

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PHI REPORT

THE RESOURCES AGENCY

To: Mike Noonan, Unit Chief THP NO. 4-08-05/CAL-1 Squiggly THP

From: Candace Gregory, Southern Region Chief

Reviewed by	<u>WAS</u>
Dist. by	<u>CA</u>
Dist. Date:	<u>5/10</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RPT	PS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PG 2	TO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ST	TLO
ARCH	LTO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RPF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OMD
INSP	BOE
OTHER:	
FPS	
Status:	<u>PHI</u>

*****SECTION I*****

Review Team Recommendations:

- PHI - 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: March 18, 2008 FILING DATE: March 21, 2008

PHI MUST BE CONDUCTED BETWEEN FILING DATE AND March 31, 2008

DATE(s) PHI CONDUCTED: April, 28 & 29, 2008 INSPECTION NO: 1

PHI/DIRECTORS DETERMINATION DATE EXTENDED BY MUTUAL CONSENT: YES

REVIEW BASED UPON PREVIOUS VISIT: DATE NO

RPF: Frank Mulhair (209) 223-7170 FIELD HOURS: _____ OFFICE HOURS: _____

 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
- (916)464-4820 Chris Cochrane
- (559)445-6278 Anthony Toto

- (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:

- 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
- Archaeologist (916) Tony Overly
- Geologist (916)322-4853 Bill Short
- Geologist (916)327-2903 John Schlosser

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

4-08-05/CAL-1 Squiggly THPFirst Review Date: March 18, 2008REVIEW 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 #18 on page 18 indicates that straw mulch will be applied to a minimum coverage of 75%, although as a mitigation to watershed cumulative impacts the plan states on page 77 that skid trails will have a minimum coverage of 80%. Please revise for consistency.
2. Item #24 indicates that roads and watercourse crossing will not be abandoned, and that the landing at project "P1" will be abandoned. Page 12 states that there are 14 segments of roads that are listed as temporary. As per 14 CCR 895.1 temporary roads will be used only during timber operations. As per 14 CCR 963.4(b) upon completion of timber operations temporary roads shall be abandoned. Please revise accordingly, and provide a Road Abandonment Plan as per 14 CCR 963.8 under Item #25 if necessary.
3. Item #31 references 14 CCR 957.2 in regards to areas requiring slash treatment and states that within 50 feet of the edge of the traveled surface of the permanent private road open for public use. In the Southern Forest District "seasonal" roads are also included as requiring treatment. Please include seasonal roads for treatment and also in regards to "Objectives."
4. Item #31 states on page 17 that burn piles will be greater than 90% consumed within 18 to 24 months from creation. Please consider if any roads provide emergency access to the public who own property in Section 22. Burn piles adjacent to emergency access roads would be an unacceptable hazard if left untreated during the fire season. Please revise proposed slash treatment as necessary to reduce risk to the public.
5. Item #32(a) indicates "No" in reference to habitat associated with the THP of sensitive species by the Board. Under #32(b) on page 18 indicates that goshawk sightings are located adjacent to clear-cut units and the areas contain potentially suitable nesting habitat. The Northern goshawk is a sensitive species as per 14 CCR 895.1, and since goshawk habitat is associated with the plan it should be addressed under Item #32(a).
6. The discussion of non-listed raptors on page 19 states that the Plan Submitter can choose not to cut trees without an amendment to the THP. The retention of trees for this purpose would be a change to the plan and an amendment would be required. Please revise accordingly.

7. Please indicate under Item #32(b) that the results of any botanical surveys conducted within the plan area will be submitted to CAL FIRE regardless of target species presence or absence.
8. Since operations may be conducted during the winter period, please include under Item #38 that hauling shall not occur between October 15 and May 1 when saturated soil conditions exist on the road as per 14 CCR 963.1(j), which includes the months on either side of the winter period.
9. As per 14 CCR 1034(x)(1), "Boundaries of logging area (shall be shown on quadrangle map or its equivalent)". Please provide on at least one map the boundary map symbol for the "THP Boundary" or "Logging Area."
10. Unit 338 is designated for cable yarding as show on page 26. Please identify the areas to be used tailhold locations. Additional acres for operating areas (including tailhold locations) need to be part of Item #8 and either included or the acreage difference explained under Item #14. If tailholds on tractors will be utilized on existing roads, those roads will need to be identified as an appurtenant road.
11. The Appurtenant Road maps on pages 30 and 32 show portions of Winton Road, although not identified as appurtenant. If Winton Road is owned or controlled by the Timberland Owner it needs to be identified as an appurtenant road and mapped to the intersection with a public road. Appurtenant roads may be shown on a map which may be planimetric with a scale as small as one-half inch equals one mile as per 14 CCR 1034(x).
12. The legend symbols associated with THP maps should be specific to each map so that particular information is readily discernible and pertinent to the map without searching for references that are not shown. Please review the THP maps, and revise accordingly.
13. The Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration is located in Section V of the THP. Please include this document at the end of Section II as directed by Item #26(d) since this is an operational part of the plan.
14. The Table of the CTMS species composition on page 42 indicates that there oaks contribute to 5 square feet of basal area per acre in the pre-harvest stand although page 99 states that oaks are in abundance and consists of approximately 22 percent of the basal area per acre. Please revise.
15. The Lower Blue Creek Planning Watershed is within the Upper Mokelumne River Hydrological Unit, and the lower portions of the Mokelumne River are listed under Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act with a pollutant / stressor of copper and zinc. As per 14 CCR 898, "When assessing cumulative impacts of a proposed project on any portion of a waterbody that is located within or downstream of the proposed timber operation and that is listed as water quality limited under Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act, the RPF shall assess the degree to which the proposed operations would result in impacts that may combine with existing listed stressors to impair a waterbody's beneficial uses, thereby causing a significant adverse effect on the environment."

