

Section 16

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PHI REPORT

THE RESOURCES AGENCY

To: Mike Noonan, Unit Chief

THP NO. 4-07-27/CAL-4 - Section 16

From: Candace Gregory, Southern Region Chief

\*\*\*\*\*SECTION I\*\*\*\*\*

Review Team Recommendations:

- PHI XX - Complete entire PHI form, Sections I-IV.
- PHI Optional      - Email Review Team Fresno ASAP if PHI is scheduled
- Focused PHI      - Complete Sections I, III, and IV

Reviewed by:       
 Dist. by:       
 Dist. Date: 9/2  
 PS  
 2 TO  
 SA TLO  
 ARCH LTO  
 RPF  OMS  
 OTHER BCE  
 FPS  
 Status: PHI

**NOTE: All responses to the preharvest inspection and the preharvest inspection report are due at Southern Region Office no later than the Friday before the second review. Please e-mail completed form to FresnoReviewTeam@fire.ca.gov. If this cannot be accomplished, it is the inspector's responsibility to contact the RPF and secure an extension and notify the Southern Region Office of the extension.**

FIRST REVIEW DATE: August 28, 2007 FILING DATE: August 31, 2007

PHI MUST BE CONDUCTED BETWEEN FILING DATE AND September 10, 2007

DATE(s) PHI CONDUCTED: September 19, 2007 INSPECTION NO: 1

PHI/DIRECTORS DETERMINATION DATE EXTENDED BY MUTUAL CONSENT: X YES

REVIEW BASED UPON PREVIOUS VISIT: DATE N/A

RPF: Lance Purdy (209) 223-7170 FIELD HOURS: 10 OFFICE HOURS: 10

\*\*\*\*\*  
 DFG REGION: 2 WQ REGION: 5A INSPECTOR: Tinsley

AGENCIES REQUESTING TO ATTEND PHI:

Regional Water Quality Control Board:

Department of Fish and Game Region:

Central Valley (Region 5)

Rancho Cordova (Region 2)

- X (916) 464-4630 Marty Hartzell
- X (916) 464-4820 Chris Cochrane
- (559) 445-6278 Anthony Toto

- X (916) 358-2892 Tina Bartlett
- (916) 358-2900 Tim Nosal
- (916) 358-2916 Sandra Jacks

Lahontan (Region 6)

Fresno (Region 4)

- (530) 542-5426 George Cella
- (530) 542-5417 Doug Cushman

- (209) 588-1879 Dan Applebee
- (559) 243-4014x238 Lisa Gymer
- (559) 243-4014x236 Margarita Gordus

REVIEW TEAM:

- X Review Team Chair
- X Forest Practice Manager
- Archaeologist
- Archaeologist
- X Geologist
- Geologist

- (559) 243-4153 Bill Solinsky
- (559) 243-4114 Mike Bacca
- (559) 243-4119 Linda Pollack
- Gerrit Fenenga
- (916) 322-4853 Bill Short
- (916) 327-2903 John Schlosser

OTHER AGENCIES:

Phone; Individual

PHI-EZ Version 8.2 (2/04/99)

4-07-27/CAL-4 - Section 16 THP

First Review Date: August 28, 2007REVIEW TEAM QUESTIONS

RPF - Please provide the following information prior to the PHI (if a PHI is required) and have the information available in writing for the CDF inspector prior to the PHI. Please also send a copy of your response to these questions to the review team in Fresno. Failure to send a copy of these responses to the Fresno office may result in delays of THP approval.

1. Please provide the USGS Quadrangle names and dates under Item #8 on page 2 as per 14 CCR 1034(g)(1)
2. Note: If the RPF will be authorized by the Plan Submitter to submit amendments during the life of the plan it must be included under Item #13(c).
3. Please include under Item # 18 (Soil Stabilization) protection measures in regards to roads and landings as stated in 14CCR 963.2 m) and 14CCR 963.5(f)(1)&(4)
4. Please include in the Winter Operations Plan under Item #23 for the LTO benefit the 14 CCR 895.1 definition of "Saturated Soil Conditions" and the definition of "Hard Frozen Conditions" if applicable.
5. Please include additional information under Item #26 for Class II watercourses in regards to 14CCR 956.3(g) and the first sentence of 956.4(b)(6).
6. Please state Under Item #26 the width of the Equipment Limitation Zones (ELZ) for the springs and wet areas.
7. Items #30 and #31 indicates that lopping will be used for fire hazard reduction within 100' of the Forest Service Co-op Road 7N28. For the benefit of the LTO please cite the 14 CCR 895.1 definition for "Lopping" (for the Southern Forest District), which states "Severing limbs from the exposed sides of the unutilized portion of trees so that portions of the severed limbs are in contact with ground."
8. Are there any private roads open to the public within the plan area that require fire hazard reduction as per 14 CCR 957.2(b)? If there are such roads within the plan area please describe the hazard reduction treatment and shown the specific roads on a map.
9. Under Item #38 (Retention Area within Clearcuts) there are references of "WRAs" and "wildlife retention areas." Please remove the reference of "wildlife" as these retention areas are not specific to wildlife.

