




United States Department of Agriculture

Final Environment Impact Statement

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit



Forest
Service

Pacific Southwest
Region

R5-MB-293b
August 2015

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer. To file a complaint of discrimination, write: USDA, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (866) 632-9992 (Toll-free Customer Service), (800) 877-8339 (Local or Federal relay), (866) 377-8642 (Relay voice users).

El USDA (Departamento de Agricultura de los Estados Unidos, por sus siglas en inglés) es un proveedor y empleador que ofrece igualdad de oportunidad. Para presentar una denuncia por discriminación, escriba a: USDA, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 o llame al (866) 632-9992 (Llamada Gratuita a Atención al Cliente), (800) 877-8339 (Retransmisión Local o Federal), (866) 377-8642 (Usuarios de Voz y Retransmisión).

This document is the final revision of the FEIS for the Land Management Plan.

It incorporates the instructions from the pre-decisional objection period.

Cover photo:

View of Fallen Leaf Lake with Mt. Tallac in the background.

Credit – all photos, graphs and maps:

U.S. Forest Service staff, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
may be duplicated for public use (not for profit)

**Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
Land Management Plan**

Final Environmental Impact Statement

**Alpine, El Dorado, and Placer Counties, California
and
Douglas and Washoe Counties, and Carson City, Nevada**

Lead Agency:

USDA Forest Service

Responsible Official:

**RANDY MOORE, REGIONAL FORESTER
Pacific Southwest Region
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592
(707) 562-9000**

For Information Contact:

**JEFF MARSOLAIS, FOREST SUPERVISOR
Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
35 College Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 543-2600**

Abstract: The Forest Service proposes to revise the 1988 Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). Plan revision would provide an updated Forest Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) that would guide management of National Forest System (NFS) lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin for approximately the next 15 years.

- The proposal updates the management direction for approximately 154,000 acres of NFS lands in California and Nevada by describing desired conditions, objectives, suitable uses, standards and guidelines and monitoring requirements.
- In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Forest Service provided opportunity for the public to comment on a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Draft Forest Plan.
- Comments have been responded to in this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which analyzes the consequences of five alternatives including a “no action” alternative which would continue management under the 1988 Forest Plan, as amended.
- Alternative E (which was added as a result of comments on the DEIS) is the Agency’s Preferred Alternative and is fully embodied in the Draft Forest Plan.

Citation:

USDA Forest Service LTBMU. 2015. Final Revised Land Management Plan Final EIS. R5-MB-293b. U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. CA: South Lake Tahoe.

Contents

Executive Summary	ES-1
Introduction	ES-1
Decision to Be Made.....	ES-1
The Planning Process.....	ES-1
The Final Environmental Impact Statement	ES-2
Issues	ES-2
Alternatives.....	ES-4
Environmental Consequences.....	ES-9
Alternative A	ES-9
Alternative B (DEIS Preferred Alternative).....	ES-10
Alternative C	ES-11
Alternative D	ES-12
Alternative E (FEIS Preferred Alternative)	ES-14
Chapter 1. Purpose and Need for the Revised Forest Plan	1-1
1.1 Introduction.....	1-1
1.2 Changes between DEIS and FEIS.....	1-2
1.3 Plan Area	1-3
1.4 Applicable Planning Regulations	1-5
1.5 Purpose and Need for Forest Plan Revision	1-5
1.6 Decision Framework.....	1-6
Levels of Planning.....	1-6
1.7 Decision to Be Made	1-7
Six Plan Decisions.....	1-7
1.8 Plan Content	1-8
Part 1: Vision	1-8
Part 2: Strategy.....	1-9
Part 3: Design Criteria	1-9
1.9 How the Management Direction Is Applied.....	1-10
1.10 The Role of Science in Environmental Analysis.....	1-10
1.11 Summary of Public Involvement, Scoping, and Collaboration	1-11
1.12 Plan Revision Issues.....	1-12
Watershed Health and Aquatic Ecosystems Issues	1-12
Terrestrial Ecosystems Issues	1-14
Recreation Issues.....	1-15
Access and Travel Management Issues.....	1-16
1.13 Laws, Regulations and Policies	1-17