Please check the following web page and include within the cumulative impacts assessment a list the stressors and discuss how this project as proposed will not combine with the listed stressor to have a significant impact on the 303(d) listed waterbody. A complete list of these impaired waterbodies is found at <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/TMDL/303dlist.htm>.

16. The boundary of biological assessment area (BAA) described on page 66 and shown on the BAA Map on page 67.2 is the Watershed Assessment Area and the area outside of the Lower Blue Creek Watershed that is within ½ mile of the THP. The BAA should be established which would allow for the assessment of all species identified during the process of scoping, and consideration of specific habitat requirements.

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 to 1.3 miles of the THP area. The plan states on pages 18 and 87 that three goshawk sightings are within one mile including G0328, which is outside of the BAA. In addition the California spotted owl sighting CA033 referenced on pages 18 and 87 is located outside of the BAA. It appears that at least two (2) additional California spotted owl territories located outside of the BAA are within one mile of the THP boundaries. The BAA needs to be large enough to adequately evaluate known raptor territories where potential habitat is within or adjacent to the plan area. 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.

17. Mitigations to reduce cumulative watershed impacts have been provided in Section IV on page 77, and Specific Measures to Implement #5 provided certain methods to be employed to mitigate potential erosion and sediment runoff concerns of site preparation activities. Please provide these measures in Section II of the plan.
18. Certain mitigations to reduce cumulative watershed impacts have been provided in Section IV on page 78. Please also provide all operational mitigations in Section II, and may included #3, #6, and #7 under Watershed Concerns and Mitigation, and #2, #3, #4, and #7 under Sediment.
19. Item #14(b) on page 4, and #1 of Watershed Concerns and Mitigation on page 78 states that at least 100 square feet of basal area will be retained within the WLPZ, although #1 of Water Temperature on page 79 states that at least 75 square feet of basal area per acre will be retained. Please revise for consistency.
20. The information and table on page 89 appear to be irrelevant to the proposed plan as Unit #625 was included in the North Spur 2 THP (4-07-33/AMA-4). Please revise or remove.

21. The Sediment discussion on page 78 under Item #6 states Wildlife Retention Units will provide interception and a filter for potential sedimentation, and the Oaks discussion on page 99 the plan indicates that oaks may be retained within Wildlife Retention Areas (WRA). On page 99 the plan states "Specific criteria for the selection of WRA's are listed in Section II of the THP." There does not appear to be mention of WRA's within Section II. Item #38 discusses that all clearcuts units shall be evaluated for the inclusion of Retention Areas. Please revise as necessary.
22. Section IV of the plan provides information regarding per acre levels of snags and oaks located within the Biological Assessment Area (BAA) on the timberland owner's property. In addition, to adequately evaluate the combined effect of management, please estimate the level of these resources on the BAA as a whole.
23. The Late Seral discussion on page 99 states that there is no late successional or old growth forest stands within the THP area. Please provide an estimate of percentage and acreage by land base within the biological assessment area of late seral stands. Please discuss the presence or absence of trees within the harvest area that contain old tree characteristics.
24. Please discuss under the Traffic Assessment Area on page 101 whether or not any public roads have any maintenance problems as per Technical Addendum #2.
25. Section II, Item 26(d): Pursuant to Fish and Game Code 1611, item 26(d) of the THP has provided notification to the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) of a proposed project that may alter the bed, bank, or channel of a lake or streambed. The THP review process is used to meet the DFG CEQA review requirements under Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 1611. The DFG received this notification on March 14, 2008.

