



State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife
2024 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEE
CASH RECEIPT
DFW 753.5a (REV. 01/01/24) Previously DFG 753.5a

Print

Save

RECEIPT NUMBER:

47-10/30/2024-051

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (If applicable)

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL	DATE
SHASTA VALLE RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT		10/30/2024
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING	DOCUMENT NUMBER	
SISKIYOU COUNTY	2024-47-051	
PROJECT TITLE		

LAKE SHASTINA FUELS REDUCTION PROJECT

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL	PHONE NUMBER
SISKIYOU COUNTY FIRE SAFE COUNCIL		(530) 925-2610
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS	CITY	STATE
215 EXECUTIVE COURT, SUITE A	YREKA	CA
		ZIP CODE
		96097

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)

☐ Local Public Agency ☐ School District ☐ Other Special District ☐ State Agency ☒ Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

☐ Environmental Impact Report (EIR) \$ 4,051.25 \$ _____
☐ Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND) \$ 2,916.75 \$ _____
☐ Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW \$ 1,377.25 \$ _____

☐ Exempt from fee
☐ Notice of Exemption (attach)
☐ CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)
☐ Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)

☐ Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only) \$ 850.00 \$ _____
☒ County documentary handling fee \$ 50.00 \$ 50.00
☒ Other NOTICE OF DETERMINATION \$ _____

PAYMENT METHOD:

☒ Cash ☐ Credit ☐ Check ☐ Other **TOTAL RECEIVED** \$ 50.00

SIGNATURE

X Wendy Winningham

AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

Wendy Winningham Deputy Clerk

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL FEE FORM

On 10/25/24, Shasta Valley RCD filed an application
(Date) (Name)
for development with the Lake Shasta. Before the application
(Name of City)
is accepted as complete for processing, fees in the following amount(s) must be deposited with
the County Clerk.

☒	Clerk Processing Fee	\$50.00
☐	Negative Declaration	\$2,916.75*
☐	EIR	\$4,051.25
☐	Categorically Exempt	\$0.00
☐	Statutorily Exempt	\$0.00
☐	Fee Exemption issued by the DFG	\$0.00
☒	Other <u>PEIR PSA Addendum</u>	\$ <u>0</u>

No project shall be operative, vested or final until the required fee is paid. *Public Resources Code §21089 (b)*

On 10/30/2024, Shasta Valley ResCons Dist deposited \$ 50⁰⁰,
(Date) (Name)
with the Siskiyou County Clerk Wendy King.
(Attest)

Application No. _____
(To be completed when application is received for processing)

Receipt # 47-10/30/2024-051/20240037
20

* If it is determined by Siskiyou County that the fee required for a Negative Declaration does not apply to your project a refund will be granted.

Notice of Determination

Appendix D

To:

☒ Office of Planning and Research

U.S. Mail:

P.O. Box 3044

Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address:

1400 Tenth St., Rm 113

Sacramento, CA 95814

From:

Public Agency: Shasta Valley RCD

Address: 215 Executive Ct. Suite A
Yreka, CA 96097

Contact: Carolyn Napper

Phone: 530-925-2610

☒ County Clerk

County of: Siskiyou

Address: 311 4th St Room 201

Yreka, CA 96097

Lead Agency (if different from above):

Address:

Contact:

Phone:

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse):

FILED

Project Title: Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction Project

Siskiyou County

Project Applicant: Siskiyou County Fire Safe Council

OCT 30 2024

Project Location (include county): Lake Shastina, Weed, CA Siskiyou County

Project Description:

BY: LAURA BYNUM, CLERK

Deputy Clerk

The proposed project includes vegetation treatment adjacent to primary roadways and evacuation routes for the community of Lake Shastina and areas surrounding the community. Treatment would occur within a 7,364-acre project area within Siskiyou County. The CalVTP treatment types that would be implemented include fuel breaks and wildland-urban interface (WUI) fuel reduction and treatment activities (i.e. prescribed burning, mechanical treatments, and herbicide application) are consistent with ☒

This is to advise that the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District has approved the above
(☒ Lead Agency or ☐ Responsible Agency)

described project on 10/16/2024 and has made the following determinations regarding the above
(date)
described project.

1. The project [☐ will ☒ will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☒ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
☐ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures [☒ were ☐ were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan [☒ was ☐ was not] adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations [☐ was ☒ was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [☒ were ☐ were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the negative Declaration, is available to the General Public at:

CEQAnet

Signature (Public Agency):

Title:

Date: 10/30/24

Date Received for filing at OPR:

PROJECT-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS AND ADDENDUM TO THE CaIVTP ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

**LAKE SHASTINA FUELS REDUCTION PROJECT
SISKIYOU COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Prepared for

Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Prepared by



**VESTRA Resources, Inc.
5300 Aviation Drive
Redding, California 96002**

OCTOBER 2024

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP) directs implementation of vegetation treatments within the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CAL FIRE's) State Responsibility Area (SRA) to serve as one component of the state's range of actions to reduce wildfire risk, reduce fire suppression efforts and costs, and protect natural resources as well as other assets from wildfire. The Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the CalVTP evaluates the environmental impacts of the CalVTP. The CalVTP is described in Chapter 2, "Program Description" of the PEIR. The PEIR has been prepared under the direction of CEQA lead agency, California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board), in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines. The document functions as a Program EIR in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 for streamlining of CEQA review of later activities consistent with the CalVTP. Proposed treatment projects are evaluated by completing the CalVTP Project-Specific Analysis (PSA).

This PSA/Addendum addresses the Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction Project (Project) proposed by the Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County. The project includes vegetation treatment in Siskiyou County in the Lake Shastina Area. Treatment will occur on up to 7,364 acres. The project includes fuel break and wildland urban interface (WUI) treatment types which will be implemented using prescribed burning, mechanical treatment, manual treatment and herbicide treatment activities. The proposed treatment types and activities are consistent with those evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR. Maintenance treatments would involve the same treatment types and activities used in the original treatment. Treatment and maintenance will occur in phases as funding is obtained. The first phase of treatment will be completed in a 185-acre area within the next four years.

1.1 Project Proponents – Lead and Responsible Agency Roles

For the purposes of the CalVTP PEIR and this PSA, a project proponent is a public agency that provides funding for vegetation treatment or has land ownership, land management, or other regulatory responsibility in the treatable landscape and is seeking to fund, authorize, or implement vegetation treatments consistent with the CalVTP. Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County has obtained funding for the project and has entered into a partnership with the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District (Shasta Valley RCD). The Shasta Valley RCD is responsible for the management for implementation of proposed treatments including monitoring/verifying implementation of applicable Standard Project Requirements (SPRs) and mitigation measures and is the CEQA Lead Agency for the project. This PSA has been prepared for SVRCD to comply with CEQA for the implementation of vegetation treatments that require a discretionary action by a state or local Agency.

1.2 Purpose of the Project-Specific Analysis and Addendum

The purpose of the PSA is to determine if the proposed vegetation treatment project is within the scope of the CalVTP PEIR. The proposed vegetation treatment project is within the scope of the PEIR if the proposed treatment methods are consistent with the treatment types and activities described in Chapter 2, "Program Description" of the PEIR, if the proposed treatment site is within the geographic limits of the CalVTP's treatable landscape, and if the environmental effects of the proposed treatment have been covered in the PEIR and none of the criteria for preparation of subsequent CEQA documentation are met (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15163(c)(2), 15162).

An Addendum to an EIR is appropriate when a project or circumstances have changed since an EIR was certified, and there are no new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts (CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, 15164, and 15168). The proposed project includes areas outside of the treatable landscape and would be a change to the project analyzed in the PEIR. This PSA/Addendum (refer to Section 3.0) includes criteria to support an Addendum to the to the CalVTP PEIR for the inclusion of proposed treatment areas outside the CalVTP treatable landscape. The checklist evaluates each resource in terms of whether the later treatment project, including the "changed condition" of additional geographic area, would result in significant impacts that

would be substantially more severe than those covered in the PEIR and/or would result in any new impacts that were not covered in the PEIR.

This document serves as both a PSA and an addendum to the CalVTP PEIR for review and analysis under CEQA for the proposed Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction vegetation treatments within and outside the CalVTP treatable landscape. The project-specific mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP), which identifies the CalVTP standard project requirements (SPRs) and mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project, is presented in Attachment A. The SPRs identified in the MMRP have been incorporated into the proposed vegetation treatments as a standard part of treatment design and implementation.

1.3 Project Revisions

PROJECT AREA OUTSIDE OF THE CALVTP TREATABLE LANDSCAPE

One of the qualifications to determine if a proposed vegetation treatment project is within the scope of the CalVTP PEIR is if the proposed treatment site is within the geographic limits of the CalVTP's treatable landscape. Most of the project area is within the treatable landscape. Within the 7,364-acre project area, 6,264 acres are within the treatable landscape and 1,100 acres are outside of the treatable landscape. Some of these areas are outside of the treatable landscape due to the method by which the CalVTP treatment landscape was digitally developed and the resultant degree of mapping resolution that results in pixelated boundaries. In addition, some areas within the project area were excluded from the treatable landscape since they were incorrectly mapped as urban, agricultural, or barren vegetation types. Areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape also include agricultural land or meadows immediately adjacent to and surrounded by the treatable landscape. Within these areas, only portions containing similar vegetation as the adjacent treatable landscape (grass, shrub, or tree fuel types) would be treated and areas under active agricultural production would not receive treatment. These areas have essentially the same, or at least substantially similar, landscape conditions as the adjacent areas within the treatment landscape, therefore the environmental analysis in the PEIR would be applicable.

2.0 TREATMENT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes vegetation treatment adjacent to primary roadways and evacuation routes for the community of Lake Shastina as well as in areas surrounding the community. Treatment would occur within a 7,364-acre project area within Siskiyou County. The CalVTP treatment types that would be implemented include fuel breaks and wildland-urban interface fuel reduction that will be established using mechanical treatment, manual treatment, prescribed burning, and herbicide treatment activities. The proposed CalVTP treatment areas are shown in Figure 1 and summarized in Table 1.

CalVTP Treatment Type	Treatment Description	CalVTP Treatment Activity	Treatment Size (Acres)	Equipment Used for Treatments	Typical Duration of Treatments
Fuel Break	Improvement of egress, fire control, development of fire-adapted communities	Mechanical (whole tree removal, mastication, biomass chipping, machine piling); Manual (hand thinning, pruning, piling); Herbicide (ground application) Prescribed burning (pile burning, broadcast/under burning)	1,359	Masticators, chippers (tracked and wheeled), excavators, skid steers, tractors, bulldozers, hand tools, chainsaws, pole saws, weed-trimmers, water trucks, ATVs, UTVs, portable water tanks, water pumps, fire hoses, leaf blowers, drip torches, fuses, Terra torch	Mechanical and Manual treatments: 1 to 6 months Prescribed burns: 1 day to 1 week Herbicide Treatment: several days to weeks
Wildland-Urban Interface Fuel Reduction	Improvement of egress, fire control, development of fire-adapted communities.	Mechanical (whole tree removal, mastication, biomass chipping, machine piling); Manual (hand thinning, pruning, piling); Herbicide (ground application) Prescribed burning (pile burning, broadcast/under burning)	6,005	Masticators, chippers (tracked and wheeled), excavators, skid steers, tractors, bulldozers, hand tools, chainsaws, pole saws, weed-trimmers, water trucks, ATVs, UTVs, portable water tanks, water pumps, fire hoses, leaf drip torches, fuses, Terra torch blowers	Mechanical and Manual treatments: 1 to 6 months Prescribed burns: 1 day to 1 week Herbicide Treatment: several days to weeks
Total Acres			7,364		

2.1 Treatment Types

The treatment types to be implemented for the project include wildland-urban-interface (WUI) fuel reduction and fuel breaks. Treatment will occur in phases as funding is obtained. Priority treatment areas within the community include areas immediately adjacent to roadways, therefore treatment will start with creation of fuel breaks. Wildland-Urban Interface Fuel Reduction will be implemented in areas surrounding the community of Lake Shastina as funding is obtained.

Fuel Breaks: In strategic locations, fuel breaks create zones of vegetation removal and ongoing maintenance, often in a linear layout, that support fire suppression by providing responders with a staging area or access to a remote landscape for fire control actions. The fuel breaks will be created adjacent to roadways within the community of Lake Shastina and surrounding residential developments within the community. Fuel break treatments will be along both sides of Big Springs Road, Jackson Ranch Road, Ordway Ranch Road, Ordway Road, Quarry Road, Solus Place, Juniper Valley Drive, and surrounding the Rancho Hills residential development and the residential development on the eastern side of Big Springs Road. See Figure 1. In areas of the project site that are currently forested, shaded fuel breaks will be created. In shrub habitats within the project area that do not currently contain trees, removal of up to 100 percent of shrubs would result in unshaded fuel breaks. Some portions of the fuel break treatment area have been previously treated and will be re-treated as part of the proposed project.

Wildland-Urban Interface Fuel Reduction: WUI fuel reduction will be implemented in areas surrounding the community of Lake Shastina. WUI fuel reduction would generally consist of strategic removal of vegetation to prevent or slow the spread of non-wind driven wildfire between structures and wildlands, and vice versa.

Treatments would vary slightly depending on the vegetation type being treated. Fuel break and WUI treatments would include:

- thin ladder fuels (i.e., hardwoods and conifers) less than 14 inches dbh.
- remove small diameter (i.e., less than 14 inches dbh) trees where larger (i.e., greater than 14 inches dbh) conifers and hardwoods exist;
- thin areas where only small diameter trees are present to an average of 24 feet between trees;
- preferentially remove trees with mistletoe infections, sooty mold, conks or other signs of rot, broken tops, or other damage;
- remove up to 90 to 100 percent of shrubs where feasible.
- remove 90–100 percent of snags
- prune lower branches of trees to twelve feet above ground or more where feasible. Limbing will not reduce tree crown ratio below 30 percent for trees less than 30 feet in height;
- manually or mechanically cut, pile, chip downed trees and branches within 300 feet to either side of roadways for ingress or egress roads into private property.
- spray herbicides where sprouting species are present.

2.2 Treatment Activities

The proposed vegetation treatment activities are prescribed burning, mechanical treatments, manual treatments, and herbicides. Each of these treatment activities is included in the CalVTP PEIR and is described in more detail below. The first phase of treatment will include approximately 185 acres concentrated along roadways in the southern portion of the project area. This treatment will occur in 2024, 2025 and 2026. The remainder of the project area would be treated as funding is obtained. The total duration of active treatment activities will be one to six months each year.

Pile Burning: Prescribed burning of piles of vegetative material to reduce fuel and/or remove biomass following treatment. Pile burning would occur in areas with no live overstory. Pile burning would occur in the winter after treatment or wet periods of the year.

Broadcast Burning: Prescribed burning to reduce fuels over a larger area or restore fire resiliency in target fire-adapted plant communities; would be conducted under specific conditions related to fuels, weather, and other variables. Low-intensity burn would be used to remove ground and litter fuels. Existing groundcover would be partially retained in a mosaic pattern in forest and shrub communities. Burning would occur in late spring when the ground is still wet, or during the fall or winter when precipitation is imminent, depending on weather conditions. Prior to prescribed burning, fire containment lines would be established or existing lines enhanced by clearing vegetation surrounding areas proposed for burning to help prevent the accidental escape of fire. Pretreatment of vegetation using mechanical or manual activities may occur.

Prescribed burns will last from one day to up to one week. An average of 45 workers would be required onsite including between 2 and 10 engines, two to four crews, up to two bulldozers and bulldozer transports, masticators or track chippers to treat the fuel break perimeter, and onsite water truck for fire suppression. Prescribed burns could be ignited using drip torches, fuses, Terra torch, or projected aerial devices. Prescribed burns would require public notification prior to the burning operation, a burn plan that includes a smoke management plan, and implementation of an Incidental Action Plan, CAL FIRE approval, and permitting.

Mechanical Treatment: Mechanical equipment includes use of motorized equipment to cut, uproot, crush/compact, or chop existing vegetation. Mechanical treatment methods (whole tree removal, mastication, biomass chipping, machine piling) could occur throughout the entire project area. Equipment used for treatment includes masticators, chippers (tracked and wheeled), excavators, skid steers, tractors, bulldozers, hand tools, chainsaws, pole saws, weed-trimmers, water trucks, ATVs, UTVs, portable water tanks water pumps, fire hoses, and leaf blowers. Typically one hand crew of up to 20 workers and at least one fire engine are used for mechanical treatments. Mechanical treatment would occur from 1 to 6 months each year.

Manual Treatment: Manual treatment could occur throughout the entire project area and would include use of hand tools and hand-operated power tools to cut, clear, or prune herbaceous or woody species. Activities could include thinning trees with chainsaws, loppers, or pruners, cutting undesired competing brush species above ground level to favor desirable species and spacing, pulling, grubbing, or digging out root system of undesired plants to prevent sprouting and regrowth, and placing mulch around desired vegetation to limit competitive growth. Treatments would require between 1 and 40 crew members. Crews would typically include between 2 and 10 personnel and up to four crews could be working simultaneously. Treatments would occur between 3 to 6 months each year.

Herbicide: Herbicide would be used to treat sprouting species present within the project area. Herbicides that may be applied include: Borax (tetraborate decahydrate), Clopyralid (monoethanolamine salt), Glyphosate (isopropylamine salt, potassium salt, dimethylamine salt & diammonium salt), Hexazinone, Imazapyr (isopropylamine salt), Sulfometuron Methyl, Triclopyr (butoxyethyl ester & triethylamine salt), Nonylphenol 9 Ethoxylates (NP9E), Cleantraxx (penoxsulam & oxyfluorfen), Velpar (hexazinone), or Indaziflam. The treatment activity would require 2 to 4 workers over several days to several weeks.

Herbicide application would comply with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) label directions, as well as California Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) label standards. Only ground-level application would occur; no aerial applications would be allowed. Application methods could include paint-on stems, backpack hand-applicator, hypo-hatchet tree injection, boom sprayers from ATVs (sprayers would be pointing down and only used in when the target species occurs throughout the treated area), or hand placement of pellets. The application method chosen would depend on the written recommendations of an independent Pest Control Advisor (PCA) licensed by DPR for the targeted weed species and characteristics of the site to which the treatment is proposed.

In riparian habitats, only hand application of herbicides approved for use in aquatic environments will be allowed and only during low-flow periods or when seasonal streams are dry. No terrestrial or aquatic herbicides will be applied within WLPZs of Class I and II watercourses, if feasible. If this is not feasible, hand application of herbicides labeled for use in aquatic environments may be used within the WLPZ provided that the project proponent notifies the applicable water quality control board within no fewer than 15 days prior to herbicide application.

2.3 Biomass Processing

Vegetation removed during implementation of the proposed treatment described above includes ladder fuels less than 14 inches dbh, shrubs, tree branches and down logs. This material would be processed and disposed using the following methods:

- **Masticating :** Vegetative debris would be removed and placed on the ground concurrently with vegetation removal and the biomass remaining after mastication would be no more than 4 inches in depth.

- Chipping: Chipped biomass would be spread over treatment areas and would not exceed 4 inches in depth. Chipped biomass could also be left in piles for removal to a biomass facility.
- Pile burning: piling by hand and subsequent pile burning during wet periods of the year

2.4 Treatment Maintenance

Future maintenance, depending on aspect, vegetation type, location, and regrowth conditions could be required every 3 to 5 years. Maintenance would include the same treatment type (fuel break and WUI) and activity (prescribed burning, manual, mechanical, and herbicide) as used for initial treatments.

Prior to implementing a maintenance treatment, the project proponent will verify that the expected site conditions as described in the PSA are present in the treatment area. As time passes, the continued relevance of the PSA will be considered by the project proponent in light of potentially changed conditions or circumstances. Where the project proponent determines the PSA is no longer sufficiently relevant, the project proponent will determine whether a new PSA or other environmental analysis is warranted.

In addition to verifying that the PSA continues to provide relevant CEQA coverage for treatment maintenance, the project proponent will update the PSA at the time a maintenance treatment is needed when more than 10 years have passed since the approval of the PSA or the latest PSA update. For example, the project proponent may conduct a reconnaissance survey to verify conditions are substantially similar to those anticipated in the PSA. Updated information should be documented.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VEGETATION TREATMENT PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction Project
2. Project Proponent Name and Address: Shasta Valley RCD
215 Executive Ct Ste A
Yreka, CA 96097
3. Contact Person Information and Phone Number: Carolyn Napper
Project Manager, Shasta Valley RCD
Phone: 530-925-2610
cnapper@SVRCD.org
4. Project Location: Treatments will occur within and surrounding the community of Lake Shastina along either side of Big Springs Road, Jackson Ranch Road, Ordway Ranch Road, Ordway Road, Quarry Road, Solus Place, Juniper Valley Drive, and surrounding the Rancho Hills residential development and the residential development on the eastern side of Big Springs Road as well as the surrounding areas. See Figure 1:
5. Total Area to be Treated (acres) 7,364
6. Description of Project: The Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction Project (project) includes vegetation treatment adjacent to primary roadways and evacuation routes for the Community of Lake Shastina as well as within the wildland-urban interface (WUI). Treatment would occur within a 7,364 acre project area within Siskiyou County. The CalVTP treatment types that would be implemented include fuel breaks and WUI fuel reduction that will be implemented using prescribed burning, mechanical, manual, and herbicide treatment activities. See Section 2 for additional details.
 - a. Initial Treatment
Initial treatment would include fuel break and WUI fuel reduction treatments by manual and mechanical methods. See Section 2 for additional details.

Treatment Types

- ☒ Wildland-Urban Interface Fuel Reduction
- ☒ Fuel Break
- ☐ Ecological Restoration

Treatment Activities

- ☒ Prescribed Burning (Broadcast), up to 7,364 acres
- ☒ Prescribed Burning (Pile Burning)
- ☒ Mechanical Treatment, up to 7,364 acres
- ☒ Manual Treatment, up to 7,364 acres
- ☐ Prescribed Herbivory, _____ acres
- ☒ Herbicide Application, up to 7,364 acres

Fuel Type [see description in CalVTP PEIR Section 2.4.1, check every applicable category; provide detail in description of Initial Treatment]

☒ Grass Fuel Type

☒ Shrub Fuel Type

☒ Tree Fuel Type

b. Treatment Maintenance

Future maintenance, depending on aspect, vegetation type, location, and regrowth conditions could be required every 3 to 5 years. Maintenance would include the same treatment type (fuel break) and activity (prescribed burning, manual, mechanical, and herbicides) as used for initial treatments.

Treatment Types

☒ Wildland-Urban Interface Fuel Reduction

☒ Fuel Break

☐ Ecological Restoration

Treatment Activities [see description in CalVTP PEIR Section 2.5.2, check every applicable category; include number of acres subject to each treatment activity, provide detail in description of Treatment Maintenance]

☒ Prescribed Burning (Broadcast), up to 7,364 acres

☒ Prescribed Burning (Pile Burning)

☒ Mechanical Treatment, up to 7,364 acres

☒ Manual Treatment, up to 7,364 acres

☐ Prescribed Herbivory, _____ acres

☒ Herbicide Application, up to 7,364 acres

Fuel Type

☒ Grass Fuel Type

☒ Shrub Fuel Type

☒ Tree Fuel Type

Use of the PSA for Treatment Maintenance

Prior to implementing a maintenance treatment, Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County (FSCSC) will verify that the expected site conditions as described in the PSA are present in the treatment area. As time passes, the continued relevance of the PSA will be considered by the FSCSC in light of potentially changed conditions or circumstances. Where the FSCSC determines the PSA is no longer sufficiently relevant, the FSCSC will determine whether a new PSA or other environmental analysis is warranted.

In addition to verifying that the PSA continues to provide relevant CEQA coverage for treatment maintenance, the project proponent will update the PSA at the time a maintenance treatment is needed when more than 10 years have passed since the approval of the PSA or the latest PSA update. For example, the FSCSC may conduct a reconnaissance survey to verify conditions are substantially similar to those anticipated in the PSA. Updated information should be documented.

7. Regional Setting and Surrounding Land Uses: The project will occur near the community of Lake Shastina, Siskiyou County, California. Land uses within and adjacent to the treatment area are mostly residential, rural

residential and agricultural. Commercial and recreational uses as well as public facilities are present along Big Springs Road within the project area.

8. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required: (e.g., permits)

Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District Burn Permit (during the non-fire season)

Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District, Smoke Management Plan approval

CAL FIRE Burn Permit (during the fire season)

California Department of Fish and Wildlife Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (for activities adjacent to streams or lakes)

Siskiyou County Agricultural Commissioner required licenses and permits for herbicide application

Coastal Act Compliance

☒ The proposed project is NOT within the Coastal Zone

☐ The proposed project is within the Coastal Zone (check one of the following boxes)

☐ A coastal development permit been applied for or obtained from the local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified Local Coastal Plan, as applicable

☐ The local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified Local Coastal Plan (in consultation with the local Coastal Commission district office) has determined that a coastal development permit is not required

9. Native American Consultation. *The Board of Forestry and Fire Protection conducted consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 during preparation of the PEIR. CalVTP SPR CUL-2 requires the project proponent to obtain the latest Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided Native Americans Contact List and to notify the California Native American Tribes in the counties where the treatment activity is located.*

A list of geographically affiliated Native American representatives was obtained from the Native American Heritage Commission on August 2, 2024. Native American contacts in Siskiyou County were contacted on August 8, 2024 and included the Alturas Rancheria of Pit River Indians, Karuk Tribe, Pit River Tribe of California, Redding Rancheria, Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, Shasta Nation, and Susanville Indian Rancheria. As of September 9, 2024, no responses from Native American tribes were received.

