

To: Mike Noonan, Unit Chief THP NO. 4-08-20/CAL-4 - Swamped THP

From: Candace Gregory, Southern Region Chief

Reviewed by:	<u>WDS</u>
Dist. by:	<u>W</u>
Dist. Date:	<u>10/4/08</u>
RD:	<u>TCU</u> PS
FG:	<u>2</u> TO
WO:	<u>5A</u> TLO
ARCH:	LTO
RPF:	<u>UMG</u>
INSP:	BOE
OTHER:	
FPS:	
Status:	<u>PHI</u>

*****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

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 26, 2008 FILING DATE: August 29, 2008

PHI MUST BE CONDUCTED BETWEEN FILING DATE AND September 8, 2008

DATE(s) PHI CONDUCTED: _____ INSPECTION NO: _____

PHI/DIRECTORS DETERMINATION DATE EXTENDED BY MUTUAL CONSENT: YES

REVIEW BASED UPON PREVIOUS VISIT: DATE _____

RPF: Heather Engstrom (209) 223-7170 FIELD HOURS: 12 OFFICE HOURS: 12

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)

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

- X (916)358-2301 Rhianna Lee
- (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 (559)243-4153 Bill Solinsky
- Forest Practice Manager (559)243-4114 Mike Bacca
- Archaeologist (559)243-4119 Linda Pollack
- Archaeologist (916)261-1108 Gerrit Fenenga
- X Archaeologist (916)651-2021 Tony Overly
- X Geologist (916)322-4853 Bill Short

OTHER AGENCIES: Mark Stewart, EBMUD Phone; (530) 621-4100

REVIEW 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. First review responses, with a cover page including the THP/NTMP number, date, an errata sheet for replacement pages to the plan, and the RPF of Record's Signature and RPF number, can be submitted by e-mail to FresnoReviewInbox@fire.ca.gov (The maximum size of the e-mail cannot exceed 2 MB). Failure to send a copy of these responses to the Fresno office may result in delays of THP approval.

1. Item #14(d) states harvest trees within the selection and fuelbreak shall be marked with blue paint above and below the stump. Please also state "which is visible from two sides" as per 14 CCR 895.1 definition of Marking.
2. As stated in Section III on page 58 under Addendum to Item #28(b) a meeting with the only downstream landowner within 1,000 feet was held and there was confirmation that there are no known domestic water uses. Please revise Item #28(b) on page 15 to indicate "Yes", and remove the last line starting with "however, notification" on page 58. Additional, please revise page 146 to state "This Page Is Intentionally Left Blank".
3. Item #31 provides for treatment of logging slash within 50 feet of all mapped seasonal roads as per 14 CCR 957.2(b), and the definition for "Lopping (For the Southern Forest District)" is stated. Please also include the 14 CCR 895.1 definition of "Lopping for Fire Hazard Reduction" as both are applicable.
4. Under Listed Plant Species of Item #32 on page 17 indicates that if species are observed that a consultation will be initiated with DFG. Please also state that CAL FIRE will be notified if listed plant species are observed in the THP.
5. In Section III the plans states on page 56 that the entire THP area has been classified as site I timberlands. As per 14 CCR 1034(X)(12), please indicate on the Silviculture Maps on page 36 through 38 that the entire THP area is site I timberlands.
6. As per 14 CCR 952.9, under Past and Future Activities of Technical Rule Addendum No. 2, past and future projects included in the cumulative impacts assessments shall be described as defined in 14 CCR 895.1 within described resource assessment areas. You have provided past and future projects within the Watershed Assessment Area (WAA), but not for the other resource assessments areas. Please provide this project information for all of the assessment areas.

The past projects under the ownership of the Timberland Owner within the BAA are shown on the Past Silviculture Maps on Pages 136 through 140. A table for the Biological Assessment Area (BAA) similar to the WAA table may be helpful in discussing past, present and future projects within the BAA.

Each resource assessment area should have at least a discussion identifying projects, if any, and how they have been considered. Please note that projects are not limited to only THPs, but includes all publicly permitted projects (state, fed, county, city). Other land disturbing activities in the assessment area should also be disclosed (subdivisions, highway construction etc). Also, remember to consider present and future publicly permitted projects, not just past projects.