10. To comply with 14 CCR 1035.4, please identify under THP Item #38 who the Plan Submitter has designated to be the responsible person to notify the Department of start up of timber operations. Additionally, please identify the following as the Department's designated personnel for the notification.

Cal Fire Area Forester  
 785 Mountain Ranch Road  
 San Andreas, Ca 95249  
 Phone (209) 754-3831  
 Thomas.Tinsley@fire.ca.gov

11. The biological assessment area should be established which would allow for the assessment of all species identified during the process of scoping. The scoping for this THP has identified raptors (Northern goshawk and the California spotted owl) and a mammal (Pacific fisher) that are further assessed within the defined biological assessment area. As stated in Technical Rule Addendum #2, Biological assessment areas will vary with the species being evaluated and its habitat.

Typically, raptor species would be assessed for an area within 1 - 1.3 miles of the THP area, dependant upon the existence of California Spotted Owl. The Pacific fisher's home range is considerably larger and would require an even larger assessment area. To complete scoping for potential special status plants, a nine quadrangle area should be used to scope for potential plants. In this case, the boundary of the THP and the watershed / biological assessment area is well within this 1-1.3 mile radius of the THP. Please revisit the biological assessment to include an assessment area large enough to assess the plan's potential to impact all of the species identified during the scoping process. Please also include a map showing the boundaries of the biological assessment area.

12. Please provide a detailed discussion under the "CEQA Analysis of the Potential Use of Herbicides Associated with this THP" that addresses the potential human exposure from the possible use of herbicide on this project. Please discuss the risks of human exposure and mitigations, techniques and protocol that will be followed to reduce such risks to insignificance. Please include in the discussion plan specific details related to the following 2 points:

1. The Recreational Assessment Area states that "fishing, hunting, hiking and similar activities are generally allowed on Sierra Pacific Industries timberland, including the proposed operations area of this THP."

2. Timing of herbicide application in regard to periods of minimal public use may be a consideration, such as treatments in the spring versus the summer recreation months, or the fall deer hunting season. Buffers near watercourses are described on page 111. Are there other areas of non-use such as ELZs, clearcut retention areas, and biological protection areas? Is aerial application necessary beyond having the option? Please also address potential exposure to company employees, contractors, and Forest Service employees.

## 13. Item 26(d):

THP #4-07-027-CAL  
 COMMENTS due April 6th 08

The plan indicates that this THP review process is to be used to meet the DFG CEQA review requirements under Fish and Game Code section 1611.

On August 24, 2007, the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) received your notification of lake or streambed alteration pursuant to Fish and Game Code 1611 within the THP.

Following CDF's acceptance of the Plan for filing and the payment of the notification fee to the appropriate Department office, the Department will determine within 30 days (per Section 1602(a)(2)) if the notification is complete and notify the Applicant in writing. If the notification is incomplete due to any missing information or discrepancy in information, the Department will describe the missing information or required clarification. You may visit the Streambed Alteration Agreement section of our website at [www.dfg.ca.gov/1600](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/1600) for further guidance with this process. Upon subsequent submittal of additional information, the Department will again determine within 30 days (per Section 1602(a)(2)) if the notification is complete and so notify the Applicant in writing. If you do not receive a completeness letter, the notification will be complete by default 30 days after receipt by the DFG.

The notification will be deemed void if the THP is returned by CDF.

The DFG is required to submit a draft Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) to you within 60 calendar days from the date the notification is determined to be complete. If you disagree with any measures in the draft Agreement, you should contact the DFG to discuss. If you disagree with any measures in the draft Agreement, and you and the DFG cannot resolve the disagreement informally, you may request an arbitration panel to resolve the disagreement. After receipt of a signed draft Agreement and the fee, the DFG will finalize the Agreement after THP approval. Please send the applicable fee to the DFG, 1600 program, 1701 Nimbus Rd., Suite A, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 and indicate the THP number. The regulations describing fees for lake or streambed alteration agreements have been revised as of November 12, 2005. The new fees for regular (<5 years) timber harvesting agreements are \$1,200 base fee, plus \$100 for each project/crossing. (DFG #1)

## 14. Plant scoping/survey report:

- a. The survey report indicates that an unknown *Allium* species was found in the project area. There is a CNPS list 1B plant (*Allium tribracteatum*). Will surveys be conducted to confirm the identification of the unknown *Allium*?
- b. The DFG appreciates the efforts of the RPF to document *Pipera colemanii*, a CNPS List 4 species. The habitat description on page 139 indicates that this species can be found in the understory of shaded conifer forests. To what extent will the shaded habitat be maintained for this species? (DFG #2)

CDF Inspector - respond to the following questions:

