Lake Tahoe
Federal Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 12, 2010
USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
Emerald Bay Conference Room
1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Attendees:

- John Pang, Michelle Sweeny, Greg McKay, Mike Berg, Andrew Bray, Steve Teshara, Jim Lawrence, Mark Kimbrough, Patrick Wright, Lon Rusk, Joanne Marchetta; via conference call – Jim Thomas, Bob Anderson, David Childs, Rochelle Nason, John Falk

Designated Federal Official (DFO)

- Terri Marceron

Chairman

- Andrew Strain

Other representatives:

- Lauri Kemper, Lahontan; Jeannie Stafford, Steve Chilton, USFWS; Jeanne McNamara, Ted Thayer, Julie Regan, TRPA; Zach Hymanson, TSC; Woody Loftis, NRCS; Karin Edwards, CTC; Tim Rowe, USGS; Jack Landy, USEPA

Members of the Public:

- Jim Hildinger, Bob Hassett

Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda & Approval of Previous Minutes - Andrew:

- Andrew requested Arla to start the roll-call. Welcome to Joanne Marchetta recently approved to the LTFAC.
- Andrew – the agenda today is on converting the preliminary recommendation package to final. Next, the package will go to TREX.
- For the meeting minutes - Terri and Andrew have not completed their reviews yet so we will hold off until a future meeting for approval.
  - Steve T. – I have a comment on the minutes: On page 5 of 9 under questions and comments, the first paragraph. It described Nason as saying she suggested the committee wouldn't support it.

- Rochelle - I agree. May have been conservation committee or urging the committee.
- Andrew – please wait until the next meeting.

SNPLMA Round 11 Background/Update – Andrew

- From a process standpoint – our goal is to make a list of capital projects and science and research themes with the rationale and send on to the TREX next week. They will review and make a recommendation to the SNPLMA Executives on May 20. The recommendation package will go to the SNPLMA Executives and then to the Secretary for final approval. There are three topics to update the committee on and seek input from:
  1) The Storm Water Quality Improvement Committee (SWQIC) review of the Lake Tahoe Nevada Stormwater Load Reduction Plan Development-Phase 1B proposal. Should it stand alone for funding or be part of $10M Erosion Control Grants (ECG)? SWQIC supports the stormwater project being funded from ECG.
     - Questions:
     - Jim – the $10M ECG reduced to $ 9.6M; did SWQIC feel that amount was adequate to cover other projects?
     - Terri – we have their notes and there was no concern. They concurred it is a priority project.
  2) For the Camp Richardson proposal there was a lot of discussion. I have no change to report; there was a lot of public input.
  3) The SEZ proposal which was originally for $628,000 has been reduced with a different scope of work and deliverables – $250,000. Jack Landy of EPA was asked to provide more information and a definition of the project and deliverables. You will hear about that in the next agenda item.
- The direction from TREX, recognizing there is more money in the bank and some coming back – they requested a project list of $30M to $34M. Additional money is available from closed projects and is coming back into the Lake Tahoe fund. We decided it was acceptable to go forward with two $34Mproposals. Justification for going over $30M will be the key. We honored the TREX request.

SNPLMA Round 11 Comments Received - Terri

- We have included public, congressional, and constituencies' comments to LTFAC members.
- Written public comment summary: 23 comments received. Actual copies of the letters are available.
- Need clarification for Tricia York, CTC, on the South Shore project: We will do 100-150 acres of hand treatment for the $200K (amount the project was scaled back to). We are targeting hand treatment for this project.
- Mr. Hilfiger's comment on the last page – he suggested we start work after Labor Day on the Camp Richardson project. Based on October 15 date (grading deadline on the Basin) all work needs to be done prior to this date. It is very expensive for contractors to work past October 15. We talked to Bob Hassett from Camp Richardson Resort and was told only one part of the work will be where visitors are located. We cannot accommodate the comment.
- Everything else was clear with rationale.

- Steve T. – I don't understand the purpose of the constituency spreadsheet.
- Terri – that table goes to TREX and SNPLMA Executives so they are able to see how this body outreached to our constituency. The Secretary would like to know your outreach as a LTFAC member.
- Steve T. – my sector and the number of organizations that I outreached show no comments submitted yet. You have my outreach letter on file.
- Linda – this is placeholder to give a synopsis of feedback today.
- Steve T. – do you understand my concern? Those above will think I am asleep as the wheel.
- Terri – **Action item**: We will add the letters to the comments on the spreadsheet. We will need your feedback by the end of tomorrow.

