

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2006

State of California
The Resources Agency

SOUTHERN REGION HEADQUARTERS
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Memorandum

To: Bill Snyder; Deputy Director - Resource Management
Attn: Jim Laughlin, Region Resource Manager

Date: August 21, 2006

Telephone: ATSS (8) 421-5552
(209) 222-3714
FAX (209) 222-2129

From: Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Subject: 5400 FOREST PRACTICE REGULATION AND TIMBER TAXATION
5410 Forest Practice Act
Preharvest Inspection
Inspection # 1
THP # 4-05-043 ELD

Persons contacted to attend PHI:

CDF: Gregory S. Thompson, Phyllis Banducci, Robert Little, Matthew S. Reischman
RPF: Rich Wade
CGS: Bill Short
WQ: Marty Hartzell, Chris Cochrane

Inspecting CDF Forester's Findings and Recommendations:

- < -In Conformance
- < -- Not in Conformance, Denial Recommended
- X < -- In Conformance with Recommendations

PHI DATE (S): 11/30/05-8/15/06

TOTAL CDF HOURS: 60

Check items that are applicable to the proposed THP. Explain items which are inappropriate or inaccurate in report.

Yes	NO	NA	
X			Silvicultural method appropriate?
X			Is Site Index indicated?
X			EHR accurate?
X			Unstable areas properly indicated?
X			Winter operations appropriate? (If proposed)
X			Watercourse Classifications accurate?
X			Watercourse Protection adequate?
X			Meadow and wet area protection adequate?
X			Road locations feasible?
X			Erosion control adequate?
X			THP map and addenda accurate?
	X		Is a domestic water supply affected?
	X		Special Treatment Area required?
	X		THP overlap an existing THP or is stocking or completion outstanding on all or a portion of the proposed plan?
	X		Wild & Scenic River affected?
	X		T & E plant or wildlife species affected?
	X		Archeological information complete?
	X		Is THP adjacent to a State or National Park? If so, was park contacted to attend preharvest inspection?
X			Will a response to concerns be required from the RPF prior to approval to mitigate potential impacts?

PREHARVEST INSPECTION REPORT

1. **WEATHER CONDITIONS DURING PREHARVEST INSPECTION:**

◆ Cold and overcast and rainy – Sunny and Warm

2. **PERSONNEL ATTENDING THE PREHARVEST INSPECTION WERE:**

CDF: Gregory S. Thompson, Phyllis Banducci, Robert Little, Matthew S. Reischman

RPF: Rich Wade

CGS: Bill Short

WQ: Marty Hartzell, Chris Cochrane

3. **WAS NOTICE OF INTENT PROPERLY POSTED AT TIMBER HARVESTING PLAN SITE?
(14 CCR 1032.7)**

➤ X < Yes ➤ _ < No (explain)

4. **If timber operations, including road and landing construction, or skidding, will occur on adjacent ownership's, have the adjacent owners been added to the Timber Harvest Plan and Notice of Intent as additional Timberland Owners?**

➤ X < N/A ➤ _ < Yes ➤ _ < No (explain)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

5. **Has the project area been accurately described within the THP, as per 14 CCR 1034(jj)?**

➤ X < Yes ➤ _ < No (If no, summarize below:)

TIMBER STAND DESCRIPTION

6. **Are timber stands correctly described, including WHR type, in the Timber Harvesting Plan?**

➤ X < Yes ➤ _ < No (list corrections below)

7. **Are the silvicultural methods prescribed appropriate for stand conditions?**

➤ X < Yes ➤ _ < No (explain) ➤ _ < N/A

The stand conditions consisted of Sierra Mixed Conifer and Red fir Forest. The stand types and vegetation types are described in detail on page 53 of the Timber Harvest Plan. The silvicultural prescriptions provided were adequate except for the following:

1. The RPF needs to provide clear enforceable stocking standards for the Alternative Prescription 2. The stands to be managed under the Alternative Prescription 2 consist of an over-story of true fir with adequate regeneration from seedlings to saplings being present. Some white thorn is present, but regeneration has been established in these areas and is above the white thorn. The RPF shall state in the plan that the Alternative Prescription # 2 shall meet 300 point count upon completion of operations. **See Recommendation # 15.**
2. A portion of the stand for unit 150-TM will not meet the stocking standards of the prescription as proposed. Previously unknown damage was present from the Fred fire and identified during the PHI. This portion of the unit shall be removed or managed under a different silvicultural prescription. **See Recommendation #16.**
3. The RPF shall establish a group visual retention area in the southwest corner of Unit 31D. The retention area shall include the area west of the existing class II watercourse. No site preparation shall occur in this area. **See Recommendation #1.**

8. Does the proposed harvest satisfy the intent of PRC 4513? ("Restore, Enhance, or Maintain" site productivity)

Yes No (explain) N/A

9. Does the proposed harvest provide for MAXIMUM SUSTAINED PRODUCTION of high-quality timber products by ensuring that post-harvest stands will:

a. Obviously satisfy minimum stocking requirements. (Countable trees only)

Yes No N/A

b. Contain required numbers of seed trees (if required)?

Yes No N/A

c. Contain leave trees that are of good form (at least 30% live crown ratio with pointed tops) and that are capable of good future growth capacity?

Yes No N/A

d. Leave trees are uniformly distributed throughout the area?

Yes No N/A

e. Contain a species mixture similar to preharvest and/or favoring high-value species?

Yes No N/A

f. Post harvest average stand diameters are larger than preharvest. (For thinning prescriptions)?

Yes No N/A

g. A regeneration and site preparation plan has been submitted, where required, that is sufficient to ensure prompt regeneration of the site?

Yes No N/A

h. Stand information was verified by:

Cactos/Cryptos sample plots ocular

other (explain)

i. Stands have been marked as follows (including stump mark if necessary):

None All trees 10 percent NA

cut tree leave tree

j. Was the mark representative and sufficient to evaluate the prescription?

Yes No N/A

k. Will additional marking, to be approved by CDF, be required prior to the start of operations.

Yes No N/A

10. Are fire protection zones present?

Yes No

Fire zones are present within the stand and are described on page 17 and 18 of the Timber harvest plan. US Forest Service Roads 11N99 Granite Springs Road, 11N29 Atherton Flat Road, 11N46 Sand Flat Road and 11N47 Carpenter Creek Road are all public roads that will have 100 foot fuel treatment zones. There are also un-gated private roads in the THP area that will have 50 foot fuel treatment zones. These roads can be located on the Appurtenant Roads Maps (pg. 34-37).

11. Are fire hazard reduction measures adequate?

Yes No (explain) N/A

12. Is the THP in an area of infestation?

Yes No

13. Are measures to treat brood material sufficient?

Yes No (explain) N/A

HARVESTING OPERATIONS

14. Are exceptions or alternative practices proposed that are not fully explained and justified?

Yes (explain) No N/A

Areas of instability were identified and addressed by the RPF within the harvest plan. These areas and propped mitigations have been reviewed by CGS. During the field review additional areas of instability were identified during the PHI. See **CGS report on unstable areas**. The RPF shall map the unstable area in the northwest portion of Unit 330 to extend southwest to the road. The proposed skid trail shall be relocated north to a flat depositional location within the unstable area. See **Recommendation #3**.

Bank failures were also identified within the THP. At reference point #18 the RPF indicated that the cut bank would be stabilized with 1 to 3 foot facing rock. During the PHI it was determined that this rock would not be required. See **CGS Report and Recommendation #8**.

15. Are operations proposed on slopes > 65%; or > 50% with a HIGH or EXTREME Erosion Hazard Rating (EHR)? (14 CCR 954.2(f)(1 & 3))

Yes (explain) No N/A

No operations are proposed on slopes > 65% or > 50% with a High or Extreme EHR. Operations are proposed on unstable soils or slide areas. See **CGS report on unstable areas**. See also **Recommendation #3**.

16. Will tractor operations occur on slopes > 50% that lead without flattening into Class I or II watercourses? (14 CCR 954.2(f)(2))

Yes (explain) No N/A

ROADS AND LANDINGS

17. Have roads and landings been correctly located and classified on the THP map?

Yes No (explain) N/A

The RPF needs to change the maps to correctly identify the status of the road (seasonal vs. permanent). Please revise the appurtenant road maps to correctly identify the status roads. See **Recommendation #12**.