Chapter 2. Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action.....	2-1
Introduction	2-1
2.1. Development of Alternatives	2-1
2.2. Elements Common to All Alternatives	2-2
2.3. Alternatives Considered in Detail	2-4
2.3.1. Alternative A: No Action (1988 Plan, as amended)	2-5
2.3.2. Alternative B: DEIS Preferred Alternative	2-6
2.3.3. Alternative C.....	2-8
2.3.4. Alternative D.....	2-9
2.3.5. Alternative E: FEIS Preferred Alternative	2-11
2.4. How the Alternatives Address Relevant Issues	2-12
2.4.1. Watershed Health and Aquatic Ecosystems	2-12
2.4.2. Terrestrial Ecosystems	2-13
2.4.3. Recreation.....	2-14
2.4.4. Access and Travel Management	2-16
2.5. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study	2-17
2.5.1. Conduct Revision as Part of a Sierra Nevada Ecoregion Plan	2-17
2.5.2. Recommend Additional Wild and Scenic Rivers	2-17
2.5.3. Revise the Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designations	2-18
2.5.4. Increase the Pace and Scale of Ecosystem Restoration	2-19
2.5.5. Citizen’s Inventoried Roadless Areas	2-20
2.5.6. No Grazing Alternative	2-20
2.5.7. 2001 SNFPA Alternative	2-20
2.5.8. Consider the Document “National Forests in the Sierra Nevada: A Conservation Strategy” As an Alternative	2-23
2.6. Comparison of Alternatives	2-24
2.6.1. How Plan Decisions Change by Alternative	2-24
2.6.2. Comparison Tables.....	2-28
Chapter 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	3-1
3.1. Introduction	3-1
3.2. Organization of the Analysis.....	3-1
3.2.1. Introduction and Scope of the Analysis	3-2
3.2.2. Methodology.....	3-2
3.2.3. Assumptions.....	3-2
3.2.4. Overview of the Affected Environment	3-2
3.2.5. Environmental Consequences	3-2
3.2.6. Analytical Conclusions	3-3
3.3. Assumptions Common to All Alternatives	3-8
3.3.1. Recreation Expansion under All Alternatives	3-9

3.4.	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences by Resource Area	3-10
3.4.1.	Access and Travel Management	3-10
3.4.2.	Air Quality	3-23
3.4.3.	Aquatic Wildlife Habitat and Species	3-64
3.4.4.	Botanical Resources	3-103
3.4.5.	Terrestrial Invasive Plants	3-129
3.4.6.	Built Environment	3-140
3.4.7.	Climate Change	3-146
3.4.8.	Cultural Resources	3-161
3.4.9.	Tribal Relations	3-164
3.4.10.	Fire and Fuels	3-167
3.4.11.	Forest Vegetation	3-203
3.4.12.	Interpretation and Education, Partnerships and Volunteers	3-253
3.4.13.	Lands Program	3-258
3.4.14.	Management Indicator Species (MIS)	3-267
3.4.15.	Minerals	3-316
3.4.16.	Natural Hazards	3-319
3.4.17.	Noise	3-322
3.4.18.	Range Resources	3-328
3.4.19.	Recreation	3-332
3.4.20.	Scenic Resources	3-375
3.4.21.	Social and Economic Conditions	3-390
3.4.22.	Soils Resource	3-400
3.4.23.	Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat and Species	3-413
3.4.24.	Water Quality and Soil Erosion	3-466
3.4.25.	Water Quantity	3-484
3.4.26.	Watershed Condition	3-488
3.4.27.	Wilderness	3-497
3.5.	Cumulative Environmental Consequences	3-506
3.5.1.	Non-Forest Service Lands	3-507
3.5.2.	Cumulative Effects by Resource Area	3-508
3.6.	Environmental Justice	3-524
3.7.	Relationship of Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity	3-524
3.8.	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	3-524
3.9.	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	3-524
Chapter 4.	Consultation and Coordination	4-1
4.1.	Preparers and Contributors	4-2
4.1.1.	Interdisciplinary Team Members – USDA Forest Service	4-2
4.1.2.	Preparers	4-8
4.2.	Consultation	4-12

4.3. Distribution of DEIS Document	4-13
4.3.1. Notification to Individuals & Organizations	4-13
4.3.2. Distribution to Additional Agencies and Community Locations.....	4-18
Index.....	I-1