- Terri – the next portion is congressional input – we sent your preliminary recommendation to staff members of the delegation. We received comments in email format.
  - Senator Feinstein office comments: She likes Round 11 fuels projects, biomass and projects to prevent AIS.
  - Senator Ensign Staff comments: Strong support for fuels, Spooner, BMP project, and a total of $34M based on projects given. Questions on the SEZ project, seems more planning orientated than implementation. Project should be on the ground.
  - I sent emails and made phone calls and offered to meet with all during my trip to DC last week. Only Reid's office took me up on the offer to meet.

Comments to be added to the spreadsheet:

- John P. – I sent a letter out requesting comments be sent to the Forest Service (FS).
- Joanne – I will send you comments from the Governing Board.
- Patrick – I sent out information to State colleagues – no issues or comments.
- Mark – no projects on the north shore. Disconnect on my part on north shore. No comments with rationale due to a misunderstanding.
- Drew – the California ski industry had no feedback.
- Rochelle – we presented a package to various League board members and environmental activists. As in the past, they were impressed with the projects, work, and funding available. The major concern is with Camp Richardson getting funding ahead of the environmental analysis (EA) work that needs to be done. There is disappointment that the EA has been "leapfrogged". This group is responding to a congressional who says funding goes on the ground, but the planning needs to be done for best decisions to be made. The big picture is how the EIP today can integrate with a larger plan for saving Lake Tahoe. We need an integrated plan for regulatory requirements and private sector requirements to work together to achieve the goals. Point in that direction in the future.
- Michelle –I have comments in three categories: Environment, education, and business. I took the liberty to look outside of the box on how to communicate with these groups. I talked to people about our projects that interests or concerns them in their day-to-day activities. We need to look at projects that build employment opportunities and do EIP implementation. The Work Certificate Program coordinates with the college and creates a certificate that has to do with government and project implementation. It is an opportunity to build synergy. The comments I heard are more forward looking. I spoke with general members of the public,

business owners, parents, and the beach going public. All tended to be in the 25-45 age range –a critical element of the population in the future of the community.

- Michael – haven't received any written comments. Similar to Michelle's comments, I spoke with people on a face-to-face basis. They are encouraged by work being done to protect the lake. Many are looking for a way to get back to work.
- Jim L. – Linda's list captures my comments correctly. A letter was sent to the Office of the Governor. You have the written comments back. I received verbal support for the $34M scenario.
- Lon – with the impact of Indian gaming – the awareness is growing that we have to compete at the lake. Side benefit is what new jobs would be generated through Round 11 implementation (on the ground).
- Greg – generally my constituency was supportive. No negative comments or questions. I tailored each presentation to each body. Strong fuels support. Most wanted the $34M level.
- Bob – I contacted several national environmental organizations. All of these organizations feel Lake Tahoe is important. The number one issue expressed – Aquatic Invasive Species. They urged projects to address the issues and policies to prevent the invasion. Lake clarity – they expressed dismay over the lack of progress. The package is fine with emphasis on AIS.
- Dave – I sent my constituency letters: Fuels, AIS, and erosion control were the focus issues.
- John F. – I spoke to a number of groups. I made oral presentations to leadership teams, and boards of realtors. I gave a package of information to the Contractors Association of Truckee, the Pacific Legal Foundation, and the Lake Front Owners Association. There was overwhelming positive feedback. 1) The higher funding level was preferred. 2) Applied science efforts were essential. 3) We need to continue money to forest fuels reduction in the WUI. 4) Keeping forest access open and available for multi-use. There was concern about closing access points - roadways to the back country in summer and winter. 5) The Camp Richardson BMP issue and the feedback to "get it done" by pursuing the BMP planning and installation. Anything of that nature should be expedited.
- Andrew – from the generated letters the issues I received: 1) Camp Richardson needs to move forward with the water quality piece. 2) On the healthy forest issues – I was told don't wait. Be proactive.
- Jim T. – go for the $3.75M science package instead of reducing it. There was a lot of support for full science funding.