7. The Past Silviculture Map on page 136 identifies a project as 4-08-113/CAL, which is incorrect. The correct location of 4-098-113 is shown on page 137. Please revise this past THP as 4-01-38/CAL.
8. Appendix Technical Rule Addendum #2 of 14 CCR 952.9 states in evaluating cumulative impacts, the RPF shall consider the factors set forth herein. Impacts to watershed resources within the Watershed Assessment Area (WAA) shall be evaluated based on significant on-site and off-site cumulative effects on beneficial uses of water, as defined and listed in applicable Water Quality Control Plans. Please describe the beneficial uses of the Mokelumne River in Section IV.

The beneficial uses of water for this system are described in Chapters 1 through 5 at the following web site:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water issues/basin plans](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water%20issues/basin%20plans)

9. In Section IV on page 122 the plan states that the "use of herbicides could occur anywhere from preharvest to ten years post harvest", and on page 123 provides to possibility to use herbicides "as a preharvest treatment". Please describe the timing, application, and type of herbicides if used prior to harvest.
10. The cover page for Section VI indicates "Squiggly THP" on page 170. Please revise to indicate "Swamped THP".
11. *Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone (WLPZ) Protection Measures - Section II, Item 26(d), page 13:* The details of any work within the bed, bank, or channel of a stream or has the potential to impact a stream immediately downstream would require being included in the 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) notification, including the details of water drafting activities, as they have the potential to impact aquatic resources. Please include the details of all work in any stream exhibiting the above jurisdictional criteria and for all potential water drafting locations that will be used for timber operations. The DFG will review all locations to determine if they need to be included in the LSAA to minimize potential impacts to less than significant. (DFG #1)

12. A 1600 LSAA notification application (1600 notification application pages 22-34) was received by the Department of Fish and Game on August 25, 2008 included within the THP pursuant to Fish and Game Code 1611. This THP review process is to be used to meet the DFG CEQA review requirements under Fish and Game Code 1611.

In order for the DFG to begin the process of issuing a LSAA, the following shall occur:

- o Send payment covering all the fees associated with the LSAA to:

Department of Fish and Game
1600 Program
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, California 95670

- o Include a copy of Items 1-13 of the THP with the payment.

Once the DFG has received payment for the projects associated with the 1611, the timeline for issuing a LSAA to the applicant will begin. In general, the applicant should receive a draft agreement within 90 days after the receipt of fees. Upon notification that CalFire has approved the THP and all LSAA feed have been received, the DFG will finalize the LSAA. Any work described as part of the 1611 notification is not authorized to begin until the applicant has received the final agreement. (DFG #2)

Visit the LSAA section of the DFG website at www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600 for further guidance with this process, review of the 1600 code, and understanding of timelines.

13. *Biological and Cultural Resources - Section II, Item 32(a), page 15:* Item 32(a) indicates that there are listed animal species (and their habitat) associated with the THP area. A general search using the USFS database, the CNDDDB and other DFG databases identified that there is the potential for the following other listed species, in addition to the northern goshawk and the species listed in the Chapter IV cumulative impacts assessment:

American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) SE - delisted
California wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) ST
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog (*Rana sierrae*) CEQA 15380
(DFG #3)

14. Additionally, a great gray owl occurrence (ST), CAL0005, was identified in Section 16, T6N, R15E, within 1-mile of a harvest area. Update the THP to include this occurrence in the listed species scoping and assessment sections. (DFG #4)

15. Please identify whether there is suitable habitat within or adjacent to the plan area for all of these species that were identified and if so, describe the methods that will be used to determine presence or absence. Additionally, if habitat is present, describe the measures that will be used to minimize potential impacts to less than significant if the species are identified during operations, if those measures have not yet been described and included in the THP. (DFG #5)
16. *Biological and Cultural Resources - Section II, Item 32(b), page 15*: Item 32(b) indicates that non-listed animal species associated with the THP will not be significantly impacted. Please provide a scoping list of non-listed species of special concern status that have the potential to occur within the plan area (a 9-quad search would be preferred), describe whether there is suitable habitat present, and provide justification of why there will not be no significant impacts by operations. Disclosing the reasoning and practice of avoiding significant impacts to the species will reduce the potential for them to become listed. (DFG #6)
17. *Biological and Cultural Resources - Section II, Item 32(b), page 16*: Northern goshawks and California spotted owls are known to have nesting territories that average a 1-mile radius. Scoping for these species for potential significant impacts by operations, therefore, needs to include all known occurrences within 1-mile of the harvest areas. Please update the scoping distance under Focused Surveys and include any occurrences that are within 1-mile of a harvest area in this section. (DFG #7)
18. New road construction projects 10 through 13 are described on page 12. To facilitate review, please include a general discussion of road construction methods (e.g. "...outsloped with rolling dips appropriate for x EHR... fill placed in lifts of less than 1-foot...") for the proposed seasonal road (project 13), and general slope conditions (e.g. "the road crosses slopes that range from x% to y%") in the area of each of the proposed road construction projects. (CGS #1)
19. Send a second notice to the Native Americans. (ARCH #1)
20. Provide the name of the current archaeological surveyor. (ARCH #2)
21. Note: The Archaeological Site Maps have the word "Archaeological" spelled wrong in both the legend and map title. (ARCH #3)