List of Tables

Table ES 1. Major program strategies by alternative	ES-6
Table 1-1. Changes to developed recreation baseline between DEIS and FEIS.	1-3
Table 2-1. Summary of Key Strategic Differences among Alternatives.....	2-29
Table 2-2. Comparison of Alternatives by Management Area.....	2-39
Table 2-3. Comparison of Alternatives by Environmental Consequences on Resources	2-41
Table 3 1. Ongoing Activities and Uses	3-44
Table 3 2. LTBMU Road System Description, by Maintenance Level.....	3-11
Table 3 3. LTBMU Trail System Description by Managed Use	3-12
Table 3 4. Miles of road by jurisdiction in the LTBMU Administrative Boundary (<i>Kjar 2011</i>)....	3-12
Table 3 5. Summary of Air Quality Issues and Indicators	3-26
Table 3 6. National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ (ppm)).....	3-31
Table 3 7. Wildland fire acres in the Lake Tahoe Basin from 2001 to 2010.....	3-33
Table 3 8. 2010 Estimated annual average emissions (tons/day) for natural sources (including wildfire).....	3-34
Table 3 9. Average concentration of NH ₃ , HNO ₃ , and O ₃ for 2002, 2006, and 2010	3-34
Table 3 10. LTBMU acreages by Watershed Assessment Units (HUC6) and condition for grouping for N deposition	3-37
Table 3 11. Baseline (2000-2004) vs. 2005-2009 data from the Bliss IMPROVE site showing the trend for worst visibility days.....	3-42
Table 3 12. Baseline (2000-2004) vs. 2005-2009 data from the Bliss IMPROVE site showing the trend for the best visibility days.....	3-43
Table 3 13. Best and worst decidviews for the glide path.....	3-44
Table 3 14. Pollutant emissions from prescribed fire for Period 1 (tons).....	3-47
Table 3 15. Pollutant emissions from wildfire for Period 1 (tons).....	3-48
Table 3 16. Total pollutant emissions (prescribed and wildfire) for Period 1 (tons) by alternative	3-49
Table 3 17. Emissions from Snowmobiles (tons/yr)	3-53
Table 3 18. Pollutant emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons)	3-54
Table 3 19. Air toxic emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons of CO ₂ equivalent)	3-55
Table 3 20. Air Quality Impact summary	3-63
Table 3 21. Biological Resource Groups and Emphasis.....	3-84
Table 3 22. Comparison of Consequences by Alternative, Aquatic Wildlife	3-100
Table 3 23. Plant species analyzed in the revised Forest Plan FEIS.....	3-104

Table 3 24. Management Status and Rarity of TEPCS Species	3-111
Table 3 25. Range of estimated whitebark pine abundance on LTBMU	3-114
Table 3 26. Comparison of Consequences by Alternative, Threatened or Endangered Plant Species.....	3-126
Table 3 27. Acreage, quantity, and relative percentages of known mapped invasive plants infestations	3-132
Table 3 28. Infestations on Non-NFS lands within the Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-132
Table 3 29. Climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies numerical ranking by alternative	3-158
Table 3 30. Mean (range) surface fuel characteristics estimated for reference (Ref.) and contemporary (Con.) forests in the Lake Tahoe Basin, USA	3-178
Table 3 31. Mean (range) canopy fuel characteristics for reference and contemporary forests in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Table recreated from Taylor et al. 2013.....	3-179
Table 3 32. Weather recorded on days when large fire occurred in Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-181
Table 3 33. Wildfire activity from 1980 through 2010; number of ignitions and acres burned by cause (human versus natural) over the last three decades.	3-182
Table 3 34. Average annual lightning strike occurrence by area approved for managed wildfire by alternative, and estimated ignitions calculated from regression equation	3-188
Table 3 35. Acre contributions to effects on Indicator 1 (Modification of Fire Behavior) by the various vegetation and fuels treatments.....	3-193
Table 3 36. Acre contributions to effects on indicator 2 (Reduction in fire return interval departure) by prescribed fire and managed wildfire.....	3-197
Table 3 37. Seral stages by canopy and tree sizes	3-206
Table 3 38. Current Status and Trend of Indicators without treatment and forest restoration goals in the Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-212
Table 3 39. Annual Aerial Tree Mortality Survey for the years 2000 to 2011. (USFS State & Private Forestry, Forest Health Protection).....	3-213
Table 3 40. Landscape Scale Desired Conditions for Major Forest Vegetation Types (desired average percent of vegetation type).....	3-216
Table 3 41. Desired Conditions for Tree and Snag Density, Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) Loading for the Major Forest Types by Stand Development Stage (Seral Stage)	3-217
Table 3 42. Current Forest Conditions by California Wildlife Habitat Relationship Class and Seral Stage based on Forest Inventory	3-218
Table 3 43. Current Stocking (Trees/Acre) by Size Class (DBH) for an average acre in the Major Forest Types.....	3-219
Table 3 44. Summary of all forest type trend changes from current conditions over a prediction of five decades.	3-222
Table 3 45. Summary of white fir/mixed conifer trend changes from current conditions over a prediction of five decades.	3-222
Table 3 46. Summary of Jeffrey pine trend changes from current conditions over a prediction of five decades.	3-223
Table 3 47. Summary of red fir trend changes from current conditions over a prediction of five decades.	3-223