EPA proposal - $628K-$250K for SEZ classification – Terri

- We received a new proposal from Jack late last week. At the last meeting we had a number of items to complete for the proposal. The first task asked that representatives meet to discuss the SEZ nomination and get a synthesis. I ask Jack to summarize and describe the changes made.
- Jack – (handout). I sent out an email in early March requesting input from agencies concerning this proposal. With a need for the classification inventory, what would be the components of a strategy as called for in the LTRA? We did coordinate through emails. The revised proposal is a result of that communication (did not meet in person, no need). Basically the proposal is cut back from the original scope to develop a classification system. It is a two-part system that includes experts from inside and outside the Basin. There is a field sampling effort to revise and

refine, and a final public classification manual. As explained in the email, we intend to pursue additional efforts that will lead to the plan as described in the draft LTRA legislation. There is great interest expressed in pursuing the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM). Before this project is completed and CRAM is selected as the final system for rapid assessment of Tahoe streams and wet meadows, it is important to develop an evaluation program and development of that strategy.

- Lauri – I can help Jack answer questions.
- Andrew – it says revised as of 4/8/10. It would be helpful to the committee to walk through the list of homework assignments from the last meeting.

What is the project going to deliver?

- Jack – I want to step back to clarify the purpose. We do not have a comprehensive Basin-wide knowledge of what SEZs exist and what types they are. The purpose is to take the first step towards identifying what types exist and to produce a map of locations and assessments of conditions. We will produce a manual of SEZ classification types. This is important to be able to develop a watershed strategy. You will see $32M is earmarked in the draft LTRA for the watershed-based restoration list. Steps in the proposal to get there: 1) develop a preliminary classification – office based search to find information on SEZs from work already done. Also Includes a Basin-wide soil survey. That assessed information will figure prominently in a classification system. 2) Based on what the technical working group comes up with, we will implement a field sampling program and publish a manual. We are proposing using science funds. Also, work could be done for rapid assessment methodology determining the condition of SEZs. Those are the primary components of a long-term strategy. We are directed by the draft LTRA to develop a long-term strategy to achieve the SEZ threshold perhaps on a ten-year basis.
- Jim L. – I want to make sure I understand the scope of the project in Round 11. To develop a classification system only?
- Jack – yes, to develop a classification system only.
- Jim L. – classification systems have been done previously. Has there been work done to get with stakeholders to identify information already out there and available? The money needed for a consultant, how did you come up with that?
- Jack – there are a number of systems out there. California is selecting a system for the entire state. CRAM is one of the systems they are looking at. Identify the needs in the Tahoe Basin and go through selecting the best one for the Basin. The office-based exercise is being done in California, we could benefit by the results of that effort. New information is being taken into account for the Basin. A comprehensive evaluation is an important first step. The second field component is $400K. For $250K total, we can do enough field sampling to publish a field classification.
- Steve T. – this is disconcerting – would it delay implementation to TMDL? Someone would read this and ask what have we got for our money in the past? How are they connected?
- Jack – TMDL is creating its own list by looking at SEZs based on EPA's wetlands focus.
- Joanne – what we know today is that not all SEZs are equal. Today we can't distinguish one from another. This system in its entirety once built out, will deliver the criteria to help us make the allocations in the future of a limited pool of EIP and LTRA dollars towards SEZ restoration. We want a Tahoe based system to help us allocate very limited dollars. We are biting off the very first element in this round.

