



DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
NORTHERN REGION HEADQUARTERS REDDING
6105 Airport Road
Redding, CA 96002
(530) 224-2445
Website: www.fire.ca.gov



OFFICIAL RESPONSE OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
TO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL POINTS RAISED DURING THE
TIMBER HARVESTING PLAN EVALUATION PROCESS

THP NUMBER: 2-20-00002-NEV-DEV2

SUBMITTER: Sierra Pacific Industries

COUNTY: Nevada

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: March 11, 2021

DATE OF OFFICIAL RESPONSE/DATE OF APPROVAL: March 16, 2021

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has prepared the following response to significant environmental points raised during the evaluation of the above-referenced plan. Comments made on like topics were grouped together and addressed in a single response. Where a comment raised a unique topic, a separate response is made. Remarks concerning the validity of the review process for timber operations, questions of law, or topics or concerns so remote or speculative that they could not be reasonably assessed or related to the outcome of a timber operation, have not been addressed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John Ramaley".

John Ramaley, RPF #2504
Forester III
Cascade, Sierra & Southern Regions

cc:
Unit Chief
Dan Ziebron, RPF
Dept. of Fish & Game, Reg. 2
Water Quality, Reg. 5
Pamela Kellerman

COMMON FOREST PRACTICE ABBREVIATIONS

CAL FIRE	Department of Forestry & Fire Protection	FPR	Forest Practice Rules
CAA	Confidential Archaeological Addendum	LTO	Licensed Timber Operator
CESA	California Endangered Species Act	NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	PHI	Pre-Harvest Inspection
CIA	Cumulative Impacts Assessment	RPF	Registered Professional Forester
CGS	California Geological Survey	THP	Timber Harvest Plan
CSO	California Spotted Owl	USFS	United States Forest Service
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height	WLPZ	Watercourse/Lake Protection Zone
DFG	Department of Fish & Game	WQ	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
DPR	Department of Pesticide Regulation	PCA	Pest Control Advisor
NSO	Northern Spotted Owl	[SIC]	Word used verbatim as originally printed in another document. May indicate a misspelling or uncommon word usage.
CDFW/DFW	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife		
AB 32	Assembly Bill 32	ARB	Air Resources Board
NPP	Net Primary Production	BOF	Board of Forestry
NEPA	National Environ. Policy Act	CAPCOA	Calif. Air Pollution Control Officers Assoc.
NEP	Net Ecosystem Production	CCR	Calif. Code of Regulations
NTMP	NonIndust. Timb. Manag. Plan	CESA	Calif. Endangered Species Act
OPR	Govm's Office of Plan. & Res.		
Pg	Petagram = 10^{15} grams		
PNW	Pacific NorthWest		
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide	PRC	Public Resources Code
CO _{2e}	Carbon Dioxide equivalent	RPA	Resource Plan. and Assess.
DBH/dbh	Diameter Breast Height	RPF	Registered Professional Forester
DFG	Calif. Department of Fish and Game	SPI	Sierra Pacific Industries
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	SYP	Sustained Yield Plan
FPA	Forest Practice Act	tC	tonnes of carbon
FPR	Forest Practice Rules	Tg	Teragram = 10^{12} grams
GHG	Greenhouse Gas	THP	Timber Harvesting Plan
ha ⁻¹	per hectare	LBM	Live Tree Biomass
LTSY	Long Term Sustained Yield	TPZ	Timber Production Zone
m ²	per square meter	USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
MAI	Mean Annual Increment	WAA	Watershed Assessment Area
MMBF	Million Board Feet	WLPZ	Watercourse. & Lake Prot. Zone
MMTCO _{2E}	Million Metric Tons CO ₂ equivalent	yr ⁻¹	per year

NOTIFICATION PROCESS

In order to notify the public of the proposed timber harvesting, and to ascertain whether there are any concerns with the plan, the following actions are automatically taken on each THP submitted to CAL FIRE:

- Notice of the timber operation is sent to all adjacent landowners if the boundary is within 300 feet of the proposed harvesting, (As per 14 CCR § 1032.7(e))
- Notice of the Plan is submitted to the county clerk for posting with the other environmental notices. (14 CCR § 1032.8(a))
- Notice of the plan is posted at the Department's local office and in Cascade Area office in Redding. (14 CCR § 1032))
- Notice is posted with the Secretary for Resources in Sacramento. (14 CCR § 1032.8(c))
- Notice of the THP is sent to those organizations and individuals on the Department's current list for notification of the plans in the county. (14 CCR § 1032.9(b))
- A notice of the proposed timber operation is posted at a conspicuous location on the public road nearest the plan site. (14 CCR § 1032.7(g))

THP REVIEW PROCESS

The laws and regulations that govern the timber harvesting plan (THP) review process are found in Statute law in the form of the Forest Practice Act which is contained in the Public Resources Code (PRC), and Administrative law in the rules of the Board of Forestry (rules) which are contained in the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The rules are lengthy in scope and detail and provide explicit instructions for permissible and prohibited actions that govern the conduct of timber operations in the field. The major categories covered by the rules include:

- *THP contents and the THP review process
- *Silvicultural methods
- *Harvesting practices and erosion control
- *Site preparation
- *Watercourse and Lake Protection
- *Hazard Reduction
- *Fire Protection
- *Forest insect and disease protection practices
- *Logging roads and landing

When a THP is submitted to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) a multidisciplinary review team conducts the first review team meeting to assess the THP. The review team normally consists of, but is not necessarily limited to, representatives of CAL FIRE, the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), and the Regional

Water Quality Control Board (WQ). The California Geological Survey (CGS) also reviews THP's for indications of potential slope instability. The purpose of the first review team

meeting is to assess the logging plan and determine on a preliminary basis whether it conforms to the rules of the Board of Forestry. Additionally, questions are formulated which are to be answered by a field inspection team.

Next, a preharvest inspection (PHI) is normally conducted to examine the THP area and the logging plan. All review team members may attend, as well as other experts and agency personnel whom CAL FIRE may request. As a result of the PHI, additional recommendations may be formulated to provide greater environmental protection.

After a PHI, a second review team meeting is conducted to examine the field inspection reports and to finalize any additional recommendations or changes in the THP. The review team transmits these recommendations to the RPF, who must respond to each one. The director's representative considers public comment, the adequacy of the registered professional forester's (RPF's) response, and the recommendations of the review team chair before reaching a decision to approve or deny a THP. If a THP is approved, logging may commence. The THP is valid for up to five years, and may be extended under special circumstances for a maximum of 2 years more for a total of 7 years.

Before commencing operations, the plan submitter must notify CAL FIRE. During operations, CAL FIRE periodically inspects the logging area for THP and rule compliance. The number of the inspections will depend upon the plan size, duration, complexity, regeneration method, and the potential for impacts. The contents of the THP and the rules provide the criteria CAL FIRE inspectors use to determine compliance. While CAL FIRE cannot guarantee that a violation will not occur, it is CAL FIRE's policy to pursue vigorously the prompt and positive enforcement of the Forest Practice Act, the forest practice rules, related laws and regulations, and environmental protection measures applying to timber operations on the timberlands of the State. This enforcement policy is directed primarily at preventing and deterring forest practice violations, and secondarily at prompt and appropriate correction of violations when they occur.

The general means of enforcement of the Forest Practice Act, forest practice rules, and the other related regulations range from the use of violation notices which may require corrective actions, to criminal proceedings through the court system. Civil, administrative civil penalty, Timber operator licensing, and RPF licensing actions can also be taken.

THP review and assessment is based on the assumption that there will be no violations that will adversely affect water quality or watershed values significantly. Most forest practice violations are correctable and CAL FIRE's enforcement program seeks to assure correction. Where non-correctable violations occur, civil or criminal action may be taken against the offender. Depending on the outcome of the case and the court in which the case is heard, some sort of supplemental environmental corrective work may be required. This is intended to offset non-correctable adverse impacts. Once a THP is completed, a completion report must be submitted certifying that the area meets the requirements of the rules. CAL FIRE inspects the completed area to verify that all the rules have been followed including erosion control work.

Depending on the silvicultural system used, the stocking standards of the rules must be met immediately or in certain cases within five years. A stocking report must be filed to certify that the requirements have been met. If the stocking standards have not been met, the area must be planted annually until it is restored. If the landowner fails to restock the land, CAL FIRE may hire a contractor to complete the work and seek recovery of the cost from the landowner.