- a. A wet area, head of a Class II watercourse, is present near the road intersection located to the northeast of Unit #368. Is the roadbed adequately drained? Is mitigation necessary to prevent potential of sediment deposition into the watercourse?
- b. Please evaluate if the EHR estimated remaining protective vegetative cover of approximately 30 percent seems reasonable for the clearcutting area after the implementation of site preparation considering that this is also the estimate for the Sanitation / Salvage, and Shelterwood Removal areas.
- c. At road project #1 the RPF proposes to move a large boulder that is currently affecting the inlet of a 60-inch culvert, but to leave the boulder in the watercourse. Please evaluate if removing the boulder from the watercourse more protective of the culvert and crossing than moving the boulder away from the culvert. (CGS #1)
- d. Please contact Ms. Tina Bartlett at (916) 358-2892 to arrange a mutually agreeable PHI date.
- e. Please contact Mr. Chris Cochrane at (916) 464-4820 to schedule a Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time.
- f. Please notify CGS Bill Short at (916) 322-4853 of the PHI date.
- g. Please notify Mike Bacca at (559) 243-4114 of the PHI date.
- h. Please notify Bill Solinsky at (559) 243-4153 of the PHI date.
- i. No need to notify Cal Fire Archaeology of the PHI date.

**Note: RPF Purdy did provide responses to a number of the First Review questions at the PHI. He stated his responses to the remaining question not answered would accompany the PHI recommendations prior to plan approval.**

/s/ Solinsky

4-07-27/CAL-4 - Section 16 THP

TO: Candace Gregory, Southern Region Chief  
FROM: Mike Noonan Unit Chief

DATE: 9 - 21 -07

\*\*\*\*\*SECTION II\*\*\*\*\*

Check items that are applicable to the proposed THP.

YES	NO	NA	
x	/	/	- Silvicultural method appropriate?
x	/	/	- Does site index appear correct?
x	/	/	- EHR accurate?
/	/	x	- Unstable areas properly indicated?
x	/	/	- Winter operations appropriate (if proposed)?
/	x	/	- If winter operations are proposed in the future, should the amendment be considered "substantial"?
x	/	/	- Watercourse classifications accurate?
x	/	/	- Watercourse protection adequate?
/	x	/	- Meadow and wet area protection adequate?
x	/	/	- Road locations feasible?
/	/	/	- Erosion control adequate?
/	/	x	- THP map and addenda accurate?
x	/	/	- Are domestic water supplies adequately protected?
/	/	/	- Archeological information complete?

If any of the above answers are answered NO, provide explanation in PHI report.

/	/	x	-Special Treatment Area required?
/	x	/	-Does 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	-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?
/	x	/	-T & E plant or wildlife species affected?

PREHARVEST INSPECTION REPORT

- 1. Did weather conditions interfere with conducting the PHI?  
 Yes       No

*Weather conditions during the PHI were sunny and cool with temperatures in the low 60's*

- 2. a. Personnel attending the preharvest inspection were:

Thomas Tinsley	CALFIRE-Inspector	Sept. 18, 2007
Bill Solinsky	CALFIRE-Review Team	Sept. 18, 2007
Ed Struffenegger	SPI-Dist. Manager	Sept. 18, 2007
Lance Purdy	SPI-Forester	Sept. 18, 2007
Kevin Roberts	SPI-Biologist	Sept. 18, 2007
Chris Cochran	WQ	Sept. 18, 2007
Tim Nosal	DFG	Sept. 18, 2007
Mark Stewart	EBMUD Rep.	Sept. 18, 2007

Note: Kevin Roberts was only in attendance for the morning tailgate review session

- b. Personnel contacted regarding the preharvest inspection:

Bill Short (CGS) was contacted but was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict.

- 3. Was Notice of Intent properly posted at timber harvesting plan site (14 CCR 1032.7)?  
 Yes       No (explain below)

*The RPF pointed out the Notice of Intent to harvest, which was posted on a sugar pine on Forest Service road 7N28. F.S 7N28 bisects the proposed plan area and is seasonally open to the public.*

- 4. If timber operations including road and landing construction or skidding will occur on adjacent ownerships, have the adjacent owners been added to the Timber Harvesting Plan and Notice of Intent as additional timberland owners?  
 YES       NO (explain below)       N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- 5. Has the project area been accurately described within the THP as per 14 CCR 1034 (jj)?  
 Yes       No If no, summarize below:

TIMBER STAND DESCRIPTION

- 6. Is the proposed harvest area zoned Timber Production Zone by the county [933.1(a)(7)]?  
 Unknown       Yes       No

7. Are timber stands correctly described in the Timber Harvesting Plan?

Yes  No (list corrections below)

The timber stands found on the project area are common for these elevations (5100 to 6300 feet) in the Central Sierra. Commercial mixed conifers species found in the area are representative of those found within the THP area. The RPF provides a table in section III of the proposed plan which indicates, commercial tree species typically found in a Sierra mixed conifer forest are present on the proposed plan area in the following representative distributions based on basal area: ponderosa/Jeffrey pine 2%, white fir 52%, red fir 3%, sugar pine 15%, Douglas-fir 0%, incense cedar 25%, and other hardwoods primarily scattered black oaks and white alders along many of the streamcourses 3%. These percentages appear to be accurate based on field review. Oaks as a stand component are scattered and limited due to the proposed plans elevation. As stated in the THP and during the PHI by the RPF 400 sq. ft. of oak per 40 acres does not exist on the proposed plan area, every effort shall be made to maintain current levels of oak stocking during timber operations. Understory species/vegetation include manzanita, mountain whitethorn, bush chinkapin and gooseberry.