The DFG will need the following items to begin the process of issuing a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA or Agreement):

- A base fee of \$1200 plus \$100 for each project (fees) sent to:
Department of Fish and Game
1600 Program
1701 Nimbus Rd., Suite A,
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 .
- A copy of the THP Items 1-13 sent with the fees.

Once the DFG has received payment for all of the projects associated with the 1611, the timeline for issuing a draft Agreement to the applicant will begin. In general, the applicant should receive a draft Agreement within 90 days from the date fees were received. Upon notification that Cal Fire has approved the THP and all LSAA fees have been received, the DFG will finalize the Agreement. Any work described as part of the 1611 notification is not authorized until the applicant has received the finalized Agreement.

Visit the Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement section of our website at www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600 for further guidance with this process, review of the 1600 code, and understanding of the timelines. (DFG #1)

26. Provide a second notice to the tribes. (ARCH #1)

CDF Inspector - respond to the following questions:

- a. Please evaluate the performance based hazard reduction and slash treatment proposed on pages 16 and 17 for effectiveness and enforceability.
- b. Please evaluate the pre-harvest levels of snags and oaks and if potential retention that is expected would be sufficient in regards to wildlife values. The plan states on page 99 that the average pre-harvest oaks presence is 26 square feet of basal area per acre.
- c. Please evaluate the likelihood and enforceability of the creation of at least one (and preferably two) retention areas per clearcut unit as stated under Item #38.
- d. Please evaluate the harvest units in regards to Wildlife Habitat Relationships (WHR), and if there are portions of WHR 5M or 5D, which is identified by a canopy of greater than 40 percent of 24 inch DBH trees, or WHR 6 that is distinguish by 24 inch DBH trees over a distinct layer of 6 to 24 inch trees.
- e. Please contact Sandra Jacks at (916) 358-2916 (sjacks@dfg.ca.gov) to arrange a mutually agreeable PHI date.
- f. Please contact Chris Cochrane at (916)464-4820 (cmcochrane@waterboards.ca.gov) to schedule a Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time.
- g. Please contact Bill Short (916) 322-4853 (Bill.Short@conservation.ca.gov) to schedule a Mutually Agreeable PHI date and time.
- h. Please notify Cal Fire Archaeologist Linda Pollack (559) 243-4119 Linda.Pollack@fire.ca.gov to arrange a mutually agreeable PHI date.
- i. Please notify Cal Fire Archaeologist Tony Overly Tony.Overly@fire.ca.gov to arrange a mutually agreeable PHI date.
- j. Please notify Mike Bacca at (559) 243-4114 of the PHI date.
- k. Please notify Bill Solinsky at (559) 243-4153 of the PHI date.

/s/ Solinsky

4-08-05/CAL-1 Squiggly THP

TO: Candace Gregory, Southern Region Chief

DATE: - -08

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?

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 (4460 and 5880 feet) in the Central Sierra. Commercial mixed conifers species found in the area are representative of those found within the THP area. The RPF states, commercial tree species typically found in a Sierra mixed conifer forest are present in the following representative distributions based on basal area: ponderosa pine 20%, white fir 21%, sugar pine 10%, Douglas-fir 3% and incense cedar 42%. These percentages appear to be accurate based on field review. The area also contains stands of hardwoods, both black and live oak which make up approximately 5 % of the stands. Oaks, specifically black oaks, appear to have limited distribution as a stand component throughout the proposed plan area. Understory species/vegetation include manzanita, white thorn, gooseberry, deer brush, bear clover, California laurel and riparian vegetation such as white alder, cottonwood, big-leaf maple and dogwood.

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)

The RPF indicated that the timber site classification had not been included on a THP map. The RPF shall indicate on the "General Location" map the entire plan area is site I timberland.

Recommendation #1

SILVICULTURE

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

Yes No (explain below)

Three silvicultural methods are proposed for use this entry, two even-aged systems, Clearcutting and Shelterwood removal and one uneven-aged, Selection. All appear to be appropriate given current stand conditions. Two of the three Shelterwood removal units (unit #350 & #351) were reviewed during the PHI. The pre-harvest stand condition in both clearly indicates adequate regeneration is present in species which are the progeny of the overstory. 21 even-aged clear cut units are proposed for harvest ranging in size from 12 to 26 acres which are irregular in shape and variable in size to the extent possible according the RPF. During the PHI the RPF agreed to list in section III of the proposed plan the acreages for each of the clear cut units. Recommendation #2