Public Comment

Public comment for this plan came in the form of a letter, included for reference at the end of this document.

The following issues/concerns were raised during the public comment period and are addressed as follows:

Concern #1: CAL FIRE received a letter expressing concerns related to Buckeye Springs.

Response #1: The CAL FIRE Forest Practice Inspector who conducting the Pre-Harvest Inspection and the RPF who wrote the amendment provided statements in response to the letter of concern received, please see below information. CAL FIRE Review Team Staff reviewed all the information and determined, the proposed harvest operations are well away from the domestic water source, additional mitigation measures are not necessary. The Department concludes that significant adverse impacts to the springs will not occur.

1st Review Responses from the RPF:

In addition to the above First Review Responses, a Notification of Domestic Water Use adjacent to the property in Section 16 was received. The spring appears to be over 200' from the property line but further analysis will be done to determine potential mitigations prior to the amendment approval.

CAL FIRE Inspector PHI Report statement:

41. Have all domestic water supplies been accurately identified and adequately protected? **Yes**

Inspector Observations: During PHI public Comment #1 was discussed. The concerns raised in the comment centered around operations above a residence's use of "seeping springs named Buckeye Springs". The RPF indicated that he would make contact with commenter after the PHI. The operations addressed in the comments are the proposed Unit in Section 16. The Unit is ground based with no new road construction. Logical logging operations would encompass skid trails at a largely side slope pattern. Other concerns will necessarily be addressed by the forest practice rules. Additionally the RPF did state that the THP will only use "direct application" of herbicides.

PHI Recommendation Responses from the RPF:

Domestic Water Response: A phone conversation with Pamela Kellerman was held on 1-13-21 to discuss potential impacts to the domestic water source on her parcel in Section 16, T16N R10E. During the conversation, it was determined that the water source is approximately 200' from the proposed harvest area and is beyond the minimum required protection zone for a domestic water source (Class I protection measures). No change has been made to the THP.

The Forest Practice Rules under 14 CCR 936.5, discuss procedures to follow when domestic water sources are noted. Class I protection, which affords the greatest protection of the 4 stream classifications, must be applied for 100 feet above the intake. The table below highlights where this is noted:

Procedures for Determining Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone Widths and Protective Measures ¹								
Water Class Characteristics or Key Indicator Beneficial Use	1) Domestic supplies, including springs, on site and/or within 100 feet downstream of the operations area and/or 2) Fish always or seasonally present onsite, includes habitat to sustain fish migration and spawning.		1) Fish always or seasonally present offsite within 1000 feet downstream and/or 2) Aquatic habitat for nonfish aquatic species. 3) Excludes Class III waters that are tributary to Class I waters.		No aquatic life present, Watercourse showing evidence of being capable of sediment transport to Class I and II waters under normal high water flow conditions after completion of Timber Operations.		Man-made Watercourses, usually downstream, established domestic, agricultural, hydroelectric supply or other beneficial use.	
Water Class	Class I		Class II		Class III		Class IV	
Slope Class (%)	Width Feet	Protection Measure	Width Feet	Protection Measure	Width Feet	Protection Measure	Width Feet	Protection Measure
					[see 916.4(c)] [see 936.4(c)] [see 956.4(c)]		[see 916.4(c)] [see 936.4(c)] [see 956.4(c)]	
<30	75	BDG	50	BEI	See CFH		See CFI	
30-50	100	BDG	75	BEI	See CFH		See CFI	
>50	150 ²	ADG	100 ³	BEI	See CFH		See CFI	

1 - See Section 916.5(e) for letter designations application to this table.
2 - Subtract 50 feet width for cable Yarding operations.
3 - Subtract 25 feet width for cable Yarding operations.

As noted in the plan, the spring is located more than 200 feet from the edge of SPI's property. THP map page 25 shows that the spring that flows into the commenters domestic water source does not have a watercourse that drains into that spring from the proposed clearcut unit (Unit 16-0408).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Department recognizes its responsibility under the Forest Practice Act (FPA) and CEQA to determine whether environmental impacts will be significant and adverse. In the case of the management regime which is part of the THP, significant adverse impacts associated with the proposed application are not anticipated.