CDF Inspector - respond to the following questions:

- a. Please evaluate the proposed Fuelbreak project for compliance with the objectives of the Community Fuelbreak Area as required by 14 CCR 953.4(c).
- b. Please evaluate the amount of oaks and snags present in the pre-harvest stands and the potential impacts to wildlife within the assessment areas in regards to reduction of vertical habitat structure.
- c. *Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone (WLPZ) Protection Measures - Section II, Item 26(d), page 13:* The locations of work proposed within the bed, bank, or channel of a stream (including water drafting sites) that would require to be included in the 1600 LSAA notification will be reviewed at the PHI to determine if the work needs to be included within the agreement as a project to minimize potential adverse impacts. (DFG #1)
- d. Please contact Rhianna Lee (rlee@dfg.ca.gov) at (916)358-2301 to Schedule a mutually agreeable PHI date.
- e. Please contact Chris Cochrane (cmcochrane@waterboards.ca.gov) at (530) 621-4100 to schedule a Mutually Agreeable PHI date.
- f. Please contact East Bay MUD Representative Mark Stewart at (916)464-4820 (mark@stewartforestry.com) to schedule a Mutually Agreeable PHI date.
- g. Please notify Bill Short (Bill.Short@conservation.ca.gov) at (916) 322-4853 of the PHI date.
- h. Please notify Cal Fire Archaeologist Tony Overly at (916) 651-2021 (Tony.Overly@fire.ca.gov) of the PHI date.
- i. Please notify Bill Solinsky at (559) 243-4153 of the PHI date.

/s/ Solinsky

4-08-20/CAL-4 - Swamped THP

FROM: Mike Noonan Unit Chief

*****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?
x	/	/	/	/	-Erosion control adequate?
x	/	/	/	/	-THP map and addenda accurate?
/	/	/	/	x	-Are domestic water supplies adequately protected?
/	/	x	/	/	-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

During the PHI weather conditions were partly sunny and warm with temperatures in the low to mid 70's.

2. a. Personnel attending the preharvest inspection were:

<i>Thomas Tinsley</i>	<i>CALFIRE-Area Forester</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Tony Overly</i>	<i>CALFIRE-Arch</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Ed Struffenegger</i>	<i>SPI-Dist. Manager</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Heather Engstrom</i>	<i>SPI-Forester</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Steve Self</i>	<i>SPI-Biologist</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Daniel DeArmond</i>	<i>SPI-Forester</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Rhianna Lee</i>	<i>DFG</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>
<i>Mark Stewart</i>	<i>EBMUD Rep.</i>	<i>Sept. 26, 2008</i>

b. Personnel contacted regarding the preharvest inspection:

<i>Bill Short</i>	<i>CGS</i>	<i>via email</i>
<i>Bill Solinsky</i>	<i>CALFIRE Fresno</i>	<i>via email</i>
<i>Chris Cochran</i>	<i>WQ</i>	<i>via email</i>
<i>Tim Nosal</i>	<i>DFG</i>	<i>via email</i>

3. Was Notice of Intent properly posted at timber harvesting plan site (14 CCR 1032.7)?

Yes No (explain below)

The Notice of Intent to Harvest and general vicinity map were posted on a stump next to the old Swamp Creek waterhole on Forest Service road 7N08. U.S.F.S 7N08 (Blue Mountain Rd.) is a well traveled road during the summer and fall months.