True mistletoe at moderate to severe levels of infestation is obvious in many of the white fir. Blister rust is evident in some of the sugar pine and dwarf mistletoe is present in some Jeffrey pine.

8. Have timber site classes been correctly identified and accurately depicted [14 CCR 1034(x)(12)]? Consider even-aged regeneration method limitations, and differences in minimum stocking requirements.

Yes  No (explain below)

This proposed plan is in a high elevation zone where site classification is very variable given soils, parent materials, high levels of surface rock and topography. It appears the RPF has accurately identified the appropriate timberland site classifications. Site classification ranges from site I to site III.

SILVICULTURE

9. Are the silvicultural methods prescribed appropriate for stand conditions?

Yes  No (explain below)

10. For even-aged management: If a "regeneration step" harvest is proposed, will the provisions of 14 CCR 953.1(a) be met?

Yes  No  N/A

11. For uneven-aged management: Are enforceable mitigation measures needed to ensure the establishment and/or maintenance of a balanced stand structure, and establishment of new reproduction?

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

12. If Group B species are proposed for management [14 CCR 952.7(c)]: Will the site occupancy of Group A species be reduced relative to Group B species?

No  Yes  N/A

13. Comments/general observations regarding silviculture.

*During the PHI the RPF agreed to the following recommendations:*

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7, include the statement that NO units shall receive an herbicide pre-treatment prior to plan approval. Recommendation #1*

*Under item #38, section II include the statement that larger diameter conifer trees within the "retention areas" may be removed during harvest. Recommendation #2*

*Include a map showing the actual proposed THP harvest boundary for clarification purposes. Recommendation #3*

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7, a statement that during the application of herbicides identified sensitive plant populations shall be avoided. Also discuss the timing of application in relation to sensitive plants floristic periods. Recommendation #4*

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7 a statement that RPF Ostergaard will be authorized by the plan submitter to submit amendments during the life of the proposed plan. Recommendation #5*

**MAXIMUM SUSTAINED PRODUCTION OF HIGH QUALITY WOOD PRODUCTS**

14. Does the THP comply with goals of 14 CCR 953.10 to restore, enhance, and maintain the productivity of the state's timberlands?

Yes       No (explain below)

*It appears the RPF shall be enhancing, maintaining and restoring timberlands where feasible to obtain the goal of MSP while giving consideration to other resources values.*

15. Will any growing stock be harvested in a manner which significantly delays reaching or maintaining MSP [14 CCR 953]?

No       Yes (explain below)

16. Does the THP comply with the MSP requirements of 14 CCR 953.11?

Yes       No (explain no answer to option "C" below, and explain yes or no answer if using option A or B)

*As stated under item #14 section II of the proposed plan, "This THP conforms to SPI's approved option A demonstration of MSP on file with CDF at its Southern Forest District Office." (Fresno)*

Will the post-harvest stand:

a. Obviously satisfy minimum stocking requirements(countable trees only)?

Yes       No       N/A

*Based on the ocular review of a number of other even-aged units within the proposed plans watershed and adjacent watersheds where the timberland owner has timberland, after site preparation activities and regenerations efforts are completed the area shall obviously meet the minimum stocking requirements.*

- 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

*Based on the ocular review of a number of other even-aged units within the proposed plans watershed and adjacent watersheds where the timberland owner has timberland, after site preparation activities and regenerations efforts are completed the area shall obviously meet the minimum stocking requirements.*

- h. Stand information was verified by:  
 Ocular     Sample Plots     Cactos/Cryptos  
 Other (explain below)
- i. Stands have been marked as follows (including stump mark if necessary):  
 All Trees     None     Percent     N/A  
 Cut Tree     Leave Tree

Was the mark representative and sufficient to evaluate the prescription?