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the project proponent)

On the basis of this PSA and the substantial evidence supporting it:

- ☒ I find that all the effects of the proposed project (a) have been covered in the CalVTP PEIR, and (b) all applicable Standard Project Requirements and mitigation measures identified in the CalVTP PEIR will be implemented. The proposed project is, therefore, **WITHIN THE SCOPE** of the CalVTP PEIR. **NO ADDITIONAL CEQA DOCUMENTATION** is required.
- ☒ I find that proposed project areas outside the CalVTP treatable landscape do not result in substantial changes in the project, no substantial changes in circumstances have occurred, and no new information of substantial importance has been identified. The inclusion of project areas outside the CalVTP treatable landscape will not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts. None of the conditions described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. **NO ADDITIONAL CEQA DOCUMENTATION** is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project will have effects that were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR. These effects are less than significant without any mitigation beyond what is already required pursuant to the CalVTP PEIR. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project will have effects that were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR or will have effects that are substantially more severe than those covered in the CalVTP PEIR. Although these effects may be significant in the absence of additional mitigation beyond the CalVTP PEIR's measures, revisions to the proposed project or additional mitigation measures have been agreed to by the project proponent that would avoid or reduce the effects so that clearly no significant effects would occur. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project will have significant environmental effects that are (a) new and were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR and/or (b) substantially more severe than those covered in the CalVTP PEIR. Because one or more effects may be significant and cannot be clearly mitigated to less than significant, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared.

Signature

Date

Rod Dowse
Printed Name

District Manager
Title

Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Agency

4.0 PROJECT-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS/ADDENDUM

4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact AES-1: Result in Short-Term, Substantial Degradation of a Scenic Vista or Visual Character or Quality of Public Views, or Damage to Scenic Resources in a State Scenic Highway from Treatment Activities	LTS	Impact AES-1, pp. 3.2-16 – 3.2-19	LTS	AES-2 AQ-2 AQ-3 REC-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact AES-2: Result in Long-Term, Substantial Degradation of a Scenic Vista or Visual Character or Quality of Public Views, or Damage to Scenic Resources in a State Scenic Highway from WUI Fuel Reduction, Ecological Restoration, or Shaded Fuel Break Treatment Types	LTS	Impact AES-2, pp. 3.2-20 – 3.2-25	Yes	AD-4 AES-1 AES-3 REC-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact AES-3: Result in Long-Term Substantial Degradation of a Scenic Vista or Visual Character or Quality of Public Views, or Damage to Scenic Resources in a State Scenic Highway from the Non-Shaded Fuel Break Treatment Type	SU	Impact AES-3, pp. 3.2-25 – 3.2-27	Yes	N/A	AES-3	N/A	NO	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Aesthetic and Visual Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to aesthetics and visual resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Impact AES-1

The project site does not include officially designated state scenic highways or designated scenic vistas. Treatment activities and equipment will be visible to the public using roadways and recreation areas within and adjacent to the project site as well as from distant viewpoints at higher elevations. The project includes manual and mechanical vegetation removal, prescribed burning, and herbicide treatment methods. As described in the PEIR, treatments would require equipment to be present within the project area for a short duration of time that will contrast with the existing agricultural, rural and residential environment in areas of the project site visible to the public. This impact would be temporary and would not dominate a view or block any views and would not degrade the visual character or quality of the area since equipment would be present in a limited geographic extent for a short period of time. Prescribed burning operations including equipment crew and smoke will be visible from public areas for short periods during treatment. In addition, the project would not introduce a new feature on the landscape.

Aesthetic impacts during active implementation of vegetation treatment activities were addressed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since it includes the treatment activities (manual, mechanical, herbicide and, prescribed burning), treatment types and treatment durations consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The project includes land outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape which constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. Treatment areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape contain similar visual characteristics and views as the land within the treatable landscape and would be visible to the public from the same areas as lands within the treatable landscape. Therefore, short term visual impacts from treatment activities would be the same in project areas within and outside of the treatable landscape. The impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

SPR AES-2 will be required for the project during treatment and maintenance to avoid staging equipment within viewsheds of public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways to the extent feasible and to minimize the visual presence of treatment-related materials and equipment. Notification along public roadways and in local media sources as described in SPR AD-4, the creation of a Smoke management plan and Burn plan as detailed in SPR AQ-2 and SPR AQ-3 will be required for prescribed burning operations to ensure no short term impact to protected visual resources will occur. There are no local plans, policies, or ordinances for the project area related to aesthetics and visual resources that are applicable to the project, therefore SPR-AD-3 does not apply for this impact. SPR REC-1 would be incorporated for public recreation areas within the project area to notify recreational users of temporary closers prior to treatment activities.

Impact AES-2

The project includes shaded fuel break treatment that will result in long-term visual changes within the project area. Within treatment areas, up to 100 percent of shrubs will be removed from some portions of the project site as well as trees less than 14-inches diameter at breast height (dbh). In treatment areas that contain only trees less than 14 inches dbh, trees will be removed to create a spacing of 24 feet between trees. As described above, the treatment area will be visible to the public traveling on roadways adjacent to the treatment area as well as from a distance on hiking trails on the surrounding hillsides and mountains. Long-term visual impacts from shaded fuel break treatment types were identified and evaluated in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant due to incorporations of SPRs and since large trees, vividness, intactness, and unity of views would remain.

The project contains fuel types and shaded fuel break treatment types consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR and is within the scope of the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the project area that is outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the EIR, however as discussed under Impact AES-1, the visual character, views, and visibility of these areas are the same as the project area within the treatable landscape and the treatment types in this area would be the same as those implemented within the treatable landscape. Long-term visual impacts of the project will be the same throughout the project area (within and outside of the treatable landscape). The impact of the project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

SPR AES-1 would be required to thin and feather adjacent vegetation to break up or screen linear edges of any clearings and mimic forms of natural clearings as reasonable for vegetation conditions. SPR AES-3 would be implemented as reasonable or appropriate for vegetative conditions. SPR REC-1 would be incorporated for public recreation areas within the project area to notify recreational users of temporary closers prior to treatment activities.

Impact AES-3

The project will result in unshaded fuel breaks in portions of the project area that contain shrub habitats where no trees are present. The fuel break treatment area will be treated with manual, mechanical, prescribed burning, and herbicide treatment methods which may remove up to one hundred percent of the existing vegetation in some areas. These areas will not be visible from an officially designated state scenic highway, but will be visible to the public from roadways and other public viewpoints. In some portions of the project site unshaded fuel breaks already exist and will be maintained. In addition, portions of the project site have been affected by recent wildfires and the existing visual condition is degraded due to charred and damaged vegetation.

The potential for unshaded fuel breaks to result in long-term degradation of a scenic vista or visual character or quality of public views was examined in the PEIR and found to be significant and unavoidable after the application of all feasible mitigation measures because it may be infeasible to relocate a non-shaded fuel break to avoid public visibility while achieving treatment objectives. The project is within the scope of the PEIR because the proposed treatment types and activities are consistent with those analyzed in the Program EIR. The inclusion of land in the project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the Program EIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing visual character is essentially the same within and outside of the treatable landscape; therefore, the long-term aesthetic impact is also the same, as described above. The impact of the project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Mitigation Measure AES-3 would apply to the project to minimize visual impacts, if feasible from any heavily used scenic vistas, public trails, recreation areas, and state scenic highways with lengthy views of non-shaded fuel breaks.

New Aesthetic and Visual Resource Impacts

The proposed treatments are consistent with the treatment types and activities covered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatments and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.2.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.2.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions pertinent to aesthetics and visual resources that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts are the same and, for the reasons described above, impacts of the proposed treatment project are consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impact. Therefore, no new impact related to aesthetics and visual resources would occur.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact AG-1: Directly Result in the Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forest Land to a Non-Forest Use or Involve Other Changes in the Existing Environment Which, Due to Their Location or Nature, Could Result in Conversion of Forest Land to Non-Forest Use	LTS	Impact AG-1, pp. 3.3-7 – 3.3-8	LTS	N/A	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Agriculture and Forestry Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to agriculture and forestry resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Impact AG-1

Portions of the project area support 10 percent or more of native tree cover and are defined as forest land by PRC Section 12220 (g). The project would result in removal of trees in forest land as defined by PRC Section 12220(g). The proposed project would include removal of trees less than 14 inches dbh, and retain smaller trees with a spacing of 24 feet in areas where only small trees are present. Impacts of vegetation removal within forestland were addressed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since following vegetation removal, forest land areas would generally support 10 percent native tree cover thereby maintaining consistency with the definition of forest land as defined by PRC Section 12220(g). The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since the proposed vegetation treatment types are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. In portions of the project site outside of treatable landscape, the project includes the same treatment types as those included for the project within the treatable landscape. Therefore, impacts will be the same for portions within and outside of the treatable landscape. This impact is consistent with the impact included in the PEIR and would not result in a substantially more severe significant impact than that covered in the PEIR. No SPRs are applicable to this impact.

New Agriculture and Forestry Resource Impacts

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities covered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.3.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.3.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project

proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to agriculture and forestry resources would occur.

4.3 Air Quality

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact AQ-1: Generate Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors During Treatment Activities that would exceed CAAQS or NAAQS	SU	Table 3.4-1; Impact AQ-1, pp. 3.4-26 – 3.4-32; Appendix AQ-1	Yes	AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, AQ-6	AQ-1	SU	No	Yes
Impact AQ-2: Expose People to Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions and Related Health Risk	LTS	Table 3.4-6; Impact AQ-2, pp. 3.4-33 – 3.4-34; Appendix AQ-1	Yes	HAZ-1, NOI-4, NOI-5	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact AQ-3: Expose People to Fugitive Dust Emissions Containing Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Related Health Risk	LTS	Section 3.4.2; Impact AQ-3, pp. 3.4-34 – 3.4-35	No	None	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Impact AQ-4: Expose People to Toxic Air Contaminants Emitted by Prescribed Burns and Related Health Risk	SU	Section 3.4.2; Impact AQ-4, pp. 3.4-35 – 3.4-37	No	AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-6	N/A	SU	N/A No	Yes
Impact AQ-5: Expose People to Objectionable Odors from Diesel Exhaust	LTS	Impact AQ-5, pp. 3.4-37 – 3.4-38	Yes	HAZ-1, NOI-4, NOI-5	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact AQ-6: Expose People to Objectionable Odors from Smoke During Prescribed Burning	SU	Section 2.5.2; Impact AQ-6; pp. 3.4-38	No	AD-4, AQ-2, AQ-6	N/A	SU	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Air Quality Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to air quality that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact AQ-1

The project site is within the Northeast Plateau Air Basin. The Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District regulates emissions of air pollutants within Siskiyou County. Siskiyou County is in Attainment for all Air quality Standards. The project includes herbicide treatment, manual treatment, mechanical treatment and prescribed burning activities. The initial treatment and as well as maintenance proposed by the project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursor from exhaust generated by off-road equipment, machine-powered hand tools, and on-road vehicle trips associated with worker commute and transport of equipment, the hauling and processing of biomass. Fugitive PM₁₀ and 2.5 dust emissions will also be generated by ground disturbance activities and vehicle travel on unpaved roads as well as smoke generated by the combustion of vegetation during prescribed burns.

The Siskiyou County APCD does not have mass emission thresholds for criteria air pollutants. However the project could result in localized exceedances of NAAQS and CAAQS in areas where people reside and work. The potential for emissions of criteria pollutants to exceed CAAQS or NAAQS thresholds was analyzed in the PEIR and found to be significant and unavoidable after application of all feasible mitigation measures because of uncertainties in the degree of emissions reduction that could occur during implementation of each project.

The project is within the scope of the PEIR since it includes treatment activities, equipment and treatment durations consistent with those considered in the PEIR. In portions of the project site outside of treatable landscape, treatment activities and duration will be the same as for treatment areas within the treatable landscape. In addition, existing air quality conditions in areas outside of the treatable landscape are the same as those within the treatable landscape in the project area. SPRs applicable to the project include SPR AD-4, SPR AQ-1, SPR AQ-2, SPR AQ-3, SPR AQ-4 and SPR AQ-6. The project will also implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1. Impacts will be consistent with the determination in the PEIR. The proposed project would not result in substantially more severe significant impacts than those analyzed in the PEIR.

Impact AQ-2

Use of vehicles and mechanical equipment during initial and maintenance treatments would result in exhaust emissions of diesel PM from off-road equipment and haul truck trips associated with treatment activities. The effects of exposure of people to diesel particulate matter emissions and related health risk were analyzed in the PEIR. This impact was determined to be less than significant since treatment activities would not take place near any single sensitive receptor for an extended period of time, diesel PM generated by treatment activities would not expose any person to an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in one million or a Hazard Index of 1.0 or greater.

Diesel particulate matter emissions from the proposed treatments are within the scope of the PEIR because the exposure potential is the same as analyzed in the PEIR, and the types and amount of equipment that would be used, as well as the duration of use during proposed treatments are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the air quality conditions and sensitive receptors (i.e., exposure potential) present outside of the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape and impacts would be the same as those included in the PEIR. SPRs applicable to this treatment are HAZ-1, NOI-4, and NOI-5. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact AQ-3

According to *A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California*, (Churchill and Hill 2000), The project is not within an area of containing ultramafic rock which is more likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos, therefore this impact is not applicable to the project.

Impact AQ-4

The project includes prescribed burning during initial and maintenance treatments which could expose people to toxic air contaminants. This impact was examined in the PEIR and found to be significant and unavoidable after the

application of all feasible mitigation measures because unpredictable changes in weather can occur during prescribed burns that could result in short-term exposure of people to concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and associated levels of acute health risk. The project is within the scope of the PEIR since the duration and parameters of the broadcast and pile burn treatments are consistent with those included in the PEIR.

The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, project areas outside of the treatable landscape contain essentially the air quality conditions as those within the treatable landscape and impacts would be the same as those included in the PEIR. SPRs applicable to this impact include AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-6. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable, consistent with the determination for this impact in the PEIR and the project would not result in a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact AQ-5

The project includes use of vehicles and mechanical equipment during initial and maintenance treatments that could expose people to objectionable odors from diesel exhaust. The potential to expose people to objectionable odors from diesel exhaust was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since diesel exhaust emissions would be temporary, would not be generated at any one location for an extended period, would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance, and treatment activities are generally in less populated, rural, or undeveloped areas where human receptors are sparse.

This impact of the project is within the scope of the PEIR because the exposure potential and the proposed activities, as well as the associated equipment and duration of use, are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the air quality conditions and sensitive receptors present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the air quality impact is also the same, as described above. SPRs applicable to this treatment are HAZ-1, NOI-4, and NOI-5. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact AQ-6

Prescribed burning during initial and maintenance treatments could expose people to objectionable odors. The potential to expose people to objectionable odors from prescribed burning was examined in the PEIR and was found to be significant and unavoidable after the application of all feasible mitigation measures because short term exposure to odorous smoke emissions from unpredictable weather changes could occur. The duration and parameters of the proposed prescribed burning treatments included in the project are within the scope of the activities addressed in the PEIR. Therefore, the resultant potential for exposure to objectionable odors from smoke is also within the scope of impacts covered in the PEIR.

The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the air quality conditions present and sensitive receptors in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the air quality impact is also the same, as described above. SPRs that are applicable to this impact are AD-4, AQ-2, and AQ-6. As This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Air Quality Impacts

The proposed treatments are consistent with the treatment types and activities covered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatments and determined they are consistent with the applicable regulatory and environmental conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.4.1, "Regulatory Setting," and Section 3.4.2, "Environmental Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the

boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to air quality that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts are the same and, for the reasons described above, impacts of the proposed treatment project are consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impact. Therefore, no new impact related to air quality would occur.

4.4 Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact CUL-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Built Historical Resources	LTS	Impact CUL-1, pp. 3.5-14 – 3.5-15	Yes	CUL-1 CUL-7 CUL-8	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact CUL-2: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources or Subsurface Historical Resources	SU	Impact CUL-2, pp. 3.5-15 – 3.5-16	Yes	CUL-1 CUL-2 CUL-3 CUL-4 CUL-5 CUL-8	CUL-2	SU	No	Yes
Impact CUL-3: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource	LTS	Impact CUL-3, p. 3.5-17	LTS	CUL-1 CUL-2 CUL-3 CUL-4 CUL-5 CUL-6 CUL-8	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact CUL-4: Disturb Human Remains	LTS	Impact CUL-4, p. 3.5-18	Yes	NA	NA	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Consistent with SPR CUL-2, a list of geographically affiliated Native American representatives was obtained from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 2, 2024. Native American contacts in Siskiyou County were contacted on August 8, 2024 and included the Alturas Rancheria of Pit River Indians, Karuk Tribe, Pit River Tribe of California, Redding Rancheria, Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, Shasta Nation, and Susanville Indian Rancheria. As of September 9, 2024, no responses from Native American tribes were received. An August 8, 2024 search of the NAHC's sacred lands database returned a positive result.

Impact CUL-1

Proposed treatment activities could occur on lands that contain built historical resources. The potential for treatment activities to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of built historical resources was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since implementation of SPRs CUL-1, CUL-7, and CUL-8 would avoid substantial adverse changes to any built historical resources by identifying, then avoiding and protecting the resources from damage that could be caused by treatment activities. Project impacts are within the scope of the PEIR because the treatment activities and intensity of disturbance is consistent with that analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the proposed treatment area, the potential to encounter built historical resources is essentially the same within and outside of the treatable landscape. In addition, the same treatment activities will be implemented in areas within and outside of the treatable landscape, therefore the potential impacts to historical resources are the same. Impacts will be consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR. SPRs applicable to the project are CUL-1, CUL-7, and CUL-8.

Impact CUL-2

The project includes mechanical treatment activities that could churn up the surface of the ground as vegetation is removed and disturb unique archaeological or subsurface historical resources. The potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of unique archaeological resources or subsurface historical resources was examined in the PEIR. SPRs CUL-1 through CUL-5 and SPR CUL-8 require a records search, pre-field research, and archaeological survey, coordination with Native American groups, worker training to recognize sensitive cultural resources, and avoiding or protecting historical resources. However, despite implementation of these SPRs, unknown unique archaeological resources or subsurface historical resources could be inadvertently damaged during treatment activities and impacts were determined to be potentially significant in the PEIR. In the event that prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires protection in place, recovery of information, recording, or otherwise treating the discovered resource appropriately. However, since there could be some rare instances where inadvertent damage to unknown resources may be extensive and a substantial adverse change may not be fully mitigated, the PEIR determined impacts to undiscovered unique archaeological or subsurface historical resources would be significant and unavoidable.

Project impacts are within the scope of the PEIR because the treatment activities and intensity of disturbance is consistent with that analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the proposed treatment area, the potential to encounter unique archaeological resources or subsurface historical resources is essentially the same within and outside of the treatable landscape. In addition, the same treatment activities will be implemented in areas within and outside of the treatable landscape, therefore the potential impacts to unique archaeological resources or subsurface historical resources are the same throughout the treatment area. Impacts will be consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR. SPRs applicable to the project are CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5 and CUL-8. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is also applicable to the project.

Impact CUL-3

Native American contacts in Siskiyou County were contacted on August 8, 2024 and included the Alturas Rancheria of Pit River Indians, Karuk Tribe, Pit River Tribe of California, Redding Rancheria, Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, Shasta Nation, and Susanville Indian Rancheria. As of September 9, 2024, no responses from Native American tribes were received. Proposed treatment activities include prescribed burning, manual and mechanical treatments, and herbicide application. The potential for treatment activities to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource was examined in the PEIR. As explained in the PEIR, while tribal cultural resources may be identified within the treatable landscape during development of later treatment projects, implementation of SPRs would avoid any substantial adverse change to any tribal cultural resource.

The project is within the scope of the PEIR since it includes the same treatment types and intensity of disturbance analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the tribal cultural affiliations present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape and the treatment activities would be the same; therefore, the potential impact to tribal cultural resources is also the same as described above. SPRs applicable to the project include CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6 and CUL-8. The impacts of the project are consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact CUL-4

Vegetation treatment activities would include mechanical treatments using heavy equipment that could churn up the surface of the ground and uncover human remains. The potential for treatment activities to uncover human remains was examined in the PEIR. The PEIR determined this impact would be less than significant since compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097 would avoid disturbance. This impact is within the scope of the PEIR because the intensity of ground disturbance is consistent with that analyzed in the PEIR. Additionally, consistent with the PEIR, the project would comply with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097 in the event of a discovery of human remains. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the treatment area, the potential for uncovering human remains during implementation of the treatment project is essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape and treatment activities would be the same; therefore, the impact related to disturbance of human remains is also the same, as described above. No SPRs are applicable to this impact. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts

The proposed treatment is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.5.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.5.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a changed circumstance to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the treatment area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to archaeological, historical, or tribal cultural resources that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to archaeological, historical, or tribal cultural resources or human remains would occur.

4.5 Biological Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact BIO-1: Substantially Affect Special-Status Plant Species Either Directly or Through Habitat Modifications	LTSM	Impact BIO-1, pp 3.6-131-3.6.138	Yes	BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-9, AQ-3, AQ-4, GEO-1, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-7, HYD-4, HYD-5	BIO-1a, BIO-1b	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-2: Substantially Affect Special-Status Wildlife Species Either Directly or Through Habitat Modifications	LTSM (all wildlife species except bumble bees) S&U (bumble bees)	Impact BIO-2, pp 3.6-139-3.6.187	Yes	BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-9, BIO-10, HAZ-5, HAZ-6, HYD-1, HYD-4	BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-2c, BIO-2e, BIO-2g, BIO-4	LTSM (all wildlife species except bumble bees) S&U (bumble bees)	No	Yes
Impact BIO-3: Substantially Affect Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community Through Direct Loss or Degradation that Leads to Loss of Habitat Function	LTSM	Impact BIO-3, pp 3.6-187-3.6.192	Yes	BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-9, HYD-4, HYD-5	BIO-3a	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-4: Substantially Affect State or Federally Protected Wetlands	LTSM	Impact BIO-4, pp 3.6-192-3.6.193	Yes	BIO-1, HYD-1, HYD-4	BIO-4	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-5: Interfere Substantially with Wildlife Movement Corridors or Impede Use of Nurseries	LTSM	Impact BIO-5, pp 3.6-193-3.6.197	Yes	SPR BIO-1, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-10, HYD-1, HYD-4	BIO-5	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-6: Substantially Reduce Habitat or Abundance of Common Wildlife	LTS	Impact BIO-6, pp 3.6-197-3.6.198	Yes	BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-12	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact BIO-7: Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	NI	Impact BIO-7, pp 3.6-198-3.6.199	Yes	AD-3	NA	NI	No	Yes

Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact BIO-8: Conflict with the Provisions of an Adopted Natural Community Conservation Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan, or Other Approved Habitat Plan	NI	Impact BIO-8, pp 3.6-199-3.6-200	Yes	NI	NA	NI	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Biological Resources Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to biological resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Pursuant to SPR BIO-1, VESTRA biologists conducted a data review of project-specific biological resources, including habitat and vegetation types, special-status plants, special-status wildlife, sensitive natural communities, and sensitive habitats (e.g., chaparral, wetland and riparian habitats) with potential to occur in the project area. US Forest Service CALVEG 2021 vegetation mapping was used to identify the habitat types within the project area and is the best available, current vegetation mapping data for the project area.

The project area is located within the Southern Cascades ecoregion, specifically Siskiyou County. The project area ranges in elevation from approximately 2800 feet to 3400 feet. Habitat types within the project area and total acreage of each type are presented in Table 4.5-1.

Table 4.5-1 Habitat Types Within the Project Area	
Habitat Type	Treatment Acres
Forest/Woodland	
Aspen	5
Eastside Pine	380
Jeffrey Pine	310
Juniper	1507
Montane Hardwood-Conifer	52
Montane Hardwood	52
Ponderosa Pine	39
Sierran Mixed Conifer	45
Forest/Woodland Total:	2343

Table 4.5-1 Habitat Types Within the Project Area	
Habitat Type	Treatment Acres
Shrub/Scrub	
Bitterbrush	2051
Montane Chaparral	285
Sagebrush	388
Shrub/Scrub Total:	2724
Herbaceous	
Annual Grassland	831
Perennial Grassland	491
Herbaceous Total:	1322
Wetland/Riparian	
Lacustrine	51
Montane Riparian	26
Wet Meadow	45
Wetland/Riparian Total:	122
Agricultural	
Cropland	51
Pasture	308
Agricultural Total:	568
Developed/Urban/Barren	
Barren	163
Pasture	122
Developed/Urban/Barren Total:	285
All Habitats Total	7,364

A list of special-status plant and wildlife species with potential to occur in the project area was compiled by completing a review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) within a five-mile radius and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California database records for the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangles containing and surrounding the project area (9 quadrangles total; CNDDDB 2024; CNPS 2024); the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool (USFWS 2024a); Siskiyou County General Plan Conservation Element (Siskiyou County 1973); and Appendix BIO-3 (Table 18a, Table 18b, and Table 19) in the PEIR (Volume II) for special-status plants and wildlife that could occur in the Southern Cascades ecoregions. A list of sensitive natural communities with potential to occur in the project area was compiled by reviewing Table 3.6-31 (pages 3.6-110 – 3.6-111) in the PEIR (Volume II) for sensitive natural communities that occur in the Southern Cascades ecoregion in the habitat types mapped in the project area.

VESTRA biologists conducted reconnaissance surveys on October 11, 2023, May 02, 2024, and May 14, 2024, to identify and document sensitive resources (e.g., aquatic habitat, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities) and to assess the suitability of habitat in the project area for special-status plant and wildlife species. Mapped habitat types were verified where possible and all wildlife observations were recorded. Based on implementation of SPR BIO-1, including review of occurrence data, species ranges, habitat requirements for each species, and habitat present within the project area as assessed during reconnaissance surveys, a list of all species with potential to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project was assembled (Attachment B). It was determined that 21 special-status plant and 10 special-status wildlife taxa have the potential to occur in the project area and 3 special-status plants and 5 special-status wildlife taxa are known to occur in the project area (Attachment B).

Impact BIO-1

Initial vegetation treatments and maintenance treatments could result in direct removal or destruction, or indirect death or reduced vigor of through habitat modification of the 24 special-status plant species with suitable habitat in the project area. Potential impacts resulting from maintenance activities would be similar to those resulting from initial vegetation treatments, because the same treatment activities would occur. However, treatment frequency and intensity can determine whether effects on certain plant species are beneficial or adverse. Initial treatment that reduces overgrowth, opens the tree canopy to allow more light penetration, or removes invasive competitors can be beneficial for some special-status plant populations; however, repeated treatments at too frequent intervals can have adverse effects on those same special-status plants.