- Lauri – whether we like it or not, Tahoe is unique with terminology. Other agencies all use other classification systems. We need to identify how much of our SEZ is a stream, how much is wet meadow, drier meadow, or lodgepole thicket. We need to know how much of the land is in each situation. That will help us function better than we currently are. Help prioritize future restoration. Inform everyone about the different functions and values of those systems. We track them all like they are equal now.
- Steve T. – sounds like something needed and has value but will take a while. To pursue this, someone needs to explain these relationships to TMDL.
- Lauri – Jack mentioned other tools being developed through previous funding. On a project by project basis we can evaluate what is possible. This is a bigger scale. In the urban setting, we are looking at removing fine particulates and giving credits for that.
- Patrick – I support the concept, but am concerned about the way it reads. It sounds like a decision is made already and that none of the existing classifications are going to be used. I wish I would have heard from the whole suite of agencies around the table that this is where they want to go. I want to make sure that this will help all of the agencies.
- Jack – I would like to hear that too. We have contacted those in the technical working group and have received suggestions. The project need exists, but not everyone is at the same starting point. It is important to take the California system and make sure it makes sense hopefully through the participation of the agencies. TMDL goals are important to consider.
- Patrick – development of the system is different than selecting.
- Mark – one governing body enforces this, the TRPA through the Governing Board. The FS may have a different opinion. As this group we could agree, agencies may not agree. TRPA needs to be the lead to adopt this. Is that what's happening?
- Joanne – our approach is not to be the top down heavy but develop a system the agencies can use to collaborate to allocate dollars. We need to anticipate and look ahead the next couple of decades for restoration projects.
- Mark – all this discussion over $250K is amazing.
- Drew – how does it benefit us to do the same thing as the State?
- Jack – we will have a preliminary result at the end of the month. We can build on that analysis. The components will only relate to Tahoe.
- Lauri – it would be easy to take California's system and adopt. We have a hard time reporting because we don't fit into the same box. We are trying to find a system that will help all the agencies. This may end up being a hybrid.
- Jim – we are near the end of SNPLMA funding and there are a lot of competing needs. We need to make sure every dollar is useful. I understand a common language for reporting. I see benefits in helping to prioritize projects. But Nevada is different than California. We know where our problems are. Maybe this project would help? You are hearing from the largest land manager and we have most of the SEZs. The LTFAC is in the business of prioritizing projects and we are talking about the last SNPLMA funds.
- Joanne – dollars are anticipated being authorized through the LTRA, so there is not just SNPLMA dollars.
- Terri – we agree as the FS to have a classification system for the Basin. We believe we can utilize and build off of current systems. It will not cost what we are talking about here. The cost is too high for this step. $200k is not needed to that degree. Agencies have not gotten together to look at the systems. We can wait for the California model and use their system. TRPA has different needs. At this point I see a need to adopt and work together. The way this project is described now, I'm not comfortable. I'm supportive but the cost is too high. We need to hire a

facilitator, and get the right agencies together to discuss. We don't need that much to get there. We need a synthesis.

- Woody – my understanding is that we were having it as a placeholder as we explore the need. The information already exists, through the process we won't need to spend $200K to find information that we already have.
- Lauri – it is a small amount of money to "herd cats" - the price of a facilitator and synthesizing the information. Maybe it doesn't take that much, but we need the approval of the agencies to bring this all together. I don't have folks in my office to participate.
- Terri – from a federal agency perspective, we want to review existing systems. We are not looking to create a hybrid. We believe there are existing systems; we just need to pick one.
- Andrew – I'm struggling with this proposal – I worked 22 years with the SEZ system mapping it. We are looking to fix something that doesn't need to be fixed, maybe tweaked. To show up now with this project proposal changes our priorities and casts us in a bad light. It sends a conflict of messages - do or don't we know our priorities. There is value in fine tuning systems, not sure everyone will stop using their current system. All new information will cause havoc. It throws a whole new wrinkle into the private sector. It changes the rules of the game. We should approach cautiously. Several FACs ago we had a handful of projects that didn't fit into science or capital – they were planning projects. This feels like a planning project. We went forward with them, but were told no funding for planning projects in the future. The problem hasn't been solved whether to keep this on the list or to move forward.
- Jack –I want to point out that we were aware of the project leading to a new definition. We can scope it in such a way that it doesn't do that.
- Lauri – you are not going to change the rules related to a SEZs. You will get a better handle of the types of SEZs.
- Andrew – when there is a SEZ to be dealt with, site specific analysis looks at it in depth and tells us what should or should not happen. I don't see that process going away.
- Lauri – it will match up the function. The current rules stay the same. SEZ rules apply to any SEZs. The project will help counties and planning agencies decide priorities down the road. We need to make the step to better inform. We don't have it today.
- Linda – the discussion has been articulate, much clearer than the proposal. Task 1 and 2 stayed the same as the original proposal. The proposal needs to articulate better on Task 1 and 2.
- Joanne – we will rewrite it by the delivery date if that makes a difference in this getting approved today.
- Patrick – I would be more comfortable with all agencies saying they buy into this. It needs to be clearer as to what the benefits are for this. If ultimately this will be used to influence planning and regulatory processes, you have to say that, otherwise there is no reason to use it. After producing the information, make sure agencies will use it.
- Jack – I read the TRPA Regional Plan update for the SEZ list. Everyone will be informed by this project. It is complimentary to TRPA.
- Patrick – ultimately yes. The proposal implies it won't affect policies and regulations. Of course it will.
- Jack – it is complimentary.
- Terri – from a FS and restoration standpoint, I feel we are pretty good where we are at.
- Jack – we hope the project will benefit all agencies, no matter where they are.
- Rochelle – I think from the League's perspective we share a concern with the private interest expressed, the regulatory program is weakened. We agree with the perspective from Patrick that the information does form policy. It should be a meaningful threshold with the latest

information; this would be a critical step in doing that. It would take pressure off urban SEZ in comparison with the current threshold. From a conversation perspective, there is more concern on the regulatory side than private. Justification gets us to a more rationale system then we have now. We need all agencies to agree that this is the right way to go toward a unified system. I suggest that agencies meet and come back with a next step. Include Joanne and Jack to head up.