Yes  No  N/A

Pursuant to 14 CCR 953.1 (a) (5) and 953.2 (a) (1) the RPF had completed a sample mark of all the proposed silvicultural methods (except clearcutting). All trees designated for removal have been mark with blue paint. The following proposed plan areas were reviewed for sample mark:

Sanitation/Salvage along watercourses A2, C2 and H2, unit #371-B 100% marked

Shelterwood removal units # 374, 370 and 368-B 100% marked

WLPZ-Selection along watercourse D2 100% marked

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

No  Yes (explain below)

HARVESTING OPERATIONS

17. Are exceptions or alternative practices proposed that are not fully explained and justified? If yes, discuss potential impacts and recommendations below:

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

18. Are tractor operations proposed on: [14 CCR 934.2(f)(1)]?

- a.  No  Yes Slopes >65%
- b.  No  Yes Slopes >50% with a HIGH or EXTREME EHR?
- c.  No  Yes Slopes >50% that lead without flattening to sufficiently trap sediment before reaching a watercourse or lake?

If yes to a, b, or c above:

d. Is such tractor use appropriate?

Yes  No (explain)  N/A

With one exception, in unit 367 there is a small area which has been identified by the RPF as >50% slopes with high EHER. The RPF has provided a detailed map of the unit (page #26-steep slope operations) and discussed in the proposed plan staying on only existing skid trails which were flagged prior to the PHI. The steep area in unit 367 was walked during the PHI. The THP map on page #26 shows a downhill connecting skid trail between the upper and lower pre-flagged skid trails proposed for use this entry. This is not an existing skid trail and given it's proximity to the WLPZ of A2 and the high EHR rating the review team recommended not skidding down the "connector". As agreed to by the RPF the "connector" between the upper and lower skids shall be deleted from the THP operations map on page #26 and not used during timber operations. In addition, the upper skid trail shall be flagged out into the area with slopes < 50% for LTO recognition. Recommendation #6. The upper skid shall be used going out to the west and the lower skid shall be used to the road below.

One other unit identified by the RPF having steep slopes >50% with moderate EHR, which shall be treated as high EHR is unit #368. This steep sloped area also was reviewed during the PHI. The RPF stated that the THP operations map on page #27 shows the one pre-flagged existing skid trail to high in

*the unit. The RPF stated he would re-map the skid trail in the proper location.*  
Recommendation #7

e. In your opinion, has the RPF met the standards of 954.2(f)(3) with a clear explanation, and justification as to why the application of the standard rule is either not feasible, or would not comply with 14 CCR 954?

Yes  No (explain)  N/A

19. Will tractor operations be limited to existing tractor roads that do not require reconstruction on slopes between 50 and 65% where the EHR is moderate [14 CCR 954.2(f)(2)]?

Yes  No (answer a & b below)  N/A

a. Is such tractor use appropriate?

Yes  No (explain)  N/A

*As discussed above the review team evaluated one unit (#368) where 14 CCR 954.2(f)2) applies. The existing skid trail proposed for use appeared to be in good stable condition requiring no reconstruction.*

b. In your opinion, has the RPF met the standards of 14 CCR 954.2(f)(3) with a clear explanation, and justification as to why the application of the standard rule is either not feasible, or would not comply with 14 CCR 934?

Yes  No (explain)  N/A

20. Did the RPF flag tractor roads prior to the PHI as required by 14 CCR 954.2(f)(3)?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*As stated above under item # 18 (d) the RPF had pre-flagged all three existing skid trails*

21. Comments/general observations regarding harvesting operations. *none*

ROADS AND LANDINGS

22. Have all THP roads and landings and all appurtenant roads been correctly located and classified on the THP map?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

23. Are any exceptions or alternative practices proposed that do not meet the standards outlined in the rules for exceptions or alternative practices?

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

24. Are proposed construction methods and mitigations as described in the THP sufficient to protect resource values?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

25. Comments/general observations regarding roads and landings.

*No new roads are proposed for construction this harvest entry.*

WATERCOURSE PROTECTION

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

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*All watercourses evaluated by the review team appear to be correctly classified and described. Watercourses visited during review include A2, C2, D2, E2, F2 and H2, as well as a number of tributary class III watercourses. There were no class I watercourses identified within the proposed plan boundaries. The closest class I watercourse is Moore Creek just north of unit #370 in the northeast corner of the THP.*

27. Are there any in-lieu or alternative practices proposed that do not meet the standards outlined in the rules for in-lieu or alternative practices?

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

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

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*The RPF has mapped a number of wet areas/springs in and around the proposed plan area and has indicated in a statement under the watercourse table item #26, section II page #14 that wet areas and springs shall be protected pursuant to 14 CCR 956.3 (c) & (d) by establishing a EEZ around their perimeters. After discussion the RPF agreed to include an additional general statement discussing the range of EEZ buffers around wet areas/springs given these areas variability in relation to harvest units and roads. Recommendation #8*

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

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

- a. Are watercourse crossings to be used when water is present?