Of the twenty four special-status plant species with suitable habitat in the project area (Attachment B), six of these special-status plant species – rosy orthocarpus (*Orthocarpus bracteosus*), horned butterwort (*Pinguicula macroceras*), water bulrush (*Schoenoplectus subterminalis*), pendulous bulrush (*Scirpus pendulus*), Siskiyou clover (*Trifolium siskiyouense*), and hairy marsh hedge-nettle (*Stachys pilosa*) – are typically associated with wetlands (e.g., freshwater emergent wetlands, freshwater forested/shrub wetlands, springs, seeps). Eight special-status plant species – alkali hymenoxys (*Hymenoxys lemmonii*), subalpine aster (*Eurybia merita*), Peck's lomatium (*Lomatium peckianum*), Shasta orthocarpus (*Orthocarpus pachystachyus*), Baker's globe mallow (*Iliamna bakeri*), Aleppo (yellow) avens (*Geum aleppicum*), Oregon polemonium (*Polemonium carneum*), and lare-flowered triteleia (*Triteleia grandiflora*) – may be associated with both wetland and upland areas. The remaining ten special-status plant species – Yreka phlox (*Phlox hirsuta*), Modoc green-gentian (*Frasera albicaulis* var. *modocensis*), Shasta ageratina (*Ageratina shastensis*), Cook's phacelia (*Phacelia cookii*), Peck's lomatium (*Lomatium peckianum*), woolly balsamroot (*Balsamorhiza lanata*), Waldo daisy (*Erigeron bloomeri* var. *nudatus*), Shasta chaenactis (*Chaenactis suffrutescens*), pallid bird's-beak (*Cordylanthus tenuis* ssp. *pallascens*), and brittle prickly-pear (*Opuntia fragilis*) – are associated with upland habitats that are present in the project area.

Pursuant to SPR HYD-4, WLPZs ranging from 50 to 150 feet adjacent to all Class I and Class II streams and lakes (defined under Forest Practice Rules as a permanent natural body of water of any size, or an artificially impounded body of water having a surface area of at least one acre; CAL FIRE 2024) within the project area would be implemented and WLPZs of sufficient size to avoid degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water would be established adjacent to all Class III and Class IV (e.g., drainage canals, irrigation ditches) streams for manual, mechanical, herbicide, and prescribed burning treatments. SPR HYD-4 would minimize adverse effects on some of these potentially occurring species. SPR HYD-4 requires the retention of at least 75 percent of surface cover and undisturbed area within WLPZs. However, the WLPZ is not a no-disturbance buffer as manual treatments within WLPZs are permitted and up to 25 percent of vegetative cover may be removed, which could potentially result in loss of special-status plants in streambank, wetland, spring, and seep habitat. Therefore, implementation of WLPZ restrictions under SPR HYD-4 will not be sufficient in protecting special-status plants within the WLPZ. Furthermore, there may be additional habitat suitable for special-status plants outside of a WLPZ, or surrounding ponds smaller than one acre (i.e., not considered a lake under Forest Practice Rules). Wetland delineations will be conducted to determine where wetland, spring, seep, and mesic habitats are located within treatment areas. Buffers of at least 25 feet will be established around any aquatic resources delineated onsite (per Mitigation Measure BIO-4; refer to Impact BIO-4 below). These buffers will generally be no-disturbance buffers; however, within meadow habitats, ignition for broadcast burning using only propane torches may occur, including within wetland buffers (see discussion regarding revisions to Mitigation Measure BIO-4, below).

Although these measures would avoid and minimize adverse effects on special-status plants typically associated with wetland areas, habitat potentially suitable for the 8 facultative special-status plant species (i.e., associated with both wetland and upland areas) and all habitat potentially suitable for the 10 upland-associated special-status plant species would not be avoided under SPR HYD-4 and Mitigation Measure BIO-4. As a result, SPR BIO-7 would be required, which would include surveying for special-status plants before implementing treatments in any habitat potentially suitable for special-status plants. If special-status plant species are observed during SPR BIO-7, Mitigation Measure BIO-1a and/or Mitigation Measure BIO-1b would be required, establishing no disturbance buffers around plants listed

under California Endangered Species Act (CESA), federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), and other special-status plants, which would include special-status plants in both wetland and upland habitat.

SPR BIO-7 would apply to all treatment activities, including maintenance treatments. This requires protocol-level surveys for special-status plants to be conducted pursuant to Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018b) before implementing mechanical, manual, prescribed burning, and herbicide treatments in any habitat potentially suitable for special-status plants, which would include upland habitat that could potentially contain facultative species that are growing outside of wetlands. Pursuant to SPR BIO-7, surveys would not be required for those special-status plants not listed under the CESA or ESA, if the target special-status plant species is an herbaceous annual species, stump-sprouting species, or geophyte species; and the specific treatments may be carried out during the dormant season for that species or when the species has completed its annual life cycle, provided the treatment would not alter habitat in a way that would make it unsuitable for the special-status plants to reestablish following treatment, or destroy seedbanks, stumps, or roots, rhizomes, bulbs and other underground parts of special-status plants. However, this would require that treatments in potentially suitable habitat for these special-status plants be restricted to the dormant season for these species and to treatments that do not disturb below the soil surface (i.e., manual treatments, herbicide application, and prescribed burning) without prior knowledge of their presence, which may unnecessarily or infeasibly constrain treatment implementation.

Three of the twenty-four special-status plant species that may occur within the project area are herbaceous annual species or geophytes. Impacts on these species would be avoided by treatment activities that do not kill or remove vegetation or disturb the soil (e.g., manual treatment, herbicide application, and prescribed burning) during the dormant season (i.e., when the plant has no aboveground parts), which would typically occur after seed set and before germination. Typically, germination will occur after the first significant rainfall (approximately 0.5 inches), and cold snap, which generally occurs between October–December (Levine et. al 2008). Treatment activities that could potentially kill or remove seeds, stumps, and underground root structures (i.e., mechanical treatments) may result in impacts on these plant species even when dormant and would not be conducted without prior implementation of SPR BIO-7. If treatments that do not kill or remove vegetation or disturb the soil (i.e., manual treatments, herbicide application, and prescribed burning) cannot be completed in the dormant season and would be implemented during the growing period of these annual and geophyte species, protocol surveys completed at the appropriate time of year (per SPR BIO-7) and avoidance of any identified plants (per Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b) must be implemented, as described below. The remaining 21 of the 24 special-status plant species that have potential to occur within the project area are perennial species, which could not be avoided seasonally in the same manner as herbaceous annual species, stump sprouters, or geophytes; therefore, protocol-level surveys under SPR BIO-7 would be necessary to identify them before implementing treatment activities regardless of the timing of treatments.

Where protocol-level surveys are required (per SPR BIO-7) and special-status plants are identified during these surveys, Mitigation Measures BIO-1a or BIO-1b, depending on species status, would be implemented to avoid loss of identified special-status plants. Per Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b, if special-status plants are identified during protocol-level surveys, a no-disturbance buffer of at least 50 feet would be established around the area occupied by the species within which prescribed fire, herbicide application, and mechanical and manual treatment, would not occur unless a qualified RPF or biologist determines, based on substantial evidence, that the species would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area. In the case of plants listed pursuant to CESA or ESA, the determination of beneficial effects would need to be made in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and/or USFWS, depending on species status. If treatments are determined to be beneficial and would be implemented in areas occupied by special-status plants, under the specific conditions described under Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b, additional impact minimization and avoidance measures or design alternatives to reduce impacts would be identified. An evaluation of the appropriate treatment design and frequency to maintain habitat function for special-status plants will be carried out by a qualified RPF or botanist. Therefore, habitat function for special-status plants would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would be designed to ensure that treatments, including follow-up maintenance, maintain habitat function for the special-status plant species present.

Three special-status plant species – rosy orthocarpus (annual herb), alkali hymenoxys (perennial herb), and woolly balsamroot (perennial herb) – have been identified previously and are known to occur within project area. If surveys pursuant to SPR BIO-7 determine these known populations are still present, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1b would be required to avoid loss of individual plants. For the perennial species, this would require establishing a no-disturbance buffer around the area occupied by the species and marking the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). The no-disturbance buffers will generally be a minimum of 50 feet from special-status plants, but the size and shape of the buffer zone may be adjusted if a qualified RPF or botanist determines that a smaller buffer will be sufficient to avoid loss of or damage to special-status plants or that a larger buffer is necessary to sufficiently protect plants from the treatment activity. For the annual and geophytic species, treatments may be conducted within this buffer outside of the growing season (e.g., after species has completed its annual life cycle) or during the dormant season using only treatment activities that would not damage the underground parts of special-status plants or destroy the seedbank.

The potential for treatment activities to affect special-status plants either directly or through habitat modifications was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Project impacts to special status plant species are within the scope of the PEIR since the project includes treatment activities and intensity of treatment consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, habitat characteristics are essentially the same within and outside of the treatable landscape (e.g., no resource is affected on land outside the treatable landscape that would not also be similarly affected within the treatable landscape). Therefore, the potential impact on special-status plants is also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-1 are SPR AQ-3, SPR AQ-4, SPR BIO-1, SPR BIO-2, SPR BIO-6, SPR BIO-7, SPR BIO-9, SPR GEO-1, SPR GEO-3, SPR GEO-4, SPR GEO-5, SPR GEO-7, SPR HYD-4, and SPR HYD-5. Biological resource mitigation measures that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-1 are Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b. As explained above, impacts on special-status plants resulting from the proposed project compared to the PEIR program description, would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-2

Initial vegetation treatments and follow-up maintenance treatments could affect special-status wildlife species either directly or through habitat modifications. Impacts to each special-status species with potential to occur within the project area are addressed below. Potential impacts resulting from maintenance activities would generally be the same as those resulting from initial vegetation treatments because the same treatment activities would occur.

Western Pond Turtle

Aquatic habitat potentially suitable for western pond turtle is present within ponds and streams in and adjacent to the project area, and this species could use upland habitat within the project area in the vicinity of these features for nesting. Western pond turtles may be present within upland habitat up to 1,500 feet from water. Pursuant to SPR HYD-4, a WLPZ of 50 to 150 feet adjacent to all Class I and Class II streams and lakes would be implemented, and WLPZs of sufficient size to avoid degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water would be established adjacent to all Class III and Class IV (e.g., drainage canals, irrigation ditches) streams. However, these measures may not avoid impacts on western pond turtles if turtles are present further than 150 feet from stream or lake habitat, are present within ponds smaller than one acre (i.e., not considered a lake under Forest Practice Rules), or if manual activities implemented within the WLPZ resulted in injury or mortality of turtles. The potential for treatment activities and maintenance treatments to result in adverse effects on western pond turtle was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on western pond turtles can be clearly avoided by physically avoiding the habitat suitable for these species, then no mitigation would be required. However, because western pond turtles may be present relatively large distances (i.e., up to approximately 1,500 feet) from aquatic habitat in the treatment area, it is unlikely that all habitat potentially suitable for the species can be avoided. As a result, SPR BIO-10

would apply, and focused visual encounter surveys for western pond turtle would be conducted by a qualified RPF or biologist within upland habitat areas suitable for the species before treatment activities that could potentially kill or remove vegetation or disturb the soil (i.e., mechanical treatments, herbicide application, and prescribed burning). If western pond turtles or their nests are identified during focused surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-2b for this species would be implemented.

Under Mitigation Measure BIO-2b, the project proponent would require flagging areas for avoidance, relocation of individual animals by a qualified RPF or biologist with an appropriate permit, and/or other measures recommended by a qualified RPF or biologist as necessary to avoid injury to or mortality of western pond turtles. The project proponent may consult with CDFW for technical information regarding appropriate measures.

Habitat function for western pond turtle would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would not occur within aquatic habitat, and pursuant to SPR HYD-4 treatments within stream WLPZs adjacent to the treatment area would be limited (e.g., no mechanical treatment, retention of at least 75 percent surface cover). This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Special-Status Birds

Three special-status bird species are known to occur in the project area: bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*), and California gull (*Larus californicus*). Three additional special-status bird species have potential to occur in the project area: golden eagle, greater sandhill crane, and prairie falcon (Attachment B). Treatment activities, including mechanical treatments, manual treatments, and prescribed burning conducted during the nesting bird season (February 1–August 31) could result in direct loss of active nests if trees or shrubs containing nests or ground nests are removed or burned. For nests within vegetation that would not be removed, treatment activities including mechanical treatments, manual treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application, could result in disturbance to active nests from auditory and visual stimulus (e.g., heavy equipment, chainsaws, vehicles, personnel) potentially resulting in abandonment and loss of eggs or chicks. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on special-status birds was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on habitat suitable for nesting special-status birds can be clearly avoided by physically avoiding habitat suitable for the species or conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity (e.g., nesting bird season), then no mitigation would be required. Adverse effects on nesting special-status birds would be clearly avoided for treatments that would occur outside of the nesting bird season (February 1–August 31).

If conducting some treatments outside of the nesting bird season is determined to be infeasible, then SPR BIO-10 would apply, and focused nesting bird surveys for bald eagle, golden eagle, bank swallow, California gull, greater sandhill crane, and prairie falcon would be conducted by a qualified RPF or biologist before implementation of treatment activities.

If no active bird nests are observed during focused surveys, then additional avoidance measures for these species would not be required. If active special-status bird nests are observed during focused surveys, then Mitigation Measures BIO-2a (for bald eagle, golden eagle, bank swallow, and greater sandhill crane) and BIO-2b (for California gull and prairie falcon) would be implemented. Under Mitigation Measures BIO-2a or BIO-2b, a no-disturbance buffer of at least 0.5 mile would be established around active bald eagle and golden eagle nests; 500 feet for greater sandhill crane nests, 300 feet for prairie falcon nests; 150 feet for California gull nests; and at least 100 feet around the nests of other special-status birds, and no treatment activities would occur within this buffer until the chicks have fledged as determined by a qualified RPF or biologist (PG&E 2014). Additionally, trees containing bald eagle nests would not be removed pursuant to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Habitat function for special-status birds would be maintained because treatment activities would not result in removal of trees (i.e., conifers, hardwoods) greater than 14 inches DBH, which would be the most likely features to be used by these species due to the cover provided by larger trees. Treatments within riparian habitat (which may provide nesting habitat for special-status bird species) that is included within a WLPZ would be limited pursuant to SPR HYD-4 (e.g., no mechanical treatment, retention of at least 75 percent surface cover). Nesting habitat for some special-status bird species that may occur in

the project area includes cliffs (e.g., golden eagle) and banks (e.g., bank swallows). Treatment activities would not occur in these habitats; thus, this nesting habitat would not be removed or modified.

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, the final determination for habitat function maintenance for bald eagle, golden eagle, bank swallow, and greater sandhill crane must be made by the project proponent in consultation with CDFW. Therefore, if Mitigation Measure BIO-2a is required for treatment activities, the project proponent would contact CDFW to seek technical input on the determination that habitat function would be maintained for bald eagle, golden eagle, bank swallow, and greater sandhill crane. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Special-Status Bumble Bees

Two special-status bumble bee species have potential to occur in the project area: Franklin's bumble bee (*Bombus franklini*) and western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis*), (Attachment B). Franklin's bumble bee is listed as endangered under ESA. The range of Franklin's bumble bee is restricted to southern Oregon and northern California, including parts of Siskiyou County and the project area (Williams et al. 2014; Xerces 2010; Xerces 2018). Franklin's bumble bee has not been observed in California since 1998, and has not been observed at all since 2006, despite ongoing surveys within the range of the species (Code and Haney 2006; Xerces 2010; Xerces 2018). The sighting in 2006 was a single bumble bee near Mt. Ashland, approximately 50 miles north of the project area (Code and Haney 2006; Xerces 2010; Xerces 2018). Surveys for the species have been conducted at least through 2017, including at least three locations in Siskiyou County (i.e., Mt. Shasta, Hilt, Montague) and no Franklin's bumble bees have been detected (Xerces 2018).

Both bumble bee species were designated as candidates for listing as endangered under CESA by the California Fish and Game Commission on June 12, 2019. A November 13, 2020, court decision by the Superior Court of Sacramento ruled that insects are not eligible for listing under CESA and vacated the candidacy of these species. CDFW appealed this decision, and on May 31, 2022, the Third District Court of Appeal in Sacramento ruled that insects are eligible for listing under CESA. On September 30, 2022, the candidacy of these bumble bee species was reinstated under CESA. Both bumble bee species have recently undergone declines in abundance and distribution and are no longer present across much of their historic range.

Bumble bees have three basic habitat requirements: suitable nesting sites for the colonies, availability of nectar and pollen from floral resources throughout the duration of the colony period (spring, summer, and fall), and suitable overwintering sites for the queens. The project area contains habitat suitable for bumble bee nesting and overwintering as well as floral resources. Treatment activities, including manual treatments, mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application could result in temporary removal of floral resources, as well as inadvertent destruction of bumble bee nests or overwintering sites through trampling, crushing, or removal of nesting or overwintering substrate (e.g., downed woody debris). The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on special-status bumble bees was examined in the PEIR.

Mandatory survey protocols for Franklin's bumble bee, and western bumble bee have not been published; however, survey considerations for CESA candidate bumble bee species, as described in CDFW 2023, follow a protocol similar to those published for other bumble bee species in the United States (e.g., rusty-patched bumble bee [*Bombus affinis*]; USFWS 2019). The USFWS survey protocol for rusty-patched bumble bee classifies habitats within the range of the species as high potential zones, low potential zones, uncertain zones, and unoccupied zones (USFWS 2019). Following the same definitions as provided in this protocol, the project area would be considered unoccupied by Franklin's bumble bee, because the last known record of Franklin's bumble bee in California was before 2000 (i.e., 1998) and because there have been at least three years of negative survey results since the last known effort (Code and Haney 2006; USFWS 2019; Xerces 2010; Xerces 2018). There are no documented western bumble bee occurrences in the project area (CNDDDB 2024). Based on all of these factors, it is unlikely that Franklin's bumble bee and western bumble bee occur in the project area. However, because absence of these species in the project area cannot be determined with certainty, SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10 would apply.

Since the project area contains suitable habitat for bumble bees that cannot be avoided, SPR BIO-10 would be implemented, and focused surveys for special-status bumble bees, focused on Franklin's bumble bee, would be

conducted in coordination with the USFWS Yreka office. If no special-status bumble bees are found during pretreatment surveys, no further measures will be required. If special-status bumble bees are detected during the focused survey, or presence within suitable habitat is assumed, Mitigation Measure BIO-2g would apply. Mitigation Measure BIO-2g would reduce potential impacts on special-status bumble bees by requiring avoidance of prescribed burning and herbicide treatment within occupied or suitable habitat within the flight season, dividing treatment units into a sufficient number of treatment units such that the entirety of the habitat is not treated within the same year, conducting treatments in a patchy pattern to the extent feasible in occupied or suitable habitat such that the entirety of the habitat is not burned or removed, and requiring that herbicides are not applied to flowering native plants within occupied or suitable habitat to the extent feasible during the flight season. A qualified RPF or biologist will determine in consultation with CDFW (for Franklin's bumble bee and western bumble bee) and USFWS (for Franklin's bumble bee) if, after implementation of feasible avoidance measures (potentially including others not listed above), the treatment will result in mortality, injury, or disturbance to the species, or if after implementation of the treatment, habitat function will remain. If consultation determines that mortality, injury, or disturbance of listed bumble bees (in the event the Candidate listing is confirmed) or degradation of occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat would occur, Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be required to mitigate for mortality, injury, or disturbance and loss of habitat function.

The PEIR concluded that impacts on special-status bumble bees would be potentially significant and unavoidable, recognizing the difficulty in detecting overwintering and nesting bumble bees and determining the occurrence and severity of impacts. Therefore, for purposes of CEQA compliance, this PSA/Addendum notes the impact as significant and unavoidable. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Monarch

Several observations of milkweed occurred within the project area during pedestrian surveys. The project area is outside of the monarch overwintering range; however, it is within the breeding and foraging range and contains various natural habitats and floral resources that likely provide foraging or breeding habitat suitable for the species. Treatment activities, including manual treatments, mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application could result in temporary removal of floral resources, including monarch host plants (i.e., milkweed), or direct mortality of monarch butterflies. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on monarch butterflies was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on monarch butterflies can be clearly avoided by conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity or physically avoiding habitat for these species, then mitigation would not be required. However, because monarchs may use habitat in the project area for large portions of the year (i.e., there is no season of sensitivity), implementation of SPR BIO-10 would be required before treatment activities. Under SPR BIO-10, presence of monarch butterflies would be assumed.

If focused surveys are conducted and monarchs are not detected, then further mitigation for the species would not be required. If monarchs are detected during focused surveys, or are assumed to be present, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2e would be implemented. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-2e, several measures will be implemented to reduce the likelihood of mortality, injury, or disturbance to monarchs and to maintain habitat function. These measures include retention of host plants (i.e., milkweed) and conducting treatments in a patchy pattern to retain floral resources and provide refuge for butterflies.

Habitat function for monarch would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would retain host plants for the species and because all habitat suitable for monarch in the project area would not be treated at once (i.e., treatments in the project area would occur over the course of several years). The project area is surrounded by natural habitat in Klamath National Forest to the west, Shasta-Trinity National Forest to the south, Mt. Shasta to the southeast and Modoc National Forest to the east; therefore, any temporary impacts resulting from project implementation in the project area would not result in significant loss of natural habitat in the vicinity of the project area. If monarchs are listed under ESA during the life of the project, then the final determination for habitat function maintenance must be made by the project proponent in consultation with USFWS. Therefore, if Mitigation Measure BIO-2e is required for treatment activities, the project proponent would contact USFWS to seek technical input on the determination that habitat function would be maintained for monarch butterflies, and input on their

proposed measures to avoid injury to or mortality of the species. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

American Badger

Habitat potentially suitable for American badger is present within drier open stages of most shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats, with friable soils in the project area. Treatment activities, including mechanical treatments and prescribed burning could result in direct loss of active dens and potential loss of young, if present in treatment areas. Manual treatments and herbicide application treatments would not result in adverse effects on American badger dens, because these treatments would typically occur within habitats where American badger dens are unlikely to occur (e.g., forest habitat), and because personnel would conduct these activities on foot, and the likelihood of a den being inadvertently crushed or otherwise destroyed would be very low. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on American badger was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on American badger can be clearly avoided by conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity or physically avoiding habitat for these species, then mitigation would not be required. However, because American badgers may use a den year-round (i.e., there is no season of sensitivity), and because focused surveys for American badgers have not been conducted, implementation of SPR BIO-10 would be required before mechanical treatments and prescribed burning. Under SPR BIO-10, focused surveys would be conducted for American badger dens within habitat suitable for the species (i.e., Bitterbrush, Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush, Annual Grassland, Perennial Grassland, Juniper) by a qualified RPF or biologist no more than 14 days prior to the start of treatment activities. If American badger dens are not detected during focused surveys, then further mitigation for the species would not be required. If American badger dens are detected during focused surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-2b would be implemented. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-2b, a no-disturbance buffer would be established around the den, the size of which would be determined by the qualified RPF or biologist and no treatment activities would occur within this buffer.

Habitat function for American badger would be maintained because habitat suitable for the species (i.e., Annual Grassland and Perennial Grassland) would be maintained and additional open woodland habitat would likely be restored through thinning and removal of ladder fuels. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Gray Wolf

Since the 2011 dispersal of Oregon wolf OR-7, one breeding pack and several dispersed wolves are currently known to be in California. Contemporary sightings of gray wolves in California have included a pack in Siskiyou County (i.e., the Shasta Pack) and more recently (i.e., 2021), a potential breeding pair of wolves near Mount Shasta (i.e., the Whaleback Pack; CDFW 2022a). The Shasta Pack was first detected in early 2015, but has not been detected since November 2015, except for one yearling identified in the pack's range in 2016 (CDFW 2022a). The Whaleback Pack occupies an approximately 480 square mile home range in eastern Siskiyou County, and in 2021, the pair produced seven pups (CDFW 2022a). There is currently one GPS-collared, breeding wolf (OR85), an additional breeding wolf (WHA01F), and an additional 5 wolves occupying or traveling through Siskiyou County in 2024 (CDFW 2024a). The home range of the Whaleback Pack includes north of Mt. Shasta, and north and east of the project area (CDFW 2024b).

Gray wolf breeding season typically lasts from January until late March, and pups are typically born in April or May; however, this season can vary depending on multiple factors, including geographic location. Wolf pups are born in a natal den, which is typically a hole in the ground, a rock crevice, a hollow log, bases of hollow trees, an overturned stump, or other quiet location (American Society of Mammologists 1974; Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources 2016). Gray wolf pups are born altricial (i.e., blind, helpless) and do not open their eyes for approximately two weeks. After approximately eight weeks, the pups are moved to a different location called a "rendezvous site." Rendezvous sites, which are usually within 1 mile of a den site, are typically open areas of grass or sedge adjacent to wetlands, and can be characterized by extensive matted vegetation, numerous trails, and beds usually at the forest edge (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources 2016). Rendezvous sites are typically used from mid-May to mid-October, and wolf

packs may use multiple rendezvous sites within their home ranges (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources 2016).

Treatment activities, including manual treatments, mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application could result in loss or disturbance of active natal dens and potential loss of helpless young if present in treatment areas. While manual treatments and herbicide application treatments would be less impactful than mechanical treatments because heavy equipment would not be used, these activities would include the use of loud hand-operated power tools (e.g., chainsaws) and presence of personnel or vehicles, which could result in disturbance to nearby natal dens or rendezvous sites, and potential abandonment of these sites. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on gray wolf was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on gray wolf can be clearly avoided by conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity or physically avoiding habitat for these species, then mitigation would not be required. However, there is no reliable season during which all impacts on this species could be avoided and avoidance of habitat is not feasible due to the species' large home range. Thus, implementation of SPR BIO-10 would be required before all treatment activities.

