consolidated strategy for competing for grants however, some of the grants the TNF has obtained recently and would expect opportunities in the future include:

Sierra Nevada Conservancy—Davies Creek watershed restoration, Perazzo Meadow restoration assessment, Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project,

Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) Commission—annual grants for a variety of tasks needed for OHV management including NEPA; OHV route maintenance; decommissioning routes and dispersed sites impacted by off-road vehicle use; install barriers and signs; monitor sensitive resources potentially affected by OHV and restoration project effectiveness; restoration where OHV damage has occurred; monitoring archeological sites; patrol, education and law enforcement; grooming snow for snowmobiles; and facility design, construction and maintenance,

Proposition 319 -- Carman, Davies & Merrill Creek restoration,

Proposition 40 -- Perazzo Meadow restoration,

California Department of Water Resources--Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project,

California Department of Fish and Game--Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project,

California Department of Boating and Waterways—numerous boat ramp improvement grants

Packard Foundation—watershed restoration, scientific monitoring of fuels reduction treatments and wildlife connectivity.

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation—watershed and meadow restoration,

Arbor Day and American Forest Foundation--reforest portions of an area burned by wildfire,

Cliffbar—trail reconstruction,

Trout Unlimited--watershed assessment of the Cold Stream watershed,

EPA planning and implementation grant for Carman watershed restoration,

Nevada/Placer County Resource Advisory Council (RAC)--restoration of aspen stand, meadows, and fens; maintain non-motorized trails; bridge construction to protect water quality and wildlife habitat; install bear proof food lockers; invasive species reduction; hazardous fuels reduction; fire lookout restoration; watershed restoration; and trails signing improvement,

Sierra County Resource Advisory Council (RAC)--road restoration, improvement and maintenance; bat research; public education and interpretation; construction of toilets and RV sanitary dump station; installation of bear proof food lockers in campground; timber stand improvement and fuels reduction; lookout restoration to retain historic character; noxious weed eradication; trail maintenance and reconstruction; shoreline restoration; cattle guard installation; flood restoration; watershed assessment and surveys; trout habitat restoration; shooting range management; and trail bridge construction.

Western Bark Beetle Initiative--masticate and pre-commercial thin plantations and land adjacent to a rural community.

Highway Transportation Aquatic Passage--plan and design aquatic organism passage

Additionally numerous organizations, including the following, provide matching in-kind contributions which permit the TNF to successfully complete for grants: **Trout Unlimited, Nevada County Fire Safe Council, Truckee River Watershed Council, and Truckee River Weed Warriors.** Some organizations, such as **Forest Fire Lookout Association,** conduct fundraising for specific projects while other organizations such as **Nevada County Land Trust** obtain grants for resource improvement on the TNF and then contract with or work cooperatively with the TNF to accomplish the work.

16. Use of Revenues

No one department or staff area would gain fee title to the donated lands. The lands would become the property of the U.S., protected in perpetuity for all Americans to enjoy, with the management entrusted to the Forest Service.

Grant funds provided by the Stewardship Council would *only* be available for the specifically funded activities on the lands agreed to by the Stewardship Council and the TNF. These funds would not be used elsewhere on the TNF.

It is anticipated that TNF would generate fewer timber revenues than PG&E and that these revenues would generally be reinvested into the lands within the timber sale area through the use of Integrated Resource Stewardship Contracts (IRSC). The timber sale area would undoubtedly involve NFS lands beyond the Stewardship lands. IRSCs focus on ecosystem benefits and outcomes, rather than the amount of timber volume removed from the land. This is accomplished by trading goods (timber) for services (such as thinning vegetation to promote healthy forests and reduce the risk of wildfire; restoring watershed areas and wildlife habitat and

improving roads). In other words, the TNF reinvests revenue from timber receipts back into the area where the funds were generated to enhance BPVs and other resource values. If the receipts generated by the sale of the timber are insufficient to produce the desired end result, these receipts can be augmented by appropriated funds, if available. There are rarely surplus receipts, but these can be used for resource improvements on other NFS lands. (There are other options for timber sale receipts but this is the most common on the TNF.)

The current leased uses would be authorized under Special Use Permits. It is expected that the USFS would generate fewer receipts from the organization camps than does PG&E. The annual base fees for these camps would be equal to 5% of the fair market value of the land. These fees are subsequently significantly reduced proportionate to the number of individuals with disability, children at risk, and youth programs that support citizenship, character building, or faith-based activities oriented to outdoor-recreation experiences. By reducing the fees in this way, the USFS recognizes the valuable service these camps provide to young people, individuals with disabilities and their families by promoting physical, mental and spiritual health through activities conducted in the natural environment. The fees generated from organization camps are deposited in an account that is used to administer the permits of all of the organization camp on the TNF. In addition to the 3 camps on these Stewardship lands there are 7 camps on the TNF (including the BSA camp at Sterling Lake, co-located on NFS and PG&E lands.)

The fees for Royal Gorge special use permit would be based on a “linear right of way” fee schedule (currently \$320/acre for this area, subject to annual adjustment). These fees would be deposited in an account that is available for administration of any ski trail or outfitter guide special use permits on the TNF. Half of the grazing fees are returned to the forest for management of the grazing program.

17. Key Personnel

Each National Forest is managed by a Forest Supervisor and is composed of ranger districts. The Stewardship land is located on all four ranger districts of the TNF. The ranger districts are managed by a District Ranger, the line officer with the closest connection to the actions occurring on the National Forest land under their direction. Each of the ranger districts has specialists in recreation, timber, silviculture, cultural resources, fire suppression/fuel treatment and wildlife biology. On the TNF, botanists, fisheries biologists, soil scientists and hydrologists are generally shared between two ranger districts, while other specialists, including engineers, landscape architect, ecologist, and rangeland management specialists, serve the entire forest. Some specialists (herpetologist, entomologists, geologists etc.) serve multiple forests. Due to the large number of staff that could serve key roles in the management of the requested parcels, only the resumes of the most of the District Rangers and Forest Supervisor are attached in Appendix A. However, the roles and responsibilities of some of the key ranger district staff members generally involved in program management and project planning are described below.

District Ranger (ranger) on the TNF administers a ranger district ranging from 149,000 to 324,000 acres, characterized by a number of significant multiple-use resource values. The ranger is responsible for many of the decisions associated with resource management on a specific ranger district, while most of the remaining decisions are made by the Forest Supervisor. The

ranger supervises the operations of the ranger district; participates with the forest supervisor, primary forest staff, and other district rangers in developing and organizing forest policies and programs; develops, organizes, and implements functional long-range planning and short-range action plans; revises program operations for consistency with strategies and program emphasis; and coordinates inter- and intra-agency resource management planning efforts.

Archeologists plan, coordinate, and direct the cultural resource program; provides advice on identification and management of cultural resources; and design inventory strategies as part of the land use planning process. This person prepares and reviews archeological reports as part of project planning to evaluate the quality of the inventory, the completeness of the report, and the significance of cultural sites found. The archeologist determines eligibility of historical properties for the National Register of Historic Places; interprets cultural resources to the public; proposes and implements cultural resource enhancement projects, etc. In the event of a large wildfire fire-line qualified archaeologists respond to manage the cultural resources. Archaeologists and other resource specialists participate on Burned Area Emergency Response teams that assess potential post-fire needs and make restoration recommendations.

Recreation/Lands Officers manage all recreation activities on the forest, including planning, constructing, operating and maintaining recreation facilities. This individual (in conjunction with their sub-staff) is responsible for administering all special use permits (which are equivalent to PG&E leases) that authorize private & commercial uses and improvements on the NFS lands.

Timber Officers are responsible for the planning and implementation of the vegetation management program. This includes overseeing the development, planning, and implementation of timber sales, IRSC projects, precommercial thinning, release and reforestation.

Silviculturists are responsible for promoting forest health and assuring the timber stands remains productive for sustained yield. This includes assessing and treating for insects and disease; writing the timber stand prescriptions and the silvicultural analysis for each timber sale as part of the NEPA process.

Fire/Fuels Management Officers supervise the fire prevention and suppression efforts and provides leadership of the fuels management program. The fuels program is responsible for plans to reduce the fire hazard; writing prescribed burn plans; and ensuring safe ignitions are performed under proper conditions.

Wildlife & Aquatic Biologists and Botanists provide technical advice and assistance in the implementation and evaluation of wildlife, aquatic and rare plant resource management programs and projects. This includes the management and conservation of biological resources, including threatened, endangered, and sensitive (TES) species and their habitats. The biologists prepare biological evaluations as part of the environmental analysis process for various projects, including vegetation/fuels, minerals, recreation, and range management projects. They coordinate with other agencies; conduct consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on federally listed species; provide leadership in the management of sensitive plant, wildlife and aquatic species, and are responsible for development of biological resource enhancement projects and programs, including measures to protect and enhance TES species/habitat and special communities/habitats; and control measures to prevent the spread of exotic terrestrial and aquatic species.

Hydrologist and soil scientists work with the other specialists to protect and enhance watershed values, including protection and/or restoration of meadows and riparian areas.

Rangeland Management Specialist is responsible for management of all grazing permits; seasonal utilization and long-term trend monitoring that assures rangeland condition is either stable or improving; and devising rehabilitation and restoration practices when conditions are not improving. Additionally they monitor threatened and endangered species habitats and special aquatic features (such as fens and peatlands) within grazing allotments to ensure conflicts are minimized and habitat integrity is maintained.

Volunteers Annually, the TNF hosts many hundreds of volunteers who provide a variety of services for the benefit of the public including activities associated with recreation (e.g. campground cleaning and maintenance; trail construction, restoration and maintenance; avalanche forecasting; trailhead and fire lookout restoration); heritage resources (e.g. site monitoring, site recording, and historic site maintenance); wildlife and botany (e.g. surveys, noxious weed eradication, bird box construction, habitat enhancement and educational presentations); water quality (e.g. river clean-up, wetland restoration); forest management and forest protection. In addition to many individuals who volunteer their time, there are numerous of groups that actively volunteer on the TNF. Some of these volunteer groups would be likely to volunteer on the Stewardship lands and are listed under question 30. There are dozens of other active volunteer groups on the TNF (not listed under question 30) who, due to their limited geographic focus, would probably not be involved in activities on the Stewardship lands.

Community Engagement and Collaboration

18. The following are a few examples of recent and ongoing collaborative efforts:

Kyburz Wildlife Undercrossing

State Highway 89 (Hwy 89) bisects the migration route for the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd and important habitat for other wildlife. In 2002, several local agencies and educators with varying interests in wildlife-road interactions, agreed to work together to reduce animal-vehicle collisions along Hwy 89 using research, education, and mitigation projects. The Hwy 89 Stewardship Team was formed, which includes the TNF, **USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Department of Fish and Game, UC Berkeley Sagehen Creek Field Station, UC Davis Agricultural Extension Service, Sierra County Fish and Wildlife Commission, and the Sierra County Department of Transportation.** Representatives from these organizations have collaborated to obtain funding and make recommendations to restore wildlife habitat connectivity across Hwy 89. Efforts to date have supported the following:

- Consolidating more than 20 years of Caltrans carcass data along Hwy 89.
- Worked with the California Department of Fish and Game, with \$20,000 of funding from the California Deer Association, to radio-collar the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd to monitor their movements.
- Implemented a \$140,000 grant to incorporate an after-school educational and work experience program for Sierra County students to investigate highway-

animal interactions, while they learned scientific monitoring techniques and the effects of highways on water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat.

- Completed Phase I of the Kyburz Undercrossing, with an underpass installation at Kyburz Meadow, using \$600,000 from the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), and a \$14,000 Title II RAC grant to install a cattleguard.
- Conducted camera monitoring to obtain baseline information of animal use along Hwy 89 focusing on the Kyburz undercrossing area.
- Planning Phase II of the Kyburz Undercrossing project, using \$750,000 from FHWA to construct fencing to keep deer off of Hwy 89 and drift them through the Kyburz underpass. Phase II is expected to be completed by 2012.
- Continuing analysis and planning for additional crossing structures along Hwy 89.

South Yuba River Management Plan

The TNF initiated the South Yuba River Management Planning process after the passage of the State Wild and Scenic River designation. Due to the popularity of this river, there was widespread public interest in keeping the river accessible and free. Forty-three public meetings and field trips were held. The Forest Service, **Bureau of Land Management** and the **California Department of Parks and Recreation** were involved in this management plan as the river flows through each agency's jurisdiction. The river was divided into segments. Management guides were developed for each segment. Management issues were discussed as a group. Consensus was the goal, however with 30-50 participants at each meeting, some of the elements were approved with 70-80% agreement. Most every aspect of river management was a part of the plan including: capacity limits, alcohol use, firearms, mountain bike access, interpretive signing, restrooms, and parking. The plan took about a year to complete and was finalized in 2005.

Sierra Nevada Checkerboard Initiative (Initiative)

The checkerboard landownership pattern, with every other section of land privately owned, is a legacy of the 1860's railroad grants and is no longer sustainable. It is an artificial grid of ownership applied to natural landscapes, watersheds, ecosystems and habitats. This land ownership pattern, with differing land management objectives, has resulted in irregular access to recreation and ineffective fuels, watershed and wildlife management. Several bioregional assessments have identified the Sierra checkerboard land ownership as problematic for managing sufficient habitat for wide-ranging, late-successional-associated species. Maintaining consistency in land management within forest areas is important in maintaining and re-establishing both north-south and east-west connectivity for wide ranging species. East-west (elevational) connectivity is needed for more resiliencies within the ecosystem as climate change progresses. North-south connectivity is needed for connecting disjunct populations, thus reducing the risk of extinction of genetically isolated populations.

The TNF and **Trust for Public Land (TPL)** worked together with the scientific community to identify the most at-risk lands and continue to work closely with the **Truckee Donner Land Trust**, **The Nature Conservancy**, the **American River Conservancy** and others to acquire high priority lands within the forest. These land trusts, working collaboratively, have leveraged tens of millions of dollars from philanthropic organizations, business interests, individuals and government sources. Ultimately the goal of the Initiative is the conservation of the headwaters of the North, Middle and South Yuba, North and Middle American, Rubicon, Bear and Little

Truckee Rivers, and the improved capacity of these watershed habitats to adapt to climate change. Together with the efforts with these partners, since 2001 the TNF has acquired over 22,000 acres of priority lands through donation, purchase and land exchange. Acquisition of the Stewardship lands identified in these planning units would complement this initiative.

Sagehen Collaborative Project

The TNF, **USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station** and the **University of California**, using a collaborative approach, are currently in the early stages of the development of management treatments for the Sagehen Basin and Experimental Forest to (1) modify landscape-scale wildfire behavior; (2) enhance the resiliency of forest stands to the adverse effects of high severity wildland fire; (3) improve protection for the residences, laboratories, and other structures at the UC Berkeley Sagehen Creek Field Station from the adverse effects of wildland fire, (4) provide for safer egress for researchers and the visiting public from the field station facilities in the event of a wildland fire; (5) protect the long-term investment in plantations from the adverse effects of high severity wildland fire; (6) improve the health of forest stands; (7) restore aspen stands, and; (8) enhance the ecological role of fire. Information on this project can be found at:

<http://sagehenforest.blogspot.com/>

Truckee River Day

For the past sixteen years, the Tahoe National Forest, in collaboration with the **Truckee River Watershed Council**, has hosted the annual Truckee River Day. Some **500-900 volunteers** donate their time completing a wide variety of restoration projects including wetland restoration, trail reconstruction, streambed stabilization, and riparian vegetation planting throughout the Truckee River Watershed.