No  Yes (explain below)

30. Are winter operations appropriate?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

31. If winter operations are appropriate, are additional mitigations needed to protect the beneficial uses of water?

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

*The RPF states in the proposed plan no timber operations, except for burning of piles, shall occur during the winter period after 3 inches of total accumulated rainfall has occurred as measured at the SPI weather station on Winton Road. The RPF may chose after an extended dry rainless period to evaluate ground conditions to ensure they are dry enough and soils are not saturated. After evaluation,*

*if ground conditions do not meet the criteria of saturated soil conditions as defined under 14 CCR 895.1. The RPF shall notify the San Andreas CDF office that timber operations are going to continue. In addition, the RPF states item# 23(1), to afford extra protection all waterbarring on skid trails with moderate EHR used during the winter period shall be spaced to the high EHR standards and all tractor areas with high EHR used during the winter period shall be waterbarred to the extreme EHR standard.*

32. Have the downstream domestic water supply notification requirements been properly met (14 CCR 1032.10)?

Yes       No (explain below)       N/A

*Under item #28 (b) the RPF has requested a waiver of the notification requirements which is explained and justified on page #52 section III of the proposed plan. The only downstream timberland owner is the U.S Forest Service.*

33. Is this THP in a watershed declared "sensitive" by the Board of Forestry?

No       Yes (If yes, provide discussion below.)

34. Comments/general observations regarding watercourse protection.

*All nine projects listed under the Road Project list on page # 12 of the proposed plan were reviewed during the PHI. The RPF agreed to the following changes and recommendations during the PHI. The proposed plan narrative and maps shall be changed as needed.*

*On all projects where road rocking is specified include the phrase, rock road surface 1-3 inch drain rock, 2-3 inches deep, the width of the road. Recommendation # 9*

*Project #1- install critical dip below watercourse A2 before rocking road. Rock road for approximately 50 feet either side of crossing. Recommendation #10*

*Project #3- include RPF to designate rolling dip locations on roadway. Cleanout existing culverts and the RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 85 feet. Recommendation #11*

*Project #4- rock the outfall of the 2 newly installed culverts and the one existing 24 inch culvert with 6 inch plus misc. riprap. Recommendation # 12*

*Project #5- rock with 6 inch plus misc. riprap the existing culvert inlet to prevent bank sloughing. Recommendation # 13*

*Project #6- open the outlet of the existing 24 inch culvert so flow is not restricted and the RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 190 feet. Recommendation # 14*

*Project #7- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 150 feet. Recommendation # 15*

*Project #8- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 60 feet. In addition cleanout 2 existing 18 inch culverts on the roadway below the Shelterwood removal area in unit# 374. Recommendation # 16*

*Project #9- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 130 feet.*

Recommendation # 17

Add project #10 to the proposed plan, re-rock the existing drafting pad and install brow logs to reduce the potential of sediment delivery to the waterhole proposed for use this entry just west of unit # 368-B. Drafting pad rock shall 3inch minus to a deep of 2 to 3 inches, the width of the pad.

Recommendation # 18

Add Project # 11 to the proposed plan, cleanout the culvert inlet on the lower crossing of watercourse H2 in unit # 370. Recommendation # 19

Add project # 12 to the proposed plan, establish channel conveying watercourse B3 across roadway. In addition rock (imported or native) outfall with 6 inch plus misc. riprap to reduce the potential for headcutting. Recommendation # 20

Add project # 13 to the proposed plan, establish rocked catch basin to inlet of existing 24 inch culvert with 6 inch plus misc. riprap (imported or native). In addition re-define existing critical dip and rock outfall for approximately 15 feet with 6 inch plus misc. riprap (imported or native). Recommendation # 20

Map the 2 additional wet areas discovered during the PHI in units # 374-Shleterwood removal area and # 367. Recommendation # 21

Under item #38 section II- along the WLPZ road segment on watercourse D2 adjacent to units # 371-B and 373, dip, waterbreak and drainage facility outlets/leadouts shall either have two waddles installed as currently described or logging slash installed to reduce the potential for sediment movement off road surface. As discussed, additional waddle installation language shall be included in the discussion. Recommendation # 22

In responses to Review Team question a, this locale was not specifically reviewed during the PHI. Although during review the location was driven by a number of times nothing appeared to warrant stopping and further investigating.

In response to Review Team question c, project #1 was visited during review. The proposed mitigation to move the boulder away from the culvert inlet appears to be adequate, attempting to remove the boulder may cause more disturbance to what appears to be a functioning well rocked inlet.

GEOLOGY, EROSION HAZARD RATING & HAZARD TREATMENT

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

Yes       No (explain below)       N/A

36. Has the erosion hazard rating for soils within the operating area been correctly calculated, as per Technical Rule Addendum #1?