As part of SPR BIO-10, and because gray wolf detections are generally not made public, a qualified RPF or biologist will contact CDFW before implementation of treatment activities to obtain general information about documented gray wolf activity within or in the vicinity of a treatment area. If information provided by CDFW indicates that there is current or prior gray wolf activity within a treatment area, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2a would be implemented. If gray wolf activity has not been documented in a treatment area, pursuant to information provided by CDFW, and the treatment area does not overlap the home range of a documented gray wolf or gray wolf pack, and CDFW concurs that the species is unlikely to occur in the treatment area, then the project will proceed without surveys. If gray wolf occurrences have not been documented in a treatment area and the treatment area does not overlap the home range of a documented gray wolf or gray wolf pack, but presence of gray wolves cannot be ruled out by CDFW, then focused surveys for gray wolf activity will be conducted within the treatment area and within 1 mile of the treatment area before implementation of treatment activities. Surveys for gray wolves will include the use of trail cameras, track plates, and other non-invasive survey methods to determine whether wolves are present within the treatment area and would be conducted by a qualified RPF or biologist. If gray wolves are not detected during focused surveys, then further mitigation for the species would not be required. If gray wolves are detected during focused surveys, the project proponent will contact CDFW immediately and treatment activities would not be initiated in the treatment area until CDFW provides further guidance. Additional surveys may be required to determine whether an active gray wolf natal den or rendezvous site is present within the treatment area, in consultation with CDFW. If an active den or rendezvous site is identified by a qualified RPF or biologist, Mitigation Measure BIO-2a would apply, and a no-disturbance buffer of at least one mile would be established around the natal den or rendezvous site, in consultation with CDFW, and no treatment activities would occur within this buffer. No activities that create loud and continuous noise will occur within the no-disturbance buffer through June 30 for a natal den site or through August 31 for a rendezvous site.

As described above in the Project Description, fuel break treatments would occur within 300 feet of roadways within and surrounding the Community of Lake Shastina and gray wolves are less likely to establish natal den sites or rendezvous sites within these relatively developed areas. However, habitat suitable for natal dens or rendezvous sites may be present in areas where WUI treatments would occur. Habitat function for gray wolf would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would not result in removal of trees (i.e., conifers, hardwoods) greater than 14 inches DBH. Therefore, some features typically used by gray wolves as natal den habitat would be retained. Other features sometimes used as natal den habitat, including large burrows or rock crevices, would not be targeted for treatments and therefore would be retained in the project area. Gray wolves have very large home ranges and use many habitat types at a landscape scale. At this scale, habitat function for gray wolves would be maintained because treatments would not result in type conversion (i.e., forest to shrub, shrub to herbaceous) through implementation of tree retention parameters and SPRs. While treatment activities could result in temporary disruption of wolf movement or movement of prey species (e.g., mule deer) in the vicinity of a treatment area, these effects would be limited to the period during which equipment and personnel were actively conducting

treatments. No barriers to wolf or deer movement would remain post-treatment, and in treatment areas with dense understory conditions, post-treatment conditions may improve for wildlife movement.

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, the final determination for habitat function maintenance must be made by the project proponent in consultation with CDFW and USFWS. Therefore, if Mitigation Measure BIO-2a is required for treatment activities, the project proponent would contact CDFW and USFWS to seek technical input on the determination that habitat function would be maintained for gray wolf and input on their proposed measures to avoid injury to or mortality of this species. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Ringtail

Ringtail is primarily nocturnal, and typically occurs in riparian areas, forests (including stands of various ages), and shrub habitats. Potential denning habitat includes rock outcrops, crevices, snags, large hardwoods, large conifers, and shrubs. Most of these habitats would be avoided, as all live trees (i.e., conifers, hardwoods) larger than 14 inches DBH would not be removed during treatment or maintenance activities and because rocky areas would not be targeted for vegetation treatment; however, shrub habitat would be targeted for treatment and would not be avoided through implementation of other measures. The potential for treatment activities, including maintenance treatments, to result in adverse effects on ringtail was examined in the PEIR.

Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on ringtail can be clearly avoided by conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity (e.g., maternity season), then mitigation would not be required. Outside of the breeding season, resting ringtails would likely flee due to the presence of equipment, vehicles, or personnel, which would reduce the risk of their injury or mortality. Manual treatments and herbicide application treatments would not result in adverse effects on ringtail dens because personnel would conduct these activities on foot, and the likelihood of a den being inadvertently crushed or otherwise destroyed would be very low. However, mechanical treatments and prescribed burning conducted during the ringtail maternity season (i.e., the period during which young would be present in a den, approximately April 15–June 30) could result in destruction of active dens within shrub habitat or disturbance to active dens potentially resulting in abandonment and loss of young, which may not yet be capable of fleeing. Adverse effects on ringtail would be clearly avoided for mechanical treatments and prescribed burning that would occur outside of the ringtail maternity season (April 15–June 30) under SPR BIO-1.

If conducting some mechanical treatments and prescribed burning outside of the ringtail maternity season is determined to be infeasible for certain treatments, then SPR BIO-10 would apply, and presence of ringtail would be assumed, or focused surveys for ringtail would be conducted within the treatment area before implementation of treatment activities. Surveys for ringtail will include the use of trail cameras, track plates, and other non-invasive survey methods to determine whether ringtails are present within the treatment area and would be conducted by a qualified RPF or biologist. If baited trail cameras are used, the qualified professionals should obtain a valid CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit. If focused surveys are conducted, and ringtails are not detected, then further mitigation for the species would not be required. If ringtails are detected during focused surveys, then additional surveys would be required to determine whether an active ringtail den is present within the treatment area. If an active den is identified by a qualified RPF or biologist, Mitigation Measure BIO-2a would be implemented. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, a no-disturbance buffer would be established around the den, the size of which would be determined through consultation with CDFW. No treatment activities would occur within this buffer.

If the presence of ringtail within the treatment area is assumed, then implementation of avoidance and minimization measures would be required pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-2a before and during implementation of mechanical treatments and prescribed burning between April 15 and June 30. Avoidance and minimization measures would include but not be limited to pre-treatment den surveys, daily sweeps of the treatment area, and biological monitoring.

Habitat function for ringtail would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would not result in removal of trees (i.e., conifers, hardwoods) greater than 14 inches DBH. Additionally, rocky areas would not be targeted for vegetation treatment. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, the final determination for habitat function maintenance must be made by the project proponent in consultation with CDFW. Therefore, if Mitigation

Measure BIO-2a is required for treatment activities, the project proponent would contact CDFW to seek technical input on the determination that habitat function would be maintained for ringtail and input on their proposed measures to avoid injury to or mortality of this species. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Special-Status Bats

Habitat potentially suitable for Townsend's big-eared bat is present within forest habitat, rocky areas, and human-made structures (e.g., barns, bridges) in the project area. Per SPR BIO-1, if it is determined that adverse effects on special-status bats would be clearly avoided by conducting treatments outside of a season of sensitivity (e.g., maternity season), then mitigation would not be required. Adverse effects on special-status bat maternity roosts would be clearly avoided if initial and maintenance treatments were implemented outside of the bat maternity season (April 1–August 31; Caltrans 2004).

Treatment activities, including mechanical treatments, manual treatments, and prescribed burning conducted within habitat suitable for bats during the bat maternity season (April 1–August 31) could disturb active bat roosts from auditory and visual stimuli (e.g., heavy equipment, chainsaws, vehicles, personnel) or smoke (e.g., prescribed burning) potentially resulting in abandonment of the roost and loss of young. Herbicide treatments that would occur away from established roads would be limited to ground-based methods, such as using a backpack sprayer or painting herbicide onto cut stems; thus, these treatments would not result in substantial disturbance to special-status bat roosts. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on special-status bats was examined in the PEIR.

If implementation of some mechanical or manual treatments, or prescribed burning, would occur during the bat maternity season, then SPR BIO-10 would apply, and focused surveys for these species would be conducted by a qualified RPF or biologist within suitable habitat areas before initiation of manual, mechanical, and prescribed burning treatments. If special-status bat roosts are identified during focused surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-2b for special-status bats would be implemented.

Under Mitigation Measure BIO-2b, a no-disturbance buffer of 250 feet would be established around active Townsend's big-eared bat roosts and mechanical treatments, manual treatments, and prescribed burning would not occur within this buffer. A no-disturbance buffer of 250 feet is necessary to protect sensitive roosts to provide adequate protection such that impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Habitat function for special-status bats would be maintained because treatment activities and maintenance treatments would not result in removal of trees (i.e., conifers, hardwoods) greater than 14 inches DBH which would be the most likely features to be used by this species. Further, bat foraging habitat, including meadows and open water, would not be modified during treatment and thus would be retained in the project area. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Lower Klamath marbled sculpin

The current range of lower Klamath marbled sculpin, which largely follows the Klamath River, and its tributary streams, is outside the project area. However, historical occurrences have been documented within Shasta River, adjacent to the project area, in 1962 and 1931 (CNDDDB 2024). Segments of the Shasta River and Lake Shastina in the project area may provide habitat suitable for this species. Lakes, rivers, and streams in the project area would not be targeted for treatment. Further, pursuant to SPR HYD-4, WLPZs would be implemented adjacent to streams in the project area, which would limit the types of treatments that would occur adjacent to streams (i.e., mechanical treatments). Because no in-water work would occur and indirect impacts on streams would be avoided through implementation of SPRs, project implementation would not result in impacts on special-status fish species. This impact of the proposed project is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Conclusion

The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on special-status wildlife was examined in the PEIR. This impact on special-status wildlife is within the scope of the PEIR, because intensity of disturbance as a result of implementing treatment activities and potential effects on special-status wildlife are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, general habitat characteristics are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape (e.g., no resource is affected on land outside the treatable landscape that would not also be similarly affected within the treatable landscape); and therefore, the potential impact on special-status wildlife is also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-2 are SPR BIO-1, SPR BIO-2, SPR BIO-3, SPR BIO-4, SPR BIO-5, SPR BIO-9, SPR BIO-10, SPR HAZ-5, SPR HAZ-6, SPR HYD-1, and SPR HYD-4. Biological resource mitigation measures that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-2 are Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, Mitigation Measure BIO-2b, Mitigation Measure BIO-2c, and Mitigation Measure BIO-2e, Mitigation Measure BIO-2g. As explained above, impacts on special-status wildlife resulting from the proposed project compared to the PEIR program description, would not constitute new or substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-3

Initial vegetation treatments and maintenance treatments could result in loss or degradation of sensitive habitats including designated sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and oak woodlands. Potential impacts resulting from maintenance activities would be similar to those resulting from initial vegetation treatments because the same treatment activities are proposed; however, re-treatment at too great a frequency could result in additional adverse effects

Based on species ranges, occurrence data, vegetation mapping, aerial photos, and the reconnaissance-level survey conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1, the following sensitive habitats (as identified in Manual of California Vegetation, and CalVTP PEIR) are not anticipated to occur within the treatment area: needle spike rush, bigleaf maple forest, tanoak forest, rocky mountain maple thicket, mountain alder thicket, resin birch thicket, torrent sedge patch, red osier thicket, Oregon ash grove, water foxtail meadow, small-fruited sedge meadow, California oat grass prairie, Idaho fescue grassland, incense cedar forest, and Washoe pine woodland.

Based on the habitat types present in the project area and the reconnaissance-level survey of the treatment area, 7 sensitive natural communities (i.e., natural communities with a rarity rank of S1, S2, or S3) are known to occur or may be present in the project area. The sensitive natural communities, the associated rarity rank, and the habitat type within which the communities may occur are presented in Table 4.5-2. In addition, an oak woodland and forest type, Oregon white oak, which are sensitive habitats pursuant to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act and PRC Section 21083.4, may occur in the project area.

During the reconnaissance-level survey conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1, several species associated with these sensitive natural communities were observed, including green leaf manzanita (*Arctostaphylos patula*), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), antelope bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*), and big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*). None of the species associated with sensitive natural communities included in Table 4.5-2 were observed; however, these species must be dominant to meet the definition of the "natural community." These communities could be present in portions of the site that could not be accessed during the reconnaissance survey. As a result, before implementation of treatment or maintenance activities, SPR BIO-3 would be implemented and a qualified RPF or biologist would identify sensitive natural communities in the treatment area to the alliance level pursuant to Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018b).

Riparian habitat is present within the project area adjacent to streams, lakes, and ponds. Under SPR HYD-4, a WLPZ of 50 to 150 feet adjacent to all Class I and Class II streams and lakes would be implemented for manual and mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application, which would limit the extent of treatment activities within riparian habitat. While these SPRs would reduce potential impacts on riparian habitat, the extent of riparian habitat within the project area has not been mapped and riparian habitat may be present outside of the

areas encompassed within WLPZs. As a result, before implementation of treatment activities, SPR BIO-3 would be implemented to identify and map the extent of riparian habitat within a treatment area. As required under SPR BIO-4, treatments in riparian habitats would retain at least 75 percent of the overstory and 50 percent of the understory canopy of native riparian vegetation and would be limited to removal of uncharacteristic or undesired fuel loads (e.g., dead or dying vegetation, invasive plants). Additionally, before any treatments in riparian habitat, the project proponent would notify CDFW pursuant to California Fish and Game Code 1602, when required.

Table 4.5-2 Sensitive Natural Communities Documented or with Potential to Occur in the Project Area			
CWHR Habitat Type	Sensitive Natural Community	Potential to Occur	Rarity Rank
Aspen	Aspen groves	Known to occur.	S3.2
Montane Chaparral	Green leaf manzanita chaparral	Known to occur.	S3S4
Montane Hardwood	Oregon white oak woodland	May occur.	S3
Montane Riparian	Water birch thicket	May occur.	S3
	Black cottonwood forest	May occur.	S3
Perennial Grassland	Ashy ryegrass - creeping ryegrass turf	May occur.	S3
	Bluebunch wheat grass grassland	May occur.	S3

Montane chaparral habitat is present within the project area. As required by SPR BIO-5, treatments implemented in chaparral will be designed to avoid type conversion where chaparral is present. This includes development of a treatment design that avoids environmental effects of type conversion in chaparral and maintenance of a minimum percent cover of mature native shrubs within the treatment area to maintain habitat function.

The project proponent would avoid impacts on sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands by avoiding treatments in these communities. However, if avoiding treatment activities within identified sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands would preclude achieving treatment objectives, then Mitigation Measure BIO-3a would apply in these areas to ensure that the characteristics which qualify the communities as sensitive (e.g., dominant canopy species, canopy relative percentage of dominant species, species composition) are retained post-treatment to the extent feasible. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-3a, treatments within sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands would be designed to avoid loss of sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands.

The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on sensitive habitats, as described above, was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant following mitigation. Impacts of the proposed project are within the scope of PEIR since treatment types and activities are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. Project impacts to sensitive habitats is within the scope of the PEIR, because, within the project area boundary, general habitat characteristics are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape (e.g., no resource is affected on land outside the treatable landscape that would not also be similarly affected within the treatable landscape), and the treatment activities and intensity of disturbance as a result of implementing treatment activities would be consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the potential impact on riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities is also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-3 are SPR BIO-1, SPR BIO-2, SPR BIO-3, SPR BIO-4, SPR BIO-5, SPR BIO-6, SPR BIO-9, SPR HYD-4, and SPR HYD-5. Mitigation Measure BIO-3a will be implemented for the project to avoid loss of sensitive natural communities and oak woodland. The biological resource mitigation measure that applies to project impacts under Impact BIO-3 include Mitigation Measure BIO-3a. As explained above, impacts on riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities resulting from the proposed project, compared to the PEIR program description, would not constitute new or substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-4

Initial vegetation treatments and maintenance treatments could result in direct or indirect adverse effects on state or federally protected wetlands. Potential impacts resulting from maintenance activities would be similar to those resulting from initial vegetation treatments because the same treatment activities are proposed. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on state or federally protected wetlands was examined in the PEIR.

During the reconnaissance-level survey conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1, many different types of aquatic habitat were observed, including Lake Shastina, creeks and ponds of various sizes, and the Shasta River. Seasonal wetlands, meadows, and seeps were also observed during the survey. US Forest Service CALVEG 2021 vegetation mapping data for the project area includes 51 acres of lacustrine habitat (i.e., reservoirs, lakes, ponds), 26 acres of montane riparian habitat, and 45 acres of wet meadow habitat. The National Wetlands Inventory classifies the project area as having 42.3 acres lake habitat, 18.6 acres riverine, 28.3 acres freshwater pond, 13.4 acres freshwater forested/shrub wetland, and 154.8 acres freshwater emergent wetland (USFWS 2024b). CALVEG vegetation data and National Wetland Inventory data are sourced using different methods, which accounts for slight differences in acreages. While these acreages likely overlap significantly, totals for both sources are provided here to provide a full picture of aquatic habitat potentially present in the project area.

Pursuant to SPR HYD-4, a WLPZ of 50 to 150 feet adjacent to all Class I and Class II streams and lakes would be implemented, and WLPZs of sufficient size to avoid degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water would be established adjacent to all Class III and Class IV streams within the project area for manual, mechanical, herbicide, and prescribed burning treatments. Establishment of WLPZs would result in avoidance of all stream and pond habitat for manual, mechanical, prescribed burning, and herbicide application treatments.

Additional wetlands that have not been identified or mapped as well as ponds smaller than one acre (i.e., not considered a lake under Forest Practice Rules), seasonal wetlands, springs, and seeps may be present in the project area. Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would apply to all treatment activities, and a qualified RPF or biologist would delineate the boundaries of these features; establish an appropriate buffer (with a minimum of 25 feet) around seasonal wetlands, springs, and seeps; and mark the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). These buffers will generally be no-disturbance buffers; however, within meadow habitats, ignition for broadcast burning using only propane torches may occur, including within wetland buffers. A larger buffer may be required if wetlands or other aquatic habitats contain habitat potentially suitable for special-status plants or special-status wildlife (e.g., western pond turtle; see Impact BIO-2).

The potential for treatment activities to adversely affect state or federally protected wetlands was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant with mitigation. Project impacts to wetlands are within the scope of the PEIR, because, within the project area boundary, general habitat characteristics are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape (e.g., no resource is affected on land outside the treatable landscape that would not also be similarly affected within the treatable landscape), and the treatment activities and intensity of disturbance as a result of implementing treatment activities would be consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the potential impact on State or Federally protected wetlands are also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-4 are SPR BIO-1, SPR HYD-1, and SPR HYD-4. The biological resource mitigation measure that applies to project impacts under Impact BIO-4 is Mitigation Measure BIO-4. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-5

Initial vegetation treatments and maintenance treatments could result in direct or indirect adverse effects on wildlife movement corridors and nurseries. Potential impacts resulting from maintenance activities would be similar to those resulting from initial vegetation treatments because the same treatment activities are proposed. The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on wildlife movement corridors and nurseries was examined in the PEIR.

Based on review and survey of project-specific biological resources (SPR BIO-1), mapped essential connectivity areas are located east of the project area connecting natural habitats north and south of the project area and connecting natural habitats west of the project area to natural habitats associated with Mt. Shasta (CDFW 2014). Natural landscape blocks east of the project area are largely associated with forested habitat of Mt. Shasta (CDFW 2017). Small portions of the project area not included in essential connectivity areas or natural landscape blocks contain natural habitat and are likely used as wildlife movement corridors to some degree, especially streams and associated riparian corridors (CDFW 2018a, CDFW 2010). Fuel break treatments would occur near existing roads and residences. Some portions of the WUI treatment area are also near developed residential areas. The size and traffic level of the roads and level of development within residential areas varies; however, these areas generally are subject to ongoing disturbances (e.g., vehicle traffic, human activity) and some level of wildlife habitat fragmentation due to historic urban, residential, and agricultural development of the region. While habitat directly adjacent to development would not be optimal habitat, wildlife may move through these areas, or use some habitats for cover or as nursery sites, especially in relatively undeveloped areas.

Pursuant to SPR HYD-4, a WLPZ of 50 to 150 feet adjacent to all Class I and Class II streams and lakes would be implemented, which would limit the extent of treatment activities within riparian habitat (e.g., no mechanical treatment, retention of at least 75 percent surface cover) that would likely function as a wildlife movement corridor. SPR BIO-12 would be implemented for treatments that would occur during the nesting bird season and would result in identification and avoidance of any common bird nursery sites (e.g., heron rookeries, egret rookeries). All live trees (e.g., conifers, hardwoods) larger than 14 inches would be retained and pursuant to SPR BIO-3, SPR BIO-4, and SPR BIO-5, treatments in sensitive natural communities, riparian habitat, and chaparral habitat, respectively, would be designed to maintain habitat function of these communities. Additionally, implementation of proposed treatments would not result in any conversion of land cover or create new barriers to wildlife movements within (locally) or across (regionally) the project area. With implementation of SPRs, habitat function within the project area would be maintained and there would not be a substantial change in the existing conditions that facilitate wildlife movement in the project area.

If during surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10 wildlife nursery sites (e.g., heron rookeries, deer fawning areas, common bat roosts) are detected, Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would apply to all treatment activities and a no-disturbance buffer would be established around these features, the size of which would be determined by a qualified biologist or RPF.

The potential for treatment activities to result in adverse effects on wildlife movement corridors and nurseries was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant with mitigation. This impact is within the scope of the PEIR, because, within the project area boundary, general habitat characteristics are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape (e.g., no resource is affected on land outside the treatable landscape that would not also be similarly affected within the treatable landscape), and the treatment activities and extent of expected disturbance as a result of implementing treatment activities are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the potential impact on wildlife movement corridors and nurseries are also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-5 are SPR BIO-1, SPR BIO-4, SPR BIO-5, SPR BIO-10, SPR HYD-1, and SPR HYD-4. The biological resource mitigation measure that applies to project impacts under

Impact BIO-5 is Mitigation Measure BIO-5. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-6

Initial treatment and maintenance treatments could result in direct or indirect adverse effects resulting in reduction of habitat or abundance of common wildlife, including nesting birds, because nesting habitat suitable for birds is present throughout the project area. Treatment activities, including mechanical treatments, manual treatments, prescribed burning, and herbicide application, conducted during the nesting bird season (February 1–August 31) could result in direct loss of active nests or disturbance to active nests from auditory and visual stimulus (e.g., heavy equipment, chainsaws, vehicles, personnel) potentially resulting in abandonment and loss of eggs or chicks.

SPR BIO-12 would apply, and for treatments implemented during the nesting bird season, a survey for nesting birds will be conducted within the project area by a qualified RPF or biologist before treatment activities. If no active bird nests are observed during focused surveys, then additional mitigation would not be required. If active nests of songbirds or raptors are observed during focused surveys, disturbance to the nests will be avoided by establishing an appropriate buffer around the nests, modifying treatments to avoid disturbance to the nests, or deferring treatment until the nests are no longer active as determined by a qualified RPF or biologist.

The potential for treatment activities to substantially reduce habitat or abundance of common wildlife, including nesting birds was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. The potential for adverse effects on common wildlife, including nesting birds, is within the scope of the PEIR, because, treatment types, activities and extent of expected disturbance as a result of implementing treatment activities would be consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the potential impact on common wildlife is also the same, as described above.

Biological resource SPRs that apply to project impacts under Impact BIO-6 are SPR BIO-1, SPR BIO-2, SPR BIO-3, SPR BIO-4, SPR BIO-5, and SPR BIO-12. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-7

The only applicable local ordinance relevant to biological resources is the Siskiyou County General Plan Conservation Element (Siskiyou County 1973). The Siskiyou County General Plan Conservation Element includes recommendations to conserve fish and wildlife habitat and natural vegetation; however, it does not include specific policies that would be applicable to the project. The County has not adopted or implemented a tree preservation or mitigation ordinance. Thus, implementation of treatment activities would not conflict with local ordinances.

The potential for projects to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources was analyzed in the PEIR and determined to have no impact. The potential for the treatment project to conflict is within the scope of the PEIR because vegetation treatment projects implemented under the CalVTP that are subject to local policies or ordinances would be required to comply with any applicable county, city, or other local policies, ordinances, and permitting procedures related to protection of biological resources, per SPR AD-3. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, the boundary of the project area is entirely within Siskiyou County; therefore, the potential conflict with local policies and ordinances are also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact BIO-8

Implementation of the proposed vegetation treatment and maintenance treatments would not result in a conflict with adopted habitat conservation plans (HCP) or natural community conservation plans (NCCP) because the project area is not within the plan area of any adopted HCP or NCCP. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR. Inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, there are no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other conservation plans in effect in areas of the project site outside of the treatable landscape, therefore the potential conflict with local policies and ordinances are also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Biological Resource Impacts

The proposed treatment is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.6.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.6.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a changed circumstance to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the treatment area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to biological resources that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to biological resources would occur.

4.6 Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact GEO-1: Result in Substantial Erosion or Loss of Topsoil	LTS	Impact GEO-1, pp. 3.7-26 – 3.7-29	LTS	AQ-4 GEO-1 GEO-2 GEO-3 GEO-4 GEO-5 GEO-6 GEO-7 GEO-8 HYD-4	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact GEO-2: Increase Risk of Landslide	LTS	Impact GEO-2, pp. 3.7-29 – 3.7-30	Yes	GEO-3 GEO-4 GEO-7 GEO-8	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Impact GEO-1

Treatment activities would result in soil disturbance and reduction of vegetative cover which has the potential to substantially increase rates of erosion and loss of topsoil. The effects of treatment activities on erosion and loss of topsoil was addressed in the PEIR, and determined to be less than significant since implementation of SPRs GEO-1 through GEO-8 will avoid and minimize the risk of substantial erosion and loss of topsoil.

The project is within the scope of the PEIR since it includes the treatment methods, activities, and equipment consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the soil and geologic site conditions are not substantially different than those present within the treatable landscape and the same treatment types and activities would be implemented. Therefore, the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil is also the same, as described above.