19. Relevant experience soliciting stakeholder input

The National Forest Management Act requires each National Forest to develop a Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) which is prepared with extensive public involvement. The TNF considered over 12,000 letters in the development of the current Forest Plan. If the Stewardship lands were to become NFS lands, the Forest Plan would be amended to reflect the inclusion of these lands and these lands would be managed accordingly.

The Forest must also seek public input regarding any proposed projects with potential to impact NFS lands. The main vehicle for soliciting public input on proposed activities on federal lands is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA requires Federal agencies to consider the environmental effects of planned management activities, including the impacts on social, cultural, and economic resources, as well as natural resources. The two major purposes of the environmental review process are better informed decisions and citizen involvement.

The level of public involvement differs depending on the complexity of the project. At a minimum, all projects are posted in a quarterly Schedule of Proposed Actions on the TNF (SOPA). The SOPA, which includes a brief description of the project & location, the planning status, expected date of decision and implementation and project contact, is posted on the TNF website (<http://www.fs.fed.us/sopa/forest-level.php?110517>) and a copy is sent to individuals who have requested it. Additional techniques for soliciting public input is done through direct mailing to potentially interested parties, public meetings, press releases, posting notifications on

forest website and in newspapers etc. Furthermore, notifications of projects that may have a significant impact on NFS lands are posted in the Federal Register.

The NEPA regulations ensure the public has a voice in Forest Service decisions about on-the-ground activities and that those decisions are well documented and fully disclosed to the public. The NEPA regulations:

- Maintain the long-standing practice of soliciting public concerns about projects on NFS land that could have environmental impacts and encourage public participation throughout project planning.
- Allow the responsible official to modify a proposed action or alternatives as the analysis progresses and requires such modifications to be made in an open and transparent process obvious to all interested parties.
- Allow “adaptive management” proposals and alternatives so that Forest Service decisions are more responsive to the uncertainties of natural resource management.

The Council on Environmental Quality has put together a guide that provides an explanation of NEPA, how it is implemented, and how people outside the Federal government — individual citizens, private sector applicants, members of organized groups, or representatives of Tribal, State, or local government agencies — can better participate in the assessment of environmental impacts conducted by Federal agencies. A *Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA* is available on CEQ’s website (http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/Citizens_Guide_Dec07.pdf).

Examples of experience soliciting stakeholder input transfer and permanent protection of land

Transfer: As described above (question 18, Sierra Nevada Checkerboard Initiative), the TNF working with various conservation groups, has an active program to acquire land with important resource values. This is a collaborative process which considers input from the public, conservation interests, resource specialists and scientific modeling. Since 2009, the TNF has acquired over 2500 acres in donations through partnerships with several land trusts.

Permanent Protection: The TNF has a significant amount of experience working with stakeholders, due to the NEPA process described above. The following represents one such effort in which there is keen interest from a variety of diverse groups and individuals.

In 2003, the TNF began a program to better manage motorized vehicle use on the Forest. Through an extensive program to involve stakeholders, a variety of information efforts were initiated. Over a period of 8 years, 20 public meetings, workshops and field visits were held. The public assisted in designing many of these meetings and workshops. News releases were sent to media. Email lists were developed and regular updates were sent out to thousands who requested information. Information was disseminated to off highway vehicle merchants and businesses in the area. The TNF website was also used to disseminate information. Interested parties included environmental groups, OHV and non-motorized user groups, commercial outfitters, businesses and community interest groups and elected officials. Presentations were made to many of these interest groups and elected officials as well as hundreds of phone calls and individual meetings. Formal public comments were requested during the scoping process as

well as on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The information gathered through this process was used to develop the proposed action, the Draft EIS, the Supplemental Draft EIS, the Final EIS and Tahoe National Forest Motorized Travel Management Record of Decision. The Motor Vehicle Use Map, which displays legal routes for motorized vehicle use was developed from the Record of Decision. Although this process was contentious, new relationships were formed and existing ones strengthened and the efforts will continue to enhance these relationships. The Tahoe National Forest continues to solicit comments from these parties on OHV issues and the TNF's annual OHV grant submittal to the State Parks, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division.

Legal Compliance and Best Practices

20. Guiding principles

"Caring for the Land and Serving People," captures the essence of the Forest Service mission. As set forth in law, the mission is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people. It includes:

- Advocating a conservation ethic in promoting the health, productivity, diversity, and beauty of forests and associated lands.
- Listening to people and responding to their diverse needs in making decisions.
- Protecting and managing the National Forests and Grasslands so they best demonstrate the sustainable multiple-use management concept.
- Developing and providing scientific and technical knowledge aimed at improving our capability to protect, manage, and use forests and rangelands.
- Providing work, training, and education to the unemployed, underemployed, elderly, youth, and disadvantaged in pursuit of our mission.

To realize the mission, the Forest Service follows 13 guiding principles:

- We use an ecological approach to the multiple-use management of the National Forests and Grasslands.
- We use the best scientific knowledge in making decisions and select the most appropriate technologies in the management of resources.
- We are good neighbors who respect private property rights.
- We strive for quality and excellence in everything we do and are sensitive to the effects of our decisions on people and resources.
- We strive to meet the needs of our customers in fair, friendly, and open ways.
- We form partnerships to achieve shared goals.
- We promote grassroots participation in our decisions and activities.
- We value and trust one another and share leadership.
- We value a multicultural organization as essential to our success.
- We maintain high professional and ethical standards.
- We are responsible and accountable for what we do.
- We recognize and accept that some conflict is natural and we strive to deal with it professionally.

- We follow laws, regulations, executive direction, and congressional intent.

USDA policy addresses appropriate employee conduct. A copy of Directive 365.1 -- Employee Responsibility and Conduct is located at: <http://www.ams.usda.gov>. The policy specific to conflict of interest is attached in Appendix B.

21. Provisions for another organization to assume ownership and management

No provisions have been made to have another organization assume ownership or management responsibility should the USFS be unable to manage the land. (If the US government is no longer able to manage public lands, this would have major implications beyond the Stewardship lands.)

The Forest Service would be responsible for the management of the land. Various “project work,” such as timber removal, fuels reduction and trail reconstruction could be done by a private company under contract. Other project work is often accomplished by volunteers. Operation of privately owned (and certain publicly owned) improvements on NFS land is done by special use permittees.

22. Violations of law

We are unaware of violations of any laws by the TNF in the past 5 years.

23. Conservation Covenant

The Forest Service policy prohibits accepting lands with conservation easements. The Forest Service has provided PG&E and the Stewardship Council with an example of a Conservation Covenant. This Covenant is our proposal to ensure that any lands donated to the TNF would be managed in accordance with the Stewardship Council’s BPVs in perpetuity. The Covenant reiterates that the management of the lands conveyed to the Forest Service would be subject to a number of federal statutes that specifically protect and enhance the Stewardship Council’s beneficial public values. Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) is the proposed holder of the Covenant.

The TNF would amend the Forest Plan to incorporate language into the management area prescriptions describing that these lands were donated to ensure the permanent protection of their natural resources. The amendment would include the objectives for protection of the BPVs, would reference the Covenant and require that all future Forest Plan revisions reference the Covenant.

Additional assurances contained in the Covenant include:

- The lands will be managed for public recreation such as hiking, camping, hunting, and fishing, subject to TNF regulations and state fish and game laws.
- The Covenant will be recorded with the County and a signed original copy will be retained by the TNF and the Covenant holder.
- The TNF will provide notice to SNC of any proposals to amend the Forest Plan or land management plans, to provide SNC the opportunity to participate in the planning process as an interested party.

- In any public proceedings regarding the modification of the Forest Plan or proposed land management activities, the Forest Service must disclose the existence of the Covenant and the intention of the Stewardship Council to effect permanent protection of the BPVs.
- If the title is ever transferred out of the federal government's hands, the government would place equivalent deed restrictions on the lands to ensure permanent preservation of the conservation values.

24. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

With hundreds of employees on the TNF, it was not reasonable to query every employee. However, employees on our leadership team and a few other key employees were queried with the following results. Additionally, some of our employees have had professional dealings with other members of the board.

The Forest Service is a non-voting member of the Stewardship Council and is represented by **Christine Nota**. Several employees of the Tahoe National Forest are personally and professionally acquainted with Ms. Nota. Therefore, she will not represent the Forest Service during any aspect of application for fee title of the requested lands.

Lee Adams is the current Chairman of the Sierra County Board of Supervisors and former Sierra County sheriff. The majority of Sierra County is located within the boundary of the Tahoe National Forest. Therefore, numerous employees of the TNF have had a personal relationship with Mr. Adams for many years. Sierra County typically receives roughly \$1.5-2 million annually from the Forest Service under the Secure Rural Schools & Community Self Determination Act, most of which is intended to provide funding for county roads and schools. Since Sierra County has such a small population (approximately 3000 residents) and has a high percentage of public land, many decisions made on the TNF have the potential to have a financial impact on Sierra County.

Several employees of the TNF have a professional relationship with **David Sutton**. The TNF has had a long standing partnership with the Trust for Public Land (TPL). TPL has been instrumental in dozens of successful efforts to consolidate land ownership patterns in the northern Sierra and has donated thousands of acres of land to the TNF. Mr. Sutton is the Sierra Nevada Program Manager and has provided a great deal of leadership in this effort.

David A Bischel (CFA) has been a friend of one of our district hydrologists (Tim Biddinger) for over 40 years. They were fraternity brothers at UC Davis; lived and went to school together at UC Berkeley; and worked together. Tim is planning on retiring in the foreseeable future and has not been in personnel contact with Mr. Bischel for several of years.

One of TNF's FERC coordinators (Beth Paulson) is currently engaged to **Randy Livingston** and has worked with various other board members on FERC relicensing projects.

PART 2 - LAND STEWARDSHIP INFORMATION

25. Specific parcels the TNF is interested in receiving in fee title

Note: Acreages were derived from the Background Packets. There have been changes in the land offered since the packets were developed. No attempt was made to update the parcel sizes to reflect these changes.

The Tahoe National Forest is interested in gaining fee title to the following lands in the Spaulding Planning Unit:

Parcel ID Number	Acres	Priority for TNF	Area
798	469	1	Six Mile Mdw
802	36	1	Upper Rock
803	35	1	Upper & Lower Rock
804	147	1	Upper & Lower Rock
805	283	1	Middle Lindsey
806	63	1	Culbertson
807	101	1	Lower Lindsey
808	36	1	Carr
799	50	2	West of Lake Valley
810	131	2	Rucker & Fuller
813	870	2	Lake Valley
795	640	3	North of Rucker
796	236	3	West of Rucker
797	608	3	NW of Rucker
824	160	3	Lake Valley Canal
825	263	5	Deer Creek Forebay
826	353	5	Deer Creek PH

The Tahoe National Forest is interested in gaining fee title to the following lands in the Fordyce Planning Unit:

Parcel ID Number	Acres	Priority for TNF	Area
775	75	2	White Rock
789	92	2	Sterling
792	20	2	Kidd
793	117	2	Kidd/Cascade
794	15	2	Cascade
785	6	4	Fordyce
782	68	4	Fordyce

The Tahoe National Forest is interested in gaining fee title to the following lands in the Bear River Planning Unit:

Parcel ID Number	Acres	Priority for TNF	Area
------------------	-------	------------------	------

827	3	2	Hwy 20
836	82	2	Upper Bear Valley
837	122	2	Upper Bear Valley
838	93	2	Upper Bear Valley
839	918	2	Bear Valley Meadow
840	32	2	NW Bear Valley Mdw
844	95	2	SW Bear Valley Mdw
845	455	2	Lower Bear Valley
846	1644	2	Lower Bear Valley
847	76	2	Lower Bear Valley
848	144	2	Lower Bear Valley
851	74	2	Lower Bear Valley

There are some parcels that are shown as constrained because of the need to have PG&E indemnified due to flooding. The Anti-Deficiency Act makes it illegal for a federal agency to indemnify anyone, since this would represent a future unlimited fiscal obligation beyond Congressional appropriations. From a practical standpoint, however, if the TNF is the recommended donee, the Office of General Council opines that these concerns can be dealt with without indemnification. The TNF could probably accept these parcels subject to PG&E reserving the right to flood the land.

26. Requirement for a lot line adjustment, boundary survey, or legal parcel split

The U.S. is exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. Therefore, simply subdividing a parcel would not require a parcel split, lot-line adjustment or survey if the parcel could be legally described. For instance, the property might be described by aliquot part, excepting therefrom all lands within 75' of elevation x' (with x representing the high water mark of a given lake when this distance defines the FERC boundary).

The need for a boundary survey would be determined on a parcel by parcel basis. If the parcel is completely surrounded by NFS land (parcel 795, for instance) there would be no need for a boundary survey. Likewise, if the parcel is bounded only by NFS land and PG&E's readily defined FERC boundary (parcel 785, for instance), there would probably be no need for a survey. In the case where the FERC boundary cannot be readily defined by a distance above high water, such as parcel 813, the most judicious approach *may* be for PG&E to retain an aliquot part.

If the parcel is bounded by NFS on one or more sides and private land on the other sides, the need for a survey of this private landline would be based on the risk of encroachments onto the subject parcel. For instance, there is little risk of encroachment on parcel 775, and the TNF may be comfortable taking this parcel without the need for a survey. It is a relatively remote parcel with little risk of timber theft or residential encroachments. On the other hand, parcel 810 has ¼ mile of landline between Stewardship and private land. Due to the proximity to private dwellings, it is expected that the center north/south section line of that section would need to be surveyed, and the portion of the line that interfaces with private would need to be marked and posted.

When a parcel needs to be surveyed, many factors influence the cost. These factors include the difficulty of the terrain, the existence of survey monuments and the number of subdivisions that the section would require. A minimum “ballpark” estimate would be \$6000 for each mile that needs to be surveyed. So for instance, if PG&E were to convey a 160 acre parcel (1/4 section), this would require two miles to be surveyed to divide the section into quarters at an approximate cost of \$12,000. If PG&E were to convey a 40 acre parcel (16th section), this would require the section to be sub-divided into quarters (2 miles of survey) and then one quarter to be further sub-divided into quarters (1 mile of survey), costing an estimated \$18,000. This cost would include survey, marking and posting the line, setting section corners and describing the parcel.

Our surveyor met with Placer County to understand how that county would deal with survey needs of canals such as parcels 824, 845 and 846. The county’s advice was that if the feature could be located on air photos or ortho-photos, these features could be excepted from the description, however, the location of the ingress and egress points of these features would need to be identified in the description.