Yes       No (explain below)       N/A

*The erosion hazard rating (EHR) appears to have been correctly calculated for the soils, slopes, silviculture and yarding systems on the proposed plan.*

*In response to Review Team question b, the RPF stated the use of an estimated 30% protective vegetative cover remaining after harvest in both the shelterwood and sanitation/salvage areas is a worst case scenario. He calculated EHR as if the prescription areas were clearcuts. Upon review the two prescriptions will not have the same effect as a clearcut and the use of the 30% estimation seems appropriate.*

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

No  Yes (explain below)  N/A

38. Are proposed hazard reduction mitigations sufficient to prevent buildup of insect populations thus preventing the spread of disease?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

39. Will proposed hazard reduction mitigations be sufficient to reduce risk to nearby structures and provide defensible space around buildings and along roads?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

40. Comments/general observations regarding geology, EHR and hazard treatment. *none*

ARCHAEOLOGY

NOTE: IF CONFIDENTIALITY IS REQUIRED OF YOUR RESPONSE, PLEASE PROVIDE THE RESPONSE ON A SEPARATE PAGE MARKED "CONFIDENTIAL".

41. Does the RPF's archaeological survey appear adequate based upon spot checks of potentially sensitive areas?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*The CAA indicated no pre-historic or historic archaeological resources have been identified within the proposed plan area. Prior to RPF Purdy's' survey for this project, the area has been surveyed twice before by Dillon in 1991 and Struffenegger in 1999.*

42. If sites are present, are the archaeological site descriptions and/or site records accurate with regard to site size, content, and mapped location?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*SPI?  
only*

43. If sites are present, is the proposed archaeological site protection adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

44. Comments/general observations regarding archaeology.

50. Are coho salmon considerations applicable to this plan?  
 No (Go TO 59)     Yes    If yes, answer questions 51-58.  
 Explain all No and N/A responses in  
 Comments/General Observations.
51. Are proposed protection measures (zones and widths) for all watercourses adequate for the protection of coho salmon habitat?  
 Yes     No     N/A
52. Is proposed total vegetation retention in the first 25 feet of the WLPZ of the post-harvest stand sufficient to provide shade cover over watercourses and maintain water temperatures? What is the percentage of shade cover over Class I and II watercourses?  
 Percentage of Shade Cover:  
 Yes     No     Preharvest     Post Harvest
53. If water temperatures were taken during the PHI or temperature information was supplied by the RPF, is water temperature relative to coho habitat within the preferred temperature range?  
 Yes     No     N/A
54. Will the post-harvest stand in the WLPZ provide for adequate recruitment of large woody debris on Class I and II watercourses?  
 Yes     No     N/A
55. Are proposed erosion control and soil stabilization measures for the following adequate to protect coho habitat?
- Operations in the WLPZ (roads, landings, or tractor operations)?  
 Yes     No     N/A
  - Watercourse crossings (permanent and temporary)?  
 Yes     No     N/A
  - Winter operations?  
 Yes     No     N/A
  - Site preparation?  
 Yes     No     N/A
56. Are protection measures adequate to deal with adverse impacts from significant rain events, even during the non-winter period?  
 Yes     No
57. Are protection measures adequate to prevent significant adverse

impacts on downstream flows from water drafting operations?

Yes  No  N/A

58. Will chemical treatments (herbicides, pesticides, or road treatments) be applied?

No  Yes If yes, answer a.

a. Is an adequate buffer provided to assure nutrient sources are not supplied to watercourses?

Yes  No

59. Comments/general observations regarding wildlife and fisheries.

*In response to RPF-Review Team question #11, after discussion the RPF during the PHI agreed to expand the scoping process for animals (raptors) to one mile from the half mile used for the proposed plan. Based on the increased scoping radius the RPF shall include any additional species detected into the proposed plan narrative as necessary. Recommendation # 23*

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

60. Are resource assessment areas appropriate?

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A (for modified THP)

*The plan appropriately established and described the geographic assessment areas for each resource subject listed in technical rule addendum #2 (watershed, soil productivity, biological, recreation, visual, and traffic) and explained the rationale for each.*

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

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

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

Yes  No (explain below)  N/A

*It appears the RPF has accurately listed all known past and future projects within the assessment area.*

\*\*\*\*\*SECTION III\*\*\*\*\*

OTHER CONCERNS

63. Are there other concerns which are not covered under the subject areas listed above in PHI Report Items 1-62?

No  Yes (explain below)

*During the PHI SPI District Manager Ed Struffenegger handed the review team new herbicide language that he stated would now appear in all subsequently submitted plans to further clarify the timberland owners use of herbicides in reforestation. Please include this new language as part of this proposed*

*plan. Recommendation #24*

64. Was a focused PHI conducted?

No  Yes If yes, note general comments and observations below in Item 66.

**RESPONSES TO PUBLIC CONCERNS**

65. Has the public raised concerns regarding the proposed harvest? If yes, list concerns and provide responses below:

No  Yes (explain below)

66. Comments/general observations to other and public concerns. none

\*\*\*\*\*SECTION IV\*\*\*\*\*

PHI REPORT RESPONSE

Registered Professional Forester's response to the CDF preharvest inspection recommendations for:

THP or Amendment # 4-07-27/CAL-4 Date September 20, 2007

\*\*\*\*\*  
CDF RECOMMENDATIONS

TO REVIEW TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_ --In Conformance.  
\_\_\_\_\_ --Not in Conformance - Denial Recommended.  
  x   -In Conformance if Recommendations Agreed Upon.