Table 3 48. Relative Comparison of the Positive Effects of Each Alternative to Achieving Desired Conditions.....	3-251
Table 3 49. Special Use Permits issued by the LTBMU, as of 12/9/2011	3-262
Table 3 50. Management Indicator Species (MIS) components for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	3-270
Table 3 51. Number of surveyed fires with Black-backed Woodpecker detections, points surveyed ¹	3-287
Table 3 52. Summary of MIS habitat and population trends.	3-311
Table 3 53. Estimated geologic hazards, consequences and risks within the LTBMU	3-320
Table 3 54. Range Resources Impact Summary	3-331
Table 3 55. National Forest Visits to the LTBMU (<i>1988 Forest Plan, NVUM 2000/05/10</i>)	3-337
Table 3 56. 2010 Recreation Activity Participation on LTBMU	3-338
Table 3 57. NVUM overall satisfaction ratings 2005 and 2010.....	3-339
Table 3 58. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classification for NFS lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin (2011).....	3-340
Table 3 59. Inventory of Developed Recreation Sites	3-345
Table 3 60. Management Areas Comparison to Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.....	3-350
Table 3 61. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classification by Alternative.....	3-351
Table 3 62. Maximum ski area operational footprint acreage on NFS lands in Lake Tahoe Basin	3-368
Table 3 63. Existing Scenic Integrity Inventory, NFS Acres & Percent of Total Area	3-378
Table 3 64. Existing Scenic Stability — NFS Acres and Percent of Total Area.....	3-378
Table 3 65. Comparison of Consequences to Scenic Integrity by Alternative.....	3-386
Table 3 66. Comparison of Consequences to Scenic Stability by Alternative.....	3-387
Table 3 67. Minimum Scenic Integrity Objective, by Acres and Alternative	3-388
Table 3 68. Annual Visitation Estimate	3-392
Table 3 69. Activity Participation on LTBMU	3-393
Table 3 70. Trip Spending and Lodging Usage	3-394
Table 3 71. LTBMU Economic Contribution to Lake Tahoe Region (2008)	3-395
Table 3 72. Employment by Program Area for the Lake Tahoe Region (total number of jobs contributed by alternative).....	3-396
Table 3 73. LTBMU Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA Program Funding by Fiscal Year	3-397
Table 3 74. LTBMU Program Funding Provided by the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA)	3-398
Table 3 75. Summary of Alternatives by Economic Alternative	3-399
Table 3 76. Employment (for the Lake Tahoe Region as defined by zip codes) – total number of jobs contributed.....	3-399
Table 3 77. Comparison of Consequences to the Soil Resource	3-411

Table 3 78. Special-status species for the LTBMU, listing status, habitat, and potential for occurrence in the LTBMU during the life of the Plan..... 3-414

Table 3 79. SPECTRUM model predicted changes in late seral closed canopy CWHR classes 5M, 5D, and 6 for the five Alternatives. 3-447

Table 3 80. SPECTRUM model predicted changes in mid seral closed canopy CWHR classes 3M, 3D, 4M, and 4D for the five Alternatives. 3-449

Table 3 81. Comparison of Alternatives by Habitat Type and Special-status Species 3-459

Table 3 82. Listed 303(d) stream segments in the Lake Tahoe Basin (2010) 3-469

Table 3 83. Comparison of overall Best Management Practices Evaluation Program Ratings..... 3-472

Table 3 84. Wilderness Indicators - Recommended Wilderness Acres and Trails by Alternative 3-498

Table 3 85. Wilderness lands located within the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit..... 3-500

Table 3 86. Impervious cover by land ownership in the Lake Tahoe Basin 3-518

Table 3 87. Impervious cover on National Forest System lands by Land Capability Class..... 3-519

Table 3 88. Listed 303(d) stream segments in the Lake Tahoe Basin (2010) 3-521

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Vicinity map of National Forest System Lands on the LTBMU..... 1-4

Figure 2-1. Proportion of Lands in each Management Area, Alternatives B, C, D, and E..... 2-40