The latest configuration of parcels 803, 805 and 806 (which show the PG&E roads being retained since these would be project roads within the FERC boundary) is a slightly different situation. The county recommended that instead of reserving these lands, that PG&E reserve these as easements, however, we understand the issue with FERC not allowing PG&E to dispose of any lands within the project boundary. If the TNF is the selected donee, we suggest the TNF and PG&E work together on a settlement agreement whereby we mutually agree that those roads be removed from the FERC project boundary, but that PG&E would reserve an easement and continue to be responsible for road maintenance. Although the maps for these parcels does not show the surrounding land as constrained, these ribbons of retained lands would represent odd ownership patterns which we believe would not serve the public or PG&E well. These low scale dirt roads are much less of an in situ monument than the canals mentioned above, and therefore, if these roads are retained by PG&E, they are more likely than the canals (addressed above) to require a survey to tie the location to the ground.

The TNF gets little annual funding for cadastral surveys (approximately \$13,000 in fiscal year 2011). We have limited opportunities to reprogram funding from other program areas into the cadastral program in order to meet critical needs, however, this simply reduces the funding available for management and enhancement of the BPVs. If PG&E and Stewardship Council are unwilling to fund a survey needed for the purpose of disposal of parcels that the TNF has identified as high priority for acquisition (especially if the reason that a survey would be needed would be to protect the donated lands from encroachments arising on neighboring private lands) the TNF would consider paying for the needed survey or waiving the need for a survey prior to transfer (thereby obligating the USA to survey the lands at a future date if or when the need arises). In summary, if the TNF is the selected donee on any of these lands, the survey needs and the party responsible for the survey should be discussed on a case by case basis.

27. USFS’s internal process for approving the acquisition of real property.

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) can acquire lands by a number of means, all of which must be authorized by Congressional legislation. The four primary authorized means of acquisition are

donation, purchase, land-for-timber exchange and land-for-land exchange. Following is brief summary of the donation process.

Donation usually starts with a landowner contacting the Forest Service and offering to donate their land. If the Forest containing or adjacent to the property determines that acquisition of the property would serve to meet objectives in the Forest Plan, then the landowner would be requested to provide a written offer of donation, in which the donor describes the location of the property, provides information on any known outstanding rights, details any intended reservations by the landowner, and acknowledges the owner's responsibility to clear title defects and tax liens. The USFS would prepare a public benefit determination addressing the suitability of the land for National Forest purposes, proposed use of the property, benefits/amenities, and any potential problems. The USFS would also obtain a preliminary title commitment, conduct an expanded Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (for hazardous materials), verify the legal description, inspect the property for encroachments or trespasses and prepare the deed along with other necessary documents for the transaction. The Forest requests formal approval from the USFS Regional Office to proceed with the donation. In cases where the lands are outside the proclaimed boundary of the NF, the Forest would also request concurrence for the acquisition from the USFS Washington Office. All documents are then submitted to the Office of General Counsel for attorney review and preliminary title approval. Once received, the Forest records the deed to the United States and completes the donation process.

28. Baseline and Enhanced Land Management

MANAGEMENT INTENT COMMON TO LAND IN ALL PLANNING UNITS

The Forest is capable of, and has every intention of, maintaining baseline management activities similar to those currently being performed by PG&E, as well as enhancing beneficial public values. As discussed, the Forest Service currently manages the land adjacent to these parcels in accordance with the Forest Plan which has similar goals and objectives as the BPVs.

In addition to direction on ecosystems management as directed in the Forest Plan, the TNF intends on conducting baseline activities (including but not limited to the following) on all donated parcels to protect and manage forest resources:

- The Forest Service would continue to patrol this area, educating and informing the public on wildfire prevention. If these lands were to become NFS lands, this patrol role would expand to include education and enforcement of resource protection, OHV regulations, campfire and woodcutting restrictions, etc.
- Current authorized land uses, not reserved by PG&E, would be authorized and administered under special use permits (subject to NEPA and the special use permit authorization process and regulations). Examples of these authorized uses would include the existing organization camps at Lake Valley, Sterling and Kidd Lake and the Royal Gorge nordic ski facilities. In some cases, (Royal Gorge LLC and Golden Empire Council Boy Scouts of America at Sterling Lake) PG&E's lease holder already has a permit for the same use on neighboring NFS land, allowing the TNF to simply amend the

existing permit. If there are any non-recreation land uses, the permittee would be charged for the cost of issuing the permit under cost recovery regulations.

- The existing Canyon Creek grazing permit would be administered on the donated land.
- The Forest Plan would be amended to address the Stewardship lands.
- Existing trails would be maintained. Numerous groups and individuals currently volunteer for maintenance of other TNF motorized and non-motorized trails; recruitment of new volunteers, along with available/interested current volunteers, would take place to assist with maintenance of trails on these parcels.
- Public information on recreation opportunities would be updated and disseminated by physically signing recreation facilities (e.g. trails) as well as through the paper and web-based recreation opportunity guides.
- Existing plantations would be managed to increase tree species diversity and enhance stand structural diversity to develop healthy forest stands that will be resilient to severe effects from wildfire, insect and disease infestations, and changing climatic conditions. This would likely be accomplished through a combination of brush control, pre-commercial thinning, prescribed burning and commercial timber harvest until the desired future condition can be maintained naturally.

The Forest also intends to take the following actions to protect and enhance the donated land:

- A travel analysis would be conducted of the existing road system to identify potential resource and public access issues; assess potential benefits, problems and risks; set priorities and identify opportunities. This would help inform decisions such as which roads should be retained and decommissioned; what the road management objectives and maintenance levels should be; and opportunities for resource improvements such as improving aquatic passage and reducing sediment production. The TNF would identify and maintain a road system that provides sustainable access to National Forest System lands for the administration, protection and utilization of lands and resources, consistent with Forest Plan direction. Following this analysis, the TNF would pursue funding to implement the decisions made through this process.

Part of this analysis would be to amend the existing the *Tahoe National Forest Motorized Travel Management Record of Decision* (September 2010) and the Motor Vehicle Use Map to incorporate the Stewardship lands. These documents establish and display which routes are open to motorized travel. Motorized travel off of designated routes would be prohibited.

If Stewardship Council funding is obtained, the TNF anticipates completing this analysis within 1-2 years. If this funding is not obtained, the TNF would complete this analysis when Congressional appropriations are available.

- Friends of Sierra Rock Art volunteers currently monitor rock art and other cultural resources on the TNF each year. It is expected that these volunteers would monitor sites on the Stewardship lands, if acquired.
- The Background Information Packets identify one of the unauthorized uses as “archaeological artifact collecting.” If any of these parcels pass into National Forest ownership, this activity would violate the Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979 as amended, which establishes both civil and criminal penalties for vandalizing cultural resources. This act states, “No person may excavate, remove, damage, or otherwise alter or deface, or attempt to excavate, remove, damage, or otherwise alter or deface any archaeological resource located on public lands...” Should any of these parcels become NFS lands, the ability to educate, inform, and as a last resort cite the public for violation of regulations and/or laws, or for causing resource damage, would be possible for the Forest Service. Forest Service patrols would increase for these purposes.

Land Conservation Plan Potential Measures

The Potential Measures listed in the LCP include recommendations to complete a variety of resource surveys and inventories, and develop management plans. The vast majority of these actions are standard operating procedures for management of NFS land. Below are examples of how the TNF addresses some of these LCP potential measures (shown in bold) as part of our standard land management.

Conduct surveys to identify biological resources and enable their protection: By law and policy the USFS is required to maintain and enhance all species including threatened, endangered and sensitive species and their habitat. The USFS works with various partners, including NGOs, California Department of Fish and Game, researchers and other public and private entities to conduct resource surveys and monitoring including, but not limited to:

- Threatened, endangered and sensitive (TES) species
- Willow flycatcher, bat species, amphibian species, rare plant species, bald eagle nesting and mid-winter monitoring and other non-TES species of special interest.
- Management Indicator Species monitoring to assess population and habitat trends of certain species (e.g. deer, black-backed woodpecker, sooty grouse, and mountain quail) which represent specific habitats that may be affected by management activities.
- Landbird monitoring which serves as a barometer of habitat conditions, such as meadow health and the impacts of climate change.
- Assessments of certain habitats such as fen and aspen condition.
- Aquatic organism passage surveys/assessments to assess whether road-stream crossings present barriers to aquatic organisms including fish and amphibians.
- Watchlist plants and plant communities to collect information about species that may become listed as sensitive; or species for which there are special concerns (e.g. species that are severely limited on neighboring forests but are found in abundance on this forest).
- Noxious and invasive weeds.
- Finally, as part of the NEPA process, resource surveys are always accomplished in connection with project proposals (such as a fuels reduction project, a timber sale or construction of a trail) and are used to analyze the impacts on the biological resource.

Complete cultural resource surveys to enable their protection and Coordinate with Native American entities when conducting cultural resource measures: By law, the USFS must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 which essentially requires cultural resource inventories be completed prior to undertaking any project that might have an impact on NFS land; evaluate the potential impacts and protect cultural resources from these impacts unless a site has been determined ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Prior to undertaking these surveys, the TNF consults with Native American tribes via established tribal relations protocols to determine if there are any sacred or religious sites within the planning area for a proposed undertaking. Due to funding limitations, more often than not, surveys for cultural resources would be conducted in response to a project proposed in the vicinity. If additional funds become available, the FS would have the opportunity to coordinate additional (non-project driven) cultural resource surveys on Stewardship lands in partnership with Native American tribal members.

Segments of the Overland Emigrant Trail cross or occupy areas immediately adjacent to parcels 792, 793, 794, 827 839 and 845. This trail is part of the California National Historic Trail, Truckee Route. The Forest Service currently monitors segments of the Truckee Route of the Overland Emigrant Trail that are located on adjacent NFS land including a pristine segment on NFS land west of parcel 793. Like other cultural resources, the Forest Service would protect this resource from potential impacts arising from any proposed projects on NFS land by following NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Forest Service is currently updating a driving tour to interpret specific points along the trail on NFS land. Interpretive signs are currently in the planning stage. At this time, no signs are planned to be placed on Stewardship lands (however, there are existing interpretive signs the Overland Emigrant Trail along Lowell Hill Road). All actions taken in regard to this trail would maintain consistency with the *Comprehensive Management and Use Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement for the California National Historic Trail (United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1999)*. This plan emphasizes preservation of the California National Historic Trail's history and physical remains as well as interpretation, where appropriate, to ensure continued protection of the trail.

Develop management plans (for recreation, cultural resource, etc.): The Forest Plan addresses these resources at a programmatic and landscape level while individual projects address these resources on a site specific level. The TNF does not *generally* anticipate developing individual plans for the Stewardship lands as management of these resources is relatively standard operating procedure based on the Forest Plan, laws, regulations and policy. Soil protection, adequate sanitation, and maintenance of healthy vegetation are objectives in all recreation facilities maintenance, reconstruction, and rehabilitation work.

Develop a noxious weed management plan in coordination with noxious weed abatement efforts: Similar to the previous statement, the Forest Plan addresses management of weeds at a programmatic and landscape level while individual projects address weed management at a site specific level. Development of an integrated weed management plan is generally not anticipated specifically for the Stewardship lands. However, if there are numerous projects planned in a particular area (such as fuels reduction and timber sale projects) it is anticipated that an

integrated weed management plan may be developed for that area as part of the planning for those projects. Such a plan would incorporate education, prevention and control/eradication of weeds.

Evaluate existing timber inventory data. Once every five years, a remote sensing laboratory image is generated of the TNF. At longer (unspecified) intervals; the TNF performs an aerial-photo interpretation inventory of vegetation typing.

Develop a fire management and response plan ensure fire preparedness. In addition to the Forest Plan, the TNF is a signatory to several plans that address fire management including:

- Fire Management Plan which is a forest-wide plan that provides direction on all aspects of fire management including prevention, suppression, fuels treatment and use of prescribed fire.
- Subgeographic coordination plan between TNF, the surrounding national forests (Humboldt-Toiyobe NF, Eldorado NF, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit) Nevada Dept. of Forestry and Calfire. This plan addresses which agency is responsible for initial attack.
- California Master Cooperative Wildland Fire Management and Stafford Act Response Plan which is a statewide coordination plan between the USFS and other federal land management agencies, Calfire and California Emergency Management Agency.
- Mutual aid agreements between the USFS and the local fire departments.

Stewardship lands would be included in these plans, if these were to become NFS land.

Develop a forest management plan to promote natural forest development, and structural and physical diversity in forest for long term ecological, economic, social and cultural benefits. This direction is already included in the existing Forest Plan. The Forest Plan would be amended to incorporate any Stewardship lands donated to the TNF.

Develop a fuels management plan for the planning unit to ensure long-term forest health and reduce fuel loading and fire hazard.

This direction is already included in the existing Forest Plan and Fire Management Plan.

Develop a wildlife and habitat management plan in coordination with adjacent landowners.

The TNF is the major adjacent landowner of the Stewardship lands. TNF does not anticipate developing additional plans specifically for the Stewardship lands. However, the TNF land allocations already include habitat delineation for numerous key wildlife species. The objective of these delineations is to identify the best available habitat for these species on NFS lands, provide a framework to manage and enhance this habitat; and provide for connectivity, linkages and movement at a landscape scale. For instance, Protected Activity Centers (PAC) are designated for California spotted owl and northern goshawk; and the forest carnivore network is designed to address species like marten, fisher, red fox, and wolverine. In many cases in the Spaulding and Bear River Planning Units, the current delineation of these Protected Activity Centers and networks are constrained by the land ownership patterns. If the Stewardship parcels are acquired by the Forest Service, these lands would be evaluated, and if appropriate, they would be delineated and managed to better protect, maintain, and enhance habitat for these species.

Protect cultural resource sites with landscape measures, and signage and restrict or formalize recreation use. Acquisition of these parcels would provide the opportunity for professional management of cultural resources including inventory, recording, evaluation, monitoring, protection, preservation, and interpretation.

Identify unauthorized uses and develop strategies to address future management. As described earlier, the USFS already patrols the NFS lands in Fordyce, Spaulding and part of Bear River Planning Units for fire prevention. If lands are in NFS ownership, the employees patrolling these lands would be able to enforce regulations pertaining to cultural and other resource protection, wildfire prevention, OHV restrictions, illegal woodcutting, etc.

Forest Service patrols would also place emphasis on compliance with the *Tahoe National Forest Motorized Travel Management Record of Decision* (September 2010) and the Motor Vehicle Use Map which would be amended to include these lands. These documents establish and display which routes are open to motorized travel.

Additionally, certain potential measures, such as **Install additional directional and safety signage for Sterling Lake** and **Construct an accessible fishing pier at Fuller Lake** are expected to be included in PG&E's Drum Spaulding license, based on PG&E's Final License Application. Other potential measures, such as **Install an interpretive kiosk at Spaulding Day Use Area** are not applicable to that lands being donated.

MANAGEMENT INTENT BY INDIVIDUAL PARCELS

Forest Plan Direction

Under the Forest Plan, the land on the TNF is organized into Management Areas (MA). Each MA has specific resource management emphases, and the Forest Plan establishes standards and guidelines (in addition to Forest-wide standards and guidelines, including those in the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment) and land management prescriptions that apply to the lands within that area. In general, the amendment to the Forest Plan (which would be completed in compliance with the conservation covenant) would incorporate the Stewardship lands into the surrounding or adjacent MA and the Stewardship lands would take on the management emphases and direction of that MA. If the character of the donated lands is not consistent with the surrounding NFS lands, additional management direction, standards, and guidelines would be developed. The Forest Plan amendment would be subject to the NEPA process, including the associated public involvement.