18. Are any exceptions or alternative practices proposed that are not fully explained or justified?

Yes (explain) No N/A

19. Are proposed construction methods and mitigation's as described in the THP sufficient to protect resource values?

Yes No (explain) N/A

Methods and mitigations in general were adequate to protect the resource values. Extra mitigation measures were needed as pertaining to roads and landings in some areas to sufficiently protect the resource values. See Recommendations #'s 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14.

WATERCOURSE PROTECTION

20. Have watercourses been correctly described and classified within the THP?

Yes No (explain) N/A

Watercourses within the plan area were correctly classified. The RPF shall change the description of reference point 18 to indicate the watercourse is a Class II and not a Class III. See Recommendation #7. Springs were identified within the plan area but no protection measures were provided. The RPF shall provide the springs with protection measures and map the two springs identified during the PHI. See Recommendation # 4.

A blown out class II crossing was identified during the PHI. This crossing had blown out during the rain events of 05-06 and had not been addressed in the THP since it occurred after the THP had been submitted. The crossing failed in a manner which the water was allowed to flow down the road, creating road damage and eroding the fill on the outside edge of the road. The RPF shall insert language into the plan stating that a culvert shall be installed at CDF Map Point #4. The culvert shall be sized for the 100 year event. See Recommendation #11.

To help maintain site productivity the RPF shall better explain when operations will cease during the winter period. See Recommendation # 9.

21. Are any in lieu or alternative practices proposed that are not fully explained and justified?

Yes (explain) No N/A

22. Are proposed protection measures for watercourses, lakes and wet areas adequate to protect the beneficial uses of water and riparian habitat?

Yes No (explain) N/A

Springs were identified within the plan area but no protection measures were provided. The RPF shall provide the springs with class II protection measures except for the two springs identified at CDF Map points 2 and 3. The RPF shall provide these two springs with site specific protection measures. These measures shall include no operations on spring at CDF Map Point #2 and the LTO shall place logs to block access to spring located at CDF Map Point #3. See Recommendation #4.

23. Are watercourse crossings necessary, appropriate and properly located?

Yes No (explain) N/A

GEOLOGY AND EROSION HAZARD RATING

24. Have soils within the THP area been correctly classified?

Yes No (explain) N/A

25. **Has the Erosion Hazard Rating for soils within the operating area been correctly calculated, as per Technical Rule Addendum #1?**

Yes No (explain) N/A

26. **Are operations proposed on unstable areas and not fully explained and justified in the THP?**

Yes (explain) No N/A

Operations are proposed on unstable areas within the plan area and have been evaluated by CGS. The RPF shall map the unstable area in the northwest portion of Unit 330 to extend southwest to the road. The proposed skid trail shall be relocated north to a flat depositional location (to be mapped by the RPF) within the unstable area. See Recommendation #3 and see also CGS report on unstable areas.

WILDLIFE AND PLANTS

27. **Are listed species or habitat present in the THP area and accurately described in the THP?**

Yes (explain) No N/A

28. **Is a CESA consultation required?**

Yes (explain) No N/A

29. **Have impacts to wildlife and plants, including listed and non-listed species, been correctly assessed within the THP and appropriate protection provided?**

Yes No (explain) N/A

30. **Has "old-growth" information been provided (if necessary) and accurately described in the THP?**

Yes (explain) No N/A

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

31. **Are resource assessment areas appropriate?**

Yes No (explain) N/A

32. **Has the RPF correctly assessed the potential for significant cumulative impacts upon resource values within the assessment areas?**

Yes No (explain) N/A

33. **Has the RPF accurately listed all known past/present projects within the assessment area?**

Yes No (explain) N/A

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC CONCERNS

34. **Have concerns regarding the proposed harvest been raised by the public?**

Yes No N/A

The RPF indicated that a complaint was received from an adjacent landowner addressing visual impacts to there property. The Visual impact to there property was addressed and it was determined that there would be no to negligible visual impacts to the neighbors property. The selection silvicultural method is being proposed next to the landowner's property and a ridge blocks any view to the Alternative Prescription (clear-cut). No negative visual impacts are anticipated from operations.