SPRs AQ-3, AQ-4, GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-6, GEO-7, GEO-8 and HYD-4 are applicable to the project and will avoid and minimize erosion and loss of topsoil. SPR HYD-3 is not applicable since the project does not include prescribed herbivory. Impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would not constitute new or substantially more severe impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact GEO-2

Removal of vegetation during treatment activities could affect the root structure in treated areas such that the stability of slopes and soils could decrease which would increase the risk of landslide. Additionally, by removing vegetation, the soil water content could potentially destabilize slopes and increase the risk of landslide. Landslide risk would increase in areas with steeper slopes and where previous landslide has occurred. This impact was considered in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since implementation of SPRs GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-7, and GEO-8 would avoid or minimize the risk of landslide. The project is within the scope of the PEIR since it would include treatment types and activities consistent with those considered in the PEIR.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, there are no steep slopes or unusual geologic conditions outside of the treatable landscape within the project area that were not considered within the PEIR. SPRs GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-7, and GEO-8 are applicable to the project and would avoid or minimize the risk of landslide from the project. The proposed project would not result in substantially more severe significant impacts than those analyzed in the PEIR.

New Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resource Impacts

The proposed treatment is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.7.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.7.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to geology and soils that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to geology and soils would occur.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered in the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact GHG-1: Conflict with Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of GHGs	LTS	Impact GHG-1, pp. 3.8-10 – 3.8-11	LTS	AD-3	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact GHG-2: Generate GHG Emissions through Treatment Activities	PSU	Impact GHG-2, pp. 3.8-11 – 3.8-17	Yes	AD-3 AQ-3	GHG-2	SU	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New GHG Emissions Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to GHG emissions that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact GHG-1

Use of vehicles and mechanical equipment and prescribed burning during initial and maintenance treatments would result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Consistency of treatments under the CalVTP with applicable plans, policies, and regulations aimed at reducing GHG emissions was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. This impact is within the scope of the PEIR because the proposed activities, as well as the associated equipment, duration of use, and resultant GHG emissions, are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the same plans, policies, and regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions apply in the areas outside the treatable landscape, as well as areas within the treatable landscape; therefore, the GHG impact is also the same, as described above. SPR AD-3 is applicable to the project and would ensure adherence to local plans and regulations. SPR GHG-1 is not applicable to the project since the project is not a registered offset project under the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Assembly Bill 1504 Carbon Inventory Process. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact GHG-2

Use of vehicles and mechanical equipment and prescribed burning during initial and maintenance treatments would result in GHG emissions. The potential for treatments under the CalVTP to generate GHG emissions was examined in the PEIR and determined to be significant and unavoidable due to reliability of estimates for direct GHG emissions

and the uncertainty of the intended net carbon benefits of reduced wildfire intensity and increased carbon sequestration in treated areas. The impact of the project is within the scope of the PEIR because the proposed activities, as well as the associated equipment and duration of use, and the intent of the treatments to reduce wildfire risk and GHG emissions related to wildfire are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. However, emissions generated by the treatment would still contribute to the annual emissions generated by the CalVTP, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable, consistent with the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the climate conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the GHG impact is also the same, as described above. SPR's AD-3 and AQ-3 are applicable to the project as is Mitigation Measure GHG-2. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Impacts Related to GHG Emissions

The proposed treatments are consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatments and determined they are consistent with the applicable regulatory and environmental conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.8.1, "Regulatory Setting," and Section 3.8.2, "Environmental Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental conditions pertinent to the climate conditions that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts are the same and, for the reasons described above, impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to GHG emissions would occur.

4.8 Energy Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact ENG-1: Result in Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy	LTS	Impact ENG-1, pp. 3.9-7 – 3.9-8	Yes	N/A	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.								
New Energy Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to energy resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?				☐ Yes ☒ No		If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion		
				Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant		
[identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]				☐	☐	☐		

Discussion

Impact ENG-1

The project will require energy consumption in the form of fossil fuel combustion in the engines of vehicles and equipment which would be used by workers accessing treatment areas and during implementation of treatment activities. This impact is addressed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. The project includes activities, work crew sizes and treatment duration consistent with those considered in the PEIR and is within the scope of the PEIR. The project includes activities outside of the treatable landscape which is a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR, however treatment activities and equipment used will be consistent in areas within and outside of the treatable landscape and energy consumption rates will be the same within and outside of the treatable landscape. The increase in the use of energy to treat areas outside of the treatable landscape will not be substantially greater than that analyzed in the PEIR. This impact is consistent with the determination of the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Energy Resource Impacts

The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable regulatory and environmental conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.9.1, "Regulatory Setting," and Section 3.9.2, "Environmental Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). Including land outside the treatable landscape in the proposed project area constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those considered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to energy resources would occur.

4.9 Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact HAZ-1: Create a Significant Health Hazard from the Use of Hazardous Materials	LTS	Impact HAZ-1, pp. 3.10-14 – 3.10-15	Yes	HAZ-1 HYD-4	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HAZ-2: Create a Significant Health Hazard from the Use of Herbicides	LTS	Impact HAZ-2, pp. 3.10-15 – 3.10-18	Yes	HAZ-5 HAZ-6 HAZ-7 HAZ-8 HAZ-9	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HAZ-3: Expose the Public or Environment to Significant Hazards from Disturbance to Known Hazardous Material Sites	LTSM	Impact HAZ-3, pp. 3.10-18 – 3.10-19	Yes	N/A	HAZ-3	LTSM	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts related to hazardous materials, public health and safety that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?		☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]		☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact HAZ-1

The project includes prescribed burning, manual treatment, and mechanical treatments requiring the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, and lubricants. Health hazards impacts from the use of hazardous materials was addressed in the PEIR and were determined to be less than significant. This project impact is within the scope of the PEIR since the treatment activities, equipment, and hazardous materials that will be used for the proposed project (fuels, oils, and lubricants) are consistent with the hazardous materials considered in the PEIR.

The project includes activities outside of the treatable landscape which is a change to the geographic extent presented in the EIR, however the type of hazardous materials and the use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials and regulations applicable to project activities are the same throughout the project area and potential hazardous materials impacts will be the same within and outside of the treatable landscape.

SPR HAZ-1 is applicable to the project and requires equipment to be properly maintained per manufacturer's specifications, regular inspection of all equipment for leaks, and requires that any equipment found leaking will be

promptly removed from the treatment site. In addition SPR HYD-4 is applicable to the project which requires that fire ignition including use of accelerants would not occur within protection zones for watercourses. The proposed project would not result in substantially more severe significant impacts than covered in the PEIR.

Impact HAZ-2

The Project includes herbicide treatment requiring transportation, use, storage, and disposal of herbicides, which could result in risks related to human exposure when applied in areas in close proximity to the public if a large spill were to occur or should spraying from equipment on vehicles occur in close proximity to public areas. This impact was analyzed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since SPRs are incorporated to minimize the potential for significant health risks.

Herbicide application methods that could be used for the project include paint-on stems, backpack hand applicator, hypo-hatched tree injection, boom sprayers from ATVs (sprayers would be pointing down and only used when the target species occurs throughout the treated area), or hand placement of pellets. The potential impacts related to the use of herbicides during treatment activities are within the scope of the activities and impacts discussed within the PEIR because the types of herbicides and application methods that would be used, which are limited to ground-based applications, are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. SPRs HAZ-5, HAZ-6, HAZ-7, HAZ-8, and HAZ-9, are applicable to the project and require preparation of a Spill Prevention and Response Plan prior to any herbicide treatment activities to provide protection to workers, the public, and the environment from accidental spills or leaks of herbicides; compliance with herbicide application regulations to protect worker and public safety; triple rinsing herbicide containers and disposal of rinsed materials at an approved site and disposal of all herbicides following label requirements and waste disposal regulations; minimization of herbicide drift into public areas through application parameters such as limitations for nozzle pressure and nozzle distance from vegetation; and notification of herbicide application within 500 feet of public areas by posting signs at herbicide treatment areas.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, the herbicide used, application methods, and exposure potential to herbicides is essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape. Therefore, the impact related to the potential for the project to result in a significant health hazard from the use of herbicides is also the same. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a sustainably more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact HAZ-3

The proposed project includes mechanical treatment and prescribed burning that have the potential to expose workers, the public, or environment to risks associated with existing hazardous materials if present within treatment areas. This impact is included in the PEIR and was determined to be less than significant with mitigation. The project includes treatment types consistent with those analyzed within the PEIR and is within the scope of the PEIR.

No SPRs are applicable to this impact. Since some portions of the project area are adjacent to developed areas including commercial and public service land uses, hazardous materials sites could be located within the boundary of the project area. Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 is required for the project to check with the landowner or entity with jurisdiction to determine if there are any sites known to have previously used, stored, or disposed of hazardous materials. If it is determined that hazardous materials sites could be located within the boundary of a treatment site, the project proponent will conduct a DTSC EnviroStor web search and consult DTSC's Cortese List to identify any known contamination sites within the project area. If a proposed mechanical treatment site or prescribed burn is located on a site included on the DTSC Cortese List as containing potential soil contamination that has not been cleaned up and deemed closed by DTSC, the area will be marked, and no soil disturbing treatment activities will occur within 100 feet of the site.

The project includes activities outside of the treatable landscape which is a change to the geographic extent presented in the EIR. Areas within and outside of the treatable landscape will include the same treatment types and activities for this project. The portions of the project area outside of the treatable landscape are generally undeveloped and not more likely to include hazardous wastes than areas within the treatable landscape. Therefore

impacts within and outside of the treatable landscape would be the same. Impacts of the proposed project area consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts

The proposed treatments are consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatments and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.10.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.10.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to hazardous materials that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts are the same and, for the reasons described above, impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to hazardous materials, public health, or safety would occur.

4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact HYD-1: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Implementation of Prescribed Burning	LTS	Impact HYD-1, pp. 3.11-25 – 3.11-27	LTS	HYD-4 AQ-3 BIO-4 BIO-5 GEO-4 GEO-6	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA
Impact HYD-2: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Implementation of Manual or Mechanical Treatment Activities	Yes	Impact HYD-2, pp. 3.11-27 – 3.11-29	Yes	BIO-1 GEO-1 GEO-2 GEO-3 GEO-4 GEO-5 GEO-7 GEO-8 HYD-1 HYD-5 HAZ-1 HAZ-5	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HYD-3: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through Prescribed Herbivory	No	Impact HYD-3, p. 3.11-29	No	None	NA	N/A	N/A	NA
Impact HYD-4: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Ground Application of Herbicides	LTS	Impact HYD-4, pp. 3.11-30 – 3.11-31	LTS	HYD-5 BIO-4 HAZ-5 HAZ-7	NA	N/A	N/A	NA

Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact HYD-5: Substantially Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern of a Treatment Site or Area	LTS	Impact HYD-5, p. 3.11-31	Yes	GEO-5 HYD-4 HYD-6	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to hydrology and water quality that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact HYD-1

The project is located in the Klamath HUC-6 watershed and North Coast Hydrologic Region. The project area is adjacent to Lake Shastina and contains portions of the Shasta River. Several unnamed ephemeral streams, ponds of various sizes, seasonal wetlands, meadows, and seeps were also observed during the Biological Reconnaissance Survey of the project area. The potential for prescribed burning to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, or conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan was analyzed in the PEIR. Impacts were determined to be less than significant since prescribed broadcast burning would include fire behavior modeling and burning would be conducted when fuel moisture and environmental conditions allow for effective fuel reduction while reducing the risk of high severity burns. Prescribed burning in chaparral and shrublands that could result in severe burns and increased sediment loading would be utilized only when it is consistent with the natural fire return interval or when the project proponent clearly demonstrates that habitat function would be protected.

The impact of the project is within the scope of the PEIR because the use of low-intensity prescribed burns and associated impacts to water quality are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the surface water conditions are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the water quality impact from prescribed burning is also the same, as described above. SPR HYD-4, AQ-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, GEO-4 and GEO-6 are applicable to the project and would protect water quality during prescribed burns. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the Program EIR.

Impact HYD-2

The proposed project includes manual and mechanical treatments. Impacts of mechanical and manual treatment related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality, and conflict or obstruction of implementation of a water quality control plan were considered in

the PEIR. The PEIR determined impacts would be less than significant since SPRs would avoid the risk of substantial degradation to surface or groundwater quality from manual or mechanical treatment activities. .

The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since the treatment types and activities proposed for the project are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The project includes activities outside of the treatable landscape which is a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. Project treatment types and activities will be the same within and outside of the treatable landscape and will result in the same water quality impacts within the same watershed, therefore, the water quality impact from manual and mechanical treatments implemented for the project is also the same as described above.

SPRs applicable to the project include BIO-1, GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-7, GEO-8, HYD-1, HYD-5, HAZ-1, and HAZ-5. Impacts of the proposed project area consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

Impact HYD-3

Prescribed herbivory is not a proposed treatment activity. This impact does not apply to the proposed project.

Impact HYD-4

Initial and maintenance treatments would include the use of herbicides. All herbicide application would comply with EPA and California Department of Pesticide Regulation label standards. The potential for the use of herbicides to violate water quality regulations or degrade water quality was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant because qualifying projects would integrate SPRs into treatment design which ensure they are applied according to the manufacturer's label directions and limit herbicide use in sensitive areas or under conditions that could lead to misapplication and require each project to be prepared to respond to a spill. The impact of the project is within the scope of the PEIR because the use of herbicides to remove vegetation and associated impacts to water quality are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, surface water conditions are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the water quality impact from use of herbicides is also the same, as described above. SPRs applicable to this impact are HYD-5, BIO-4, HAZ-5 and HAZ-7. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact HYD-5

The project includes use of mechanical equipment and off-road vehicles that could result in ground disturbance that intersects existing drainage patterns within the project site. This impact was analyzed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since SPR HYD-6 requires that all projects avoid disturbance of existing drainage system and maintain pre-treatment drainage conditions. The project includes the treatment types and activities considered in the PEIR analysis and is within the scope of the PEIR. The project includes activities outside of the treatable landscape which is a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. Project treatment types and activities will be the same within and outside of the treatable landscape and would result in the same potential impacts to drainage patterns throughout the project site within and outside of the treatable landscape. SPRs applicable to the project include GEO-5, HYD-4 and HYD-6. Impacts of the proposed project area consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

The proposed treatment is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.11.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.11.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing environmental and regulatory conditions pertinent to hydrology and water

quality that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to hydrology and water quality would occur.

4.11 Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact LU-1: Cause a Significant Environmental Impact Due to a Conflict with a Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation	LTS	Impact LU-1, pp. 3.12-13 – 3.12-14	Yes	AD-3	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact LU-2: Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth	LTS	Impact LU-2, pp. 3.12-14 – 3.12-15	Yes	N/A	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to land use and planning, population and housing that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Impact LU-1

The project area includes mostly private land within the Lake Shastina Community Services District and unincorporated Siskiyou County. No policies were identified in the Siskiyou County General Plan that are specifically applicable to the project. Project areas within the Lake Shastina Community Services District (LSCSD) are subject to applicable LSCSD Ordinances. The potential for vegetation treatment activities to cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation was examined in the PEIR. This impact is within the scope of the PEIR because the treatment types and activities are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. No conflict would occur because the project proponent would adhere to SPR AD-3. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent considered in the PEIR. However, land uses in the project area are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the land use impact is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

Impact LU-2

The project could require an average 45 workers for prescribed burning activities. Manual, mechanical, and herbicide treatment activities would require fewer workers. The potential for initial treatments and maintenance treatments to result in substantial unplanned population growth as a result of increases in demand for employees was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. Impacts associated with short-term increases in the demand for

workers during implementation of the treatment project are within the scope of the PEIR because the number of workers required for implementation of the treatments is consistent with the crew size analyzed in the PEIR for the types of treatments proposed (i.e., 10–50 workers for prescribed burns, one to 50 crew members, and up to four crews for mechanical and manual treatments, and up to 10 workers for herbicide treatments). In addition, the proposed project is not anticipated to require the hiring of new employees. The inclusion of land in the proposed project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, the population and housing characteristics of the project area are essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the population and housing impact is also the same, as described above. No SPRs are applicable to this impact. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing Impacts

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.12.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.12.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to land use and planning, population and housing that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to land use and planning, population and housing would occur.

4.12 Noise

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact NOI-1: Result in a Substantial Short-Term Increase in Exterior Ambient Noise Levels During Treatment Implementation	LTS	Impact NOI-1, pp. 3.13-9 – 3.13-12; Appendix NOI-1	LTS	AD-3 NOI-1 NOI-2 NOI-3 NOI-4 NOI-5 NOI-6	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact NOI-2: Result in a Substantial Short-Term Increase in Truck-Generated SENL's During Treatment Activities	LTS	Impact NOI-2, p. 3.13-12	Yes	NOI-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Noise Impacts: Would the treatment result in other noise-related impacts that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact NOI-1

The proposed project includes prescribed burning, mechanical vegetation treatment, and manual vegetation treatment, and herbicide treatment activities. Prescribed, burning, mechanical vegetation treatment and manual vegetation treatment are the most noise intensive vegetation treatment activities. The project includes treatment adjacent to developed areas with noise-sensitive receptors. Exposure of noise-sensitive receptors to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels was analyzed in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant because SPRs require consistency with local noise policies and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them, limit vegetation treatment activities to daytime hours, ensure proper notification of nearby sensitive receptors, and locate treatment activities and staging areas away from sensitive receptors to minimize noise exposure. Additionally, any increase in noise exposure at nearby receptors would be temporary and periodic.

The proposed project is within the scope of the treatment activities and impacts addressed in the PEIR because the number and types of equipment proposed are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. SPRs AD-3, NOI-1, NOI-2, NOI-3, NOI-4, NOI-5 and NOI-6 are applicable to the project. Siskiyou County does not have a noise ordinance and the Siskiyou County General Plan Noise Element does not contain any noise standards or exempted hours applicable to noise from construction activities that would also apply to vegetation treatment activities. Inclusion of land in the project area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented

in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the exposure potential to any sensitive receptors present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the noise impact is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR

Impact NOI-2

Initial and maintenance treatments would involve large trucks hauling heavy equipment to the project area. The potential for a substantial short-term increase in Single-Event Noise Levels generated by trucks was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since treatment activities would be required to adhere to SPR NOI-1, which limits vegetation treatment activities to daytime hours avoiding the potential to result in sleep disturbance during noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours.

SPR NOI-1 is applicable to the proposed treatments. The project is within the scope of the PEIR because the number and types of equipment proposed are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the exposure potential is essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the noise impact is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Noise Impacts

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.13.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.13.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to noise that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to noise would occur

4.13 Recreation

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact REC-1: Directly or Indirectly Disrupt Recreational Activities within Designated Recreation Areas	LTS	Impact REC-1 pp. 3.14-6 – 3.14-7	Yes	SPR REC-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Recreation Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to recreation that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact REC-1

Recreational areas within or adjacent the project area include Lake Shastina and public and private lake access areas including the public fishing access and boat ramp and Lake Shastina Property Owner Association boat ramp. Lake Shastina Campground/Day Use Area, the Lake Shastina Golf Resort, and Hoy Park are also present within the project area. The project could result in disruption of recreational activities by restricting public access to surrounding areas for safety reasons or through potential nuisance impacts including , degradation of scenic resources through short-term presence of equipment or long-term changes to the landscape within the viewshed of designated recreation areas, decreased air quality due to prescribed burning and use of motorized equipment along unpaved roadways, or from traffic as a result of ingress/egress of heavy equipment with may limit, restrict, or delay access to recreation areas.

The potential for vegetation treatment and maintenance activities to disrupt recreation activities was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since regulatory compliance, SPRs, and mitigation measures would minimize impacts to aesthetics, air quality and transportation. The potential for the proposed treatment project to impact recreation is within the scope of the PEIR because the treatment activities, types, and intensity are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. SPR-REC-1 will be required if project activities require the temporary closure of recreational facilities during treatment activities.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, the availability of recreational resources within the project area is essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the impact to recreation is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Recreation Impacts

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.14.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.14.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to recreation that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to recreation would occur

4.14 Transportation

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact TRAN-1: Result in Temporary Traffic Operations Impacts by Conflicting with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing Roadway Facilities or Prolonged Road Closures	LTS	Section 3.15.2; Impact TRAN-1 pp. 3.15-9 – 3.15-10	LTS	AD-3, TRAN-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact TRAN-2: Substantially Increase Hazards due to a Design Feature or Incompatible Uses	LTS	Impact TRAN-2 pp. 3.15-10 – 3.15-11	Yes	AD-3 HYD-2 TRAN-1	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact TRAN-3: Result in a Net Increase in VMT for the Proposed CalVTP	PSU	Impact TRAN-3 pp. 3.15-11 – 3.15-13	Yes	None	AQ-1	PSU	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Transportation Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to transportation that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact TRAN-1

Initial and maintenance treatments would temporarily increase vehicular traffic along project roads. The potential for a temporary increase in traffic to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing roadway facilities or prolonged road closures was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant. The proposed treatments would be short term, and temporary increases in traffic related to treatments are within the scope of the PEIR because the treatment duration and limited number of vehicles (i.e., heavy equipment transport, crew vehicles for crew members) associated with the proposed treatments are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. In addition, the proposed treatments would not all occur concurrently, and increases in vehicle trips associated with the treatments would be dispersed on multiple roadways. The SPR's applicable to this treatment are AD-3 and TRAN-1. The proposed project implementation will abide by all local plan, policies, and ordinances and if necessary, implement traffic control as needed.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the

existing transportation conditions (e.g., roadways and road use) present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the transportation impact is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact TRAN-2

Initial and maintenance treatments would not require the construction of new roadways or alteration of any existing roadways. The project includes prescribed burning which would produce smoke and potentially affect visibility along nearby roadways such that a transportation hazard could occur and hauling of heavy machinery and operation of large trucks on roadways during treatment could potentially result in increased transportation hazards due to incompatible uses. Increase of hazards due to a design feature or from incompatible uses during treatment activities was analyzed in the PEIR and impacts were determined to be less than significant. The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since it includes treatment activities, crew sizes and treatment duration consistent with those analyzed within the PEIR, therefore impacts from the proposed project would also be less than significant.

SPRs applicable to the proposed treatment are AD-3, HYD-2 and TRAN-1 requiring that construction of new road be avoided, traffic management plans be prepared if deemed necessary, and compliance with local standards and policies for traffic, including, but not limited to applicable transportation haul and/or oversized trucking requirements. Inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing transportation conditions (e.g., roadways and road use) present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the transportation impact is also the same, as described above. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact TRAN-3

Initial and maintenance treatments could temporarily increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT) above baseline conditions from heavy vehicle trips to haul equipment and materials, trips associated with workers commuting to and from the treatment areas and hauling of biomass to a bioenergy facility. This impact was identified as potentially significant and unavoidable in the PEIR because implementation of the CalVTP would result in a net increase in VMT. However, as noted under Impact TRAN-3 in the PEIR, individual vegetation treatment projects under the CalVTP are reasonably expected to generate fewer than 110 trips per day, which would cause a less-than-significant transportation impact for specific later activities, as described in the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts, published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR 2018). Treatment and maintenance activities are expected to require a maximum 45 crew members at one time. Therefore, crew sizes would be sufficiently small that the total increase in VMT would not exceed 110 trips per day. In addition, as mentioned above, the increase in vehicle trips would be dispersed to multiple roadways. Temporary increases in VMT are within the scope of the activities and impacts addressed in the PEIR because the number and duration of increased vehicle trips is consistent with that analyzed in the PEIR. Because the project would generate VMT during project implementation, it would contribute to the environmental significance conclusion in the PEIR; therefore, for purposes of CEQA compliance, this PSA/Addendum notes the impact as significant and unavoidable.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing transportation conditions (e.g., roadways and road use) present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the transportation impact is also the same, as described above.

New Transportation Impacts

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.15.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.15.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project

proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to transportation that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to transportation could occur.

4.15 Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered in the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact UTIL-1: Result in Physical Impacts Associated with Provision of Sufficient Water Supplies, Including Related Infrastructure Needs	LTS	Section 3.16.1 pp. 3.16-2 – 3.16-3; Impact UTIL-1 p. 3.16-9	Yes	N/A	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact UTIL-2: Generate Solid Waste in Excess of State Standards or Exceed Local Infrastructure Capacity	SU	Section 3.16.1 pp. 3.16-3 – 3.16-5; Impact UTIL-2 pp. 3.16-10 – 3.16-12	Yes	UTIL-1	N/A	SU	No	Yes
Impact UTIL-3: Comply with Federal, State, and Local Management and Reduction Goals, Statutes, and Regulations Related to Solid Waste	LTS	Section 3.16.2 pp. 3.16-6 – 3.16-7; Impact UTIL-2 p. 3.16-12	Yes	UTIL-1	N/A	SU	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Public Services, Utilities and Service System Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to public services, utilities and service systems that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

Impact UTIL-1

Initial and maintenance treatments would include prescribed burning activities which would require on-site water supplies for fire suppression. Water would also be needed onsite for dust control during vegetation removal within non-shaded fuel breaks. Physical impacts associated with the provision of sufficient water supplies, including related infrastructure needs was evaluated in the PEIR. Impacts were determined to be less than significant since treatment activities would occur over a large geographic area which would disperse pressure on local water providers and the increase in demand for water attributable to implementation of the CalVTP would be negligible and would not discernably affect the availability of water supply.

The proposed project is within the scope of the activities and impacts addressed in the PEIR because the size of the area proposed for treatments, amount of water required for dust control, and water source types are consistent with

those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the water supplies present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the water supply impact is also the same, as described above. No SPRs are applicable to this impact. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

Impact UTIL-2

The proposed project includes prescribed burning, pile burning, mechanical treatment, manual treatment and herbicide application treatment activities. Mechanical and manual vegetation removal generate solid organic waste in the form of woody biomass. A portion of the biomass from the project generated by manual and mechanical treatment activities could be transported to a biomass facility for processing. SPR UTIL-1 requiring a Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan is applicable to the project and requires proponents of projects that would transport solid organic waste offsite to identify the amount of solid organic waste to be managed onsite and transported offsite for processing and to clearly identify the location and capacity of the intended processing facility, consistent with local and state regulation to demonstrate that adequate capacity exists to accept the treatment materials. This determination is consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

The potential for generation of solid waste to exceed local infrastructure capacity was analyzed in the PEIR. This impact was identified as potentially significant and unavoidable in the PEIR because biomass hauled off-site could exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure for handling biomass. The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since the type and amount of biomass that may need to be hauled offsite are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. Although the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of the bioenergy facility in Weed or other bioenergy facilities in the region, the project would contribute to the environmental significance conclusion the PEIR; therefore, for purposes of CEQA compliance, this PSA/Addendum notes the impact as significant and unavoidable. SPR UTIL-1 is applicable to the project. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, organic solid waste generation and disposal rates would be the same within and outside of the treatable landscape; therefore impacts related to biomass are also the same as described above.