The key land management emphasis of the MA's that would apply to the Stewardship parcels is italicized in the discussions below. In addition to maintaining these broader management objectives identified in the Forest Plan, the Forest Service would pursue the activities described in the discussions below to enhance the beneficial public values on the identified parcels. Many of these actions would be ongoing activities; therefore no timeline has been attached.

Of noteworthy significance, the Forest Plan classifies much of the higher elevation NFS lands surrounding the Stewardship lands as unsuited for regulated timber production. Trees may be

removed from these lands to meet resource objectives such as removing hazard trees, enhancing visual quality, or improving wildlife habitat, when these can be accomplished in a sustainable manner; however, generally these lands are not managed for timber production. Unsuitable lands are defined in the National Forest Management Act Regulations, the criteria for which include:

- Lands not at least 10% occupied by forest trees of any size or formerly having such tree cover.
- There is not reasonable assurance that such lands can be adequately restocked within 5 years after final harvest.
- Technology is not available to ensure timber production from the land without irreversible resource damage to soil productivity or watersheds.

The Stewardship Council's definition for Sustainable Forestry is quite broad. However, since the timber resources on these unsuitable lands would not be managed for economic benefits, when the lands are classified as unsuited, Sustainable Forestry is not listed as a BPV in the discussion below, even though the management of these lands would meet part of the Stewardship Council's definition of this BPV.

Additionally, a Visual Quality Objective (VQO) is assigned to all NFS lands as part of the Forest Plan. The VQO defines how evident management activities should be and the duration of visual impacts. VQOs of Retention and Partial Retention are consistent with the preservation of the viewshed objective of the Open Space BPV. Under a Retention VQO management activities are not to be visually evident and under Partial Retention, management activities should be visually subordinate to the character of the landscape.

It should be noted that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Forest Service to complete an environmental analysis for proposed actions that may cause effects on the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with the environment. Public scoping and subsequent engagement of interested parties is a part of this process. All actions envisioned below are subject to NEPA. The USFS cannot commit to completing any action until a decision is made through this process. All proposed activities are subject to the availability of congressionally appropriated or other funding.

Spaulding Planning Unit

Parcels 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, and 808 would be incorporated into the Grouse MA (Parcels 802 through 807) and the South Yuba MA (Parcel 808); however, parcel 808 would be managed with similar management objectives as the Grouse MA. *The primary management emphasis for the Grouse MA is non-motorized dispersed recreation. The area is considered unsuited for regulated timber management. Management emphasis would be placed on providing recreational opportunities, protecting wet meadows, maintaining water quality, maintaining healthy fisheries, and maintaining high visual quality.*

These parcels are primarily surrounded by National Forest System land and fall within the Grouse Ridge Non-motorized Recreation Area. Acquisition of these parcels is integral to

protecting and enhancing the non-motorized recreational values in the area. Recreation facilities, such as hiking trails, would be actively managed.

The parcels around Lindsey Lakes, Culbertson Lake and Rock Lakes are currently grazed in the Canyon Creek allotment. Grazing activities would be expected to continue if the Stewardship land is acquired. This is the only active grazing allotments on the requested Stewardship lands.

To meet the LCP proposed measure “**Support the expansion and integration of the trail network**” the TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding to construct a single tract non-motorized trail from the Lower Lindsey Trailhead to Lower Rock Lake. The current hiking situation on these parcels is less than optimal. Hikers parking at the Lower Lindsey Lake trailhead must first walk almost 3 miles along open and gated roads (primarily PG&E’s service roads) to access Lower Rock Lake. A single track trail, located off the roads would greatly enhance the experience and recreation resources of these parcels. The TNF anticipates completing this trail construction within 5 years of acquisition, pending the availability of Stewardship funding. The TNF anticipates recruiting volunteer labor to assist with the maintenance of this trail.

If the USFS is not the donee, it is critical that the conservation easement seek to preserve the semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience, consistent with the surrounding public lands and subject to existing valid access rights such as PG&E’s rights. Public motorized vehicle use of this area would greatly impact the current recreation users. The TNF would also request that trail easements along the existing routes be reserved in the favor of the USA if these parcels are not donated to the TNF.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Agricultural Uses; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcel 810 also has high recreational value. A portion of Parcel 810 would be included in the Fuller MA and the remaining section would be included in the South Yuba MA. The area is generally considered *unsuited for regulated timber management*; however, some wildlife habitat improvement projects may be proposed, such as aspen stand improvement. Several aspen stands are known to persist in the general area. Partnerships and funding for aspen stand improvement projects would be sought out. *The resource management emphases for the Fuller MA, and this parcel, are water-oriented developed recreation, maintaining quality fish habitat, protection of water quality, and maintaining visual quality.*

This parcel would be managed primarily for recreation. To meet the LCP potential measure “**Build and connect the trail system between Fuller, Rucker and Spaulding Lake,**” the TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding. There is a strong demand for hiking trails in this area as supported by PG&E’s recreation surveys (done as part of the Drum-Spaulding relicensing) in which over 70% of those surveyed at Rucker Lake and Spaulding Lake indicated that hiking is an activity they participate in. The proposal would include construction of a bridge and approximately 1.5 miles of trail (approximately ½ mile of which is on NFS land and would be funded by the USFS), and signing. It would involve NFS, Stewardship and PG&E retained land. The TNF anticipates completing this trail construction within 3 years of acquisition,

pending the availability of Stewardship funding and an easement from PG&E. The TNF anticipates recruiting volunteer labor to assist with the maintenance of these trails.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcels 798, 799, 813 and 824 are either adjacent to, or near, Lake Valley Reservoir. Parcels 798, 799, and 813 would be included in the Mears MA and Parcel 824 would be included in the Monumental MA. *The primary management emphases for both of these MAs are vegetation management, hazardous fuels reduction and wildlife habitat improvement. Management direction for the Mears MA also emphasizes protection and preservation watershed values, cultural resource management, and recreation management. Partial retention VQO applies to the foreground of trails, primary roads accessing the trailhead, the railroad and I-80, with less restrictive VQOs in the rest of the area.* However, since the land around Lake Valley Reservoir is currently not National Forest System land and the character of this land is different from the rest of the Mears MA, it is anticipated that additional management direction may apply to the donated parcels. Examples of additional management direction include more restrictive visual quality objectives of the foreground and middle foreground as viewed from the lake.

Forestry practices anticipated in this area include thinning timber stands to reduce density to increase resilience to insects and diseases and changing climatic conditions, increasing/maintaining tree species diversity, and enhancing stand structural diversity, among others. There would be opportunities for fuels reduction projects that would include the reintroduction of low intensity ground fire into the ecosystem, in the form of prescribed fire. This would enhance forest health and contribute to sustainable forestry.

Due to the interface between urban areas and the wildland, some of these parcels have a high potential for fire starts. The TNF would evaluate the opportunities to develop various fuel break projects in and around these areas. Fuels reduction through prescribed burning, biomass removal and mastication would increase resilience to wildfire. These would also limit the adverse effects of high severity wildfire on watershed conditions and any developments or improvements located within the parcels, such as the I-80 corridor, high voltage transmission lines, and other special use facilities, thus reducing the potential impact on life and property.

Currently the road to the Mears trailhead is gated by PG&E. To meet the LCP proposed measure **Support the expansion and integration of the trail network**, the TNF anticipates analyzing the feasibility of opening and maintaining roaded access to the historic Mears Trail, improving the current trailhead and providing a trail link to Lake Valley Reservoir recreation facilities. The TNF anticipates completing this project within five years of acquisition, pending the availability of Stewardship funding and if necessary, access across PG&E retained land.

Current delineation of protected California spotted owl habitat is constrained by the land ownership patterns. If these parcels are acquired by the Forest Service, the areas protected for spotted owl would be evaluated and if appropriate, reconfigured to more appropriately reflect the key habitat.

The TNF's primary interest in parcel 798 is the protection and enhancement of the Six Mile Valley meadow and is aware of San Joaquin Office of Education's interest in this land for the Eagle Mountain Lodge area. Although the TNF is also interested in acquiring the entire parcel, the TNF would be interested in a parcel split of this parcel if the Stewardship Council determines this would be the best distribution of the land.

Based on information provided in the Lake Spaulding Background Packet and a review of other available information, the Forest Service is concerned about the current and future condition of natural resources associated with the Six Mile Valley meadow system. This meadow appears to be severely impacted and the TNF is equipped with the experience and expertise to protect and enhance these resources through implementation of restoration projects. Concerns about natural resources associated with the meadow system exist due to past grazing, proximity and design of the road prism, OHV activity, Eagle Mountain Lodge parking lot, and the 2001 Gap Fire. Past grazing operations often cause modifications to local hydrology such as relocating the main stream channel and installing diversion ditches to temporarily improve forage volume. These activities are detrimental to the long term health of the meadow resulting in stream channel incision, lowering of the water table, and loss of herbaceous meadow vegetation and fish habitat. The existing road prism and parking lot may be affecting surface flows, subsurface hydrology, and aquatic organism passage. OHV activity has affected meadow vegetation, and is likely causing adverse effects to water quality and hydrologic functioning. The 2001 Gap Fire eliminated much of the native vegetative cover surrounding the meadow and, in concert with the existing road prism, may be a vector for noxious weed colonization.

The TNF is requesting one time funding from the Stewardship Council for the initial restoration and protection efforts of the Six Mile Valley meadow, including completing NEPA, cultural resource survey and evaluation, rare plant and noxious weed surveys, treating noxious weeds, evaluating hydrologic connectivity, assessing possible stream restoration activities, closing and decommissioning unauthorized routes, revegetating the road prisms, preventing future vehicle access into meadow, restoring Eagle Mountain Lodge parking lot, and thinning encroaching conifers. NEPA is anticipated to be completed within three years of acquisition, pending the availability of Stewardship funding. Restoration related activities would be completed during the field season following a decision on the environmental document.

The NEPA for this project is expected to be relatively expensive. This is due to the amount of data gathering required for this project. However, this NEPA document is anticipated to be used as the launching pad to pursue supplementary funds for additional stream restoration projects within the meadow. The TNF would continue to work with partners such as American Rivers and the Placer County Resource Advisory Council and seek additional partners, funding and volunteers to implement restoration projects to address these resource concerns and restore sensitive habitats for special status plants and wildlife. (As noted in question 11, the TNF has been successful in competing for a variety of funding sources to accomplish meadow restoration elsewhere on the TNF.)

Cultural resource surveys would be conducted as part of the NEPA process. Based on the information provided in the Background Information Packet and professional knowledge, there

are cultural resources located in the vicinity of the former Eagle Mountain Lodge and a high likelihood that sites would be identified within Six Mile Valley, including the Overland Emigrant Trail. Wherever possible, cultural resources would be flagged and avoided during implementation of restoration activities; however, if cultural resources cannot be avoided, an evaluation of significance would need to be conducted. Following site evaluations, the sites would either be determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or released from further management. Cultural resource evaluations (especially for prehistoric sites) can be quite costly depending on the type, size, depth and extent of the site. Based on the information available at this time and professional judgment, the TNF is requesting funding for evaluation of three sites. If additional evaluations are necessary for project implementation, additional funding would be sought from the Stewardship Council and other funding sources. If less than three sites need to be evaluated, excess funding would be returned to the Stewardship Council or applied towards additional meadow restoration, at the Council's discretion.

An email from the Stewardship Council (4/27/11) indicated that Eagle Mountain Lodge has been demolished. If this parcel were to be donated to the TNF, the USFS would request PG&E to complete the removal of the foundation prior to the transaction. The parking lot appears to have affected meadow vegetation at the southwestern end of the meadow. As part of the Six Mile Valley meadow restoration project discussed above, the TNF would decompact soils and reintroduce native plant species in the former Eagle Mountain Lodge parking lot. There may be the opportunity to retain a small portion of the parking lot as a future trailhead.

The TNF anticipates evaluating the feasibility of linking existing trails near the old Eagle Mountain Lodge location to trails located on the adjacent private property at the Snowflower ATV and SnoPark. This could provide a range of diverse and seasonal recreation opportunities (potentially for both summer and winter, motorized and non-motorized trails). If motorized trails are identified in the feasibility assessment, the TNF would apply for planning and development grants with the State of California (green sticker grant program) to fund analysis, construction and maintenance of motorized trails. Numerous groups and individuals currently volunteer in maintenance of other Forest motorized and non-motorized trails. Recruitment of new volunteers, along with available/interested current volunteers, would take place to assist with maintenance of trails on these parcels.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Sustainable Forestry; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcels 795, 796, and 797 would be included in the South Yuba MA. *The primary management emphases for this MA are vegetation management, hazardous fuels reduction and wildlife habitat improvement.* Forestry practices would be expected to include thinning timber stands to reduce density to increase resilience to insects and diseases and changing climatic conditions, increase/maintain tree species diversity, and enhance stand structural diversity, among others. Fuels reduction through prescribed burning, biomass removal and mastication would increase resilience to severe effects from wildfire. The need for various fuel break projects would be evaluated in and around areas of high public use and improvements. Fuels reduction projects

would help limit the adverse effects from high severity wildfire to the watershed and any developments or improvements located within the parcels.

Current delineation of protected spotted owl and goshawk habitat on neighboring NFS land is constrained by the land ownership patterns. If these parcels are acquired by the Forest Service, the areas protected for spotted owl and goshawk habitat would be evaluated and if appropriate, reconfigured to more appropriately reflect the key habitat.

Other opportunities identified for these parcels include aspen stand improvement projects, ecosystem and watershed restoration projects, OHV management, and cultural resource management. Visual quality would be retained for the foreground of highly used roads, trails and trailheads through *retention and partial retention* VQOs.

There may be an opportunity to provide a winter parking in parcel 796. If so, the TNF would pursue other funding sources for this project.

The TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding to construct a small, low development scale trailhead to connect Camp 19 with the existing Ridge Trail. The trailhead is envisioned sufficient for 5 cars with gravel surface, barriers, signs and bulletin board. This project is proposed to be completed within 3 years.

The TNF is aware of Nevada County Land Trust's (NCLT) interest in acquiring the land around Camp 19 (a portion of parcel 797). If this land were to become NFS, the TNF would consider issuing a special use permit for NCLT proposed use of this parcel. If the Stewardship Council determines parcel split of this parcel this would be the best distribution of the land, the TNF would be interested in acquiring the remaining portion of the parcel not acquired by the NCLT. However, one of the TNF's primary interests in this land is the constraint the land ownership pattern places on the configurations of the spotted owl and goshawk PACs. If the east half of this land is donated to an entity other than the TNF, the TNF requests that this habitat issue be addressed in the conservation easement.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Sustainable Forestry; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Management on Parcels 825 and 826 are located outside the forest boundary and would be included in the *Chalk MA with emphasis are vegetation management and wildlife habitat management*. Projects would likely focus on ecological restoration such as timber stand and wildlife habitat improvements, while protecting other cultural and natural resources. Of particular concern is the current distribution of California spotted owl habitat. Several protected activity centers are constrained by land ownership patterns. If these parcels are acquired by the Forest Service, the areas protected for spotted owl would be evaluated and if appropriate, reconfigured to more appropriately reflect the key habitat.