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 (3500 to 5600 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 on page #54, 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 per acre: ponderosa pine 36%, white fir 50%, sugar pine 10%, Douglas-fir 0%, incense cedar 66%, and other hardwoods primarily scattered black oaks and white alders along many of the streamcourses less than 2%. These percentages appear to be accurate based on field review. During field review very few oaks were observed. As a stand component oaks distribution is scattered and limited due to the proposed plans elevation, SPI indicated 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.

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)

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

The proposed timber harvest plan, plans to harvest 424 acres (24 units ranging in size from 8 to 20 acres) using the clearcut method.

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

9 acres are proposed for harvest using the selection method. All 9 acres are within the WLPZ of class II watercourses.

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.

In addition to the clearcut and selection silvicultural methods, the plan proposes to create 116 acres of shaded fuelbreak on the prominent ridge system which runs northeast to southwest between the Swamp Creek and South Fork of the Mokelumne River drainages. In response to RTQ a, after evaluation it does appear the fuelbreak shall meet the objectives pursuant to 14 CCR 953.4(c).

During the PHI SPI RPF Engstrom requested a waiver of marking for the fuelbreak beyond the sample mark which was reviewed. The sample mark appears to meet the objectives of a Community Fuelbreak area. Harvest trees have been marked in blue.

The RPF shall change the response to item #14 (d), section II of the proposed plan, from no to YES. In addition the RPF shall include language which will describe to the LTO which trees shall be harvested or retained, and how the fuelbreak area boundaries will be determined. Please include the marking waiver language handed to the review team during the PHI. Recommendation # 1

The review team also requested the RPF call the local CALFIRE units' Pre Fire Engineer (PFE) to determine if the proposed fuelbreak is part of an existing cooperative fuelbreak system or if not is it appropriate given the local CALFIRE units' fire plan. The PFE in TCU is Mr. Bruce Lodge, 754-3831. Recommendation # 2

The RPF agreed to remove the sentence under item #14 (d) which discusses "no harvest" groups. Recommendation # 3

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

The sample mark in the selection areas observed during the field evaluation indicate leave trees shall be uniformly distributed throughout.

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

See the proposed plan's site preparation addendum on pages # 5 & 6, section II. 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.

Under section III of the proposed plan the RPF states, "In an effort to achieve maximum sustainable production of high quality timber products across the ownership, as much land as feasible has been brought back into production through site preparation activities. These areas are either open, contain a high density of undesirable brush species, or environmental conditions have resulted in low forest growth results. Some of these areas are adjacent to Clearcut units. Site Preparation activities of these low production areas will likely take place simultaneously with site preparation activity of the associated nearby Clearcut unit."

The review team (CALFIRE) requested and the RPF agreed to notify the local inspector via letter with an accompanying map when and where this activity is to or may occur. As was discussed this is not timber operations under the proposed plan, and as such the notification would not require an

amendment to the plan. The RPF shall include the approximate additional acreage outside of the acreage identified in the proposed plan for the even-aged unit to be site prepped. Recommendation # 4

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 953.2 (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:

*WLPZ-Selection along watercourse B2 in units # 2946 & 2957 and G2 in unit #281.
Community Fuelbreak northwest of unit #265.*

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

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

- 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

21. Comments/general observations regarding harvesting operations.

The RPF agreed during the PHI to delete the reference to cable yarding on page #19, item #38 of section II of the proposed plan. Recommendation #5

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.

As described on page# 11, under item #25 section II of the proposed plan the RPF proposes to construct one new seasonal road segment approximately 1200 feet in length and three temporary road spurs to facilitate logging in even-aged units # 1989, 2239 and 2957. During the PHI 3 of the 4 road segments were reviewed. The entire length of the proposed new seasonal road adjacent to even-aged unit #265

was walked. The flagged road appeared to have good alignment, had gradients between 10 and 15%, did not cross any drainages and follows an old skid trail for most of its proposed length.

After discussion during field review the RPF agreed in response to first RTQ #18 to include the approximate side slope gradient (%) for the proposed new road construction segment and a brief general discussion of road construction. Recommendation # 6

During the PHI the RPF agreed to delete the seasonal road depicted on the THP maps below even-aged unit # 265. As mentioned above, it appears this is an old skid trail. It is waterbarred, covered with vegetation and is not drivable. Recommendation # 7

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 B1 (WLPZ road segments along Swamp Creek) B2, E2, G2, and H2 as well as a number of tributary class III watercourses L3 and O3.