Impact UTIL-3

The project includes manual and mechanical treatment activities that would generate biomass that would be scattered onsite, pile burned or transported to a biomass facility for processing. SPR UTIL-1 is applicable to the proposed project and requires the project proponent to prepare a Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan that identifies the amount of solid organic waste to be transported offsite to a biomass power plant, wood product processing facility, and/or composting for processing. This SPR also prohibits solid organic waste generated during vegetation treatments from being transported to a landfill for disposal. Impacts related to compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction goals, statutes, and regulations related to solid waste were analyzed in the PEIR. Impacts were determined to be less than significant since implementation of the CalVTP would divert solid organic waste generated from treatment activities from solid waste facilities to a biomass power plant, wood product processing facility, and/or composting for processing which would decrease the amount of waste transported to solid waste facilities.

The proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR since the type and amount of biomass that may need to be hauled offsite is consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. SPR UTIL-1 is applicable to disposal of material outside of the treatment area. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, organic solid waste would be disposed using the same methods in areas within and outside of the treatable landscape; therefore impacts related to biomass are also the same as described above. This determination is

consistent with the PEIR and would not constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than what was covered in the PEIR.

New Impacts to Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.16.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.16.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to public services, utilities, and service systems that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to public services, utilities and service systems could occur.

4.16 Wildfire

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact WIL-1: Substantially Exacerbate Fire Risk and Expose People to Uncontrolled Spread of a Wildfire	LTS	Section 3.17.1; Impact WIL-1 pp. 3.17-14 – 3.17-15	Yes	HAZ-2, HAZ-3, HAZ-4 AD-3 AQ-3	N/A	LTS	No	Yes
Impact WIL-2: Expose People or Structures to Substantial Risks Related to Post-Fire Flooding or Landslides	LTS	Section 3.17.1; Impact WIL-2 pp. 3.17-15 – 3.17-16	Yes	AQ-3 GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5 GEO-8	N/A	LTS	No	Yes

¹NA: not applicable; there are no SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact. None: there are SPRs and/or MMs identified in the PEIR for this impact, but none are applicable to the treatment project.

New Wildfire Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts related to wildfire that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	☐ Yes	☒ No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion	
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	
[Identify new impact here, if applicable; add rows as needed]	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

Impact WIL-1

The project includes use of vehicles, heavy machinery, and prescribed burning during initial treatment and maintenance that can increase the risk of an accidental wildfire ignition. Impacts related to exacerbation of fire risk and exposure of people to uncontrolled wildfire were examined in the PEIR. The PEIR determined this impact would be less than significant since several SPRs would be implemented to reduce the risk of uncontrolled spread of fire from treatment activities. In addition, given the extensive preparation and planning prior to a prescribed burn, active monitoring and maintenance during a prescribed burn, and implementation of stringent safety protocols, prescription burning would not substantially exacerbate fire risk that could result in the uncontrolled spread of wildfire.

The project is within the scope of the PEIR since the treatment activities, treatment duration, and type of equipment to be used for the treatment are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR. The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the wildfire risk of areas outside of the treatable landscape is the same as the areas within the treatable landscape and risk of wildfire would be the same as described in the PEIR. SPRs applicable to this treatment are HAZ-2 through HAZ-4, AD-3, and AQ-3. Consistent with the determination in the PEIR, risk of accidental wildfire ignition from the project would be less than significant. The project would not result in a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

Impact WIL-2

Initial treatment and treatment maintenance for the project would include prescribed burning. The potential for post-fire flooding and landslides was examined in the PEIR and determined to be less than significant since prescribed burning implemented under the CalVTP would be low severity and typically retain substantial vegetation, therefore maintaining stability of the soil. In addition, SPRs would be incorporated into qualifying projects under the CalVTP to stabilize disturbed soils from treatment to minimize erosion. The project is within the scope of the PEIR since the severity and duration of proposed prescribed burns are consistent with those analyzed in the PEIR and impacts of the project would be less than significant.

The inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the CalVTP treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the post-fire landslide risk of the project area is essentially the same within and outside the treatable landscape; therefore, the wildfire impact is also the same, as described above. SPRs applicable to this impact are AQ-3, GEO-3 through GEO-5, and GEO-8. Post-fire flooding and landslide risk impacts of the project are consistent with the determination in the PEIR and the project would not result in a substantially more severe significant impact than covered in the PEIR.

New Impacts to Wildfire

The proposed project is consistent with the treatment types and activities considered in the CalVTP PEIR. The project proponent has considered the site-specific characteristics of the proposed treatment project and determined they are consistent with the applicable environmental and regulatory conditions presented in the CalVTP PEIR (refer to Section 3.17.1, "Environmental Setting," and Section 3.17.2, "Regulatory Setting," in Volume II of the Final PEIR). The project proponent has also determined that the inclusion of land in the proposed treatment area that is outside the treatable landscape constitutes a change to the geographic extent presented in the PEIR. However, within the boundary of the project area, the existing conditions that are pertinent to wildfire that are present in the areas outside the treatable landscape are essentially the same as those within the treatable landscape; therefore, the impacts of the proposed treatment project are also consistent with those covered in the PEIR. No changed circumstances are present, and the inclusion of areas outside of the CalVTP treatable landscape would not give rise to any new significant impacts. Therefore, no new impact related to wildfire could occur.

4.0 References Cited

- American Society of Mammalogists. 1974. Mammalian Species. *Canis Lupus*. Available: <https://academic.oup.com/mspecies/article/doi/10.2307/3503924/2600650>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- Ascent Environmental. 2022. Project-Specific Analysis and Addendum to the CalVTP Program EIR of the West Mount Shasta Forest Resiliency Project prepared for Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District. Available: <https://calfire.app.box.com/s/ec15ildwbhdh0boj1iz9v5t8n8r8cmqi/file/1356011673116>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- Ascent Environmental. 2023. Project-Specific Analysis and Addendum to the CalVTP Program EIR of the Western Klamath Landscape Fuels Reduction and Forest Health Project prepared for Mid Klamath Watershed Council and CAL FIRE. Available: <https://calfire.app.box.com/s/ec15ildwbhdh0boj1iz9v5t8n8r8cmqi/file/1356015597026>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2024. California Forest Practice Rules 2024. Available: <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/qs5p1yk4/2024-forest-practice-rules-and-act-final.pdf>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2010. Potential Riparian Connections - CEHC [ds622]. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios6/Default.aspx?tool=cnddbqv>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2014. Essential Connectivity Areas - California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) [ds620]. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios6/Default.aspx?tool=cnddbqv>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2017. Natural Landscape Blocks - California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) [ds621]. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios6/Default.aspx?tool=cnddbqv>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018a. Natural Areas Small - California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) [ds1073]. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios6/Default.aspx?tool=cnddbqv>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018b. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2024a. Wolf Management Update California Department of Fish and Wildlife January – March 2024. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=222380&inline>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2024b. Approximate Area of Gray Wolf Activity, January 2024. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=219800&inline>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2022. California's Known Wolves – Past and Present. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=201829&inline>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2023. Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species June 6, 2023. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=213150&inline>. Accessed July 1, 2024.

- California Department of Transportation. 2004 (December). California Bat Mitigation Techniques, Solutions, and Effectiveness. Prepared by H. T. Harvey & Associates, Sacramento, CA.
- California Native Plant Society. 2024. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v9-01 1.5). Available: <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org>. Retrieved May 9, 2024.
- California Natural Diversity Database. 2024. Results of electronic records search. Sacramento: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch. Retrieved May 9, 2024.
- Code, B. H. and S. L. Haney. 2006. Franklin's Bumble Bee Inventory in the Southern Cascades of Oregon. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management, Medford, OR.
- Consortium of California Herbaria. 2024. Data provided by the participants of the Consortium of California Herbaria. Available: ucjeps.berkeley.edu/consortium/. Accessed May 2024.
- de Groot, R., et al. 2002. A Typology for the Classification Description and Valuation of Ecosystem Functions, Goods and Services. *Ecological Economics* 41(3), February 2002.
- Levine, L. M., McEachern, A. K., and C. Cowan. 2008. "Rainfall Effects on Rare Annual Plants." *Journal of Ecology*. 96:794-806.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2022. Soil classification maps. Available: <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/survey/class/maps/>. Accessed May 9, 2024.
- Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation. Second edition. California Native Plant Society Press, Sacramento, California, USA.
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). 2014. Nesting Birds: Species-Specific Buffers for PG&E Activities.
- Siskiyou County. 1973. Siskiyou County General Plan. Available: <https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/planning/page/general-plan>. Accessed July 1, 2024.
- Ronald K. Churchill and Robert L. Hill. 2000. A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California—Areas More likely to Contain Naturally Occurring asbestos.
- Siskiyou County Planning Department. 1973. The Conservation Element of the General Plan Siskiyou County, California. June 1973.
- Underwood, E. C., et al. 2018. Global Change and the Vulnerability of Chaparral Ecosystems. *Bulletin, Ecological Society of America*. Published October 1, 2018.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. Survey Protocols for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis*) Version 2.2. April 12, 2019. Available: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/guideline/survey/population/10383/office/32410.pdf> Accessed July 1, 2024.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2024a. Information for Planning and Consultation electronic records search. Available: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>. Retrieved May 9, 2024.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2024b. National Wetlands Inventory search. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory>. Retrieved June 13, 2024.
- Williams, P. H., R. W. Thorp, L. L. Richardson, and S. R. Colla. 2014. Bumble Bees of North America. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Natural Heritage Inventory Screening Guidance for Gray Wolf. Available: <https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/EndangeredResources/documents/wolfScreeningGuidance.pdf>. Accessed July 1, 2024.

Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. 2010. Petition to List Franklin's Bumble Bee *Bombus franklini* (Frison), 1921 as an Endangered Species under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Available: <https://www.xerces.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/bombus-franklini-petition.pdf>. Accessed July 1, 2024.

Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. 2018. A Petition to the State of California Fish and Game Commission to List the Crotch Bumble Bee (*Bombus crotchii*), Franklin's Bumble Bee (*Bombus franklini*), Suckley Cuckoo Bumble Bee (*Bombus suckleyi*), and Western Bumble Bee (*Bombus occidentalis occidentalis*) as Endangered Under the California Endangered Species Act. Available: <https://www.xerces.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/CESA-petition-Bombus-Oct2018.pdf>. Accessed July 1, 2024.

Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. 2021. Franklin's Bumble Bee Species Distribution Model. Available: <https://www.pnwbumblebeeatlas.org/ffbb.html>. Accessed July 1, 2024.

ATTACHMENT A -MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE LAKE SHASTINA FUELS REDUCTION PROJECT

PURPOSE AND ROLES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21081.6 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[d] and 15097) require public agencies “to adopt a reporting and monitoring program for changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” A mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) is required for approval of the proposed project because the Project-Specific Analysis/Addendum to the California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP) Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) (PSA/Addendum) identifies potential significant adverse impacts and all feasible mitigation measures have been adopted. Standard project requirements (SPRs), which are part of the project description, have been incorporated to avoid or minimize adverse effects. Where potentially significant impacts remain after application of SPRs, mitigation measures have been identified to further reduce and/or compensate for those impacts. While only mitigation measures are required to be covered in an MMRP, both SPRs and mitigation are included in this MMRP to assist in implementation of all environmental protection features of later activities consistent with the CalVTP Program EIR.

This MMRP has been prepared to facilitate implementation of SPRs and mitigation measures from the CalVTP Program EIR applicable to the Lake Shastina Fuels Reduction Project. The table below includes the applicable SPRs and mitigation measures, the timing in which the SPR or mitigation measures will be implemented, as well as the implementing entity and the verifying/monitoring entity. The implementing entity is the agency or organization responsible for carrying out the requirement. The Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County (FSCSC) is responsible for implementation of SPRs and mitigation measures either directly or through contracts with technical specialist (archeologist or biologist), vegetation management contractors, or partner agencies. The verifying/monitoring entity is the agency or organization responsible for ensuring that the requirement is implemented. The verifying/monitoring entity for the project is the Shasta Valley RCD who has been contracted by FSCSC to provide project oversight and management of the project.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Cultural resource SPRs and mitigation measures require that qualified individuals implement components of the measures. The requirements listed below will be met to be considered qualified and may be performed by individuals of various titles (including supervised designees) as long as they are qualified.

Qualified Archaeologist: To be qualified, an archaeologist would hold a Prehistoric Archeology, Historic Archeology, Conservation, Cultural Anthropology, or Curation degree from an accredited university and meet the Secretary of Interior's Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61). The project proponent will review the resume and approve the qualifications of the archaeologists.

Archaeologically Trained Resource Professional: To be qualified, an archaeologically-trained resource professional would hold a valid Archaeological Training Certificate issued by CAL FIRE and the Board or equivalent state or local agency training or certification. Work performed by an archaeologically-trained resource professional must be reviewed and approved by a qualified archaeologist.

Biological resource SPRs and mitigation measures require that qualified individuals implement components of the measures. The requirements listed below will be met to be considered qualified and may be performed by individuals of various titles (including biologist, botanist, ecologist, Registered Professional Forester, biological technician, or supervised designees working at the direction of a qualified professional) as long as they are qualified for the task at hand.

Qualified Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or Biologist: To be qualified, an RPF or biologist would hold a wildlife biology, botany, ecology, forestry, or other relevant degree from an accredited university and: 1) be knowledgeable in relevant species life histories and ecology, 2) be able to correctly identify relevant species and habitats, 3) have experience conducting field surveys of relevant species or resources, 4) be knowledgeable about survey protocols, 5) be knowledgeable about state and federal laws regarding the protection of special-status species, and 6) have experience with CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). The project proponent will review the resume and approve the qualifications of RPFs or biologists. If species-specific protocol surveys are performed, surveys would be conducted by qualified RPFs or biologists with the minimum qualifications required by the appropriate protocols, including having CDFW or USFWS approval to conduct such surveys, if required by certain protocols.

Qualified RPF or Botanist: To be qualified, an RPF or botanist would 1) be knowledgeable about plant taxonomy, 2) be familiar with plants of the region, including special-status plants and sensitive natural communities, 3) have experience conducting floristic botanical field surveys as described in CDFW "Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities" (current version dated March 20, 2018), or experience conducting such botanical field surveys under the direction of an experienced botanical field surveyor, 4) be familiar with the *California Manual of Vegetation* (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at <http://vegetation.cnps.org/>), and 5) be familiar with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to plants and plant collecting. The project proponent will review the resume and approve the qualifications of RPFs or botanists.

Qualified RPF or Biological Technician: To be qualified, an RPF or biological technician would 1) be knowledgeable in relevant species life histories and ecology, 2) be able to correctly identify relevant species and habitats, 3) have experience conducting biological monitoring of relevant species or resources, and 4) be knowledgeable about state and federal laws regarding the protection of special-status species. The project proponent will review the resume and approve the qualifications of RPFs or biological technicians.

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Administrative Standard Project Requirements				
SPR AD-1 Project Proponent Coordination: For treatments coordinated with CAL FIRE, CAL FIRE will meet with the project proponent to discuss all natural and environmental resources that must be protected using SPRs and any applicable mitigation measures; identify any sensitive resources onsite; and discuss resource protection measures. For any prescribed burn treatments, CAL FIRE will also discuss the details of the burn plan in the incident action plan (IAP). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment coordinated with CAL FIRE	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AD-2 Delineate Protected Resources: The project proponent will clearly define the boundaries of the treatment area and protected resources on maps for the treatment area and with highly-visible flagging or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway) prior to beginning any treatment to avoid disturbing the resource. "Protected Resources" refers to environmentally sensitive places within or adjacent to the treatment areas that would be avoided or protected to the extent feasible during planned treatment activities to sustain their natural qualities and processes. This work will be performed by a qualified person, as defined for the specific resource (e.g., qualified Registered Professional Forester or biologist). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AD-3 Consistency with Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances: The project proponent will design and implement the treatment in a manner that is consistent with applicable local plans (e.g., general plans, Community Wildfire Protection Plans, CAL FIRE Unit Fire Plans), policies, and ordinances to the extent the project is subject to them. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AD-4 Public Notifications for Prescribed Burning: At least three days prior to the commencement of prescribed burning operations, the project proponent will: 1) post signs along the closest public roadway to the treatment area describing the activity and timing, and requesting persons in the area to contact a designated representative of the project proponent (contact information will be provided with the notice) if they have questions or smoke concerns; 2) publish a public interest notification in a local newspaper or other widely distributed media source describing the activity, timing, and contact information; 3) send the local county supervisor and county administrative officer (or equivalent official responsible for distribution of public information) a notification letter describing the activity, its necessity, timing, and measures being taken to protect the environment and prevent prescribed burn escape. This SPR applies only to prescribed burn treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	At least three days prior to the commencement of prescribed burning operations	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
SPR AD-5 Maintain Site Cleanliness: If trash receptacles are used on-site, the project proponent will use fully covered trash receptacles with secure lids (wildlife proof) to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverages, and other worker generated miscellaneous trash. Remove all temporary non-biodegradable flagging, trash, debris, and barriers from the project site upon completion of project activities. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to, during, and following treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AD-6 Public Notifications for Treatment Projects. One to three days prior to the commencement of a treatment activity, the project proponent will post signs in a conspicuous location near the treatment area describing the activity and timing, and requesting persons in the area to contact a designated representative of the project proponent (contact information will be provided with the notice) if they have questions or concerns. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance. Prescribed burning is subject to the additional notification requirements of SPR AD-4.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	One to three days prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AD-7 Provide Information on Proposed, Approved, and Completed Treatment Projects. For any vegetation treatment project using the CalVTP PEIR for CEQA compliance, the project proponent will provide the information listed below to the Board or CAL FIRE during the proposed, approved, and completed stages of the project. The Board or CAL FIRE will make this information available to the public via an online database or other mechanism. Information on proposed projects (PSA in progress): ▶ GIS data that include project location (as a point); ▶ project size (typically acres); ▶ treatment types and activities; and ▶ contact information for a representative of the project proponent. The project proponent will provide information on the proposed project to the Board or CAL FIRE as early as feasible in the planning phase. The project proponent will provide this information to the Board or CAL FIRE with sufficient lead time to allow those agencies to make the information available to the public no later than two weeks prior to project approval. The project proponent may also make information available to the public via other mechanisms (e.g., the proponent's own website). Information on approved projects (PSA complete): ▶ A completed PSA Environmental Checklist; ▶ A completed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (using Attachment A to the Environmental Checklist);	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to, during and after treatment and maintenance activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► GIS data that include a polygon(s) of the project area, showing the extent of each treatment type included in the project (ecological restoration, fuel break, WUI fuel reduction). Information on completed projects: ► GIS data that include a polygon(s) of the treated area, showing the extent of each treatment type implemented (ecological restoration, fuel break, WUI fuel reduction) ► A post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report) that includes ▪ Size of treated area (typically acres); ▪ Treatment types and activities; ▪ Dates of work; ▪ A list of the SPRs and mitigation measures that were implemented ▪ Any explanations regarding implementation if required by SPRs and mitigation measures (e.g., explanation for feasibility determination required by SPR BIO-12; explanation for reduction of a no-disturbance buffer below the general minimum size described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-2b). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Aesthetic and Visual Resource Standard Project Requirements				
SPR AES-1 Vegetation Thinning and Edge Feathering: The project proponent will thin and feather adjacent vegetation to break up or screen linear edges of the clearing and mimic forms of natural clearings as reasonable or appropriate for vegetation conditions. In general, thinning and feathering in irregular patches of varying densities, as well as a gradation of tall to short vegetation at the clearing edge, will achieve a natural transitional appearance. The contrast of a distinct clearing edge will be faded into this transitional band. This SPR only applies to mechanical and manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AES-2 Avoid Staging within Viewsheds: The project proponent will store all treatment-related materials, including vehicles, vegetation treatment debris, and equipment, outside of the viewshed of public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways to the extent feasible. The project proponent will also locate materials staging and storage areas outside of the viewshed of public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways to the extent feasible. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
SPR AES-3 Provide Vegetation Screening: The project proponent will preserve sufficient vegetation within, at the edge of, or adjacent to treatment areas to screen views from public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways as reasonable or appropriate for vegetation conditions. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Air Quality Standard Project Requirements				
SPR AQ-1 Comply with Air Quality Regulations: The project proponent will comply with the applicable air quality requirements of air districts within whose jurisdiction the project is located. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AQ-2 Submit Smoke Management Plan: The project proponent will submit a smoke management plan for all prescribed burns to the applicable air district, in accordance with 17 CCR Section 80160. Pursuant to this regulation a smoke management plan will not be required for burns less than 10 acres that also will not be conducted near smoke sensitive areas, unless otherwise directed by the air district. Burning will only be conducted in compliance with the burn authorization program of the applicable air district(s) having jurisdiction over the treatment area. Example of a smoke management plan is in Appendix PD-2. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to prescribed burns	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AQ-3 Create Burn Plan: The project proponent will create a burn plan using the CAL FIRE burn plan template for all prescribed burns. The burn plan will include a fire behavior model output of First Order Fire Effects Model and BEHAVE or other fire behavior modeling simulation and that is performed by a qualified fire behavior technical specialist that predicts fire behavior, calculates consumption of fuels, tree mortality, predicted emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and soil heating. The project proponent will minimize soil burn severity from broadcast burning to reduce the potential for runoff and soil erosion. The burn plan will be created with input from a qualified technician or certified State burn boss. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to prescribed burns	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR AQ-4 Minimize Dust: To minimize dust during treatment activities, the project proponent will implement the following measures: ▶ Limit the speed of vehicles and equipment traveling on unpaved areas to 15 miles per hour to reduce fugitive dust emissions, in accordance with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Fugitive Dust protocol. ▶ If road use creates excessive dust, the project proponent will wet appurtenant, unpaved, dirt roads using water trucks or treat roads with a non-toxic chemical dust suppressant (e.g., emulsion polymers, organic material) during dry, dusty conditions.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Any dust suppressant product used will be environmentally benign (i.e., non-toxic to plants and will not negatively impact water quality) and its use will not be prohibited by ARB, EPA, or the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project proponent will not over-water exposed areas such that the water results in runoff. The type of dust suppression method will be selected by the project proponent based on soil, traffic, site-specific conditions, and air quality regulations. ▶ Remove visible dust, silt, or mud tracked-out on to public paved roadways where sufficient water supplies and access to water is available. The project proponent will remove dust, silt, and mud from vehicles at the conclusion of each workday, or at a minimum of every 24 hours for continuous treatment activities, in accordance with Vehicle Code Section 23113. ▶ Suspend ground-disturbing treatment activities, including land clearing and bulldozer lines, when there is visible dust transport (particulate pollution) outside the treatment boundary, if the particulate emissions may "cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any of those persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property," per Health and Safety Code Section 41700. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR AQ-6: Prescribed Burn Safety Procedures. Prescribed burns planned and managed by non-CAL FIRE crews will follow all safety procedures required of CAL FIRE crew, including the implementation of an approved Incident Action Plan (IAP). The IAP will include the burn dates; burn hours; weather limitations; the specific burn prescription; a communications plan; a medical plan; a traffic plan; and special instructions such as minimizing smoke impacts to specific local roadways. The IAP will also assign responsibilities for coordination with the appropriate air district, such as conducting onsite briefings, posting notifications, weather monitoring during burning, and other burn related preparations. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during prescribed burn treatment activities	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources Standard Project Requirements				
SPR CUL-1 Conduct Record Search: An archaeological and historical resource record search will be conducted per the applicable state or local agency procedures. Instead of conducting a new search, the project proponent may use recent record searches containing the treatment area requested by a landowner or other public agency in accordance applicable agency guidance. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
SPR CUL-2 Contact Geographically Affiliated Native American Tribes: The project proponent will obtain the latest Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided Native Americans Contact List. Using the appropriate Native Americans Contact List, the project proponent will notify the California Native American Tribes in the counties where the treatment activity is located. The notification will contain the following: ▶ A written description of the treatment location and boundaries. ▶ Brief narrative of the treatment objectives. ▶ A description of the activities used (e.g., prescribed burning, mastication) and associated acreages. ▶ A map of the treatment area at a sufficient scale to indicate the spatial extent of activities. ▶ A request for information regarding potential impacts to cultural resources from the proposed treatment. ▶ A detailed description of the depth of excavation, if ground disturbance is expected. In addition, the project proponent will contact the NAHC for a review of their Sacred Lands File. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment The NAHC was contacted for a Native Americans Contact List for the project and review of their Sacred Lands File on August 2, 2024. Notification letters were sent to the Native American tribes on the contact list on August 8, 2024.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR-CUL-3 Pre-field Research: The project proponent will conduct research prior to implementing treatments as part of the cultural resource investigation. The purpose of this research is to properly inform survey design, based on the types of resources likely to be encountered within the treatment area, and to be prepared to interpret, record, and evaluate these findings within the context of local history and prehistory. The qualified archaeologist and/or archaeologically-trained resource professional will review records, study maps, read pertinent ethnographic, archaeological, and historical literature specific to the area being studied, and conduct other tasks to maximize the effectiveness of the survey. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR CUL-4 Archaeological Surveys: The project proponent will coordinate with an archaeologically-trained resource professional and/or qualified archaeologist to conduct a site-specific survey of the treatment area. The survey methodology (e.g., pedestrian survey, subsurface investigation) depends on whether the area has a low, moderate, or high sensitivity for resources, which is based on whether the records search, pre-field research, and/or Native American consultation identifies archaeological or historical resources near or within the treatment area. A survey report will be completed for every cultural resource survey completed. The specific requirements will comply with the applicable state or local agency procedures. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
SPR CUL-5 Treatment of Archaeological Resources: If cultural resources are identified within a treatment area, and cannot be avoided, a qualified archaeologist will notify the culturally affiliated tribe(s) based on information provided by NAHC and assess, whether an archaeological find qualifies as a unique archaeological resource, an historical resource, or in coordination with said tribe(s), as a tribal cultural resource. The project proponent, in consultation with culturally affiliated tribe(s), will develop effective protection measures for important cultural resources located within treatment areas. These measures may include adjusting the treatment location or design to entirely avoid cultural resource locations or changing treatment activities so that damaging effects to cultural resources will not occur. These protection measures will be written in clear, enforceable language, and will be included in the survey report in accordance with applicable state or local agency procedures. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR CUL-6 Treatment of Tribal Cultural Resources: The project proponent, in consultation with the culturally affiliated tribe(s), will develop effective protection measures for important tribal cultural resources located within treatment areas. These measures may include adjusting the treatment location or design to entirely avoid cultural resource locations or changing treatment activities so that damaging effects to cultural resources will not occur. The project proponent will provide the tribe(s) the opportunity to submit comments and participate in consultation to resolve issues of concern. The project proponent will defer implementing the treatment until the tribe approves protection measures, or if agreement cannot be reached after a good-faith effort, the proponent determines that any or all feasible measures have been implemented, where feasible, and the resource is either avoided or protected. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR CUL-7 Avoid Built Historical Resources: If the records search identifies built historical resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the project proponent will avoid these resources. Within a buffer of 100 feet of the built historical resource, there will be no prescribed burning or mechanical treatment activities. Buffers less than 100 feet for built historical resources will only be used after consultation with and receipt of written approval from a qualified archaeologist. If the records search does not identify known historical resources in the treatment area, but structures (i.e., buildings, bridges, roadways) over 50 years old that have not been evaluated for historic significance are present in the treatment area, they will similarly be avoided. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Treatment Maintenance:	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR CUL-8 Cultural Resource Training: The project proponent will train all crew members and contractors implementing treatment activities on the protection of sensitive	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD	Prior to and during treatment