Forestry practices anticipated include thinning timber stands to reduce density to increase resilience to insects and diseases and changing climatic conditions, increase/maintain tree species

diversity, and enhance stand structural diversity, among others. Fuels reduction through prescribed burning, biomass removal and mastication would increase resilience to severe effects from wildfire. Various fuel break projects could be initiated in and around improvements and areas of high public use.

There are existing OHV trails on NLF land in this vicinity and there may also be opportunities to expand the existing multiple use trail system. If expansion of this trail system is considered desirable, the TNF would pursue Green Sticker OHV grant funding to explore this opportunity.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Sustainable Forestry; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Bear Valley Planning Unit

Note: The TNF is currently working with Nevada County Land Trust and Placer Land Trust on a trail proposal in this planning unit. An addendum will be submitted to this document to address this trail proposal prior to the due date for the Bear River Planning Unit.

The TNF's primary interest in these parcels is the opportunity to restore north to south connectivity across Interstate 80 in the vicinity of the Bear River. Several separate connectivity analyses have identified an area in the vicinity of Bear Valley as providing critical linkages for north to south connectivity on the west side of the Sierra Nevada for a variety of wildlife species (Spencer et al, 2010), including species associated with late-successional forests (Tahoe National Forest, Forest Carnivore Network, 2006) and for restoring fisher populations throughout the Sierra Nevada (Zielinski et al, 2005). The California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project identifies north-south connectivity in the west side of the Sierra Nevada as a high priority for regional and local connectivity planning, referencing "north-south connectivity in the area of Interstate 80 and Bear River as an area that is considered an imperiled wildlife linkage."

Interstate 80, and State Highways 20 and 49, in combination with water conveyances (penstocks and canals) associated with hydropower projects, create barriers for animal migration, dispersal, mating, and effective gene flow, all of which are essential in maintaining viable wildlife populations and functioning ecosystems. Portions of the Bear River, including Bear Valley and Highways 80 and 20 are included in an area identified for local connectivity planning in a \$750,000 FHWA grant to California Department of Transportation. Although a formal collaborative process has not been initiated, the Tahoe National Forest and the California Department of Fish and Game have been identified as partners in this first step to restore connectivity across the landscape.

Cursory model runs conducted by Patrick Huber of U. C. Davis has identified three kinds of potential linkages across Interstate 80, generally following a northwest to southeast direction as follows:

- Open-forest habitats lying in a band south of Lake Spaulding to Bear Valley
- Natural habitats occurring in a band that cross through Bear Valley

- Forested habitats occurring in a band that crosses south of Bear Valley and the Blue Canyon Airport.

Consolidating these parcels into the Tahoe National Forest would support unified management of the resource values identified in this area. If the TNF is not the selected donee for these parcels, the TNF requests that the conservation easement placed on these lands address this issue of wildlife connectivity.

There is evidence of both historic and prehistoric use of the parcels in the Bear Valley Planning Unit. As discussed elsewhere, management of cultural resources includes compliance with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, survey and monitoring by professional archeologists and volunteer groups and increased patrols to reduce site plundering.

Parcels 827, 836, 837, 838, and 839 would be incorporated into the Red MA. *The primary management emphasis for the Red MA is dispersed recreation and wildlife habitat improvement. Management emphasis would be placed on providing dispersed recreational opportunities, produce more accessible, higher-value forage for wildlife, reclaim meadows, improve riparian vegetation, and waterfowl nesting opportunities, maintain the historic integrity of the Overland Emigrant Trail and maintain fuels treatments along travel routes. The primary VQO is retention. These lands are considered unsuited for regulated timber management.*

Acquisition of these parcels would enhance habitat and provide for connectivity, linkages and movement at a landscape scale, especially for early-successional species and deer migration. Under public ownership, these lands would remain in their natural condition to facilitate these critical wildlife needs.

To meet the LCP potential measure “**Expand and integrate the trail network in the area to enhance recreation opportunities,**” the TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding for the following trail-related opportunities:

- Reroute approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of the Pioneer National Recreation Trail to improve the recreational experience. This portion of the trail is currently located on the roadbed of old Highway 20. Acquisition of parcels 827, 839 and 840 would facilitate this reroute. This project is proposed to be completed within a year of acquisition, if Stewardship funding is obtained. If Stewardship funding is not obtained, the TNF anticipates constructing this reroute when volunteer labor is available to accomplish this work.
- The Forest is currently exploring the potential of a trail along the Bear River, with various non-profit groups. The TNF expects to submit an addendum to this LSP to address a proposal for the Bear River Parkway trail.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcel 840, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 851 would be included in the Chalk MA. *The resource management emphases for the Chalk MA are timber and wildlife habitat management, along with fuels reduction activities and maintaining the Overland Emigrant Trail. Partial retention VQO applies to middleground views from Highway 20 and 80 and less restrictive VQOs apply to*

the rest of the area. If this land is acquired, the appropriate VQO would need to be addressed if popular trails or other recreation facilities are constructed on these parcels.

According to Placer County Department of Agriculture (February 2011), these parcels in the Bear River Planning Unit are known to have numerous occurrences of spotted knapweed and Scotch thistle, and one occurrence of skeleton weed. At least seven of these occurrences have over 250 plants per location. These species have been identified as high priority for containment or eradication. Placer County has sprayed the spotted knapweed and Scotch thistle occurrences with herbicide several times. However, the number of occurrences and plants remaining are considered existing infestations. The California Invasive Plant Council's modeling (2011) suggests that spotted knapweed and Scotch thistle in the Sierra Nevada will increase with future climate change. With climate change, Bear Valley meadow is considered susceptible to weed infestation over the next four decades. The TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding to treat these weeds twice per year for about 5 years or until the seed stored in the soil is depleted.

The current recreation use is primarily dispersed equestrian and OHV day use. As noted above, the TNF is exploring two trail construction projects (reroute of the Pioneer National Recreation Trail and a Bear River Parkway Trail) to meet the LCP potential measure to **“Expand and integrate the trail network in the area to enhance recreation opportunities.”**

The area contains deer migration routes, holding areas, and key winter deer range. Current delineation of northern goshawk and spotted owl habitat is constrained by the land ownership patterns. If these parcels are acquired by the Forest Service, the areas protected for spotted owl and goshawk habitat would be evaluated and if appropriate, reconfigured to more appropriately reflect the key habitat.

There are opportunities for various fuel break projects. Fuels reduction projects would help limit the adverse effects from high severity wildfire to the watershed and any developments or improvements located within the parcels such as the I-80 corridor and high voltage transmission lines.

Other potential opportunities identified for these parcels include ecological restoration projects, watershed restoration projects, OHV management, and cultural resource management.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Sustainable Forestry and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Fordyce Planning Unit

There are no active grazing allotments within this planning unit and there are no plans to open the closed allotments on NFS land at this time.

Parcels 775 would be incorporated into the Castle MA. *The primary management emphasis for the Castle MA is to enhance dispersed recreation opportunities and to maintain the remote qualities of the area. Manage vegetation primarily through special cutting practices to maintain the health and vigor of the timber stands and to enhance other resource values, i.e. range and*

wildlife. The VQO is retention. Rehabilitate eroded areas. Put protective measures in place for the willow flycatcher to manage habitat.

This parcel would be managed primarily for dispersed recreation values. The proposed travel analysis plan would include a focus on the concentration of roads and wheel tracks on this parcel, opportunities to decommission excess routes and reduce sedimentation. Following this analysis, funding would be sought from appropriate sources (such as Green Sticker OHV grants) to implement decisions made through this analysis.

Currently, the White Rock Lake area contains small amounts of suitable habitat for willow flycatcher, but the USFS is not aware of any known detections of these birds. Mountain yellow legged frogs (a species warranted for listing on the federal Endangered Species list) are known to inhabit the White Rock Lake watershed. Parcel 775 provides some suitable habitat for this species. If this parcel is acquired, the TNF would monitor and work to improve water quality and riparian habitat to benefit these and other species..

Acquisition of this parcel would complement the efforts of Truckee Donner Land Trust, The Trust for Public Land and the TNF to reduce the impact of the checkerboard land ownership pattern in this area. The TNF has been actively working with these land trusts and Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) to acquire the rest of this section of land from SPI.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcels 782, 785, and 789 would be incorporated into the Fordyce MA. *The primary management emphasis for the Fordyce MA is water-oriented recreation (with primitive access) and to retain a predominately natural landscape. Maintain the existing density of vegetative cover, including mature and over mature coniferous trees. Vegetation in this area is unsuited for timber production. The VQOs is retention for the foreground and middleground for lands viewed from the lake surface and travel routes and partial retention for the remaining lands.*

These parcels would be managed primarily for dispersed recreation values. To meet the LCP proposed measure “**Explore the potential to expand and integrate the non-motorized trail network with surrounding USFS lands**” construction of a non-motorized trail around the Sterling Lake is proposed (on NFS, PG&E and Stewardship lands). The TNF is requesting Stewardship Council funding for this purpose. This proposed trail would tie into the existing and (PG&E’s) proposed recreation sites at Sterling Lake, connect with the existing trail system and utilize safety rail on the dam that PG&E is proposing to install, pending Division of Safety of Dam’s (DSOD) approval. The proposal is to complete this project within 5 years of acquisition, pending the availability of Stewardship funding.

On the south side of parcel 789, PG&E currently leases property to Golden Empire Council Inc., Boy Scouts of America. Forest Plan direction includes managing this facility (which is co-located on NFS and PG&E land) *to protect the water quality of Sterling Lake and provide for user safety.* If the Forest Service obtains this parcel, the facilities on the Stewardship lands would

be incorporated into the current Special Use Authorization (subject to NEPA), with appropriate clauses to address these concerns as needed.

It is assumed that, due to the isolated nature of the parcels, the TNF is the only party interested in parcels 782 and 785. If this is the case, and if it is determined that it will be costly to transfer these land, the TNF concurs that the best alternative would be for PG&E to retain these lands due to the large amount of land that PG&E is already retaining in this area.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Parcels 792, 793, and 794 would also be incorporated into the Loch Leven MA. *The primary management emphasis for the Loch Leven MA is dispersed recreation, and wildlife management practices that improve habitat for indicator species and support dispersed recreation activities. Maintain the historical integrity of the Overland Emigrant Trail. The lands are unsuited for regulated timber production.*

These parcels would be managed primarily to protect and enhance the recreation resources. There is the opportunity to construct a trail from the Kidd Lake Group Campground, around Lower Cascade Lake and connecting with Palisades Creek Trail which accesses the North Fork American Wild and Scenic River and Long Lake (located on NFS lands to the south). The TNF is requesting Stewardship funding for this project. This project would accomplish a couple objectives:

- Currently the parking for the Palisades Creek Trail is located on NFS land just south of the Stewardship land. This trail is the access to Lower Cascade Lake and runs at an excessive grade from the parking area to the lake. As part of PG&E's relicensing, PG&E is proposing to establish several campsites around Lower Cascade Lake to meet the demand for dispersed camping, but is not proposing to construct a trail for access to these campsites. This proposed trail would serve the users of these campsites while establishing a single route located on a sustainable grade. The project may involve moving the parking to the Stewardship land if it is determined that this would facilitate the optimum trail location. The TNF would rehabilitate the existing, overly steep, eroded trail with other sources of funding.
- The new trail construction would enhance the recreation experience of the users of the PG&E Kidd Lake Group Campground and others users of the area providing a lakeshore trail along the shore of Kidd and Lower Cascade Lakes.

This project is likely to involve Stewardship, NFS and retained PG&E lands. This project would be completed within 10 years of acquisition.

Acquisition of these parcels would complement the efforts of Truckee Donner Land Trust (TDLT) to reduce the impact of population growth in the Donner Summit area. TDLT has been actively working with TNF and the landowner who owns the northwest portion of Kidd Lake in the hopes of purchasing that parcel.

Beneficial Public Values Enhanced: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

29. Physical Enhancements/Capital Improvements

It should be noted that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Forest Service to involve all interested parties and address environmental effects when planning projects that may impact National Forest System lands. The “no action” alternative must always be considered, and in some cases this is the selected alternative. The projects listed below include the TNF’s current preliminary vision of what these projects would include, however, until these proposals are addressed through the NEPA process, including public scoping, it is unknown what the final decision will be. NEPA does not allow the agency to make pre-decisional commitments that would usurp this process, therefore the TNF cannot commit to the specifics of any projects until a decision is made through the NEPA process.

The proposals below include a request for funding for environmental analysis. This funding would cover all aspects of the NEPA process including resource surveys, public involvement and documentation. The cost figures below assume that the land transactions would occur within a year. If the land transactions are significantly delayed beyond that, these figures may need to be adjusted for inflation.

All Planning Units

Develop a travel analysis plan including environmental analysis. Utilize this analysis to amend the Tahoe National Forest Motorized Travel Management Record of Decision and the Motor Vehicle Use Map; and pursue funding for implementation. This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$75,000.

The analysis process, including NEPA, is projected to be completed within two years following acquisition. Funding for implementation, including reprinting the updated Motor Vehicle Use Map for public distribution; road decommissioning and restoration; and aquatic organism passage improvements would be pursued from other sources following the decision. Implementation of this analysis would enhance the following BPV’s: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; Sustainable Forestry and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Spaulding Planning Unit

Mears Trailhead

The Mears Trailhead has been preliminarily identified for expansion as it may not meet user needs for Mears Lake Valley Trail. The TNF’s initial vision is that the appropriate development would include roaded access to the trailhead, a single-unit vault toilet, a bulletin board (for postings such as pack in pack out; vehicle use restrictions, a map and other public information), a graveled parking area with 5 or 6 parking spaces including a pull-through site for equestrian truck and trailer parking space, rock barriers and ¼ mile of trail connection to Lodgepole

Campground. Environmental analysis (\$30,000), toilet (\$45,000) trailhead construction and signing (\$16,000), trail construction (\$9000). This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$100,000.

The environmental analysis for this project would take approximately two years. Design, planning and construction of this project could be completed within five years of acquisition. This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Lindsey, Culbertson, Rock Lakes Trail System

This project is envisioned as approximately three miles of new non-motorized trail construction from Lower Lindsey Lake trailhead to Lower Rock Lake. This would enable hikers to bypass approximately 2.8 miles of hiking on roads. It is also anticipated that this construction would relocate some of the heavy use of the trails in the Carr Lake area, by providing another “easy to get to” attractive trail opportunity in the vicinity. This could improve the recreation experience of users both on the Stewardship lands and elsewhere on NFS lands. Environmental analysis (\$20,000), three miles of new trail construction (\$105,000), signs (\$5,000). This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$130,000.

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 2 years following acquisition and the project implementation is projected to be completed within 5 years of acquisition. This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Rucker, Fuller, Spaulding Lakes Trail System

This project is envisioned as construction of an accessible interpretive trail around the south and east shores of Fuller Lake (including fisherman access to the shoreline across retained PG&E land) and a non-motorized trail connection from this trail to the Pioneer National Recreation Trail, Rucker Lake Campground, & Spaulding Lake Trail. This would involve land that PG&E is retaining, Stewardship land and NFS land. Environmental analysis (\$20,000), approximately 1 mile of trail construction on PG&E retained and Stewardship lands (\$35,000), 1 bridge (\$50,000), development and installation of interpretive and other signs (\$10,000) (Additionally, the TNF would fund ½ mile of trail construction on NFS land.) This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$115,000

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 1 years following acquisition and the project implementation is projected to be completed within 3 years of acquisition. This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Camp 19 Trailhead for the Ridge Trail

This project is envisioned as the construction of a small, low development-scale trailhead to serve as a connection between Camp 19 and the existing Ridge Trail. Environmental analysis (\$10,000), 5-car trailhead with gravel surface and barriers, (\$13,500), signs/bulletin board (\$2500). This is a one-time cost. Total request: (\$26,000).