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

The RPF states under item #35, section II- oaks, preferably larger oaks shall be protected/managed to ensure they are maintained as a stand component. Oaks identified for protection shall have cavity nesting and mast production attributes as well as others listed under item #35, page #20 section II of the proposed plan. The plan narrative states, "The objective is to maintain retention areas that include oaks as undisturbed islands into the future within the context of the even-aged units..... If present a minimum of two to three oaks (preferably greater than 25 inches DBH) shall be left in each even-aged regeneration unit. Oaks outside of the even-aged regeneration units shall be protected and not felled, with exception to those that are a hazard or threaten the safety of those operating the plan." As stated above under item # 7 oaks, specifically black oaks were not in abundance in many of the even-aged units proposed for harvest. A general reconnaissance of the upper end of the lower Blue Creek watershed in the proposed plan area indicates black oaks appear to have an uneven distribution, depending on canopy closure and elevation oaks appear to be prevalent in some areas but not others. During the PHI and general watershed reconnaissance many of the existing even-aged units observed did contain a black oak component either in groups in "retention areas" or singularly as part of the unit. In a number of units oaks removed during a previous harvest were observed to have re-sprouted from their root collars and were growing up as a component of the conifer stand.

In response to RTQ b & c, as the RPF pointed out in his response to RTQ #14, the discrepancy in the basal area of oaks (5 sq ft vs. 26 sq ft.) stems from the fact that the 5 sq ft of oak is present within the units proposed for harvest and the 26 sq ft is a per acre watershed value. The topic of oaks, oak plan language, retention areas and enforceability was a lengthy discussion on two occasions during the PHI. During the PHI the review team and plan proponent could not sufficiently resolve this issue of how many oaks should be left of those that are present (retention areas), what would enforceable language in the plan be to ensure retention, and if current oak retention practices were limiting when one considers overall watershed wildlife values. The RPF requested to know the basis of the 400 sq ft per 40 acre language in the rules. The review team DFG representatives said they would research the history as to where those oak retention levels originated. The RPF agreed to re-visit with his District Manager the oak language in the proposed plan and discuss further with CALFIRE Fresno review team and DFG a resolution to this issue. Snag levels throughout the plan area and general watershed do not appear to be a limiting factor for wildlife.

13. Comments/general observations regarding silviculture.

During the PHI the RPF agreed to remove the phrase "no harvest groups" from the proposed plan. Under item #38 section II of the proposed plan the RPF states, "Larger diameter conifer trees within the retention areas may be removed during harvest." Recommendation #3

Sample mark was reviewed during the PHI for the following silvicultural prescriptions:

Two of the three Shelterwood removal units (#350 & #351) were 100% marked prior to the PHI.

Mark was in blue and prescription appropriate.

WLPZ selection 100 % mark along class I watercourse, Blue Creek - A1 was light. Trees in all the representative diameter/age classes had been designated for removal. Mark was in blue and the prescription appropriate.

No potential "retention areas" within even-aged units had been flagged prior to PHI for evaluation. The proposed plan under item #35 section II describes those stand attributes that lend themselves for inclusion in "retention areas".

As agreed to by the RPF during the PHI the THP maps on THP pages #26, 30 & 34 shall be changed to show the area north of watercourse 2F is not proposed for selective harvest this entry. Recommendation #6

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 proposed plan 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

- 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

Approximately 360 acres of the proposed plan is even-aged management clear cut. Leave trees shall not be uniformly distributed in these areas.

- 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 site preparation addendum on pages # 5-7 of the proposed plan. The addendum includes a provision for site preparation in the Shelterwood removal to "manage forest fuels and/or attain a more optimum stocking level."

- 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

The review team evaluated the WLPZ selection sample mark along portions of watercourse 1A - Blue Creek. Harvest trees within the WLPZ's are marked with blue paint. The harvest mark appeared to be "light" and should meet the requirements pursuant to 14 CCR 956.5 Protection Measures. The RPF stated the WLPZ was 100% marked.

Two of the three Shelterwood removal units (#350 & #351) were 100% marked prior to the PHI. Mark was in blue and the prescription appropriate.

- 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.

Reminder: Yarding systems proposed for use include tractor and cable (skyline). The RPF indicates under item #16 section II, cable yarding operations, may be performed in any tractor operating areas.

Pursuant to 14 CCR 895.1, any change in type or location of logging (yarding) system or basic equipment type is considered a substantial deviation to the plan. As such if any change in yarding systems occurs a substantial deviation/ major amendment to the plan shall be submitted. The amendment shall be accompanied by a yarding systems map identifying the location of the change.