- Andrew – we have a full package for TREX, we still need to take public input on projects. Ideally, I would like a consensus on the science and capital list this afternoon. I hadn't intended to agree with anything we hadn't seen in writing. I'm not sure how it could work itself out with the SEZ project.
- Rochelle – I suggest that as an advisory committee, delegate this to the agency members to work out within the time left. Joanne, Patrick, Terri, and Jim should develop something that all could agree on. Don't lose the opportunity.
- Andrew – can you outline in your write up the project will take approximately 3 years to complete and the cost estimate breakdown?
- Jack – the original scope was $94,500.
- Andrew – classification at $94, 500, sampling is $155,500. $628K for all three years, three tasks done?
- Jack – need SNPLMA science funding for the third task.

Public Hearing –

- Bob Hassett – thank you for your support of the Camp Richardson project and considering it. NEPA will be complete in the next few months. It doesn't affect the timeline of this project. In this time, as we look around the country, people are watching to see what is happening with government spending. It is important to show people (and Camp Richardson is highly visible). This is such a positive step. People can see what's happening on the ground helping to protect Lake Tahoe. It is an improvement to the quality of the lake and people can see how money is being spent.
- Andrew – we are now at a point in time to reach consensus on both lists as presented as the preliminary recommendation. Everyone has the handouts. We will call for a consensus on the list and dollars.
- Jack – on the SEZ project – we talked about the options, and have considered coming back with a revised proposal in Round 12. A delay of one year would give us extra time to reach agreement on the way to move forward to a better outcome.
- Michelle – I would love to add funding back to the yellow-legged frog project.
- Andrew – could spread the $250K to several projects.

Consensus gauge – Andrew read over the options:

1. Yes and I support it
2. Acceptable and I support it
3. Can live with it and I support it
4. Willing to step aside and I support it
5. Willing to step aside – do not support it – won't block it
6. Blocking, don't support it (must give an option instead)
7. Need more information

Capital Project package of - $26.8M

1. 1
2. 12
3. 2
4. 0
5. 1
6. 0
7. 0

Science and Research package – $3.165M

1. 0
2. 12
3. 4
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0
7. 0

- Steve T. – does the $250,000 for SEZ go back in the bank?
- John P. – can the balance go to South Shore? $80,000 to the frogs, $120,000 to South Shore?
- Patrick – does it change priority of projects?

$34M Capital package (minus $250,000 for SEZ)

1. 1
2. 11
3. 4
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0
7. 0

Science and Research - $3.75M second alternative

1. 2
2. 13
3. 1
4. 0
5. 0

6. 0
7. 0

Alternative three – $34M plus

- Andrew - SEZ goes to zero, $80K to frogs, FS South Shore hazardous fuels $370,000 (up from $200,000)
- Jim – the constituency says fuels all the way. I am more comfortable to put all the $250K in fuels. The frog project has been brought up many times.
- Michelle – go with funding fuels.
- John P – give $250K to South Shore.
- Terri – for the frog project we could seek other funding. It is not timely for Round 11 (next fiscal year would be better).

1. 7
2. 8
3. 1
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0
7. 0

Science and Research package at $3.75M funding level

1. 8
2. 6
3. 0
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0
7. 0

- Rochelle – has to go 1 or 2 except for 5 on the Camp Richardson project.

Consensus on the overall priority to move forward to the public and TREX the $34M plus package

1. 12
2. 1
3. 1
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0
7. 0

- Steve T. – this package seems the most rationale and responsive to congressional input.
- Patrick – we are saving money by doing it this way, costs will be higher in Round 12. The fiscal impact needs to be explained.

- Joanne - this fully funds AIS, and includes higher funding for fuels.
- Andrew – big SNPLMA Round 11 is in play right now. We are in the running for fuels dollars. In past years, we have provided comment to the big SNPLMA process as the FAC. Do you want to do that this year? The comment period is until April 28.
- Terri – the preliminary recommendation under big SNPLMA totals $3.679M for fuels. The Basin has two projects totaling $800,000K, they are recommended to be fully funded.
- Steve T. – yes, send a letter of support.
- Joanne – TRPA would like to support it as well.
- Andrew – **Action item**: I will put together a letter of support.