Figure 3-1. Air Quality Jurisdictions for LTBMU Area 3-29

Figure 3-2. Area designations for federal 8-hour ozone 3-32

Figure 3-3. Area designations for state 8-hour ozone 3-32

Figure 3 4. Areas likely to contain NOA in the Lake Tahoe Area 3-33

Figure 3 5. Concentration of HNO₃ for 2 weeks period ending Aug. 1, 2002 (Adapted from Bytnerowicz 2004)..... 3-35

Figure 3 6. Watershed condition for HUC6 3-36

Figure 3 7. Ozone damage to pine needles 3-38

Figure 3 8. Bliss IMPROVE site location..... 3-39

Figure 3 9. Glide path proposed in the visibility SIP..... 3-41

Figure 3 10. BLIS1 pollutant species for the best and worst 20% 3-41

Figure 3 11. Light extinction from each pollutant on worst visibility days at BLIS1 3-42

Figure 3 12. Light extinction from each pollutant on best visibility days at BLIS1 3-43

Figure 3 13. Worst and best 20% visibility days 3-44

Figure 3 14. Pollutant emissions from prescribed fire for Period 1 (tons)..... 3-47

Figure 3 15. Pollutant emissions from wildfire for Period 1 (tons)..... 3-48

Figure 3 16. Total pollutant emissions (prescribed and wildland) for Period 1 (tons) 3-49

Figure 3 17. Air toxic emissions for Period 1 (tons)..... 3-50

Figure 3 18. Period 1 black carbon emissions (tons) 3-50

Figure 3 19. GHG emissions for Period 1 (metric tons of CO₂ equivalents) 3-51

Figure 3 20. Biomass removed in Period 1 (bone dry tons) 3-53

Figure 3 21. Pollutant emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons) 3-54

Figure 3 22. Air toxic emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons of CO₂ equivalents)..... 3-56

Figure 3 23. Above-ground live biomass (bone dry tons) 3-57

Figure 3 24. Carbon sequestration under each alternative (equivalents of CO₂ in metric tons). 3-57

Figure 3 25. Page from the Washoe Lands document “Lake of the Sky: Washoe Stewardship of Lake Tahoe” (*Washoe 2004*)..... 3-166

Figure 3 26. Percent of ignitions throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin by fire management unit (FMU) and cause (Human vs. Natural) 1973-2010..... 3-174

Figure 3 27. Number of ignitions throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin by fire management unit (FMU) and cause (Human vs. Natural) 1973-2010..... 3-174

Figure 3 28. Fire type map based on FLAMMAP output (see “Current wildfire potential” above) 3-176

Figure 3 29. Condition Class based on mean FRID (CC[FRI])..... 3-180

Figure 3 30. Wildfire acres burned in the Lake Tahoe Basin by decade (1973-2010) 3-183

Figure 3 31. Number of human and natural ignitions 1973-2010..... 3-183

Figure 3 32. Fire Causes and Acres Burned by Year..... 3-184

Figure 3 33. Monthly average number of days that meet permissible burn day and burn plan prescription criteria..... 3-185

Figure 3 34. Average lightning strike occurrence in the Lake Tahoe Basin recorded by month from 1990 through 2009 3-186

Figure 3 35. Average number of lightning strikes occurring from 1990 through 2010 in areas approved for managed wildfire by alternative 3-186

Figure 3 36. Linear regression of lightning ignitions by lightning strikes from 1990 through 2010..... 3-187

Figure 3 37. Potential acres of managed wildfire produced using the Fire Spread Probability (FSPro) model. 3-189

Figure 3 38. Major Forest California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) vegetation types 3-207

Figure 3 39. Cumulative Mortality, trees per acre (TPA) across the LTBMU, 2000-2011 3-214

Figure 3 40. All Forested trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative A. 3-225

Figure 3 41. White fir-mixed conifer trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative A. ... 3-225

Figure 3 42. White fir-mixed conifer percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative A. 3-226

Figure 3 43. Jeffrey pine trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative A. 3-226

Figure 3 44. Jeffrey pine percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative A..... 3-227

Figure 3 45. Red fir trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative A..... 3-227

Figure 3 46. Red fir percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative A. 3-228

Figure 3 47. Net growth and removals (in 100s of cubic feet of volume) in Alternative A. 3-228

Figure 3 48. Inventory and growth of large trees greater than 30 inches in diameter in Alternative A. 3-229

Figure 3 49. All Forested trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative B..... 3-230