REVIEW TEAM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Evaluate the TOTAL plan as required in the 5000 Manual – Resource Management Procedures, Section 5448.1. Are you recommending feasible alternatives which will have less impact on the environment? If yes, please explain.

The Plan has been evaluated; no new alternatives are being recommended however several PHI recommendations are being made. See PHI recommendations at the end of this report. With alternatives in the Plan and the PHI recommendations it is not likely there will be impacts to the environment.

2. Consider projects located in the immediate vicinity of this plan along with past, present, probable future projects and any significant environmental problems that you are aware of both inside and outside the resource assessment areas. Are the effects of these projects or environmental problems likely to combine with this THP to cause significant adverse cumulative effects?

The past and present projects listed in the THP were reviewed. The impacts associated with past, present and probable future projects with which this project may combine to create significant adverse impacts can be mitigated with the standard Forest Practice Rules and attached recommendations.

3. Item 14, Silviculture

- a. Please review the alternative shelterwood removal to ensure the overstory is old enough to be parents of the residual understory and that commercial thinning will result in maintaining or increasing the average stand diameter (both in the alternative and as a stand alone prescription); that selection retains representatives of the best phenotypes; and that sanitation/salvage is properly applied.

The silvicultural prescriptions were reviewed during the PHI. The overstory for the shelterwood removal is old enough to be the parents of the residual stand. The thinning as described will help space the residual trees and increase growth. The alternative shelterwood needs to be modified to provide more clear enforceable stocking standards. See Recommendation #15. All other prescriptions were deemed appropriate.

- b. Please review the even aged units that are over 20 acres. Are any site specific measures needed to mitigate the increased size?

The units as proposed take advantage of topography and stand type and no specific measures are needed to mitigate the increased size.

- c. Does the fuelbreak prescription actually accomplish a fuelbreak?

See page 155 of the plan for CDF's response to the fuelbreak.

- d. There is no marking waiver, but hogfuel chips are listed in 14e. Does the LTM in the fuelbreak meant to allow cutting small poles so that a marking waiver isn't needed? Will there be any biomass operations in cut tree areas and should a marking waiver be requested? If so, please evaluate.

Waiver should not be required as the stand is being marked on a leave tree basis.

- e. Please evaluate the site preparation addendum. Ripping is not included yet it is referred to on pages 10 and 92. Does ripping require inclusion into the addendum?

The RPF shall indicate whether ripping will occur. This question is addressed under the RPF questions. See RPF responses to first review questions.

4. Item 18, Soil Stabilization.

- a. Please evaluate stabilization measures. Please refer to Item D to be addressed by the RPF.

RPF shall address as per Item D.

- b. Are the two EHR areas easily identifiable on the ground, or should the entire area be classified as High EHR?

The EHR areas are identifiable by unit boundaries.

4. Item 21. Unstable Areas. Please review the unstable areas, especially those affected by timber operations. Are these areas properly mapped and protected? What units do they affect? Since much of this THP is underlain by some classification of unstable area, is ripping a good idea, and if so should it be prescribed in all site preparation areas? Are the unstable areas not recognized in Wagner and Spittler properly mapped?

See CEG report along with Recommendation #3.

5. Item 23, Winter Operations. Evaluate the winter operations plan to ensure adequate resource protection. Is subitem 11 appropriate?

See Recommendation #9.

7. Item 25, Roads. Are there any site specific mitigations needed for road construction not already listed?
 - a. Evaluate options to new road construction. Are new roads better for long term management and resource protection than using and mitigating existing steeper roads? Especially review the new construction within identified unstable group areas.
 - b. Please evaluate road and watercourse crossing abandonment. Are the proposed methods reasonable?
 - c. Please review as many reference points listed on pages 14-15 as possible. Please try to review at least reference points 2, 4, 8, 17, 19, 24, and the specifications for rocking critical dips.

The road systems were and crossings were evaluated and deemed appropriate with recommendations. See Recommendations #'s 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14.

