

**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION**

1234 East Shaw Avenue
FRESNO, CA 93710-7899
(559) 243-4100
Website: www.fire.ca.gov

**FOREST PRACTICE
HARVEST PLAN DOCUMENTATION****ORIGINAL VERSION OF
RESPONSIBLE AGENCY
FIRST REVIEW TEAM QUESTIONS
CGS, WQ, DFG**

The attached documents are copies of original questions submitted by the California Geological Survey (CGS), Regional Water Quality Control Boards (WQ), Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and/or other Responsible Agency Review Team members as part of the First Review process. 14CCR 1037.5 and 14CCR 1090.19

In some cases, revisions to original questions are made by the submitting agency and/or the CDF Review Team Chair. Reasons for revisions include, but are not limited to, spelling and grammar, clarity, identification of potential significant impact, and/or identification of statutory authority.

The submitting agency representative is contacted regarding changes to his/her question(s) except for grammar and/or spelling. The timing of this contact depends upon review schedules, staffing, availability of the submitter, etc. If contact occurs prior to filing a plan, the First Review Team Chair and the submitter, working under the authority of the Forest Practice Rules, revise the question. This may include deleting the question, or combining it with another question similarly asked. If contact is not possible prior to filing, the Review Team Chair notifies the representative, informing him/her of the change and clarifying that if unacceptable, their concerns can be raised during the review process.

CONSERVATION IS WISE—KEEP CALIFORNIA GREEN AND GOLDEN

PLEASE REMEMBER TO CONSERVE ENERGY. FOR TIPS AND INFORMATION, VISIT "FLEX YOUR POWER" AT WWW.CA.GOV.

Solinsky, Bill

From: Short, Bill [Bill.Short@conservation.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 4:34 PM
To: Fresno Review Team; Solinsky, Bill; Bacca, Mike
Subject: 1st Review: THP 4-09-03/CAL-1; NTMP 4-09NTMP-03/ELD; Amendment #6 to THP 4-07-28/ELD-16
Attachments: 20090519_1st RTTentList.pdf

Fresno Review Team –

CGS offers the following 1st Review questions and comments on the referenced THP, NTMP, and THP Amendment:

THP 4-09-03/CAL-1

- Please notify CGS of the PHI for this THP.

NTMP 4-09NTMP-03/ELD

- No questions or comments.

THP 4-07-28/ELD-16, Amendment #6

- No questions or comments.

Regards, Bill Short

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This message contains information from the State of California, California Geological Survey, which may be privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

RECEIVED

MAY 19 2009

SOUTHERN REGION HEADQUARTERS
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board



Timber Harvest – First Review

THP NUMBER: 4-09-003 Cal (Sugar Spring)

FIRST REVIEW DATE: May 18, 2009

REVIEW PERSON: DDH for MH

PHI STATUS:

- Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time
- Notify of PHI date and time
- Do Not Notify

CONTACT:

- Angela Wilson (530) 224-4856 or awilson@waterboards.ca.gov
- Debra Hallis (530) 224-4801 or dhallis@waterboards.ca.gov
- Marty Hartzell (916) 464-4630 or mhartzell@waterboards.ca.gov
- Anthony Toto (559) 445-6278 or atoto@waterboards.ca.gov

Review Team: The Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for the protection and restoration of the beneficial uses of water in the Central Valley as delineated in the Clean Water Act and the California Water Code. All Timber Harvest Plans that are received by the Regional Board are screened for potential threat to water quality. If the “Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time” line is selected above, Regional Board staff has determined, based upon professional judgment, that the referenced plan has the potential to impact the beneficial uses of water quality due to the following operational proposals:

	Type of Silviculture
	Degree of Site Preparation
	Yarding Methods
	Erosion Hazard Rating
X	Ground-based Equipment Operations
X	Winter Operations
X	Road and Landing Construction and/or Reconstruction
X	Class I, II, III, IV or Domestic Supply
X	WLPZ In-lieu Operations

If the “Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time” line is selected above Regional Board staff hereby request participation in the interdisciplinary review team process for this THP, and that a mutually agreeable PHI date and time be scheduled.

Questions for RPF:

Page 15, 25, 64 (WLPZ roads): WLPZ roads are mapped on page 25 and described on pages 15 & 64, but Item 27 is checked “no” for all responses. Please clarify.