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
archaeological, historical, or tribal cultural resources. Workers will be trained to halt work if archaeological resources are encountered on a treatment site and the treatment method consists of physical disturbance of land surfaces (e.g., soil disturbance). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Biological Resources Standard Project Requirements				
SPR BIO-1: Review and Survey Project-Specific Biological Resources. The project proponent will require a qualified RPF or biologist to conduct a data review and reconnaissance-level survey prior to treatment, no more than one year prior to the submittal of the PSA, and no more than one year between completion of the PSA and implementation of the treatment project. The data reviewed will include the biological resources setting, species and sensitive natural communities tables, and habitat information in this PEIR for the ecoregion(s) where the treatment will occur. It will also include review of the best available, current data for the area, including vegetation mapping data, species distribution/range information, CNDDDB, California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, relevant BIOS queries, and relevant general and regional plans. Reconnaissance-level biological surveys will be general surveys that include visual and auditory inspection for biological resources to help determine the environmental setting of a project site. The qualified surveyor will 1.) identify and document sensitive resources, such as riparian or other sensitive habitats, sensitive natural community, wetlands, or wildlife nursery site or habitat (including bird nests), and 2.) assess the suitability of habitat for special-status plant and animal species. The surveyor will also record any incidental wildlife observations. For each treatment project, habitat assessments will be completed at a time of year that is appropriate for identifying habitat and no more than one year prior to the submittal of the PSA, unless it can be demonstrated in the PSA that habitat assessments older than one year remain valid (e.g., site conditions are unchanged and no treatment activity has occurred since the assessment). If more than one year passes between completion of the PSA and initiation of the treatment project, the project proponent will verify the continued accuracy of the PSA prior to beginning the treatment project by reviewing for any data updates and/or visiting the site to verify conditions. Based on the results of the data review and reconnaissance-level survey, the project proponent, in consultation with a qualified RPF or biologist, will determine which one of the following best characterizes the treatment:	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance Y:	Prior to treatment Initial data review and reconnaissance-level survey have been conducted; see PSA/Addendum for summary of results.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
1. Suitable Habitat Is Present but Adverse Effects Can Be Clearly Avoided. If, based on the data review and reconnaissance-level survey, the qualified RPF or biologist determines that suitable habitat for sensitive biological resources is present but adverse effects on the suitable habitat can clearly be avoided through one of the	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance Y:	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
following methods, the avoidance mechanism will be implemented prior to initiating treatment and will remain in effect throughout the treatment: a. by physically avoiding the suitable habitat, or b. by conducting treatment outside of the season when a sensitive resource could be present within the suitable habitat or outside the season of sensitivity (e.g., outside of special-status bird nesting season, during dormant season of sensitive annual or geophytic plant species, or outside of maternity and rearing season at wildlife nursery sites). Physical avoidance will include flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway) to delineate the boundary of the avoidance area around the suitable habitat. For physical avoidance, a buffer may be implemented as determined necessary by the qualified RPF or biologist. 2. Suitable Habitat is Present and Adverse Effects Cannot Be Clearly Avoided. Further review and surveys will be conducted to determine presence/absence of sensitive biological resources that may be affected, as described in the SPRs below. Further review may include contacting USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, CDFW, CNPS, or local resource agencies as necessary to determine the potential for special-status species or other sensitive biological resources to be affected by the treatment activity. Focused or protocol-level surveys will be conducted as necessary to determine presence/absence. If protocol surveys are conducted, survey procedures will adhere to methodologies approved by resource agencies and the scientific community, such as those that are available on the CDFW webpage at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols. Specific survey requirements are addressed for each resource type in relevant SPRs (e.g., additional survey requirements are presented for special-status plants in SPR BIO-7). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR BIO-2: Require Biological Resource Training for Workers. The project proponent will require crew members and contractors to receive training from a qualified RPF or biologist prior to beginning a treatment project. The training will describe the appropriate work practices necessary to effectively implement the biological SPRs and mitigation measures and to comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations. The training will include the identification, relevant life history information, and avoidance of pertinent special-status species; identification and avoidance of sensitive natural communities and habitats with the potential to occur in the treatment area; impact minimization procedures; and reporting requirements. The training will instruct workers when it is appropriate to stop work and allow wildlife encountered during treatment activities to leave the area unharmed	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
and when it is necessary to report encounters to a qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will immediately contact CDFW or USFWS, as appropriate, if any wildlife protected by the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) is encountered and cannot leave the site on its own (without being handled). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Sensitive Natural Communities and Other Sensitive Habitats				
SPR BIO-3: Survey Sensitive Natural Communities and Other Sensitive Habitats. If SPR BIO-1 determines that sensitive natural communities or sensitive habitats may be present and adverse effects cannot be avoided, the project proponent will: ▶ require a qualified RPF or biologist to perform a protocol-level survey following the CDFW "Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities" (current version dated March 20, 2018) of the treatment area prior to the start of treatment activities for sensitive natural communities and sensitive habitats. Sensitive natural communities will be identified using the best means possible, including keying them out using the most current edition of <i>A Manual of California Vegetation</i> (including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/), or referring to relevant reports (e.g., reports found on the VegCAMP website). ▶ map and digitally record, using a Global Positioning System (GPS), the limits of any potential sensitive habitat and sensitive natural community identified in the treatment area. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
SPR BIO-4: Design Treatment to Avoid Loss or Degradation of Riparian Habitat Function. Project proponents, in consultation with a qualified RPF or qualified biologist, will design treatments in riparian habitats to retain or improve habitat functions by implementing the following within riparian habitats: ▶ Retain at least 75 percent of the overstory and 50 percent of the understory canopy of native riparian vegetation within the limits of riparian habitat identified and mapped during surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-3. Native riparian vegetation will be retained in a well distributed multi-storied stand composed of a diversity of species similar to that found before the start of treatment activities. ▶ Treatments will be limited to removal of uncharacteristic fuel loads (e.g., removing dead or dying vegetation), trimming/limbing of woody species as necessary to reduce ladder fuels, and select thinning of vegetation to restore densities that are characteristic of healthy stands of the riparian vegetation types characteristic of the	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
region. This includes hand removal (or mechanized removal where topography allows) of dead or dying riparian trees and shrubs, invasive plant removal, selective thinning, and removal of encroaching upland species. ▶ Removal of large, native riparian hardwood trees (e.g., willow, ash, maple, oak, alder, sycamore, cottonwood) will be minimized to the extent feasible and 75 percent of the pretreatment native riparian hardwood tree canopy will be retained. Because tree size varies depending on vegetation type present and site conditions, the tree size retention parameter will be determined on a site-specific basis depending on vegetation type present and setting; however, live, healthy, native trees that are considered large for that type of tree and large relative to other trees in that location will be retained. A scientifically-based, project-specific explanation substantiating the retention size parameter for native riparian hardwood tree removal will be provided in the Biological Resources Discussion of the PSA. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, erosion potential, suitability of wildlife habitat, presence of sufficient seed trees, light availability, and changes in stream shading may inform the tree size retention requirements. ▶ Removed trees will be felled away from adjacent streams or waterbodies and piled outside of the riparian vegetation zone (unless there is an ecological reason to do otherwise that is approved by applicable regulatory agencies, such as adding large woody material to a stream to enhance fish habitat, e.g., see Accelerated Wood Recruitment and Timber Operations: Process Guidance from the California Timber Harvest Review Team Agencies and National Marine Fisheries Service). ▶ Vegetation removal that could reduce stream shading and increase stream temperatures will be avoided. ▶ Ground disturbance within riparian habitats will be limited to the minimum necessary to implement effective treatments. This will consist of the minimum disturbance area necessary to reduce hazardous fuels and return the riparian community to a natural fire regime (i.e., Condition Class 1) considering historic fire return intervals, climate change, and land use constraints. ▶ Only hand application of herbicides approved for use in aquatic environments will be allowed and only during low-flow periods or when seasonal streams are dry. ▶ The project proponent will notify CDFW when required by California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 prior to implementing any treatment activities in riparian habitats. Notification will identify the treatment activities, map the vegetation to be removed, identify the impact avoidance identification methods to be used (e.g., flagging), and appropriate protections for the retention of shaded riverine habitat, including buffers and other applicable measures to prevent erosion into the waterway.				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► In consideration of spatial variability of riparian vegetation types and condition and consistent with California Forest Practice Rules Section 916.9(v) (February 2019 version), a different set of vegetation retention standards and protection measures from those specified in the above bullets may be implemented on a site-specific basis if the qualified RPF and the project proponent demonstrate through substantial evidence that alternative design measures provide a more effective means of achieving the treatment goals objectives and would result in effects to the Beneficial Functions of Riparian Zones equal or more favorable than those expected to result from application of the above measures. Deviation from the above design specifications, different protection measures and design standards will only be approved when the treatment plan incorporates an evaluation of beneficial functions of the riparian habitat and with written concurrence from CDFW. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR BIO-5: Avoid Environmental Effects of Type Conversion and Maintain Habitat Function in Chaparral and Coastal Sage Scrub. The project proponent will design treatment activities to avoid type conversion where native coastal sage scrub and chaparral are present. An ecological definition of type conversion is used in the CalVTP PEIR for assessment of environmental effects: a change from a vegetation type dominated by native shrub species that are characteristic of chaparral and coastal sage scrub vegetation alliances to a vegetation type characterized predominantly by weedy herbaceous cover or annual grasslands. For the PEIR, type conversion is considered in terms of habitat function, which is defined here as the arrangement and capability of habitat features to provide refuge, food source, and reproduction habitat to plants and animals, and thereby contribute to the conservation of biological and genetic diversity and evolutionary processes (de Groot et al. 2002). Some modification of habitat characteristics may occur provided habitat function is maintained (i.e., the location, essential habitat features, and species supported are not substantially changed). During the reconnaissance-level survey required in SPR BIO-1, a qualified RPF or biologist will identify chaparral and coastal sage scrub vegetation to the alliance level and determine the condition class and fire return interval departure of the chaparral and/or coastal sage scrub present in each treatment area. For all treatment types in chaparral and coastal sage scrub, the project proponent, in consultation with a qualified RPF or qualified biologist will: ► Develop a treatment design that avoids environmental effects of type conversion in chaparral and coastal sage scrub vegetation alliances, which will include evaluating and determining the appropriate spatial scale at which the proponent would consider type conversion, and substantiating its appropriateness. The project proponent will	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
demonstrate with substantial evidence that the habitat function of chaparral and coastal sage scrub would be at least maintained within the identified spatial scale at which type conversion is evaluated for the specific treatment project. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, erosion potential, suitability of wildlife habitat, spatial needs of sensitive species, presence of sufficient seed plants and nurse plants, light availability, and edge effects may inform the determination of an appropriate spatial scale. ► The treatment design will maintain a minimum percent cover of mature native shrubs within the treatment area to maintain habitat function; the appropriate percent cover will be identified by the project proponent in the development of treatment design and be specific to the vegetation alliances that are present in the identified spatial scale used to evaluate type conversion. Mature native shrubs that are retained will be distributed contiguously or in patches within the stand. If the stand consists of multiple age classes, patches representing a range of middle to old age classes will be retained to maintain and improve heterogeneity, to the extent needed to avoid type conversion. These SPR requirements apply to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance. Additional measures will be applied to ecological restoration treatment types: ► For ecological restoration treatment types, complete removal of the mature shrub layer will not occur in native chaparral and coastal sage scrub vegetation types. ► Ecological restoration treatments will not be implemented in vegetation types that are within their natural fire return interval (i.e., time since last burn is less than the average time listed as the fire return interval range in Table 3.6-1) unless the project proponent demonstrates with substantial evidence that the habitat function of chaparral and coastal sage scrub would be improved. ► A minimum of 35 percent relative cover of existing shrubs and associated native vegetation will be retained at existing densities in patches distributed in a mosaic pattern within the treated area or the shrub canopy will be thinned by no more than 20 percent from baseline density (i.e., if baseline shrub canopy density is 60 percent, post treatment shrub canopy density will be no less than 40 percent). A different percent relative cover can be retained if the project proponent demonstrates with substantial evidence that alternative treatment design measures would result in effects on the habitat function of chaparral and coastal sage scrub that are equal or more favorable than those expected to result from application of the above measures. Biological considerations that may inform a deviation from the minimum 35 percent relative cover retention include but are not limited to soil moisture				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
requirements, increased soil temperatures, changes in light/shading, presence of sufficient seed plants and nurse plants, erosion potential, and site hydrology. ► If the stand within the treatment area consists of multiple age classes, patches representing a range of middle to old age classes will be retained to maintain and improve heterogeneity. These SPR requirements apply to all treatment activities and only the ecosystem restoration treatment type, including treatment maintenance. A determination of compliance with the SB 1260 prohibition of type conversion in chaparral and coastal sage scrub is a statutory issue separate from CEQA compliance that may involve factors additional to the ecological definition and habitat functions presented in the PEIR, such as geographic context. It is beyond the legal scope of the PEIR to define SB 1260 type conversion and statutory compliance. The project proponent, acting as lead agency for the proposed later treatment project, will be responsible for defining type conversion in the context of the project and making the finding that type conversion would not occur, as required by SB 1260. The project proponent will determine its criteria for defining and avoiding type conversion and, in making its findings, may draw upon information presented in this PEIR.				
SPR BIO-6: Prevent Spread of Plant Pathogens. When working in sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, or oak woodlands that are at risk from plant pathogens (e.g., lone chaparral, blue oak woodland), the project proponent will implement the following best management practices to prevent the spread of <i>Phytophthora</i> and other plant pathogens (e.g., pitch canker (<i>Fusarium</i>), goldspotted oak borer, shot hole borer, bark beetle): ► clean and sanitize vehicles, equipment, tools, footwear, and clothes before arriving at a treatment site and when leaving a contaminated site, or a site in a county where contamination is a risk; ► include training on <i>Phytophthora</i> diseases and other plant pathogens in the worker awareness training; ► minimize soil disturbance as much as possible by limiting the number of vehicles, avoiding off-road travel as much as possible, and limiting use of mechanized equipment; ► minimize movement of soil and plant material within the site, especially between areas with high and low risk of contamination; ► clean soil and debris from equipment and sanitize hand tools, buckets, gloves, and footwear when moving from high risk to low risk areas or between widely separated portions of a treatment area; and	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► follow the procedures listed in Guidance for plant pathogen prevention when working at contaminated restoration sites or with rare plants and sensitive habitat (Working Group for <i>Phytopheras</i> in Native Habitats 2016). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Special-Status Plants				
SPR BIO-7: Survey for Special-Status Plants. If SPR BIO-1 determines that suitable habitat for special-status plant species is present and cannot be avoided, the project proponent will require a qualified RPF or botanist to conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plant species with the potential to be affected by a treatment prior to initiation of the treatment. The survey will follow the methods in the current version of CDFW's "Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities." Surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status plant species will be conducted in suitable habitat that could be affected by the treatment and timed to coincide with the blooming or other appropriate phenological period of the target species (as determined by a qualified RPF or botanist), or all species in the same genus as the target species will be assumed to be special-status. If potentially occurring special-status plants are listed under CESA or ESA, protocol-level surveys to determine presence/absence of the listed species will be conducted in all circumstances, unless determined otherwise by CDFW or USFWS. For other special-status plants not listed under CESA or ESA, as defined in Section 3.6.1 of this PEIR, surveys will not be required under the following circumstances: ► If protocol-level surveys, consisting of at least two survey visits (e.g., early blooming season and later blooming season) during a normal weather year, have been completed in the 5 years before implementation of the treatment project and no special-status plants were found, and no treatment activity has occurred following the protocol-level survey, treatment may proceed without additional plant surveys. ► If the target special-status plant species is an herbaceous annual, stump-sprouting, or geophyte species, the treatment may be carried out during the dormant season for that species or when the species has completed its annual lifecycle without conducting presence/absence surveys provided the treatment will not alter habitat or destroy seeds, stumps, or roots, rhizomes, bulbs and other underground parts in a way that would make it unsuitable for the target species to reestablish following treatment. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Invasive Plants and Wildlife				
SPR BIO-9: Prevent Spread of Invasive Plants, Noxious Weeds, and Invasive Wildlife. The project proponent will take the following actions to prevent the spread of invasive plants, noxious weeds, and invasive wildlife (e.g., New Zealand mudsnail): ▶ clean clothing, footwear, and equipment used during treatments of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, other debris or seed-bearing material, or water (e.g., rivers, streams, creeks, lakes) before entering the treatment area or when leaving an area with infestations of invasive plants, noxious weeds, or invasive wildlife; ▶ for all heavy equipment and vehicles traveling off road, pressure wash, if feasible, or otherwise appropriately decontaminate equipment at a designated weed-cleaning station prior to entering the treatment area from an area with infestations of invasive plants, noxious weeds, or invasive wildlife. Anti-fungal wash agents will be specified if the equipment has been exposed to any pathogen that could affect native species; ▶ inspect all heavy equipment, vehicles, tools, or other treatment-related materials for sand, mud, or other signs that weed seeds or propagules could be present prior to use in the treatment area. If the equipment is not clean, the qualified RPF or biological technician will deny entry to the work areas; ▶ stage equipment in areas free of invasive plant infestations unless there are no uninfested areas present within a reasonable proximity to the treatment area; ▶ identify significant infestations of invasive plant species (i.e., those rated as invasive by Cal-IPC or designated as noxious weeds by California Department of Food and Agriculture) during reconnaissance-level surveys and target them for removal during treatment activities. Treatment methods will be selected based on the invasive species present and may include herbicide application, manual or mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and/or herbivory, and will be designed to maximize success in killing or removing the invasive plants and preventing reestablishment based on the life history characteristics of the invasive plant species present. Treatments will be focused on removing invasive plant species that cause ecological harm to native vegetation types, especially those that can alter fire cycles; ▶ treat invasive plant biomass onsite to eliminate seeds and propagules and prevent reestablishment or dispose of invasive plant biomass offsite at an appropriate waste collection facility (if not kept on site); transport invasive plant materials in a closed container or bag to prevent the spread of propagules during transport; and ▶ implement Fire and Fuel Management BMPs outlined in the "Preventing the Spread of Invasive Plants: Best Management Practices for Land Mangers" (Cal-IPC 2012, or current version).	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Wildlife				
SPR BIO-10: Survey for Special-Status Wildlife and Nursery Sites. If SPR BIO-1 determines that suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species or nurseries of any wildlife species is present and cannot be avoided, the project proponent will require a qualified RPF or biologist to conduct focused or protocol-level surveys for special-status wildlife species or nursery sites (e.g., bat maternity roosts, deer fawning areas, heron or egret rookeries, monarch overwintering sites) with potential to be directly or indirectly affected by a treatment activity. The survey area will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist based on the species and habitats and any recommended buffer distances in agency protocols. The qualified RPF or biologist will determine if following an established protocol is required, and the project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding appropriate survey protocols. Unless otherwise specified in a protocol, the survey will be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the beginning of treatment activities. Focused or protocol surveys for a special-status species with potential to occur in the treatment area may not be required if presence of the species is assumed. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	No more than 14 days prior to the beginning of treatment activities unless otherwise specified in a protocol.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
SPR BIO-12. Protect Common Nesting Birds, Including Raptors. The project proponent will schedule treatment activities to avoid the active nesting season of common native bird species, including raptors, that could be present within or adjacent to the treatment site, if feasible. Common native birds are species not otherwise treated as special status in the CalVTP PEIR. The active nesting season will be defined by the qualified RPF or biologist. If active nesting season avoidance is not feasible, a qualified RPF or biologist will conduct a survey for common nesting birds, including raptors. Existing records (e.g., CNDDDB, eBird database, State Wildlife Action Plan) should be reviewed in advance of the survey to identify the common nesting birds, including raptors, that are known to occur in the vicinity of the treatment site. The survey area will encompass reasonably accessible areas of the treatment site and the immediately surrounding vicinity viewable from the treatment site. The survey area will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist, based on the potential species in the area, location of suitable nesting habitat, and type of treatment. For vegetation removal or project activities that would occur during the nesting season, the survey will be conducted at a time that balances the	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Surveys no more than 14 days prior to treatment during nesting bird season (Feb 1- Aug 31). Implement avoidance prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
effectiveness of detecting nests and the reasonable consideration of potential avoidance strategies. Typically, this timeframe would be up to 3 weeks before treatment. The survey will occur in a single survey period of sufficient duration to reasonably detect nesting birds, including raptors, typically one day for most treatment projects (depending on the size, configuration, and vegetation density in the treatment site), and conducted during the active time of day for target species, typically close to dawn and/or dusk. The survey may be conducted concurrently with other biological surveys, if they are required by other SPRs. Survey methods will be tailored by the qualified RPF or biologist to site and habitat conditions, typically involving walking throughout the survey area, visually searching for nests and birds exhibiting behavior that is typical of breeding (e.g., delivering food). If an active nest is observed (i.e., presence of eggs and/or chicks) or determined to likely be present based on nesting bird behavior, the project proponent will implement a feasible strategy to avoid disturbance of active nests, which may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following: ► Establish Buffer. The project proponent will establish a temporary, species-appropriate buffer around the nest sufficient to reasonably expect that breeding would not be disrupted. Treatment activities will be implemented outside of the buffer. The buffer location will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist. Factors to be considered for determining buffer location will include: presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography, nest height above ground, baseline levels of noise and human activity, species sensitivity, and expected treatment activities. Nests of common birds within the buffer need not be monitored during treatment. However, buffers will be maintained until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. ► Modify Treatment. The project proponent will modify the treatment in the vicinity of an active nest to avoid disturbance of active nests (e.g., by implementing manual treatment methods, rather than mechanical treatment methods). Treatment modifications will be determined by the project proponent in coordination with the qualified RPF or biologist. ► Defer Treatment. The project proponent will defer the timing of treatment in the portion(s) of the treatment site that could disturb the active nest. If this avoidance strategy is implemented, treatment activity will not commence until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. Feasible actions will be taken by the project proponent to avoid loss of common native bird nests. The feasibility of implementing the avoidance strategies will be determined				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
by the project proponent based on whether implementation of this SPR will preclude completing the treatment project within the reasonable period of time necessary to meet CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. Considerations may include limitations on the presence of environmental and atmospheric conditions necessary to execute treatment prescriptions (e.g., the limited seasonal windows during which prescribed burning can occur when vegetation moisture, weather, wind, and other physical conditions are suitable). If it is infeasible to avoid loss of common bird nests (not including raptor nests), the project proponent will document the reasons implementation of the avoidance strategies is infeasible in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any change in the feasibility of avoidance strategies from those explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report). The following avoidance strategies may also be considered together with or in lieu of other actions for implementation by a project proponent to avoid disturbance to raptor nests: ► Monitor Active Raptor Nest During Treatment. A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will monitor an active raptor nest during treatment activities to identify signs of agitation, nest defense, or other behaviors that signal disturbance of the active nest is likely (e.g., standing up from a brooding position, flying off the nest). If breeding raptors are showing signs of nest disturbance, one of the other avoidance strategies (establish buffer, modify treatment or defer treatment) will be implemented or a pause in the treatment activity will occur until the disturbance behavior ceases. ► Retention of Raptor Nest Trees. Trees with visible raptor nests, whether occupied or not, will be retained. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resource Standard Project Requirements				
SPR GEO-1 Suspend Disturbance during Heavy Precipitation: The project proponent will suspend mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and herbicide treatments if the National Weather Service forecast is a "chance" (30 percent or more) of rain within the next 24 hours. Activities that cause mechanical soil disturbance may resume when precipitation stops and soils are no longer saturated (i.e., when soil and/or surface material pore spaces are filled with water to such an extent that runoff is likely to occur). Indicators of saturated soil conditions may include, but are not limited to: (1) areas of ponded water, (2) pumping of fines from the soil or road surfacing, (3) loss of bearing strength resulting	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
in the deflection of soil or road surfaces under a load, such as the creation of wheel ruts, (4) spinning or churning of wheels or tracks that produces a wet slurry, or (5) inadequate traction without blading wet soil or surfacing materials. This SPR applies only to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR GEO-2 Limit High Ground Pressure Vehicles: The project proponent will limit heavy equipment that could cause soil disturbance or compaction to be driven through treatment areas when soils are wet and saturated to avoid compaction and/or damage to soil structure. Saturated soil means that soil and/or surface material pore spaces are filled with water to such an extent that runoff is likely to occur. If use of heavy equipment is required in saturated areas, other measures such as operating on organic debris, using low ground pressure vehicles, or operating on frozen soils/snow covered soils will be implemented to minimize soil compaction. Existing compacted road surfaces are exempted as they are already compacted from use. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR GEO-3 Stabilize Disturbed Soil Areas: The project proponent will stabilize soil disturbed during mechanical, prescribed herbivory treatments, and prescribed burns that result in exposure of bare soil over 50 percent or more of the treatment area with mulch or equivalent immediately after treatment activities, to the maximum extent practicable, to minimize the potential for substantial sediment discharge. If mechanical, prescribed herbivory, or prescribed burn treatment activities could result in substantial sediment discharge from soil disturbed by machinery, animal hooves, or being bare, organic material from mastication or mulch will be incorporated onto at least 75 percent of the disturbed soil surface where the soil erosion hazard is moderate or high, and 50 percent of the disturbed soil surface where soil erosion hazard is low to help prevent erosion. Where slash mulch is used, it will be packed into the ground surface with heavy equipment so that it is sufficiently in contact with the soil surface. This SPR only applies to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and prescribed burns that result in exposure of bare soil over 50 percent of the project area treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Within seven days of mechanical or prescribed burn treatment activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR GEO-4 Erosion Monitoring: The project proponent will inspect treatment areas for the proper implementation of erosion control SPRs and mitigations prior to the rainy season. If erosion control measures are not properly implemented, they will be remediated prior to the first rainfall event per SPR GEO-3 and GEO-8. Additionally, the project proponent will inspect for evidence of erosion after the first large storm or rainfall event (i.e., ≥ 1.5 inches in 24 hours) as soon as is feasible after the event. Any area of erosion that will result in substantial sediment discharge will be remediated	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to the rainy season and following the first large storm event following treatment activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
within 48 hours per the methods stated in SPRs GEO-3 and GEO-8. This SPR applies only to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR GEO-5 Drain Stormwater via Water Breaks: The project proponent will drain compacted and/or bare linear treatment areas capable of generating storm runoff via water breaks using the spacing and erosion control guidelines contained in Sections 914.6, 934.6, and 954.6(c) of the California Forest Practice Rules (February 2019 version). Where waterbreaks cannot effectively disperse surface runoff, including where waterbreaks cause surface run-off to be concentrated on downslopes, other erosion controls will be installed as needed to maintain site productivity by minimizing soil loss. This SPR applies only to mechanical, manual, and prescribed burn treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR GEO-6 Minimize Burn Pile Size: The project proponent will not create burn piles that exceed 20 feet in length, width, or diameter, except when on landings, road surfaces, or on contour to minimize the spatial extent of soil damage. In addition, burn piles will not occupy more than 15 percent of the total treatment area (Busse et al. 2014). The project proponent will not locate burn piles in a Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone as defined in SPR.HYD-4. This SPR applies to mechanical, manual, and prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR GEO-7 Minimize Erosion: To minimize erosion, the project proponent will: (1) Prohibit use of heavy equipment where any of the following conditions are present: (i) Slopes steeper than 65 percent. (ii) Slopes steeper than 50 percent where the erosion hazard rating is high or extreme. (iii) Slopes steeper than 50 percent that lead without flattening to sufficiently dissipate water flow and trap sediment before it reaches a watercourse or lake. (2) On slopes between 50 percent and 65 percent where the erosion hazard rating is moderate, and all slope percentages are for average slope steepness based on sample areas that are 20 acres, or less, heavy equipment will be limited to: (i) Existing tractor roads that do not require reconstruction, or (ii) New tractor roads flagged by the project proponent prior to the treatment activity. (3) Prescribed herbivory treatments will not be used in areas with over 50 percent slope. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
SPR GEO-8 Steep Slopes: The project proponent will require a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or licensed geologist to evaluate treatment areas with slopes greater than 50 percent for unstable areas (areas with potential for landslide) and unstable soils (soil with moderate to high erosion hazard). If unstable areas or soils are identified within the treatment area, are unavoidable, and will be potentially directly or indirectly affected by the treatment, a licensed geologist (P.G. or C.E.G.) will determine the potential for landslide, erosion, of other issue related to unstable soils and identify measures (e.g., those in SPR GEO-7) that will be implemented by the project proponent such that substantial erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and WUI fuel reduction, non-shaded fuel breaks, and ecological restoration treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Hazardous Material and Public Health and Safety Standard Project Requirements				
SPR HAZ-1 Maintain All Equipment: The project proponent will maintain all diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment per manufacturer's specifications, and in compliance with all state and federal emissions requirements. Maintenance records will be available for verification. Prior to the start of treatment activities, the project proponent will inspect all equipment for leaks and inspect everyday thereafter until equipment is removed from the site. Any equipment found leaking will be promptly removed. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-2 Require Spark Arrestors: The project proponent will require mechanized hand tools to have federal- or state-approved spark arrestors. This SPR applies only to manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Yes Treatment Maintenance: Yes	Prior to equipment being delivered onsite	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-3 Require Fire Extinguishers: The project proponent will require tree cutting crews to carry one fire extinguisher per chainsaw. Each vehicle would be equipped with one long-handled shovel and one axe or Pulaski consistent with PRC Section 4428. This SPR applies only to manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-4 Prohibit Smoking in Vegetated Areas: The project proponent will require that smoking is only permitted in designated smoking areas barren or cleared to mineral soil at least 3 feet in diameter (PRC Section 4423.4). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-5 Spill Prevention and Response Plan: The project proponent or licensed Pest Control Advisor (PCA) will prepare a Spill Prevention and Response Plan (SPRP) prior to	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to herbicide treatment activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
beginning any herbicide treatment activities to provide protection to onsite workers, the public, and the environment from accidental leaks or spills of herbicides, adjuvants, or other potential contaminants. The SPRP will include (but not be limited to): ▶ a map that delineates staging areas, and storage, loading, and mixing areas for herbicides; ▶ a list of items required in an onsite spill kit that will be maintained throughout the life of the activity; ▶ procedures for the proper storage, use, and disposal of any herbicides, adjuvants, or other chemicals used in vegetation treatment. This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR HAZ-6 Comply with Herbicide Application Regulations: The project proponent will coordinate pesticide use with the applicable County Agricultural Commissioner(s), and all required licenses and permits will be obtained prior to herbicide application. The project proponent will prepare all herbicide applications to do the following: ▶ Be implemented consistent with recommendations prepared annually by a licensed PCA. ▶ Comply with all appropriate laws and regulations pertaining to the use of pesticides and safety standards for employees and the public, as governed by the EPA, DPR, and applicable local jurisdictions. ▶ Adhere to label directions for application rates and methods, storage, transportation, mixing, container disposal, and weather limitations to application such as wind speed, humidity, temperature, and precipitation. ▶ Be applied by an applicator appropriately licensed by the State. This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during herbicide treatment activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-7 Triple Rinse Herbicide Containers: The project proponent will triple rinse all herbicide and adjuvant containers with clean water at an approved site, and dispose of rinsate by placing it in the batch tank for application per 3 CCR Section 6684. The project proponent will puncture used containers on the top and bottom to render them unusable, unless said containers are part of a manufacturer's container recycling program, in which case the manufacturer's instructions will be followed. Disposal of non-recyclable containers will be at legal dumpsites. Equipment will not be cleaned, and personnel will not be washed in a manner that would allow contaminated water to directly enter any body of water within the treatment area or adjacent watersheds. Disposal of all herbicides will follow label requirements and waste disposal regulations.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During herbicide treatment activities.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR HAZ-8 Minimize Herbicide Drift to Public Areas: The project proponent will employ the following herbicide application parameters during herbicide application to minimize drift into public areas: ▶ application will cease when weather parameters exceed label specifications or when sustained winds at the site of application exceeds 7 miles per hour (whichever is more conservative); ▶ spray nozzles will be configured to produce the largest appropriate droplet size to minimize drift; ▶ low nozzle pressures (30-70 pounds per square inch) will be utilized to minimize drift; and ▶ spray nozzles will be kept within 24 inches of vegetation during spraying. This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During herbicide treatment activities	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HAZ-9 Notification of Herbicide Use in the Vicinity of Public Areas: For herbicide applications occurring within or adjacent to public recreation areas, residential areas, schools, or any other public areas within 500 feet, the project proponent will post signs at each end of herbicide treatment areas and any intersecting trails notifying the public of the use of herbicides. The signs will include the signal word (i.e., Danger, Warning or Caution), product name, and manufacturer; active ingredient; EPA registration number; target pest; treatment location; date and time of application; restricted entry interval, if applicable per the label requirements; date which notification sign may be removed; and a contact person with a telephone number. Signs will be posted prior to the start of treatment and notification will remain in place for at least 72 hours after treatment ceases. This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to the start of herbicide treatment until 72 hours after herbicide treatment ceases.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Hydrology and Water Quality Standard Project Requirements				
SPR HYD-1 Comply with Water Quality Regulations: Project proponents must also conduct proposed vegetation treatments in conformance with appropriate RWQCB timber, vegetation and land disturbance related Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and/or related Conditional Waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements (Waivers), and appropriate Basin Plan Prohibitions. Where these regulatory requirements differ, the most restrictive will apply. If applicable, this includes compliance with the conditions of general waste discharge requirements (WDR) and waste discharge requirement waivers for timber or silviculture activities where these waivers are designed to apply to non-commercial fuel reduction and forest health projects. In general, WDR and Waivers of waste discharge requirements for fuel reduction and forest health activities require that	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements					Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
wastes, including but not limited to petroleum products, soil, silt, sand, clay, rock, felled trees, slash, sawdust, bark, ash, and pesticides must not be discharged to surface waters or placed where it may be carried into surface waters; and that Water Board staff must be allowed reasonable access to the property in order to determine compliance with the waiver conditions. The specifications for each WDR and Waiver vary by region. Regions 2 (San Francisco Bay), 4 (Los Angeles), 8 (Santa Ana), and 7 (Colorado River) are highly urban or minimally forested and do not offer WDRs or Waivers for fuel reduction or vegetation management activities. The current applicable WDRs and Waivers for timber and vegetation management activities are included in Appendix HYD-1. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.								
SPR HYD-2 Avoid Construction of New Roads: The project proponent will not construct or reconstruct (i.e., cutting or filling involving less than 50 cubic yards/0.25 linear road miles) any new roads (including temporary roads). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.					Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR HYD-4 Identify and Protect Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones: The project proponent will establish Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones (WLPZs) on either side of watercourses as defined in the table below, which is based on 14 CCR Section 916.5 of the California Forest Practice Rules (February 2019 version). WLPZ's are classified based on the uses of the stream and the presence of aquatic life. Wider WLPZs are required for steep slopes. Procedures for Determining Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone (WLPZ) widths					Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Water Class	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV				
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	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	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	Man-made watercourses, usually downstream, established domestic, agricultural, hydroelectric supply or other beneficial use.				