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 2 years following acquisition and the design and construction is projected to be completed within 3 years of acquisition. This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Six Mile Valley meadow restoration and protection

This project is envisioned as the first of several efforts to restore hydrologic connectivity and improve native vegetation of this meadow. Environmental analysis (including cultural resource surveys, rare plant and noxious weed surveys, and other resource surveys) (\$67,000). Evaluation of three cultural resource sites (\$45,000). Treat noxious weeds (\$8000). Evaluate the hydrologic connectivity of the meadow especially from the effects of multiple roads located in the meadow, and assess possible stream channel restoration activities (\$18,000). Decommission unauthorized routes in the meadow and re-vegetate road prism (\$3,300). Thin encroaching conifers (\$12,100). Protect the meadow from unauthorized vehicular access onto the meadow surface (fencing, boulders and gates) (\$12,800). Decompact and seed former Eagle Mountain Lodge parking lot (\$10,000). This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$176,200.

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within three years following acquisition and this portion of the restoration activities are projected to be completed the following field season. Additional restoration efforts are expected to follow utilizing other available funding. This project would enhance the following BPV's: Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; Preservation of Open Space; Outdoor Recreation by the General Public; and Preservation of Historic Resources.

Bear River Planning Unit

Reroute Pioneer National Recreation Trail

This project would involve rerouting this existing trail off of the roadbed of old Hwy. 20, down the hill into Bear Valley, providing a superior trail experience than the roadbed provides. This would involve approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of new trail construction. Environmental analysis (\$20,000), trail construction (\$25,000). This is a one-time cost. Total request of \$45,000.

The NEPA process and construction is projected to be completed within one year following acquisition.

This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Noxious weed treatment

This project involves treating existing infestations of noxious weeds (including spotted knapweed, skeleton weed and Scotch thistle) with herbicides. Herbicides would be administered by hand and treatment would be repeated until the seed stored in the soil is depleted. Thistles are known to germinate at different times through the year so it is likely that more than one visit per Scotch thistle infestation would be needed annually. The cost estimate is based on two treatments a year for 5 years and assumes that new vectors, such as increased motorized vehicle use, are not introduced into the area. Initial survey for weeds (\$6000), environmental analysis

(\$75,000), chemically treat weeds, monitor, document and track results in a database annually for 5 years (\$56,000). Note: Utilizing herbicides on NFS land is controversial which results in the high NEPA cost. Manually pulling the weeds is another option. NEPA for hand pulling weeds would be far less costly; however this manual treatment is not expected to be as effective as herbicide treatment, especially with spotted knapweed and skeleton weed. Total request: \$137,000.

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 3 years following acquisition and implementation to be conducted over the following five years or until the seeds stored in the soil is depleted.

This project would enhance the Protection of the Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants.

Fordyce Planning Unit

Kidd/Cascade Lake Trails

This project is envisioned as the construction of a non-motorized trail in the Kidd/Lower Cascade lakes area, the abandonment and realignment of a short section of the existing Palisades Creek Trail (an existing TNF system trail) and potentially re-establishing the parking area for the Palisades Creek Trail onto parcel 775 (if this would facilitate the best trail realignment).

Environmental assessment (\$20,000); approximately 1.75 miles of trail construction (\$71,250).

This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$ 91,250.

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 3 years following acquisition.

Construction and implementation is anticipated to occur in two phases, with all project work anticipated to be completed within 10 years of acquisition. Phase 1: Construction of new trail from the Palisades Creek Trailhead and encircling Lower Cascade Lake. Relocate existing trailhead if this would provide the best trail alignment (completed within 5 years of acquisition). Phase two: Construction of new trail leading from PG&E's Kidd Lake group camp on north side of Kidd Lake and connecting to the Lower Cascade Lake trail (completed within ten years of acquisition).

This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

Sterling Lake Trail

This project is envisioned as construction of a non-motorized trail around Sterling Lake connecting the existing and proposed recreation sites with the existing trail system.

Environmental analysis (\$20,000), approximately one mile of trail construction (\$38,000), signs (\$2000). This is a one-time cost. Total request: \$60,000.

The NEPA process is projected to be completed within 3 years following acquisition and the implementation is projected to be completed within 5 years of acquisition.

This project would enhance Outdoor Recreation while Protecting Natural Habitat of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants; and Preserving of Historic Resources.

30. Land Conservation Partners and Youth Opportunities

Due to the constrained timeframe for this submittal and the uncertainty of any lands being donated to the TNF, little effort has been made to develop partnership proposals for these lands. However, the TNF has had discussions with the following potential partners who have expressed interest in being involved in the management of these lands: Nevada County Land Trust, Placer Land Trust and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California.

The following partners currently volunteer on or have partnerships with the TNF, and many of these groups are likely to be involved in the management of the Stewardship Lands in a volunteer or partner capacity:

Cultural Resource Monitoring: Friends of Sierra Rock Art

Technical expertise for the Aspen, Meadow, and Fen Restoration: American Rivers

Various ecosystem restoration projects: Sierra Nevada Conservancy, Bear River Watershed Group, North Fork American River Alliance, CABY (Consumnes, American, Bear, and Yuba Rivers), Upper American River Foundation, South Yuba River Citizens League (SYRCL), Trout Unlimited, Fly Casters,

Noxious Weed Eradication: Red Bud Chapter--California Native Plant Society,

Trail maintenance and construction: National Smokejumpers Association, Backcountry Horseman, Bicyclists of Nevada County, Gold Country Trails Council, Oregon California Trail Association, Racers Under the Sun, Nevada County Woods Riders, Boonie Bouncers, Grass Valley 4 Wheel Drive Club, Friends of Fordyce Lake, Sacramento Jeepers.

Many of the various organizations and funding sources identified in question 11 (Organizational Experience), question 18 (Community Engagement and Collaboration) and question 15 (recent grants) are likely also to be involved in these lands. Other potential partners identified include California Deer Association, the Wildlife Habitat Council and California Landscape Conservation Cooperative.

As discussed in the response to question 16, the USFS supports youth use of organization camps (such as the camps at Sterling Lake and Lake Valley Reservoir) through a significantly reduced fee structure at these facilities. Numerous youth groups not mentioned above, such as the Boy Scouts, Regional Occupational Program and local schools are often involved volunteering on the TNF and may be involved in volunteer projects on the Stewardship lands. Additionally, some of the groups listed above, such as SYRCL, have youth activities that have programs and volunteer on the TNF. When funding sources are available (such American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding), the TNF employs youth and young adults through various manpower programs such as Americorp, Student Conservation Association, California Conservation Corp and Youth Conservation Corp. Finally, recognizing that today's youth are tomorrow's conservationists, the Forest Service is a national leader in developing and supporting programs and activities that encourage kids to get outdoors and discover nature, such as Kids in the Woods and Discover the Forest. Although the TNF would incorporate the program concepts into the management of the Stewardship lands as the opportunities arise, with the anticipation of declining budgets it may not be possible to develop or pursue many opportunities to engage in such projects in the foreseeable future.

31. Previous experience working with the proposed land conservation partners

As evidenced by the projects listed in question 11 (Organizational Experience); the list of recent grants (question 15); projects listed in question 18 (Community Engagement and Collaboration); and examples of active volunteers (questions 17, 18, 30), the Tahoe National Forest has a long history of partnering with volunteers, conservation groups, and others on projects in which we share a common goal. These projects have centered on many aspects of land management, including trail construction and maintenance; wetland and habitat restoration; interpretation; fire lookout restoration; watershed improvement; wilderness management and cultural resource monitoring, maintenance and enhancement. The TNF is open to meeting with any groups interested in partnering on projects that would benefit the resources and the American public.

32. Letter from potential land conservation partners

Due to the constrained timeline and uncertainty that the USFS will acquire any of these parcels, no attempt was made to gather letters of support or flesh out details of responsibility for projects on these lands.

33. Public Input

Fordyce Unit Planning Unit

(Response to LCP comments by IMBA)

Site specific trail planning has not occurred at this time. The determination of appropriate trail users (mountain bikes, horses, etc.) would be made through the NEPA process. Appropriate public involvement (as described in section 19) would be conducted.

(Response to comment 4/14/11 to coordinate the protection of the Overland Emigrant Trail)

As discussed, the TNF would protect the Overland Emigrant Trail through the National Historic Preservation Act and is currently developing interpretive signs for the trail. The TNF is interested in coordinating with parties interested in the protection of this trail.

Lake Spaulding Planning Unit

(Response to comments by John Moore and comments recorded at the public meeting 4/14/11)

The Grouse Lakes area has been closed to public motorized vehicle use since 1972.

Approximately 5671 acres of lands have been acquired by the USFS in the Grouse Lakes area in the past two decades. NFS ownership of parcels 802-807 would secure the continued closure to motorized vehicle use of these parcels. If the USFS is the selected donee, these parcels would be managed as part of the Grouse Management Area for which the primary resources emphasis is non-motorized recreation.

(Response to comments by Izzy Martin on behalf of Tsi Akim)

Any actions proposed by the USFS would be subject to the NEPA process, which include both sites specific resource surveys and protection (including cultural resource surveys) and appropriate public involvement. The TNF consults with Native Americans prior to any projects via established tribal relations protocols.

Bear Valley Planning Unit

(Response to comments by John Moore)

National Forest System lands are generally open to the public. The USFS places restrictions on public use of the land in limited circumstances for resource protection (such as restricting

seasonal access to protect watershed values during the winter months or to protect certain species during critical periods of their life cycle) or public safety (such as during an active forest fire.) For this reason, if the USFS were to become the donee, there would be no need to provide a public right of way, since the lands would belong to the public.

Any actions proposed by the USFS would be subject to the NEPA process. Preventing vehicle encroachment of meadows through barriers and enforcement is standard operating protocol. Resources and user can benefit by reconstructing visitor-created trails using proper trail design, location and construction techniques.

Visual quality objectives (VQOs) are established in the Forest Plan for all NFS land. These VQOs are established to restrict visually disruptive land management actions within viewsheds that are important to the public, while allowing for more intensive land management on lands that are visually less sensitive. The visual quality for the foreground and middle ground would be maintained from Highway 20 under NFS ownership. Most of the Bear River Planning Unit is outside the proclaimed boundary of the TNF and therefore VQOs would need to be developed for these lands as part of the Forest Plan amendment.

34. Budget and Funding Plan

Please use the following information in conjunction with the Budget and Funding Plan. Like PG&E, the TNF's budget accounting method does not allow us to determine the costs associated with land management activities on specific lands. Our funding is more related to a specific program area, which is then directed to overall program administration and site specific projects, not to specific parcels of the Forest. With congressionally appropriated funding allocated to the management of the entire 839,000 acres of the TNF and grant funding generally allocated to a site-specific project, we are unable to estimate a meaningful baseline management cost for the acres contained in these parcels.

However, since the stated purpose of the Budget and Funding Plan is to evaluate the funding needs and financial capacity of potential donees, we have prepared the spreadsheet as if the applicable aspects of the current forest budget would be spread equally across the forest including the Stewardship lands. Essentially, the "committed funds" figures are based on an average of dollars per acre currently allocated to the public lands within the TNF. In other words, since the requested Stewardship lands represent slightly less than 1% of the current public land base of the TNF, generally that same percent of the forest annual budget is shown as allocated to the Stewardship lands in the spreadsheet. In a few cases (such as fire prevention/suppression and road maintenance) a more realistic estimate was made of projected funds that would be available for the Stewardship lands, based on the nature of the Stewardship lands in comparison with the other lands on the TNF. The figures used for these projections are based on the preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 budget.

Likewise, for baseline and enhanced management activities on the Budget and Funding Plan, the outputs displayed generally represent slightly less than 1% of some of the TNF Fiscal Year 2010 key accomplishments. The information displayed on the Proposed Budget and Funding Plan should not be considered a commitment to provide this amount of funding or generate these

accomplishments annually on the Stewardship lands, but rather an indication of the agency's financial and organizational capacity to manage these lands.

The funding shown on the spreadsheet for **baseline** activities includes funding for both enhanced and baseline activities. When activities are displayed that would be accomplished using appropriated funding, no attempt was made to display how much any given activity would cost per unit. As a result, the Net Revenue row of the spreadsheet will appear out to be out of balance.

As evidenced by the response to question 15, the TNF has the capacity to successfully obtain a wide variety of grants, and would expect to pursue grant opportunities if these lands were to become NFS lands. However, most of the grants the TNF receives are project and site specific. Therefore, with the exception of Green Sticker OHV funds (which are a somewhat predictable grant funding stream and in many cases can be used across the TNF), no attempt was made to speculate what grant funding might be available to Stewardship lands in the future.

No attempt was made to project timber receipts. The amount of timber receipts that would be generated from these lands is speculative, based on numerous factors including the price of timber, volume by species, status of existing road system etc. Development of a reliable estimate would have required a significant effort. Suffice to say, the timber receipts generated would likely be less than those generated by PG&E. The TNF anticipates utilizing Integrated Resource Stewardship Contracts to ensure that revenues generated from timber receipts would be reinvested into land management enhancement efforts within the area where timber sale revenues are generated (see question 16). Receipts from the organization camp and ski trails leases displayed represent typical receipt for similar uses on NFS land.

The TNF acknowledges that there may not be sufficient Stewardship Council funding available to fund all donees' requests for enhancements. Therefore, of the enhanced management funding that the USFS is requesting of the Stewardship Council, the TNF recommends following order of priority for funding of projects (obviously dependent on which lands are donated to the TNF):

- Travel Analysis Plan
- Bear River Noxious Weed Eradication
- Six Mile Valley meadow restoration
- Bear River Parkway Trail (addendum proposing this enhancement to be submitted later)
- Fuller/ Rucker / Spaulding Lake Trail Construction & Interpretation
- Lindsey Lake Trail Relocation
- Reroute Pioneer National Recreation Trail
- Mears Trail and Trailhead Improvements
- Camp 19 Trailhead
- Kidd Lake Trail
- Sterling Lake Trail

For the capital investment projects, NEPA, design, planning and construction are all included in the funding request. The funding displayed is based on the initial proposals as described in the question 29. As disclosed in the response to that question, any proposal on NFS lands is subject to the NEPA process and, based on public input and resource concerns, the final decision is often different from the original proposal.

The ability to accomplish any activity on NFS land is subject to the availability of congressionally appropriated or other funds. The Forest Service prides itself on being a “can do” organization. When funding becomes available, the agency is able to mobilize to respond and get the job done. A case in point would be the recent American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). This was an unprecedented effort to jumpstart the nation’s economy, create jobs, and put a down payment on addressing long-neglected infrastructure, unlike any since the Great Depression. However, due to previous reductions in staffing, many agencies at all levels of the government were not able to get contracts awarded and as of 2/25/2011, nationwide only 66% of the funds for grants, contracts and loans had been paid out. In contrast, as of 11/16/2010, the Pacific Southwest Region of the Forest Service had been spent 99.4% of these funds. On the TNF, the ARRA funding represented a one-time approximate increase of 25% over the forest’s annual budget. Consequently, it was a significant, but successful, effort to award contracts to get Americans back to work quickly and efficiently.