During the PHI the RPF agreed to the following recommendations:

Shall change item #16 to include cable, high lead as a yarding system to be used during operations. Recommendation #4

Shall change the wording under item # 20 to make it clear that ground-based equipment shall not be used in cable yarding areas or answer item #20 "YES". Recommendation #5

Shall change the appropriate THP maps to indicate the areas within unit # 350 which are greater than 50% slope. Recommendation # 7

Shall change the yarding system in portions of unit #338 from cable to tractor yarding and show the new road construction in unit #338 out to the break in slope to facilitate cable yarding of the lower portions of the proposed even-aged unit. RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps as necessary. Recommendation #8

ROADS AND LANDINGS

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

 Yes X No (explain below) N/A

The proposed plan states in item #25, section II on page #12 under road reconstruction, that there are 14 segments of temporary road. During the PHI it was determined that a number of these road segments were old skid trails and not roads. The review team assessed temporary roads (skid trails) in units # 340, 350 & 365 leading to unit #94. As such these segments of skid trails proposed by the RPF for use during log haul need to be identified as new road construction in the proposed plan. The review team did not visit all 14 segments identified as temporary road, but requested the RPF re-visit all 14 segments to determine their proper classification, then make the necessary changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps accordingly. All segments of proposed new road construction shall be described in the plan and established pursuant to 14 CCR 963. Recommendation # 9

In addition, the lower WLPZ road in unit #162 is identified as a seasonal road. Project P2 includes the installation of a temporary culvert crossing of watercourse 2H to be removed after operations in this unit. The RPF shall re-classify this road as temporary and map accordingly in the proposed plan. Recommendation #10

In addition, project P1 described under item #25, section II on page #12 involves new road construction. The RPF shall describe the new road construction including the approximate length of the new road proposed. Given the proposed new roads jump up gradient the entire segment of new road including sidecast shall be straw mulched and seeded or slash packed by "walking in" slash Recommendation #11

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

See recommendations above under item # 22

25. Comments/general observations regarding roads and landings.

During the PHI the RPF stated a number of the temporary roads and new road construction segments may be obliterated upon completion of operations if they are within the boundaries of an even-aged unit. This would be done as part of unit site preparation to increase planting opportunities and bring more ground under production. The RPF stated that specifically which roads were to be obliterated is unknown at this time and primarily the decision of the regeneration forester. After discussion the review team requested the RPF include a statement in the proposed plan describing the obliteration of certain road segments and then when the decision is made as to which would be site prepped to bring more ground under production a minor deviation shall be submit amending the document. Recommendation #12

As agreed to by the RPF during the PHI the proposed plan shall include a statement that NO landing shall be excavated at the terminus of the new road construction segment in unit #350. Recommendation #13

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 in section III of the proposed. Watercourses visited during review include 1A, 1B, 2B, 2H, and 2I as well as a number of tributary class III watercourses. The proposed plan identified 2 class I watercourses, 1A-Blue Creek and 1B-Cherry Creek both were reviewed. Blue Creek is in a stable, good condition, contains numerous pools, abundant large woody debris and as stated in the proposed plan has greater than 80 % canopy for most of it's length. Locally Blue Creek is well known as an excellent fishing spot with healthy trout populations. Over the years the Calaveras Fish and Game commission has also stocked portions of Blue Creek.

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

One in-lieu practice involving the use of an existing landing and skid trail within the WLPZ of a class I watercourse, 1B-Cherry Creek was proposed (WLI). The entire road length within unit # 336 which the RPF proposed to skid on is within the WLPZ of the class I watercourse-Cherry Creek. In a number

of locales along this segment the road is in close proximity to the creek. The review team was concerned with the proposed skid length and the volume of logs to one landing and that too much disturbance may result in potential erosion and sediment issues given the roads proximity to Cherry Creek. The existing skid trail systems, as well as possible alternative landing locations above and outside the existing WLPZ were considered. After field review and discussion the review team made a number of recommendations the RPF agreed to.

A second landing location shall be established in what appears to be an old borrow pit adjacent to the WLPZ road. This will shorten up the skidding length and log volume to any one landing ultimately reducing the potential for erosion and sediment concerns. If a landing slash pile is generated from timber operations in this landing, the pile shall have a berm established around it to prevent any ash from potentially migrating into the stream course. The inside ditch presently in place shall be maintained after operations in the landing are complete and prior to the winter period. To reduce the size of the potential landing pile, as much slash as possible shall be pushed back up the skid trail system. Only trees harvested from between the WLPZ road and Cherry Creek shall be skidded on the road. All trees above the road but still within the WLPZ shall be fell away and skidded out on a skid trail outside the class 1 WLPZ. The RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan and maps as necessary. Recommendation # 14

All of the existing WLPZ road drainage facility lead outs on Cherry Creek presently have 3 to 6 inch angular rock in them acting as energy dissipaters to catch sediment. The review team concluded the rock has been effective in reducing the potential for sediment delivery to adjacent Cherry Creek. All drainage facility lead-outs shall be re-rocked with similar size material prior to the start of the winter period the year of timber operations. The rocked area shall be the width of the lead-out and at least ten feet down or to the break in slope which ever is less. Recommendation # 15