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

No in-lieu practices were proposed.

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

See recommendation below under item # 34.

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

See recommendation below under item # 34.

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

No Yes (explain below) N/A

See recommendation below under item # 34.

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

Yes No (explain below) N/A

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

No Yes (If yes, provide discussion below.)

The proposed plan is located entirely within the Swamp Creek watershed, CALWATER 2.2 ID# 6532.600802.

34. Comments/general observations regarding watercourse protection.

During the PHI the review team evaluated WLPZ road segments # 2, 3, 4, 5 & 8. Based on the proximity of a number of the road segments to the watercourse and the location and condition of a number of existing drainage facilities, the RPF agreed to the following recommendations:

The proposed plan shall include three general statements which pertain to all WLPZ road segments.

All drainage facilities either existing or installed after timber operations shall have the leadouts back bladed. No leadouts shall be pushed out, resulting in potentially perched material which may enter the adjacent watercourse. Recommendation #8

All drainage facilities either existing or installed after timber operations shall have straw bales (cut open) or waddles placed in their leadouts to reduce the potential for the delivery of sediment. Recommendation # 9

No log haul shall occur on any WLPZ road segments during the Winter operating period. Recommendation # 10

On WLPZ road segment # 2 all existing drainage facilities shall be re-established regardless of road use. Recommendation # 11 During the PHI it was discussed that there would be no log haul over WLPZ road segment # 2, based on the construction of temporary road (project # 11 into unit # 1989). All timber shall be skidded uphill away from the lower road.

The RPF shall map the Swamp Creek waterhole on the appropriate THP maps. Recommendation # 12

The RPF shall change the WLPZ #8 identifier on page #42 of the proposed plan from WMPZ to WLPZ. Recommendation # 13

Projects 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 & 13 listed under the Road Project list on pages # 11 & 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. Recommendation # 14

Project # 2 shall have a rolling dip installed above the class III watercourse. The head cut on the downhill side shall be filled in with material found on site and the outlet of the discussed overside drain shall be rip-rapped to the same specifications as an installed culvert outlet.

Project # 3 (unstable area # 5) the discussion shall be changed to include the placement of ultra blocks instead of K rail for stabilization purposes. The ultra blocks shall be "keyed" into the road prism a minimum of 6 inches. The last 3 ultra blocks (approximately 15 feet) from the beginning of the inside ditch to be pulled shall have riprap placed behind them approximately three feet wide/back to act as a "French" drain to facilitate conveying water seepage towards the ditch and away from the seasonal road. All spoils/debris removed from road prism shall be end-hauled to a location outside the WLPZ.

Project # 6 (unstable area # 1) change the narrative to say "fillslope failure" not cutbank failure. In addition, a rolling dip shall be installed on the east side of the road segment identified for rocking. The road rock shall extend up and over the rolling dip installed.

Project # 7 narrative shall changed to include a rocked critical dip below the installation of a 48 inch culvert. The seasonal road shall be rocked 15 feet either side of the culvert/streamcourse centerline. The "washout" shall be filled in with non-organic material found on-site. The toe of the fill placed in the washout shall have large rock available on-site keyed in to help stabilize the fill and reduce the potential of movement. Please include a new project #7 drawing and include the same project description in the DFG 1600 application.

Project # 8 include the waterholes' dimensions in the project description, approx. 50x8x8 and a drawing of project site. After evaluation DFG concluded this is a 1600 application project, include the project description in the DFG 1600 application.

Project # 9 change the project drawing on page # 34 of the proposed plan to indicate the installation of a rolling dip not critical dip.

In response to RTQ c, the review team evaluated those project locations which potentially would require 1600 notification during the PHI. The RPF stated and DFG concurred that the two had been in discussion about whether there is a need to include the drafting of water in the 1600 agreement. Both stated it is an on-going discussion that to date had not fully been resolved. CALFIRE recommended the two continue discussion and just keep both the local inspector and the Fresno review team abreast of their discussions.

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.

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.

The proposed plan identified five unstable areas, two of which were reviewed during the PHI. Unstable areas U1 & U5 were evaluated, both were part of projects reviewed. See above the recommendations to proposed projects # 3 & 6. The remaining three identified unstable areas U2, U3 & U4 are not in close proximity to proposed harvest units.