PART 3- SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- 1.) As a Federal Agency, the USFS is exempt from taxation and an Internal Revenue Service Determination Letter is not available.
- 2.) A scanned copy of the signed letter attached under Organizational Information, question 7
- 3.) Appendix A Resumes for Forest Supervisor and District Rangers
- 4.) Appendix B Conflict of Interest Statement
- 5.) Appendix C Preliminary Operating Budget (FY 2011); and, financial statements for the past three fiscal years

Appendix A--Resumes for Forest Supervisor and District Rangers

RESUME

Tom Quinn

13052 Woodstock Dr.
Nevada City, CA 95959
W: 530-478-6200
tquinn01@fs.fed.us

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. Natural Resource Management, Policy, and Administration. Department of Forestry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

M.S. Forest Management/Resource Economics. College of Forestry, Wildlife, and Range Sciences. University of Idaho. Moscow, Idaho.

B.S. Natural Resource Management, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. High honors.

Senior Executive Fellows Program Graduate, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge, MA.

Leadership and Executive Development. UCLA Continuing Education Program.

WORK EXPERIENCE:

February, 2008- Present: **Forest Supervisor**, Tahoe National Forest, Nevada City, CA. Recognized as one of the most complex and diverse national forests in California, the Tahoe straddles the Sierra Nevada Mountains, reaching from the suburbs of Sacramento to near the shores of Lake Tahoe. Among the myriad of programs are significant timber, fuels/fire, off-highway vehicle, mining, diverse recreation opportunities, including several large downhill winter sports resorts. Strengthening relationships with our many partners continues to be my focus. I lead a team of over 450 employees.

January, 2003- February, 2008: **Forest Supervisor**, Stanislaus National Forest, Sonora, CA. The Stanislaus NF is located in the central Sierra Nevada mountains, adjacent to Yosemite National Park. Within 2 hours of several million residents, the forest has an extremely complex array of natural resource programs and issues. As Forest Supervisor I led a staff of over 400 employees and hundreds of volunteers, with an annual budget of over \$25 million. Collaborative efforts with local communities have been a specific area of success during my tenure.

August, 2002- November, 2002: **National Forest System Budget Coordinator**, USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C. I served a four month detail as coordinator of the national forest system budgeting program. I worked directly for the Deputy Chief for National Forest Systems in preparing and implementing financial data for all national forest system programs. I supervised four senior staff in this position.

December, 1999- December, 2002: **Policy Analyst**, USDA Forest Service, Policy Analysis Staff, Washington, D.C. I conducted analyses of a wide range of Forest Service programs and policies including forest, rangeland, and recreation management. I was the national program leader responsible for implementation of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-determination Act. I also served as representative of the agency's Programs and Legislation deputy chief area on the urban national forest coalition.

February, 1998-August, 1998: **Deputy Forest Supervisor** (Detail), Santa Fe National Forest, Santa Fe, New Mexico. I served for six months in this leadership position for the 1.6 million acre Santa Fe National Forest. The forest has a \$10 million annual budget and approximately 200 employees.

1997-December, 1999: **Staff Officer for Recreation, Lands, Heritage, Minerals, Engineering, and Land Management Planning/NEPA Coordination**, Santa Fe National Forest, Santa Fe, New Mexico. I led a professional and technical staff of approximately 40 persons in coordination of all aspects of the above programs, including program development, budgeting, and project implementation.

1991-1997: **District Ranger**, Santa Catalina Ranger District, Coronado National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Tucson, Arizona. Responsible for leadership of approximately 60 employees and hundreds of volunteers managing a highly complex 255,000 acre urban-interface national forest unit. Community involvement, partnership development, and interagency coordination were major focus areas during my tenure.

1990-1991: **District Ranger**, Hood Canal Ranger District, Olympic National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Hoodport, Washington. Line officer for management and administration of a 220,000 acre ranger district. Responsible for leadership of approximately 50 employees in a wide range of resource management disciplines including forestry and protection of high-valued anadromous fisheries. Tribal, industry, and community coordination was essential to my success.

1987-1990: **Interdisciplinary Planning Team Leader**, Olympic National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Olympia, WA. Coordinated production, implementation, and monitoring of long-range national forest management plan and associated environmental impact statement. Supervised up to 10 career professionals in many resource disciplines.

1987: **Policy Analyst**, Policy Analysis Staff, USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.. Served on extended detail to the Forest Service's national office of policy analysis. Prepared policy reports and briefing papers for agency officials.

1983-1987: **Forester and Natural Resource Specialist**, Boise National Forest, Boise, Idaho. Served as member and leader of Forest Planning and project level interdisciplinary teams on a variety of resource management issues.

1981-1983: **Forest Economist/Planning Specialist**, Malheur National Forest, John Day, Oregon. Planning and project team member and leader. Served as principal economist and operations research analyst for 1.5 million acre national forest. In addition to conducting economic analyses, I adapted large linear programming models for Forest Planning (including timber, range, and wildlife) applications.

1979-1980: **Instructor**, Natural Resources/Forest Management, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho. Instructed large class of resource management juniors and seniors in principles and applications of resource economics and forest resource management and regulation.

1977-1978: **Urban Forester/Environmental Specialist**, County of Essex, New Jersey. Developed youth and adult environmental education and awareness programs in an urban setting. Administered urban tree protection and planting programs. Worked closely with county Parks and Recreation Dept. Excellent communications skills were a necessity.

References Upon Request.

22830 Foresthill Road, Foresthill, CA 95631
Phone Work: 530-367-2224
Phone Cell: 530-906-2095
Email: cfischer@fs.fed.us

Qualifications

- Registered Professional Forester , RPF#2723
- MS Forestry, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- BS Forest Management, University of Idaho

Experience

District Ranger

Tahoe National Forest, American River Ranger District, August 2008 – Present

Regional NRIS Program Manager

U.S. Forest Service, Regional Office, June 2003 – August 2008
Vallejo, CA

District Ranger – Detail Assignment

Eldorado National Forest, Georgetown Ranger District, November 2006 – March 2007

Forester I (Watershed Assessment Forester)

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection,
Fire and Resource Assessment Program, Sacramento, April 2002 – June 2003

Research Analyst II (Forestry GIS Specialist)

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection,
Fire and Resource Assessment Program, Sacramento, April 2000 - April 2002

Staff Research Associate III (Vegetation Management Specialist)

University of California, Davis
On-site with CDF-FRAP April 1997 – April 2000

Forestry Specialist

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison, WI, May 1994 – April 1997

Forester Intern

Weyerhaeuser Corporation, Federal Way, WA, May 1994 – August 1994

Forest Technician

U.S. Forest Service, Clearwater National Forest, Idaho, May 1993 – November 1993

**Quentin L. Youngblood
Tahoe National Forest
Sierraville Ranger District
PO Box 66
Sierraville CA 96126
(530)-994-3401**

Education B.S. Forest Management - 1985, Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, Texas

Experience

1988-1990	Forestry Technician, USDA Forest Service - Davy Crockett National Forest, Neches Ranger District - Crockett, Texas.
1990-1991	Wildlife Biologist, USDA Forest Service - Davy Crockett National Forest, Neches Ranger District - Crockett, Texas.
1991-1993	Resource Officer, USDA Forest Service-Delta National Forest - Rolling Fork, Mississippi.
1993-1998	Zone Wildlife Biologist, USDA Forest Service-Tahoe National Forest, Sierraville and Truckee Ranger Districts - Sierraville, California.
1998-2000	District Ranger, USDA Forest Service, Six Rivers and Klamath National Forests, Orleans and Ukonom Ranger Districts - Orleans, California.
2000-2007	Ecosystem Staff Officer, USDA Forest Service, Six Rivers National Forest – Eureka, California
2007–Present	District Ranger, USDA Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest-Sierraville Ranger District. Sierraville CA

Details/Special Assignments

1992	District Timber Management Officer, USDA Forest Service, Delta National Forest – Rolling Fork, Mississippi
1997	Regional Wildlife Program Manager, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Regional Office – San Francisco, California
2004	Deputy Director Ecosystem Conservation – USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Regional Office – Vallejo, California

References

Debra Whitman, Director – Ecosystem Management, USDA Forest Service -Pacific Southwest Region. Phone: 707-562-8689

Jeff Walter, Forest Supervisor – Ochoco National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. Phone: 541-416-6625

Will Metz, Forest Supervisor – Cleveland National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. Phone: 858-674-2901

Genice F. Froehlich
Yuba River Ranger District
Tahoe National Forest
1594 Highway 49
Camptonville, CA 59522
530-288-3231
Email: gfroehlich@fs.fed.us

Work Experience:

District Ranger GS-0340-13 Yuba River Ranger District 15924 Highway 49, Camptonville, CA 95922	5/3/2010 – Present Supervisor: Tom Quinn (530) 478-6200
Forest Plan Revision Biologist GS-0486-12 Apache Sitgreaves National Forest, Supervisor's Office 30 Chiricahua Dr., Springerville, AZ 85938	5/1/2008 – 5/10/2010 Deryl Jevons (928)333-6261
Forest Plan Revision Biologist/NEPA Coordinator. GS-0486-12 1 Apache Sitgreaves National Forest, Supervisor's Office 30 Chiricahua Dr., Springerville, AZ 85938	0/01/2007 – 5/1/2008 Deryl Jevons (928)333-6261
Interdisciplinary Environmental Coordinator GS-0486-12 Apache Sitgreaves National Forest, Lakeside Ranger District 2022 W. White Mtn. Blvd., Lakeside, AZ 85929	2/23/2003–10/01/2007 Ed Collins (928)368-5111
Detail, Acting District Ranger. GS-0340-13 Cibola National Forest, Sandia Ranger Station 11776 Hwy. 337, Tijeras, NM 87059	2/19/2006 – 6/17/2006 Nancy Rose (505)346-3804
District Wildlife Biologist, GS-0486-11 Apache Sitgreaves National Forest, Lakeside Ranger District 2022 W. White Mtn. Blvd., Lakeside, AZ 85929	12/03/2001 – 2/22/2004 Ed Collins (928)368-5111
Wildlife Staff Officer, GS-0486-11 Coronado National Forest, Safford Ranger District P. O. Box 709, Safford, AZ 85548	02/1992-12/2002 Richard Kvale(202)2051410
Wildlife Biologist, GS-0486/07-09 Coronado National Forest 300 W. Congress, Tucson, AZ 85701	03/1990-02/1992 Randall Smith (520)388-8370

Education:

University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85701 Major: Wildlife and Fisheries Science	M.S., 1990 GPA: 3.75 out of 4.00
University of California, Davis, CA 95616 Major: Wildlife and Fisheries Biology	B.S., 1987 GPA: 3.36 out of 4.00
Lake Tahoe Community College, South Lake Tahoe, CA 95702 Major: Science and Mathematics	A.A., 1985 GPA: 3.81 out of 4.00

Job-Related Training Courses:

Required Computer Security, No Fear Act, Reasonable Accommodation, Civil Rights, yearly online
OWCP/SHIPS for Supervisors (2006)
NEPA Program Management (2005)
Continuing Education - Conservation Biology and Restoration Ecology (2005)
Continuing Education in Ecosystem Management (2004)
HazMat Awareness (1992, 1998, 2000), OSHA
Forest Vegetation Simulator, Common Stand Exam, Habitat Typing (1994-2002)
1st and 2nd 40 – Supervisory Training (1994; 2002), plus other miscellaneous self-improvement
Programmatic Consultation (Endangered Species Coordination) (2000)
ArcView GIS Systems and ArcGIS; (1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2005)
Continuing Education - Leadership and Communications (1998)
Multi-Party Negotiations; Straight Talk (1998)
Range Permit Administration (1997)
Certification to survey Southwest Willow Flycatcher (1996)
Forest Protection Officer Training; 1995 plus yearly updates through 2002
Mexican Spotted Owl; Certified (1995-1997) Teacher (1998-2002)

Northern goshawk survey techniques (1995 - monitoring yearly since)
Threatened and Endangered Species Management and Consultation (1993, 1995)
Ecosystems Management Training (1995)
Remote Sensing (1994)
Forest Plan Implementation (1900-01; 1992)

Fire Training:

S-110, S-130, S-190, I-100, PMS-418, SA-130, D-110, S-260, S-261, S-360, I-SUITE, I-SUITE Train the Trainer, Local Fire Management Leadership, S-420, S-460,
Fire Refresher (yearly).

Fire Qualifications:

Resource Adviser (1992-2000); PTRC: 2002-Present; TIME: 2003-Present; EQTR: 2005-Present; COST: 2006-Present; FSC2: 2008-Present.

/s/ Genice Froehlich

2/22/2011

GENICE FROEHLICH

DATE

Appendix B

Excerpted from USDA Employee Responsibility and Conduct

0.735-14 Conflict-of-interest.

a. The following prohibitions apply to both a regular employee and a special Government employee:

1. He or she may not have a direct or indirect financial interest that conflicts substantially, or appears to conflict substantially, with his or her responsibilities and duties as a Federal employee;
2. He or she may not engage, directly or indirectly, in a financial transaction relying upon information obtained through his or her employment for his or her personal benefit or disclose such information for the benefit of another;
3. He or she may not participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds, commodities, or other property for speculative purposes if such action might tend to interfere with the proper and impartial performance of his or her duties or bring discredit upon the Department;
4. If he or she is concerned in any way with the administration of programs for the purchase or sale of commodities, price support programs, commodity loan programs, or other programs which directly affect market prices of agricultural commodities, he or she may not directly or indirectly speculate in any agricultural commodity;
5. He or she may not, after his or her Government employment has ended, represent any other person (other than the United States), in any formal or informal appearance before, or with the intent to influence, make any communication on behalf of any other person; (i) to the United States, (ii) in connection with any particular Government matter involving a specific party, in which the United States is a party or has an interest and in which he or she participated personally and substantially as a Government employee (18 U.S.C. 207(a));
6. He or she may not, within 2 years after his or her Government employment has ended, represent any other person (other than the United States), in any formal or informal appearance before, or with the intent to influence, make any communication on behalf of any other person; (i) to the United States, (ii) in connection with any particular Government matter involving a specific party, in which the United States is a party or has an interest and which was actually pending under his or her official responsibility within a period of 1 year prior to the termination of such responsibility (18 U.S. C. 207 (b) (i));
7. He or she may not, having been employed as specified in 18 U.S.C. 207(d) as a high Government official, for 2 years after his or her Government employment has ended, aid, counsel, advise, consult, or assist in representing any other person (other than the United States) by personal presence at any formal or informal appearance: (i) before the United States, (ii) in connection with any particular Government matter involving a specific party, (iii) in which he or she participated personally and substantially for the Government (18 U.S.C. 207(b)(ii));
8. He or she may not, having been employed and as specified in 18 U.S.C. 207(d) as a high Government official (other than a special Government employee who serves for fewer than 60 days in a calendar year), for 1 year after his or her Government employment has ended, represent anyone (other than the United States) in any formal or informal appearance before, or with the intent to influence, make any communication on behalf of anyone to the department or agency in which he or she was employed, in connection with any particular

Government matter, whether or not involving a specific party, which is pending before that department or agency or in which such department or agency has a direct and substantial interest (18 U.S.C. 207(c)). The above prohibition shall not apply to communications or representations made by a former employee--

i. Who is an elected official of a State or local government; or

2. Whose principal occupation is with--

A. An agency or instrumentality of a State or local government.

2. An accredited institution of higher education, or

3. A hospital or medical research organization when the representation or communication is made on behalf of such government, institution, hospital, or organization (18 U.S.C. 207(d)(2)).