Questions for CDF:

Memorandum

Date: May 20, 2009

To: Review Team Chair
Resource Management
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
1234 East Shaw Ave.
Fresno, CA 93710-7899

RECEIVED

MAY 20 2009

From: Department of Fish and Game
North Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

SOUTHERN REGION HEADQUARTERS
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Subject: Department of Fish and Game (DFG) First Review Comments

4-09-003-CAL, Sugar Springs THP
Daniel DeArmond, RPF #2855

Rhianna Lee rllee@dfg.ca.gov, and Tim Nosal tnosal@dfg.ca.gov, DFG, request a mutually agreeable PHI date for this THP. For questions regarding these comments, please contact Rhianna Lee at (916) 358-2301 and Tim Nosal at (916) 358-2853.

Questions/Comments to the RPF:

Information to be provided prior to the PHI

Section II, Item 26(d), Page 9: This section is checked no in regards to requiring a FGC 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement which would also require information for the 1602 or 1611 notification process. Will water drafting occur on or within the plan area within DFG jurisdiction? If so, the following information for each site at the point of diversion is requested to be included for each water hole if the RPF chooses to use the THP for the purpose of FGC §1611 Notification:

1. Volume of water to be diverted or drafted, intended use, and equipment to be used.
2. Type and density of vegetation to be affected and an estimate of the area involved.
3. A diagram or sketch of the location that clearly indicates the stream drainage.
4. A description of the period of time in which operations will be carried out.

The DFG recommends that a complete detailed description of the water drafting activities be provided, including rationale and provisions that will be implemented that would minimize the potential for substantial adverse effects to the bed, bank or channel of the stream. Such potential effects include sedimentation, equipment petroleum contamination, and direct or indirect impacts to aquatic species (including potential for dewatering downstream habitats). This description will allow the DFG to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required for the water drafting activities.

Biological Scoping, Section II, Item 32(a), Page 12: The table of occurrences under the raptor section does not specify the species as California spotted owl.

Biological Scoping, Section II, Item 32(a), Page 12: What measures will be taken if a listed mammal species is discovered during timber operations?

Section II, Item 32 (a), Page 12 and Section IV: Scoping tools identify an occurrence of great gray owl (*Strix nebulosa*) within the vicinity of the plan area. Please specify if habitat occurs within the biological assessment area and include rationale that addresses this species in plan scoping in terms of likelihood of impacts.

Section II, Item 32 (b), Page 12 and Section IV: Measures for non-listed raptors are included in this section. What species of non-listed raptors have been identified as having the potential to occur within the plan area?

Section II, Item 32 (b), Page 12 and Section IV: Several non-listed, special concern species were identified as having the potential to occur within the plan area. These include fringed myotis, hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), long-legged myotis, and silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), all DFG species of special concern or watch list species. Please include rationale that addresses why these non-listed species will not be adversely impacted during operation or cumulative projects. What measures will be implemented if any maternal sites of these species are discovered during operations?

Section II, Item 32 (b), Page 12 and Section III: The Pacific fisher (*Martes pennanti*) is included in this section. Does the fisher have the potential to be impacted during timber harvest operations? Please discuss the habitat requirements of fisher, the known and historic range, potential to occur within the project area, potential impacts or threats including supporting rationale, and proposed mitigation if impacts are identified to have the potential to occur.

Cumulative Impacts Assessment, Section IV, Page 75: Although the plan does include a discussion of the general habitat for Pacific fisher, it does not discuss the potential for impacts to species and essential habitat elements in relation to the biological assessment area. The DFG recommends that the assessment for cumulative impacts for fisher address suitable denning, resting, and foraging habitat for fisher. A thorough analysis should include a detailed description of the presence and distribution of snags, den and potential nest trees, presence of hardwoods, and large woody debris in its current condition on the THP and within the Biological Assessment Area (generally hardwoods ≥ 16 inches dbh, conifers ≥ 32 inches dbh with wildlife habitat structure, snags ≥ 16 inches dbh, and large woody debris ≥ 16 inches). Significant barriers to movement (e.g. large areas of little or no canopy cover, terrain features, and anthropogenic features) should also be addressed. Post-project conditions should demonstrate that the habitat features above will be maintained, increased, or not significantly reduced or fragmented, as the plan is within the historic range of the fisher.

Questions for Review Team Chair:

None at this time.

Agency Questions to be addressed at PHI:

None at this time.

cc: THP File

ec: Mss. Lorna Dobrovolny, Sandra Jacks, Rhianna Lee
Messrs. Dave Richter, Tim Nosal
Department of Fish and Game
North Central Region

ldobrovolny@dfg.ca.gov
sjacks@dfg.ca.gov
rlee@dfg.ca.gov
drichter@dfg.ca.gov
tnosal@dfg.ca.gov

Messrs. Mike Bacca, William Solinsky
Fresno Review Team
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

FresnoReviewTeam@fire.ca.gov