The RPF shall remove the phrase "if needed" from the statement, "If needed, dips or drivable waterbars locations shall be designated by the RPF." Under Road Segments within WLPZs, item #38, section II, page# 22. Recommendation # 16

In addition, during field review the RPF stated a desire to skid on the temporary road within the WLPZ of class 1 Blue Creek in unit # 162. This in-lieu practice has not been addressed in the proposed plan. The RPF shall write an in-lieu practice to use the WLPZ road within unit #162 for skidding purposes. The RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan and maps as necessary. Recommendation # 17

Note: The temporary road in unit #162 shall be abandoned after operations are complete and the temporary culvert crossing has been removed. The WLPZ road segment is at the upper edge of a 150 WLPZ with an adequate vegetative strip between the road and Blue Creek.

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

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)

During field review one small class II watercourse 2I was evaluated potentially for use when water is present. The watercourse crosses a seasonal road proposed for log haul and currently has no drainage structure in place. 2I was flowing the day of the PHI. The review team considered the watercourse crossing minor in scope and review team DFG representatives felt a 1600 series application would not be needed, but felt it warranted some protection after the RPF stated he may need to use the crossing while it was wet. The RPF agreed to include this as a new project, P5. The crossing shall be rocked with 3 to 6 inch rock, the width of the road to a minimum depth of 6 inches. Rocking shall extend 15 feet either side of channel centerline. This project shall be completed regardless of whether the crossing is wet or dry at the time of use. The project shall be completed prior to the start of the winter period the year of use if dry or before use if wet. The RPF shall ensure watercourse 2I is not diverted into the inside ditch just west of the crossing. Recommendation # 18.

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

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.)

34. Comments/general observations regarding watercourse protection.

All three proposed projects (P1, P2 & P3) were evaluated by the review team during the PHI. The review team recommendation #11 for P1 is stated above under item # 22.

P2 narrative needs to include the rock specifications described in P3. Recommendation # 19.

In addition, a new project P4 shall be included in the proposed plan.

P4-shall re-establish the outside berm on the seasonal road crossing of watercourse 3I in unit #364. The berm shall carry surface run-off away from the crossing to a new leadout approximately 100 feet down from the crossing. The existing dip above the 3I crossing shall be maintained.

Recommendation # 20

The RPF agreed to the following recommendations during the PHI:

The locations of all waterholes potentially to be used for dust abatement purposes shall be identified on the appropriate THP map. Recommendation #21

*RPF shall remove the asterisks (**) from the watercourse table for those watercourses not flagged to reduce the WLPZ width by 25 feet for cable yarding. Recommendation #22*

RPF shall amend into the THP document DFG 1600 series Stream Alteration Agreement (SAA) when

approved. Recommendation #23

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

The RPF identified two unstable areas within the proposed plan boundaries (U1 & U2). Both unstable areas were evaluated by the review team during the PHI. The RPF agreed to the following recommendations:

U1- The area above U1 in even-aged unit # 343 identified and mapped by the RPF as an area with slopes greater than 65% shall be excluded from timber operations. The RPF shall make all changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps as necessary to show this area no longer in the plan. Even-aged unit # 343 boundary shall be re-flagged prior to timber operations in this unit. Recommendation # 24

U2-The RPF shall flag the location of drainages facilities on the skid trail above the unstable area to the extreme EHR spacing for a distance of 200 feet. Recommendation # 25

The entire length of road from project P1 to unstable area U1 in unit # 343 shall be waterbarred to high EHR spacing. Recommendation # 26

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.

In response to RTQ a, the RPF pursuant to 14 CCR 957.11 through 957.12 choose the application of performance based rules for slash treatment and hazard reduction. The RPF proposed a range of acceptable alternatives to treat slash and address hazard reduction around structures and within 50 feet and 100 feet of private and public roads respectively. As evidenced by first review team question # 4,

the review team found aspects of the proposed performance based treatments unacceptable. During the PHI the field review team also found aspects of the proposed treatments unacceptable and didn't feel that they, "provide a level of fire and pest protection to property and resources that meets or exceeds the intent of protection provided under 14 CCR 957 through 957.8." The proposed performance based treatments include potentially leaving slash piles within hazard reductions zones for up to 24 months. Depending on when the pile was created this could lead to a slash pile remaining for up to 21 months longer than permitted under 14 CCR 957.2. The review team believes the proposed range of acceptance which allows for piles to be only 50% consumed does not to meet the intent of 14 CCR 957 either. After much discussion the review team and plan proponent agreed to re-visit the performance based approach to slash treatment and hazard reduction, discuss a range of acceptable alternatives, alternative language for the plan and standards and treatments which afford a level of enforceability. This issue was not resolved during the PHI. The plan proponent shall work directly with the CALFIRE Fresno review team to develop a resolution.