9. Except as permitted by paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, he or she may not participate personally and substantially as a Government officer or employee through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in a judicial or other proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other particular matter in which, to his or her knowledge, he or she, his or her spouse, minor child, partner, organization in which he or she is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he or she is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest (18 U.S.C. 208(a)).

2. The prohibition in paragraph (a)(9) of this section shall not apply if the employee first advises his

or her agency head or the Director of Personnel of the nature and circumstances of the particular Government matter involved, makes full disclosure of the financial interest, and receives in advance a written determination made by the agency head or the Director of Personnel that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the

Government may expect from the employee. Authority to make such written determinations may not be redelegated by the agency head or the Director of Personnel.

3. Any holding in a widely held mutual fund or regulated investment company which does not specialize in a particular industry or commodity and as to which the employee has no managerial control or directorship, except where otherwise prohibited by statute or regulation, is exempted from the prohibition in paragraph (a)(9) and the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section as being too remote or too inconsequential to affect the integrity of an employee's services to the Government.

4. The following prohibitions apply only to a regular employee:

1. He or she may not, except in the discharge of his or her official duties, represent anyone else before a court or Government agency in a matter in which the United States is a party or has an interest (18 U.S.C. 203 and 205); or

2. He or she may not receive any salary or supplementation of his or her Government salary from a private source as compensation for his or her services to the Government (18 U.S.C. 209).

5. The following prohibitions apply only to a special Government employee:

1. He or she may not, except in the discharge of his or her official duties, represent anyone else before a court or Government agency in a matter in which the United States is a party or has an interest and in which he or she has at any time participated personally and

substantially for the Government (18 U.S.C. 203 and 205); or

2. He or she may not, except in the discharge of his or her official duties represent anyone else in a matter pending before the Government agency he or she serves unless he or she has served there no more than 60 days during the past 365 days (18 U.S.C. 203 and 205).

Directive 365.1 -- Employee Responsibility and Conduct Page 16 of 39

<http://agnis/sites/AMSIssuances/Shared%20Documents/365-1.htm> 8/8/2008

6. This section does not preclude an employee from:

1. Acting without compensation, and if not inconsistent with the faithful performance of his or her duties, as agent or attorney for any person who is the subject of disciplinary, loyalty, or other personnel administration proceedings in connection with those proceedings;

2. Giving testimony under oath or making statements required to be made under penalty for perjury or contempt; or

3. Having a financial interest or engaging in financial transactions to the same extent as a private citizen not employed by the Government, provided it is not prohibited by law, Executive Order 11222, as amended, 5 CFR Part 735, this part, or agency regulations supplementing this part.

7. This section does not purport to paraphrase the restrictions contained in 18 U.S.C., Chapter 11. The omission of a restriction in no way relieves an employee of the legal effect of such restriction.



**BOARD OF
DIRECTORS**

Fran Cole
President

Joe Byrne
Vice-President

Jason Muir
Secretary

Jim Bair
Rebecca Coffman
Brent Fraser
Sue Hoek
Dave Palley
Jack Stillens
Bill Trabucco

Jim Ward
Interim Treasurer

STAFF

Marty Coleman-Hunt
Executive Director

Jean Gilbert
Operations Manager

Bill Haire
Trails Coordinator

Luci Wilson
Stewardship Coordinator

Kaye Wedel
Outreach Coordinator

Melony Vance
Treks Coordinator

Chris Gee
AmeriCorps Member

Allene Zanger
Executive Director
Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
15 North Ellsworth Avenue, Suite 100
San Mateo, CA 94401

Re: Support for USFS, Tahoe National Forest application for PG&E parcels
in the Fordyce, Lake Spaulding and Bear River Planning Units

Dear Ms Zanger,

Nevada County Land Trust (NCLT) is grateful that PG&E will protect the Yuba-Bear River Watershed by making lands available for donation to qualified conservation organizations. We are in favor of the conservation of lands for the benefit of our community and for Sierra watershed health.

Nevada County Land Trust is in support of the application by USFS, Tahoe National Forest to receive in fee title a donation of PG&E parcels in the Fordyce, Lake Spaulding and Bear River Planning Units. The intent is for TNF to manage these forested lands as a part of the larger TNF forested lands in the area, thereby creating a consistent forest management practices across the landscape.

For donated lands that TNF receives, Nevada County Land Trust would be grateful to participate as a Conservation Partner to develop recreational amenities, such as mixed-use trails, especially as they connect to other community trails.

Sincerely,

Marty Coleman-Hunt
Executive Director
Nevada County Land Trust



175 Joerschke Drive, Suite R • Grass Valley, CA 95945
Phone: 530.272.5994 • Fax: 530.272.5997

Website: www.NevadaCountyLandTrust.org • Email: info@NevadaCountyLandTrust.org

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units

Tahoe National Forest

PROJECT BUDGET - TRANSACTION COSTS

A. Document Preparation Costs

Task	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	Total Cost	Funding Request	Comments
Preliminary Title Report	Group	9	700	6,300	6,300	
Chain of Title	Parcel	36	1,000	36,000	36,000	May be less or not needed if PG&E is the long-term owner or can produce the chain of title
Deed Prep, title work, Phase 1 review, land inspections, legal description verification etc	Planning Unit	3	30,000	90,000		0 Salary costs for transaction will be covered by USFS
"expanded" Phase 1	Parcel	36	500	18,000		0 The USFS policy requires additional due diligence beyond a standard Phase 1. The USFS will cover the marginal costs above a standard Phase 1.
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>						
A. Total Document Preparation Costs				150,300	42,300	

B. Closing Costs

Task	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	Total Cost	Funding Request	Comments
Policy of Title Insurance	Group	9	1,000	9,000	9,000	
Escrow costs	Group	9	1,500	13,500	13,500	
Recording costs	Group	9	150	1,350	1,350	
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>						
B. Total Closing Costs				23,850	23,850	

C. Other

Task	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	Total Cost	Funding Request	Comments
Boundary Survey & legal description	mile	56	6,000	336,000	336,000	This is a very rough estimate. See question 26 and additional notes below.
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>						
C. Total Other				336,000	336,000	

TOTAL TRANSACTION COSTS				510,150	402,150	
--------------------------------	--	--	--	----------------	----------------	--

Additional Notes:

It is assumed that parcels will be grouped into logical geographic units for the PTR. Larger groupings of units may reduce the the needed funding. It was assumed that the following groups of units could be established: 2 units for Bear River (east and west); 4 units for Spaulding (based on maps 1,2, 4 and 5 of Background Packet) and 3 units for Fordyce (based on maps in background packet but it was assumed that the Fordyce and Sterling parcels could be included in a single group).

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units
Tahoe National Forest

PROJECT BUDGET - BASELINE LAND OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (SEE NOTE 1)

PROJECT REVENUES

Source	Description	Non- SC Sources of Funding		Comments
		One-Time Grants	Ongoing Funding	
Committed Funds (cash received or award made)				
Grant Awards			8,400	Based on typical annual Green Sticker OHV funding level only . No attempt was made to project other potential grant funds due to the speculative nature of this exercise. Based on average receipts for similar uses currently existing on forest Includes baseline and enhanced management costs.
Lease Revenues			3,800	
Appropriated funds etc.			276,000	
Total Committed Funds		-	288,200	
Pending Funds (no award made to date)				
Grant Awards				Since these lands are not NFS, no grants are pending on these lands.
Fundraising				
Matching Funds				
General Fund/Reserves				
Other (Describe)				
Total Pending or Potential Funds		-	-	
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>				
TOTAL PROJECT REVENUES		-	288,200	

PROJECT EXPENSES

A. Baseline Management Activities

Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	SC Funding Request		Comments
							One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	
Patrol	OHV, recreation, law enforcement and Fire prevention patrol	Acres	8,000			48,000		-	Includes appropriated and Green Sticker OHV funding.
Planning	Land Management Plan Amendment	each	1	100,000	100,000			-	
Maintenance	Road Maintenance/ improvement	mile	27			X		-	*
Maintenance	Trail Maintenance/ improvement	mile	1			X		-	*
Administration	NEPA and reissue special use permits	each	4	1,000		4,000		-	
Administration	Special Use and Grazing permits administered	each	5			X		-	
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>									
A. Total Baseline Management Activities					100,000	52,000	-	-	

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
 Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units
 Tahoe National Forest

B. Baseline Land Ownership Costs

Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	SC Funding Request		Comments
							One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	
Protection	Fire suppression	Acres	as needed			X			
To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells									
B. Total Baseline Land Ownership Costs					-	-	-	-	

C. Other

Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	Comments
Input Activity									
To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells									
C. Total Other					-	-	-	-	

TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES					100,000	52,000	-	-	
NET REVENUE/(EXPENSE) - BASELINE LAND OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES					(100,000)	236,200	-	-	

Additional Notes:

Please see additional explanations addressed in question 34 of the narrative.

Budget portrayed above (in H14) includes both baseline and enhanced management activities.

* These accomplishments were calculated as a percentage of TNF 2010 accomplishments to provide a picture of the typical amount of work that would be accomplished on property similar to the requested lands.

Note 1: According to the Stewardship Council's Land Conservation Program Funding Policy, the Stewardship Council will require future land owners to demonstrate that they have the funding and other capacity to maintain that property interest so as to preserve and/or enhance the beneficial values on the Watershed Lands. Exceptions to this guideline will be rare and considered only in circumstances where,

- 1) The funding of baseline land ownership and management activities will clearly lead to enhancement of the beneficial public values on the lands; and/or,
- 2) The funding of baseline land ownership and management activities is only temporary (≤5 years).

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units
Tahoe National Forest
PROJECT BUDGET - ENHANCEMENTS TO BENEFICIAL PUBLIC VALUES

PROJECT REVENUES

Source	Description	Non- SC Sources of Funding One-Time Grants	Ongoing Funding	Comments
Committed Funds (cash received or award made)				
Grant Awards				See question 34 of LSP
Timber Revenues				See question 34 of LSP
General Fund/Reserves				Included in Baseline budget
Other (Describe)				
Total Committed Funds		-	-	
Pending Funds (no award made to date)				
Grant Awards				
Fundraising				
Matching Funds				
General Fund/Reserves				
Other (Describe)				
Total Pending or Potential Funds		-	-	
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again ->select insert copied cells</i>				
TOTAL PROJECT REVENUES		-	-	

PROJECT EXPENSES

A. Enhanced Land Management Activities

Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	SC Funding Request One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	Comments
Noxious Weed Treatment	NEPA, weed surveys and twice annual weed treatment for approximately 5 years Bear River Planning Unit	Known Occurances	29				81,000	11,200	See priority list question 34; estimated ongoing annual cost needed for 5 years
Six Mile Valley meadow restoration	NEPA, surveys, evaluate hydrologic connectivity, decommission & restore unauthorized routes, thin conifers, prevent vehicular access, evaluate 3 cultural resource sites, decompact and seed Eagle Mountain Lodge parking lot, treat noxious weeds,	Acres	45				176,200		See priority list question 34
Planning	Travel Analysis Plan	each	1	75,000			75,000		
Resource Protection	Noxious Weed Treatment throughout planning units	Acres	8			X		*	
Enhancement	Re-vegetation (Planting, seeding etc)	Acres	23			X		*	
Enhancement	Timber Stand Improvement	Acres	46			X		*	
Resource Protection	Fuels reduction	Acres	120			X		*	
Harvest	Timber offered for sale	MBF	390			X		*	
Enhancement	Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or improved	Acres	200			X		*	

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units

Tahoe National Forest

Resource Protection	Monitor cultural resource sites	50% of known rock art sites	1	X	Approximately 50% of all known rock art sites on TNF monitored annually by volunteers (FSRA); other cultural resource sites are monitored by the TNF
Enhancement	Stream Habitat Enhancement	Mile	0.1	X	*
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again -> select insert copied cells</i>					
A. Total Enhanced Land Management Activities				-	-
				332,200	11,200

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Land Stewardship Proposal Budget and Funding Plan
Spaulding, Fordyce and Bear River Planning Units
Tahoe National Forest
B. Capital Improvements

Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	SC Funding Request		Comments
							One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	
Trail and Trailhead construction	NEPA & construction Mears Trailhead & Trail	Ea	1	100,000			100,000		See priority list question 34; 1 toilet; 1 trailhead, 1/4 mile of trail construction
Trail construction	NEPA & construction Rucker, Fuller Spaulding Lake Trails	Ea	1	115,000	17,000		115,000		See priority list question 34; construction of 1 1/2 mile trail & 1 bridge; interpretation. (1/2 mile of construction paid by USFS)
Trail construction	NEPA & construction Lindsey, Culbertson, Rock Lake Trails	EA	1	130,000			130,000		See priority list question 34; 3 miles of trail construction
Trailhead construction	NEPA & construction Camp 19 Trailhead	EA	1	26,000			26,000		See priority list question 34; trailhead construction
Trail construction	NEPA & reroute Pioneer Trail	EA	1	45,000			45,000		See priority list question 34; 3/4 mile trail construction
Trail construction	NEPA and construction Sterling Lake Trail	EA	1	60,000			60,000		See priority list question 34; 1 mile trail construction
Trail construction	NEPA and construction Kidd/Cascade Lake Trail	EA	1	91,250	5,000		91,250		See priority list question 34; 1 3/4 mile trail construction (Old trail rehabilitation paid by USFS)
<i>To add a row: right click on the row above -> select copy -> right click again -> select insert copied cells</i>									

B. Total Capital Improvements	22,000	-	567,250	-
--------------------------------------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------

C. Other	The following is projection based on what the TNF accomplished in FY 2010 on similar acreage.						SC Funding Request		
Task	Description	Unit of Measure	Number of Units	Cost/Unit	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	One-Time Costs	Ongoing Annual Costs	Comments
Survey	Survey for Cultural resource sites	Acres	22			X		*	
Biological Survey	Survey & monitoring for TES wildlife & neotropical birds	Acres	1,000			X		*	
Biological Survey	Survey for sensitive & watchlist plants and noxious weeds	Acres	723			X		*	

TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES	22,000	-	899,450	11,200
NET REVENUE/(EXPENSE) - ENHANCEMENT OF BENEFICIAL PUBLIC VALUES	(22,000)	-	899,450	11,200

Additional Notes:

* These accomplishments were calculated as a percentage of TNF 2010 accomplishments to provide a picture of the typical amount of work that would be accomplished on property similar to the requested lands. No attempt was made to quantify the cost/unit of this work that would be accomplished with non-Stewardship Council funds.