Estimating Private Investment on Fuels Management – Greg McKay

- Greg went over his PowerPoint presentation.
- John P. – Greg did a great job getting this together.

Logistics and Review:

- Schedule future meetings – we are done with the work of this round and this charter. All of you had the opportunity to reapply. List of things we want to talk about in the future:
  - Update on TIIMS
  - Tahoe Science Consortium review of Erosion Control Program
  - Stream channel restoration
  - LCT restoration/recovery efforts
  - Rechartering – whether we want to provide the Secretary any input on what the charter should look like. Have the past charters changed all that much? It is a reason to get back together?
    - Terri – the charter does not include LTRA until it has passed.

- Andrew – do we need to meet again anytime soon?
- Terri – if you want to look at the charter and make changes, you need to meet in the next couple of days.
- Steve T. – I would like to look at it.
- Terri – **Action item**: Give Terri your comments, she will share with the group and determine if a meeting is needed.

Round Robin –

- Terri – on May 19 the SNPLMA Executives are in the Basin to look at projects. If LTFAC members want to look at projects as well, you all are invited. There will be a variety of partners attending.
- Terri - the Round 10 science projects were concurred by TREX. PSW awarded those projects.

Adjourned 4:55 p.m.

Minutes certified by LTFAC Chairman Andrew Strain

Andrew Strain 7·16·10

Signature Date

Joanne Marchetta
<jMarchetta@trpa.org>
04/19/2010 03:53 PM

To Linda Lind <llind@fs.fed.us>
cc Arla S Hains <ashains@fs.fed.us>
bcc
Subject FW: Revised SNPLMA Round 11 SEZ classification project nomination

Hi Linda,
This is the friendly reminder email I said I'd send based on our brief conversation today about the LTFAC meeting minutes. Please make sure that the minutes reflect that the basis of TRPA's vote of "3" on the capital projects packages was solely based on having pulled out the SEZ Classification project proposal from this round. As to all other elements of the packages, TRPA was fully supportive at the "1" or "2" level of acceptance.

Thank you,
Joanne

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
775-589-5226

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
fax 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

From: Landy.Jacques@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Landy.Jacques@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 5:48 PM
To: Arla S Hains; Linda Lind
Cc: Pajarillo.Jovita@epamail.epa.gov; pwright@tahoe.ca.gov; Jim Lawrence; Joanne Marchetta; Terri Marceron; tmarceron@fs.fed.us; tyork@tahoe.ca.gov; Woody Loftis; Jonathan W Long; Tobi Tyler; Doug Smith; jpepi@tahoe.ca.gov; Jason Kuchnicki; jkeely@fs.fed.us; Sue Norman; hsinger@waterboards.ca.gov; Paul Nielsen; Jeanne Mcnamara
Subject: Revised SNPLMA Round 11 SEZ classification project nomination

Dear Interested Parties,

Attached please find a revised nomination for SNPLMA Round 11 funding entitled: "Development of a SEZ Classification System." The original EPA-sponsored nomination was revised following extensive input and discussion concerning the provision of the draft LTRA that it is based upon (also attached FYI). As a result, the requested budget has been reduced from $628,560 to $250,000, and the scope narrowed from SEZ classification, inventory and condition assessment, to development of a SEZ classification system.

TRPA (the lead agency proposing this project) and EPA are committed to pursuing other funding sources to complete other elements of a SEZ restoration program and the watershed strategy, including:
-- conducting a SEZ inventory and condition assessment based on the classification system developed by this project (for which SNPLMA science research funding may be sought), using high resolution remote

sensing data being acquired this year;
-- possible development of California Rapid Assessment Methodology (CRAM) modules for Tahoe Basin streams and meadows;
-- development and implementation of a SEZ status and trends monitoring and evaluation program; and
-- development of a prioritized SEZ restoration strategy.
The timing and extent of these efforts will depend upon funding opportunities and agency capacity.

We intend to undertake these efforts with full consideration and maximum usage of existing information concerning stream and SEZ conditions and the NRCS soil survey, based on extensive fieldwork already conducted by partner agencies.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have, either in response to this or at Monday's LTFAC meeting.

Thanks,
Jack

Jack Landy
U.S. EPA Lake Tahoe Basin Coordinator
c/o TRPA
P. O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
tel: (775) 589-5248
fax: (775) 588-4527
e-mail: landy.jacques@epa.gov