8. Item 26, Watercourses. Evaluate for proper watercourse classification and protection.

Proposed protection measures and classifications were accurate except for the description of Reference point #18. See Recommendation #7.

9. Item 31. Please evaluate the exception for piling and burning. Please review Item C for the RPF.

The RPF will address this issue in his response to the first review questions.

10. Item 32, Biological.

- a. Does this comply with the most recent DFG/SPI agreements?
- b. Are any goshawk nests within units? This is unclear. If so, what units are they and has DFG been consulted? Do you have any recommendations for nest protection?
- c. Discuss with the RPF the requirement to only notify the SPI biologist if an occupied raptor nest is identified. CCR 959.2d requires notifying DFG and CDF. CCR 959.4 states the requirement for protection to be in agreement with the Director. Does the RPF's intent comply with these rule requirements?

An old goshawk nest was located in the selection unit in the past. Currently the nest is not active. The protection measures provided in the plan will provide protection for raptors.

11. CAA. Please spot check for CAA site identification and protection.

Two sites were identified by the RPF prior to the PHI. See Recommendations # 17 and 18.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The RPF shall establish a group visual retention area in the southwest corner of Unit 31D. The retention area shall include the area west of the existing class II watercourse. No site preparation shall occur in this area.
- 2) The RPF shall indicate in the THP that the waterhole located at the southeast corner of Unit 32B on Carpenter Creek shall be constructed as an off channel waterhole. The outlet of the waterhole shall be rocked to prevent scour. Additionally, a critical dip shall be established in the haul road west of the Carpenter Creek.
- 3) The RPF shall map the unstable area in the northwest portion of Unit 330 to extend southwest to the road. The proposed skid trail shall be relocated north to a flat depositional location (to be mapped by the RPF) within the unstable area.
- 4) The RPF shall provide springs within the plan area with Class II protection measures, unless otherwise described and mitigated within the plan. The RPF shall also map the two springs identified during the PHI. See CDF Map Point's # 2 and 3.
- 5) The RPF shall remove the culvert replacement language located on page 50 of the plan as the culvert has already been replaced under a past project.
- 6) Reference Point 4, as described in the plan shall be revised by adding that the fill slopes at the crossing shall be pulled back. A berm shall be kept to prevent the watercourse from overflowing the channel.
- 7) Reference Point 18 shall be revised to state a rocked rolling dip shall be placed on the road below the landing to properly drain water that comes

from the landing. Reference Point 18 shall also be changed to indicate that the watercourse is a class II. See CDF Map Point #1 for location of rocked rolling dip.

- 8) Reference Point 19 shall be revised to state that the cut bank "may" be stabilized with 1 to 3 foot facing rock.
- 9) The RPF shall revise language on page 10 of the THP (Item 23, Paragraph starting with "1. Erosion Hazard Rating" to better indicate when operations will be suspended from saturated soil conditions.
- 10) The RPF shall revise Reference point 25 by stating the rolling dip shall be rocked and armored with rip rap that averages 12" in diameter. Language referencing the USFS shall be removed.
- 11) The RPF shall insert language into the plan stating that a culvert shall be installed at CDF Map Point #4. The culvert shall be sized for the 100 year event.
- 12) The RPF shall revise the appurtenant road maps to indicate the proper classification of the roads.
- 13) The RPF shall revise Reference point 24 by stating that road fabric will be used to help keep the road rock from sinking and that no traffic shall occur on the rocked dip when water is flowing over the rock.
- 14) The RPF shall place the following mitigation measures into the plan to address the road section between Reference Point 3 and Reference Point 7.
 - The RPF shall identify the drainage structure points.
 - Drainage structure outlets that are within the Class II WLPZ shall be rocked.
 - Additionally the RPF may propose new road construction to re-align the section of road from the Class II crossing to Reference Point #7. The old road shall then be abandoned.
- 15) The RPF shall State in the plan that the Alternative Prescription #2 will meet 300 point count upon completion of operations.
- 16) The RPF shall re-designate the silviculture boundary for Unit 150-TM. The RPF shall remove the portion of the unit that will not meet the stocking standards for Alternative Prescription #2 or provide a different silviculture for that area.

Gregory S. Thompson
RPF #2719