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 X 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 X No (explain below) ___ N/A
43. If sites are present, is the proposed archaeological site protection adequate to prevent significant adverse impacts?
 ___ Yes X 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 X Yes (explain below)

As stated by the RPF, habitat for the Northern goshawk exists within the proposed plan boundaries. One Northern goshawk observation occurred during plan layout, but outside any proposed harvest unit. Item #32, section II on page #18 & 19 discusses SPI's listed raptor policy.

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 #18 through 20 the RPF describes listed species, their habitat, and SPI company survey protocol when listed and non-listed raptors, other wildlife and sensitive plants 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 # 81 through 100 in section IV.

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

No Yes (explain below)

In response to RTQ d, the review team did not observe during field review any wildlife habitat relationships (WHR) 5M, 5D, or 6 within the proposed harvest units. DFG representative Applebee pointed out a small pocket not exceeding a couple acres in size of stand structure that may after stand measurements have qualified. The stand was on the southside of Blue Creek and west of unit #162.

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.

During the PHI the RPF agreed to:

Elaborate in the proposed plan on the Biological Assessment area scoping process, to include a justification of why the half mile area is sufficient for all species and their habitats.

Elaborate on the nature and type of correspondence, with whom, information received or not received concerning late successional forest stands.

*Elaborate on the nature and type of correspondence, with whom, information received or not received, estimated levels (number per acre, basal area per acre) concerning snags and oaks.
Recommendation # 27.*

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 April 21, 2008. The letter covers a number of concerns pertaining to resource values and treatment options which include, silviculture, oak resources, alternatives to harvest, deer range values, snags, special status species, at-risk amphibians, furbearers, watershed resources, herbicides and cumulative impacts.

Silviculture:

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 Black oaks exist within the proposed plan boundaries at a basal area level of 5 sq. ft per acre. Based on field observations this appears to be correct. A few oaks were observed scattered throughout proposed harvest units. It does not appear oaks are a limiting factor to the presence of wildlife species.

Deer range: most of the proposed plan area is identified as intermediate range for the Salt Springs deer herd, where the deer may stay for a few weeks while transitioning between winter and summer 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.

Snags: have been adequately addressed in the proposed plan document. During field review snags were observed in many areas and do not appear to be a limiting factor to the presence of wildlife.

Special status species: The plan addresses both the California spotted owl and the Northern goshawk, as well as 5 sensitive plant species..

At-risk amphibians, furbearers, watershed resources and potential herbicide use appear to be adequately addressed in the proposed document.

Cumulative impact: It is not likely that the effects of other projects or environmental changes will combine with this THP to cause significant adverse cumulative effects. Recommended changes resulting from the PHI, in conjunction with those mitigations already incorporated into the THP by the RPF should reduce the potential of adverse impacts. The cumulative effects analysis included in the THP presents data which supports the position that there is not a likelihood of significant adverse cumulative effects. No other agency to date has presented information to suggest that there would be significant adverse cumulative effects from the propose project.

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 # 4-08-05/CAL-1 Date _____

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 indicated that the timber site classification had not been included on a THP map. The RPF shall indicate on the "General Location" map the entire plan area is site I timberland. Recommendation #1

During the PHI the RPF agreed to list in section III of the proposed plan the acreages for each of the clear cut units. Recommendation #2

During the PHI the RPF agreed to remove the phrase "no harvest groups" from the proposed plan. Under item #38 section II of the proposed plan the RPF states, "Larger diameter conifer trees within the retention areas may be removed during harvest." Recommendation #3

RPF shall change item #16 to include cable, high lead as a yarding system to be used during operations. Recommendation #4

Shall change the wording under item # 20 to make it clear that ground-based equipment shall not be used in cable yarding areas or answer item #20 "YES". Recommendation #5

As agreed to by the RPF during the PHI the THP maps on THP pages #26, 30 & 34 shall be changed to show the area north of watercourse 2F is not proposed for selective harvest this entry. Recommendation #6

RPF shall change the appropriate THP maps to indicate the areas within unit # 350 which are greater than 50% slope. Recommendation # 7

RPF shall change the yarding system in portions of unit #338 from cable to tractor yarding and show the new road construction in unit #338 out to the break in slope to facilitate cable yarding of the lower portions of the proposed even-aged unit. RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps as necessary. Recommendation #8

The RPF shall re-visit all 14 segments to determine their proper classification, then make the necessary changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps accordingly. All segments of proposed new road construction shall be described in the plan and established pursuant to 14 CCR 963. Recommendation # 9

In addition, the lower WLPZ road in unit #162 is identified as a seasonal road. Project P2 includes the installation of a temporary culvert crossing of watercourse 2H to be removed after operations in this unit. The RPF shall re-classify this road as temporary and map accordingly in the proposed plan.