Figure 3 50. White fir-mixed conifer trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative B. ... 3-231

Figure 3 51. White fir-mixed conifer percent departure from desired conditions in
Alternative B. 3-231

Figure 3 52. Jeffrey pine trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative B. 3-232

Figure 3 53. Jeffrey pine percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative B..... 3-232

Figure 3 54. Red fir trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative B..... 3-233

Figure 3 55. Red fir percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative B. 3-233

Figure 3 56. Net growth and removals (in 100s of cubic feet of volume) in Alternative B. 3-234

Figure 3 57. Inventory and growth of large trees greater than 30 inches in diameter in
Alternative B. 3-234

Figure 3 58. All Forested trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative C. 3-235

Figure 3 59. White fir-mixed conifer trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative C. ... 3-236

Figure 3 60. White fir-mixed conifer percent departure from desired conditions in
Alternative C. 3-236

Figure 3 61. Jeffrey pine trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative C. 3-237

Figure 3 62. Jeffrey pine percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative C. 3-237

Figure 3 63. Red fir trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative C. 3-238

Figure 3 64. Red fir percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative C. 3-238

Figure 3 65. Net growth and removals (in 100s of cubic feet of volume) in Alternative C. 3-239

Figure 3 66. Inventory and growth of large trees greater than 30 inches in diameter in
Alternative C. 3-239

Figure 3 67. All Forested trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative D. 3-240

Figure 3 68. White fir-mixed conifer trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative D. ... 3-241

Figure 3 69. White fir-mixed conifer percent departure from desired conditions in
Alternative D. 3-241

Figure 3 70. Jeffrey pine trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative D. 3-242

Figure 3 71. Jeffrey pine percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative D. 3-242

Figure 3 72. Red fir trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative D. 3-243

Figure 3 73. Red fir percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative D. 3-243

Figure 3 74. Net growth and removals (in 100s of cubic feet of volume) in Alternative D. 3-244

Figure 3 75. Inventory and growth of large trees greater than 30 inches in diameter in
Alternative D. 3-244

Figure 3 76. All Forested trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative E. 3-246

Figure 3 77. White fir-mixed conifer trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative E. ... 3-246

Figure 3 78. White fir-mixed conifer percent departure from desired conditions in
Alternative E. 3-247

Figure 3 79. Jeffrey pine trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative E. 3-247

Figure 3 80. Jeffrey pine percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative E..... 3-248

Figure 3 81. Red fir trends over time for each seral stage in Alternative E..... 3-248

Figure 3 82. Red fir percent departure from desired conditions in Alternative E. 3-249

Figure 3 83. Net growth and removals (in 100s of cubic feet of volume) in alternative E..... 3-249

Figure 3 84. Inventory and growth of large trees greater than 30 inches in diameter in
Alternative E. 3-250

Figure 3 85. Map of Lake Tahoe Basin distribution and condition of 231 aquatic MIS sites
for streams tributary to Lake Tahoe. 3-275

Figure 3 86. Condition scores for 231 sites sampled from 1998-2007 along 10 major
tributaries of Lake Tahoe. 3-276

Figure 3 87. Map of the Sierra Nevada bioregion for MIS, comprised of ten national
forests (including the LTBMU) 3-308

Figure 3 88. LTBMU Program Funding by Fiscal Year 3-398

Figure 3 89. Map of HUC 6 Watersheds Defined in the Lake Tahoe Basin 3-491

Figure 3 90. HUC 7 Watersheds and Subbasins Defined in the Lake Tahoe Basin 3-493

List of Maps

1. Management Areas – Alt. A
2. Management Areas – Alt. C
3. Management Areas – Alt. D
4. Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Zones – Alts. A, B and C
5. Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Zones – Alt. D
6. Existing Developed & Permitted Recreation Sites
7. Existing Developed & Permitted Recreation Sites – Inset
8. Recreation Residence Tracts
9. Condition Class Mean Fire Return Interval (FRI)
10. Changes in Recreation Opportunities – Alt. D
11. PAC and HRCA Alts. A, B, C and D
12. Old Forest Emphasis Areas (OFEA) and Critical Aquatic Refuges (CAR)
13. Special Status Species Habitat Areas – Alts. B, C, D, and E
14. Whitebark Pine Special Status Species habitat Area
15. Management Areas – Alternative E
16. Stanford Rock Backcountry Management Area