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

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

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.

See attached report from CALFIRE Archaeologist Tony Overly which includes PHI recommendations.

WILDLIFE, FISHERIES, AND PLANTS

45. Are any state or federal (T&E) listed species or habitat present in the THP area?

No Yes (explain below)

Under item #32 section II the RPF indicates that yes known listed species or their habitat is present on the proposed plan area. The RPF discusses the three known sightings of a northern goshawk within a mile of proposed operations. Of these only one sighting is a documented nest site as indicated in the proposed plan. Item #32 section II of the proposed plan discusses survey protocol and protection measures for the goshawk as well as non-listed species.

The RPF states, there are known occurrences of Calochortus clavatus var. avius within the biological assessment area (BAA) and that suitable habitat for an additional six plant species does exist within or adjacent to the THP boundary. Sierra Pacific industries botanical scoping process is described in detail in the Biological section of the Cumulative Impacts Assessment (CIA)

46. Is a CESA or FESA consultation required? If questionable, contact DFG for assistance.

No Yes (explain below)

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

Yes No If not, discuss and list recommendations below:

Under item #32 on pages #15 through 18 the RPF describes listed species, their habitat, and SPI company survey protocol when listed and non-listed raptors are discovered during timber operations. In addition, accurate descriptions of listed species and habitats can be found in the Biological section of the Cumulative Impacts Assessment, pages # 97 through 116 in section IV.

48. Is late successional forest present on this THP (14 CCR 959.16)?

No Yes (explain below)

49. If late successional forest is present and proposed for harvesting, will such harvest significantly reduce the amount and distribution of late succession forest stands, or their functional wildlife habitat value so it constitutes a significant adverse impact of the environment as defined in Section 895.1?

No Yes (explain below) N/A

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?

- a. Operations in the WLPZ (roads, landings, or tractor operations)?

Yes No N/A

- b. Watercourse crossings (permanent and temporary)?

Yes No N/A

- c. Winter operations?

Yes No N/A

- d. 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.

The review team during the PHI requested the RPF's responses to first review team questions (RTQ) DFG # 13 & 14 be included in the proposed plan where appropriate. Recommendation # 15

In response to RTQ b, as stated above oaks have a very limited distribution within the proposed plan and upper reaches of the Swamp Creek watershed. Lower down in the watershed oaks are more prevalent. Within the assessment area as a whole the impacts to wildlife, specifically the vertical habitat structure present, should be negatively impacted by the proposed harvest.

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)

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)

The Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC) has submitted a letter of Concern dated September 7, 2008. The letter covers a number of concerns pertaining to resource values and treatment options which include, silviculture, oak resources, impacts to deer, pacific fisher, at-risk wildlife and watershed resources.

Oak resources: Under question #35 of section II the RPF describes how oaks shall be retained in retention areas and individually within even-aged units. The plan also states very few Black oaks exist within the proposed plan boundaries. Based on field observations this appears to be correct. A few oaks were observed scattered through the assessment area realizing that the proposed THP extends the length of the Swamp Creek watershed and elevations only increases to the east to areas outside the normal distribution of forest-zone hardwoods. It does not appear oaks are a limiting factor to the

presence of wildlife species.

Deer range: The proposed plan should promote a mosaic of vegetation, an increase in forbs, grasses and herbaceous shrubs and enhance forest edge attributes when compared to the existing pre-harvest conditions. This created condition in conjunction with oak retention standards should potentially enhance the area as useable deer habitat.

Special status species: The plan addresses both the California spotted owl and the Northern goshawk.

At-risk wildlife:

Additional public comment was received from the Center for Biological Diversity.

66. Comments/general observations to other and public concerns.

*****SECTION IV*****

PHI REPORT RESPONSE

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

THP or Amendment # 4-08-020/CAL-4 Date 10/3/2008

CDF RECOMMENDATIONS _____ -- In Conformance.
TO REVIEW TEAM: _____ -- Not in Conformance - Denial Recommended.
 x -- In Conformance if Recommendations Agreed

Upon.