Recommendation #10

In addition, project P1 described under item #25, section II on page #12 involves new road construction. The RPF shall describe the new road construction including the approximate length of the new road proposed. Given the proposed new roads jump up gradient the entire segment of new road including sidecast shall be straw mulched and seeded or slash packed by "walking in" slash

Recommendation #11

The RPF shall include a statement in the proposed plan describing the obliteration of certain road segments and then when the decision is made as to which would be site prepped to bring more ground under production a minor deviation shall be submit amending the document. Recommendation #12

As agreed to by the RPF during the PHI the proposed plan shall include a statement that NO landing shall be excavated at the terminus of the new road construction segment in unit #350.

Recommendation #13

A second landing location shall be established in what appears to be an old borrow pit adjacent to the WLPZ road. This will shorten up the skidding length and log volume to any one landing ultimately reducing the potential for erosion and sediment concerns. If a landing slash pile is generated from timber operations in this landing, the pile shall have a berm established around it to prevent any ash from potentially migrating into the stream course. The inside ditch presently in place shall be maintained after operations in the landing are complete and prior to the winter period. To reduce the size of the potential landing pile, as much slash as possible shall be pushed back up the skid trail system. Only trees harvested from between the WLPZ road and Cherry Creek shall be skidded on the road. All trees above the road but still within the WLPZ shall be fell away and skidded out on a skid trail outside the class 1 WLPZ. The RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan and maps as necessary. Recommendation # 14

All of the existing WLPZ road drainage facility lead outs on Cherry Creek presently have 3 to 6 inch angular rock in them acting as energy dissipaters to catch sediment. The review team concluded the rock has been effective in reducing the potential for sediment delivery to adjacent Cherry Creek. All drainage facility lead-outs shall be re-rocked with similar size material prior to the start of the winter period the year of timber operations. The rocked area shall be the width of the lead-out and at least ten feet down or to the break in slope which ever is less. Recommendation # 15

The RPF shall remove the phrase "if needed" from the statement, "If needed, dips or drivable waterbars locations shall be designated by the RPF." Under Road Segments within WLPZs, item #38, section II, page# 22. Recommendation # 16

The RPF shall write an in-lieu practice to use the WLPZ road within unit #162 for skidding purposes. The RPF shall make all the changes to the proposed plan and maps as necessary. Recommendation # 17

The RPF agreed to include this as a new project, P5. The crossing shall be rocked with 3 to 6 inch rock,

the width of the road to a minimum depth of 6 inches. Rocking shall extend 15 feet either side of channel centerline. This project shall be completed regardless of whether the crossing is wet or dry at the time of use. The project shall be completed prior to the start of the winter period the year of use if dry or before use if wet. The RPF shall ensure watercourse 2I is not diverted into the inside ditch just west of the crossing. Recommendation # 18.

P2 narrative needs to include the rock specifications described in P3. Recommendation # 19.

In addition, a new project P4 shall be included in the proposed plan.

P4-shall re-establish the outside berm on the seasonal road crossing of watercourse 3I in unit #364. The berm shall carry surface run-off away from the crossing to a new leadout approximately 100 feet down from the crossing. The existing dip above the 3I crossing shall be maintained. Recommendation # 20

The locations of all waterholes potentially to be used for dust abatement purposes shall be identified on the appropriate THP map. Recommendation #21

*RPF shall remove the asterisks (**) from the watercourse table for those watercourses not flagged to reduce the WLPZ width by 25 feet for cable yarding. Recommendation #22*

RPF shall amend into the THP document DFG 1600 series Stream Alteration Agreement (SAA) when approved. Recommendation #23

U1- The area above U1 in even-aged unit # 343 identified and mapped by the RPF as an area with slopes greater than 65% shall be excluded from timber operations. The RPF shall make all changes to the proposed plan narrative and maps as necessary to show this area no longer in the plan. Even-aged unit # 343 boundary shall be re-flagged prior to timber operations in this unit. Recommendation # 24

U2-The RPF shall flag the location of drainages facilities on the skid trail above the unstable area to the extreme EHR spacing for a distance of 200 feet. Recommendation # 25

The entire length of road from project P1 to unstable area U1 in unit # 343 shall be waterbarred to high EHR spacing. Recommendation # 26

Elaborate in the proposed plan on the Biological Assessment area scoping process, to include a justification of why the half mile area is sufficient for all species and their habitats.

Elaborate on the nature and type of correspondence, with whom, information received or not received concerning late successional forest stands.

Elaborate on the nature and type of correspondence, with whom, information received or not received, estimated levels (number per acre, basal area per acre) concerning snags and oaks. Recommendation # 27.

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)

Date

RPF Signature