   Yes   x   No -- PHI map attached as part of the recommendations.

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7, include the statement that NO units shall receive a herbicide pre-treatment prior to plan approval. Recommendation #1*

*Under item #38, section II include the statement that larger diameter conifer trees within the "retention areas" may be removed during harvest. Recommendation #2*

*Include a map showing the actual proposed THP harvest boundary for clarification purposes. Recommendation #3*

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7, a statement that during the application of herbicides identified sensitive plant populations shall be avoided. Also discuss the timing of application in relation to sensitive plants floristic periods. Recommendation #4*

*Under the Site Preparation addendum on pages #5-7 a statement that RPF Ostergaard will be authorized by the plan submitter to submit amendments during the life of the proposed plan. Recommendation #5*

*As agreed to by the RPF the "connector trail" between the upper and lower skids in unit # 367 shall be deleted from the THP operations map on page #26 and not used during timber operations. In addition, the upper skid trail shall be flagged out into the area with slopes < 50% for LTO recognition. Recommendation #6.*

*The RPF stated that the THP operations map on page #27 shows the one pre-flagged existing skid trail to high in unit # 368. The RPF stated he would re-map the skid trail in the proper location. Recommendation #7*

*After discussion the RPF agreed to include an additional general statement discussing the range of EEZ buffers around wet areas/springs given these areas variability in relation to harvest units, roads etc. Recommendation #8*

*On all projects where road rocking is specified include the phrase, rock road surface 1-3 inch drain rock, 2-3 inches deep, the width of the road. Recommendation # 9*

*Project #1- install critical dip below watercourse A2 before rocking road. Rock road for approximately 50 feet either side of crossing. Recommendation #10*

Project #3- include RPF to designate rolling dip locations on roadway. Cleanout existing culverts and the RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 85 feet. Recommendation #11

Project #4- rock the outfall of the 2 newly installed culverts and the one existing 24 inch culvert with 6 inch plus misc. riprap. Recommendation # 12

Project #5- rock with 6 inch plus misc. riprap the existing culvert inlet to prevent bank sloughing. Recommendation # 13

Project #6- open the outlet of the existing 24 inch culvert so flow is not restricted and the RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 190 feet. Recommendation # 14

Project #7- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 150 feet. Recommendation # 15

Project #8- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 60 feet. In addition cleanout 2 existing 18 inch culverts on the roadway below the Shelterwood removal area in unit# 374. Recommendation # 16

Project #9- RPF shall flag and/or stake road rocking distance of approximately 130 feet. Recommendation # 17

Add project #10 to the proposed plan, re-rock the existing drafting pad and install brow logs to reduce the potential of sediment delivery to the waterhole proposed for use this entry just west of unit # 368-B. Drafting pad rock shall 3inch minus to a deep of 2 to 3 inches the width of the pad. Recommendation # 18

Add Project # 11 to the proposed plan, cleanout the culvert inlet on the lower crossing of watercourse H2 in unit # 370. Recommendation # 19

Add project # 12 to the proposed plan, establish channel conveying watercourse B3 across roadway. In addition rock (imported or native) outfall with 6 inch plus misc. riprap to reduce the potential for headcutting. Recommendation # 20

Add project # 13 to the proposed plan, establish rocked catch basin to inlet of existing 24 inch culvert with 6 inch plus misc. riprap (imported or native). In addition re-define existing critical dip and rock outfall for approximately 15 feet with 6 inch plus misc. riprap (imported or native). Recommendation # 20

Map the 2 additional wet areas discovered during the PHI in units # 374-Shleterwood removal area and # 367. Recommendation # 21

Under item #38 section II- along the WLPZ road segment on watercourse D2 adjacent to units # 371-B and 373, dip, waterbreak and drainage facility outlets/leadouts shall either have two waddles installed as currently described or logging slash installed to reduce the potential for sediment movement off road surface. As discussed, addition waddle installation language shall be included in the discussion. Recommendation # 22

*In response to RPF-Review Team question #11, after discussion the RPF during the PHI agreed to expand the scoping process for animals (raptors) to one mile from the half mile used for the proposed plan. Based on the increased scoping radius the RPF shall include any additional species detected into the proposed plan narrative as necessary. Recommendation # 23*

*During the PHI SPI District Manager Ed Struffenegger handed the review team new herbicide language that he stated would now appear in all subsequent submitted plans to further clarify the timberland owners use of herbicides in reforestation. Please include this new language as part of this proposed plan. Recommendation #24*

\*\*\*\*\*

**RPF RESPONSE:**

- I agree to the above recommendation(s) and include the recommendation(s) and/or attachment(s) as part of the plan.
- I agree to the above recommendation(s) with the following exceptions: ----- as noted and explained below.
- I agree to an extension of the date of plan determination. Such extension is granted to \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
RPF Signature Date