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

The RPF shall change the response to item #14 (d), section II of the proposed plan, from no to YES. In addition the RPF shall include language which will describe to the LTO which trees shall be harvested or retained, and how the fuelbreak area boundaries will be determined. Please include the marking waiver language handed to the review team during the PHI. Recommendation # 1

The review team also requested the RPF call the local CALFIRE units' Pre Fire Engineer (PFE) to determine if the proposed fuelbreak is part of an existing cooperative fuelbreak system or if not is it appropriate given the local CALFIRE units' fire plan. The PFE in TCU is Mr. Bruce Lodge, 754-3831. Recommendation # 2

The RPF agreed to remove the sentence under item #14 (d) which discusses "no harvest" groups. Recommendation # 3

The review team (CALFIRE) requested and the RPF agreed to notify the local inspector via letter with an accompanying map when and where this activity is to or may occur. As was discussed this is not timber operations under the proposed plan, and as such the notification would not require an amendment to the plan. The RPF shall include the approximate additional acreage outside of the acreage identified in the proposed plan for the even-aged unit to be site prepped. Recommendation # 4

The RPF agreed during the PHI to delete the reference to cable yarding on page #19, item #38 of section II of the proposed plan. Recommendation #5

After discussion during field review the RPF agreed in response to first RTQ #18 to include the approximate side slope gradient (%) for the proposed new road construction segment and a brief general discussion of road construction. Recommendation # 6

During the PHI the RPF agreed to delete the seasonal road depicted on the THP maps below even-aged unit # 265. As mentioned above, it appears this is an old skid trail. It is waterbarred, covered with vegetation and is not drivable. Recommendation # 7

All drainage facilities either existing or installed after timber operations shall have the leadouts back bladed. No leadouts shall be pushed out, resulting in potentially perched material which may enter the adjacent watercourse. Recommendation # 8

All drainage facilities either existing or installed after timber operations shall have straw bales (cut

open) or waddles placed in their leadouts to reduce the potential for the delivery of sediment.

Recommendation # 9

No log haul shall occur on any WLPZ road segments during the Winter operating period.

Recommendation # 10

On WLPZ road segment # 2 all existing drainage facilities shall be re-established regardless of road use. Recommendation # 11 During the PHI it was discussed that there would be no log haul over WLPZ road segment # 2, based on the construction of temporary road (project # 11 into unit # 1989). All timber shall be skidded uphill away from the lower road.

The RPF shall map the Swamp Creek waterhole on the appropriate THP maps. Recommendation # 12

The RPF shall change the WLPZ #8 identifier on page #42 of the proposed plan from WMPZ to WLPZ. Recommendation # 13

Projects 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 & 13 listed under the Road Project list on page # 11 & 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. Recommendation # 14

Project # 2 shall have a rolling dip installed the class III watercourse. The head cut on the downhill side shall be filled in with material found on site and the outlet of the discussed overside drain shall be rip-rapped to the same specifications as an installed culvert outlet.

Project # 3 (unstable area # 5) the discussion shall be changed to include the placement of ultra blocks instead of K rail for stabilization purposes. The ultra blocks shall be "keyed" into the road prism a minimum of 6 inches. The last 3 ultra blocks (approximately 15 feet) from the beginning of the inside ditch to be pulled shall have riprap placed behind them approximately three feet wide/back to act as a "French" drain to facilitate conveying water seepage towards the ditch and away from the seasonal road. All spoils/debris removed from road prism shall be end-hauled to a location outside the WLPZ.

Project # 6 (unstable area # 1) change the narrative to say "fillslope failure" not cutbank failure. In addition, a rolling dip shall be installed on the east side of the road segment identified for rocking. The road rock shall extend up and over the rolling dip installed.

Project # 7 narrative shall changed to include a rocked critical dip below the installation of a 48 inch culvert. The seasonal road shall be rocked 15 feet either side of the culvert/streamcourse centerline. The "washout" shall be filled in with non-organic material found on-site. The toe of the fill placed in the washout shall have large rock available on-site keyed in to help stabilize the fill and reduce the potential of movement. Please include a new project #7 drawing and include the same project description in the DFG 1600 application.

Project # 8 include the waterholes' dimensions in the project description, approx. 50x8x8 and a drawing of project site. After evaluation DFG concluded this is a 1600 application project, include the project description in the DFG 1600 application.

Project # 9 change the project drawing on page # 34 of the proposed plan to indicate the installation of a rolling dip not critical dip.

The review team during the PHI requested the RPF's responses to first review team questions (RTQ)

DFG # 13 & 14 be included in the proposed plan where appropriate. Recommendation # 15

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