CAL FIRE has reviewed the potential impacts from the harvest and reviewed concerns from the public and finds that there will be no expected significant adverse environmental impacts from timber harvesting as described in the Official Response above. Mitigation measures contained in the plan and in the Forest Practice Rules adequately address potential significant adverse environmental effects.

CAL FIRE has considered all pertinent evidence and has determined that no significant adverse cumulative impacts are likely to result from implementing this THP. Pertinent evidence includes, but is not limited to the assessment done by the plan submitter in the watershed and biological assessment area and the knowledge that CAL FIRE has regarding activities that have occurred in the assessment area and surrounding areas where activities could potentially combine to create a significant cumulative impact. This determination is based on the framework provided by the FPA, CCR's, and additional mitigation measures specific to this THP.

CAL FIRE has supplemented the information contained in this THP in conformance with Title 14 CCR § 898, by considering and making known the data and reports which have been submitted from other agencies that reviewed the plan; by considering pertinent information from other timber harvesting documents including THP's, emergency notices, exemption notices, management plans, etc. and including project review documents from other non-CAL FIRE state, local and federal agencies where appropriate; by considering information from aerial photos and GIS databases and by considering information from the CAL FIRE maintained timber harvesting database; by technical knowledge of unit foresters who have reviewed numerous other timber harvesting operations; by reviewing technical publications and participating in research gathering efforts, and participating in training related to the effects of timber harvesting on forest values; by considering and making available to the RPF who prepares THP's, information submitted by the public.

CAL FIRE further finds that all pertinent issues and substantial questions raised by the public and submitted in writing are addressed in this Official Response. Copies of this response are mailed to those who submitted comments in writing with a return address.

ALL CONCERNS RAISED WERE REVIEWED AND ADDRESSED. ALONG WITH THE FRAMEWORK PROVIDED BY THE FOREST PRACTICE ACT AND THE RULES OF THE BOARD OF FORESTRY, AND THE ADDITION OF THE MITIGATION MEASURES SPECIFIC TO THIS THP, THE DEPARTMENT HAS DETERMINED THAT THERE WILL BE NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS RESULTING FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS THP.

RECEIVED
DEC 31 2020
REDDING
FOREST PRACTICE

Pamela & Joseph Kellerman

Po Box 82
Forbestown, Ca. 95941

PC #1

Revised by:	AS
Dist. by:	AS
Dist. Date:	1-5-2021
RU	PS
FG	TO
WQ	TLO
ARCH	LTO
APF	DMG
WSP	BOE
OTHER:	
FPS	
Station:	LOC

NEU

FOOT

December 23, 2020

Forest Practice Program Manager

Timber Harvest Plan

Cal Fire.

No. 2-20-00002NEV AM#2

6105 Airport Road
Redding, CA. 96002

Dear Manager,

This is in response to a letter I received from you regarding the Timber Harvest Plan for section 09 of T16N, R10E, in Nevada County. My property is located at 15936 Buckeye Road, Nevada City.

My residence uses seeping springs, named Buckeye Springs, for all uses. The springs move through the soil to form surface and subsurface water supplies. I use it for drinking water because of the pristine quality of the water. The spring seeps out of the ground and feeds three holding ponds. I am concerned that your proposed Timber Harvest will disturb my water supply either by soil compaction, erosion, runoff, or pollution.

The detailed map you included indicates you will be performing logging operations at the same location as the headwaters/ origins of Buckeye Springs. Skid trails should be away from seeps and springs. Road building, and other excavation could increase runoff and damage soil productivity through soil disturbance, compaction, and erosion. Water that once flowed below the surface may be intercepted by road cuts, which could lead to increased erosion. All of these activities can change the natural drainage of the springs, interrupt the direction of the water flow, or disrupt and eliminate my water source from the springs.

In addition, pollution from leaking or spilled fuels, applying chemicals, or using herbicides could penetrate the soil surface and pollute the groundwater that feeds the springs.

Buckeye Springs is an important water source for other residents and wildlife in the area. I would prefer that your company takes extra precautions to avoid the area around the headwaters of the spring.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,



Pamela Kellerman

(530) 675-9508

pkain6@gmail.com

Cc: Sierra Pacific Industries