Standard Project Requirements					Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
	to sustain fish migration and spawning.	that are tributary to Class I waters.	completion of timber operations.					
WLPZ Width (ft) – Distance from top of bank to the edge of WLPZ								
< 30 % Slope	75	50	Sufficient to prevent the degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water. Determined on a site-specific basis.					
30-50 % Slope	100	75						
>50 % Slope	150	100						
Source: 14 CCR Section 916.5 [936.5, 956.5] (February 2019 version)								
The following WLPZ protections will be applied for all treatments:								
▶ Treatment activities with WLPZs will retain at least 75 percent surface cover and undisturbed area to act as a filter strip for raindrop energy dissipation and for wildlife habitat. If this percentage is reduced a qualified RPF will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the percent surface cover reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced percent as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report). This requirement is based on 14 CCR Section 916.4 [936.4, 956.4] Subsection (b)(6) (February 2019 version) and 14 CCR Section 916.5 (February 2019 version). ▶ Equipment, including tractors and vehicles, must not be driven in wet areas or WLPZs, except over existing roads or watercourse crossings where vehicle tires or tracks remain dry. ▶ Equipment used in vegetation removal operations will not be serviced in WLPZs, within wet meadows or other wet areas, or in locations that would allow grease, oil, or fuel to pass into lakes, watercourses, or wet areas. ▶ WLPZs will be kept free of slash, debris, and other material that harm the beneficial uses of water. Accidental deposits will be removed immediately.								

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
▶ Burn piles will be located outside of WLPZs. ▶ No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within WLPZs however low intensity backing fires may be allowed to enter or spread into WLPZs. ▶ Within Class I and Class II WLPZs, locations where project operations expose a continuous area of mineral soil 800 square feet or larger shall be treated for reduction of soil loss. Treatment shall occur prior to October 15th and disturbances that are created after October 15th shall be treated within 10 days. Stabilization measures shall be selected that will prevent significant movement of soil into water bodies and may include but are not limited to mulching, rip-rap, grass seeding, or chemical soil stabilizers. ▶ Where mineral soil has been exposed by project operations on approaches to watercourse crossings of Class I, II, or III within a WLPZ, the disturbed area shall be stabilized to the extent necessary to prevent the discharge of soil into watercourses or lakes in amounts that would adversely affect the quality and beneficial uses of the watercourse. ▶ Where necessary to protect beneficial uses of water from project operations, protection measures such as seeding, mulching, or replanting shall be used to retain and improve the natural ability of the ground cover within the WLPZ to filter sediment, minimize soil erosion, and stabilize banks of watercourses and lakes. ▶ Equipment limitation zones (ELZs) will be designated adjacent to Class III and Class IV watercourses with minimum widths of 25 feet where side-slope is less than 30 percent and 50 feet where side-slope is 30 percent or greater. An RPF will describe the limitations of heavy equipment within the ELZ and, where appropriate, will include additional measures to protect the beneficial uses of water. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR HYD-5 Protect Non-Target Vegetation and Special-status Species from Herbicides: The project proponent will implement the following measures when applying herbicides: ▶ Locate herbicide mixing sites in areas devoid of vegetation and where there is no potential of a spill reaching non-target vegetation or a waterway. ▶ Use only herbicides labeled for use in aquatic environments when working in riparian habitats or other areas where there is a possibility the herbicide could come into direct contact with water. Only hand application of herbicides will be allowed in riparian habitats and only during low-flow periods or when seasonal streams are dry. ▶ No terrestrial or aquatic herbicides will be applied within WLPZs of Class I and II watercourses, if feasible. If this is not feasible, hand application of herbicides labeled for use in aquatic environments may be used within the WLPZ provided that the	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During herbicide treatment activities	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
project proponent notifies the applicable regional water quality control board no fewer than 15 days prior to herbicide application. The feasibility of avoiding herbicide application within WLPZ of Class I and II watercourses will be determined by the project proponent and may be based on whether doing so will preclude achieving CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. The reasons for infeasibility will be documented in the PSA. ▶ No herbicides will be applied within a 50-foot buffer of ESA or CESA listed plant species or within 50 feet of dry vernal pools. ▶ For spray applications in and adjacent to habitats suitable for special-status species, use herbicides containing dye (registered for aquatic use by DPR, if warranted) to prevent overspray. ▶ Application will cease when weather parameters exceed label specifications or when sustained winds at the site of application exceeds 7 miles per hour (whichever is more conservative); ▶ No herbicide will be applied during precipitation events or if precipitation is forecast 24 hours before or after project activities. This SPR applies to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR HYD-6 Protect Existing Drainage Systems: If a treatment activity is adjacent to a roadway with stormwater drainage infrastructure, the existing stormwater drainage infrastructure will be marked prior to ground disturbing activities. If a drainage structure or infiltration system is inadvertently disturbed or modified during project activities, the project proponent will coordinate with owner of the system or feature to repair any damage and restore pre-project drainage conditions. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Mark drainage system prior to treatment activities, repair if needed following treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Noise Standard Project Requirements				
SPR NOI-1 Limit Heavy Equipment Use to Daytime Hours: The project proponent will require that operation of heavy equipment associated with treatment activities (heavy off-road equipment, tools, and delivery of equipment and materials) will occur during daytime hours if such noise would be audible to receptors (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship). Cities and counties in the treatable landscape typically restrict construction-noise (which would apply to vegetation treatment noise) to particular daytime hours. If the project proponent is subject to local noise ordinance, it will adhere to those to the extent the project is subject to them. If the applicable jurisdiction does not have a noise ordinance or policy restricting the time-of-day when noise-generating activity can occur noise-generating vegetation treatment activity will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday and federal holidays. If the project proponent is not subject to local ordinances (e.g., CAL FIRE), it will adhere to the restrictions stated above or may elect to adhere to the restrictions identified by the local ordinance encompassing the treatment area. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
SPR NOI-2 Equipment Maintenance: The project proponent will require that all powered treatment equipment and power tools will be used and maintained according to manufacturer specifications. All diesel- and gasoline-powered treatment equipment will be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. This SPR applies to all activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR NOI-3 Engine Shroud Closure: The project proponent will require that engine shrouds be closed during equipment operation. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR NOI-4 Locate Staging Areas Away from Noise-Sensitive Land Uses: The project proponent will locate treatment activities, equipment, and equipment staging areas away from nearby noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship), to the extent feasible, to minimize noise exposure. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR NOI-5 Restrict Equipment Idle Time: The project proponent will require that all motorized equipment be shut down when not in use. Idling of equipment and haul trucks will be limited to 5 minutes. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During Treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
SPR NOI-6 Notify Nearby Off-Site Noise-Sensitive Receptors: For treatment activities utilizing heavy equipment, the project proponent will notify noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship) located within 1,500 feet of the treatment activity. Notification will include anticipated dates and hours during which treatment activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, of the project representative. Recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors) will also be included in the notification. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	14-days prior to Treatment within 1,500 feet of noise-sensitive receptors	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Recreation Standard Project Requirements				
SPR REC-1 Notify Recreational Users of Temporary Closures. If a treatment activity would require temporary closure of a public recreation area or facility, the project proponent to will coordinate with the owner/manager of that recreation area or facility. If temporary	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	At least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of treatment activities	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
closure of a recreation area or facility is required, the project proponent will work with the owner/manager to post notifications of the closure at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of the treatment activities. Additionally, notification of the treatment activity will be provided to the Administrative Officer (or equivalent official responsible for distribution of public information) of the county(ies) in which the affected recreation area or facility is located. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.		requiring temporary closure of a public recreation area or facility.		
Transportation Standard Project Requirements				
SPR TRAN-1 Implement Traffic Control during Treatments: Prior to initiating vegetation treatment activities the project proponent will work with the agency(ies) with jurisdiction over affected roadways to determine if a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is needed. A TMP will be needed if traffic generated by the project would result in obstructions, hazards, or delays exceeding applicable jurisdictional standards along access routes for individual vegetation treatments. If needed, a TMP will be prepared to provide measures to reduce potential traffic obstructions, hazards, and service level degradation along affected roadway facilities. The scope of the TMP will depend on the type, intensity, and duration of the specific treatment activities under the CalVTP. Measures included in the TMP could include (but are not be limited to) construction signage to provide motorists with notification and information when approaching or traveling along the affected roadway facilities, flaggers for lane closures to provide temporary traffic control along affected roadway facilities, treatment schedule restrictions to avoid seasons or time periods of peak vehicle traffic, haul-trip, delivery, and/or commute time restrictions that would be implemented to avoid peak traffic days and times along affected roadway facilities. If the TMP identifies impacts on transportation facilities outside of the jurisdiction of the project proponent, the TMP will be submitted to the agency with jurisdiction over the affected roadways prior to commencement of vegetation treatment projects. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance. Smoke generated during prescribed burn operations could potentially affect driver visibility and traffic operations along nearby roadways. Direct smoke impacts to roadway visibility and indirect impacts related to driver distraction will be considered during the planning phase of burning operations. Smoke impacts and smoke management practices specific to traffic operations during prescribed fire operations will be identified and addressed within the TMP. The TMP will include measures to monitor smoke dispersion onto public roadways, and traffic control operations will be initiated in the event burning operations could affect traffic safety along any roadways. This SPR applies	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Coordinate and prepare TMP prior to treatment, implement TMP during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
only to prescribed burn treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.				
Public Services and Utilities Standard Project Requirements				
SPR UTIL-1: Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan. For projects requiring the disposal of material outside of the treatment area, the project proponent will prepare an Organic Waste Disposition Plan prior to initiating treatment activities. The Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan will include the amount (e.g., tons) of solid organic waste to be managed onsite (i.e., scattering of wood materials, generating unburned piles, and pile burning) and transported offsite for processing (i.e., biomass power plant, wood product processing facility, composting). If the project proponent intends to transport solid organic waste offsite, the Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan will clearly identify the location and capacity of the intended processing facility, consistent with local and state regulations to demonstrate that adequate capacity exists to accept the treated materials. This SPR applies only to mechanical and manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment requiring disposal of material outside of the treatment area.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
Mitigation Measure AES-3: Conduct Visual Reconnaissance for Non-Shaded Fuel Breaks and Relocate or Feather and Screen Publicly Visible Non-Shaded Fuel Breaks The project proponent will conduct a visual reconnaissance of the treatment area prior to implementing non-shaded fuel breaks to observe the surrounding landscape and determine if public viewing locations, including scenic vistas, public trails, and state scenic highways, have views of the proposed treatment area. If none are identified, the non-shaded fuel break may be implemented without additional visual mitigation. If the project proponent identifies public viewing points, including heavily used scenic vistas, public trails, recreation areas, and state scenic highways with lengthy views (i.e., longer than a few seconds) of a proposed non-shaded fuel break treatment area, the project proponent will, prior to implementation, attempt to identify any feasible change in location of the fuel break to reduce its visibility from public viewpoints. If no feasible location changes exist that would reduce impacts to public viewers and achieve the intended wildfire risk reduction objectives of the proposed non-shaded fuel break, the project proponent will implement, where feasible, a shaded fuel break rather than a non-shaded fuel break, if the shaded fuel break would achieve the intended wildfire risk reduction objectives. With the shaded fuel break, the project proponent will thin and feather adjacent vegetation to break up the linear	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to implementing non-shaded fuel break treatment types.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
edges of the fuel break and strategically preserve vegetation at the edge of the fuel break, as feasible, to help screen public views and minimize the contrast between the fuel break and surrounding vegetation.				
Air Quality				
Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement On-Road Vehicle and Off-Road Equipment Exhaust Emission Reduction Techniques Where feasible, project proponents will implement emission reduction techniques to reduce exhaust emissions from off-road equipment. It is acknowledged that due to cost, availability, and the limits of current technology, there may be circumstances where implementation of certain emission reduction techniques will not be feasible. The project proponent will document the emission reduction techniques that will be applied and will explain the reasons other techniques that could reduce emissions are infeasible. Techniques for reducing emissions may include, but are not limited to, the following: ▶ Diesel-powered off-road equipment used in construction will meet EPA's Tier 4 emission standards as defined in 40 CFR 1039 and comply with the exhaust emission test procedures and provisions of 40 CFR Parts 1065 and 1068. Tier 3 models can be used if a Tier 4 version of the equipment type is not yet produced by manufacturers. This measure can also be achieved by using battery-electric off-road equipment as it becomes available. Prior to implementation of treatment activities, the project proponent will demonstrate the ability to supply the compliant equipment. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification and operating permit (if applicable) will be available upon request at the time of mobilization of each unit of equipment. ▶ Use renewable diesel fuel in diesel-powered construction equipment. Renewable diesel fuel must meet the following criteria: ▪ meet California's Low Carbon Fuel Standards and be certified by CARB Executive Officer; ▪ be hydrogenation-derived (reaction with hydrogen at high temperatures) from 100 percent biomass material (i.e., non-petroleum sources), such as animal fats and vegetables; ▪ contain no fatty acids or functionalized fatty acid esters; and ▪ have a chemical structure that is identical to petroleum-based diesel and complies with American Society for Testing and Materials D975 requirements for diesel fuels to ensure compatibility with all existing diesel engines. ▶ Electric- and gasoline-powered equipment will be substituted for diesel-powered equipment.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
- Workers will be encouraged to carpool to work sites, and/or use public transportation for their commutes. - Off-road equipment, diesel trucks, and generators will be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NO_x and PM.				
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources				
Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Protect Inadvertent Discoveries of Unique Archaeological Resources or Subsurface Historical Resources If any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources will be halted and a qualified archaeologist will assess the significance of the find. The qualified archaeologist will work with the project proponent to develop a primary records report that will comply with applicable state or local agency procedures. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, a data recovery plan will be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find constitutes a unique archaeological resource, subsurface historical resource, or tribal cultural resource), the archaeologist will work with the project proponent to develop appropriate procedures to protect the integrity of the resource. Procedures could include preservation in place (which is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites), archival research, subsurface testing, or recovery of scientifically consequential information from and about the resource. Any find will be recorded standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) will be submitted to the appropriate regional information center.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	During treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Biological Resources				
Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Avoid Loss of Special-Status Plants Listed under ESA or CESA If listed plants are determined to be present through application of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-7, the project proponent will avoid and protect these species by establishing a no-disturbance buffer around the area occupied by listed plants and marking the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway), exceptions to this requirement are listed later in this measure. The no-disturbance buffers will generally be a minimum of 50 feet from listed plants, but the size and shape of the buffer zone may be adjusted if a qualified RPF or botanist determines that a smaller buffer will be sufficient to avoid killing or damaging listed plants or that a larger buffer is necessary to sufficiently protect plants from the treatment activity. The appropriate buffer size will be determined based on plant phenology at the time of treatment (e.g., whether the plants are in a dormant, vegetative, or flowering state), the individual species' vulnerability to the treatment method being	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
used, and environmental conditions and terrain. For example, paint-on or wicking application of herbicides to invasive plants may be implemented within 50 feet of listed plant species without posing a risk, especially if the listed plants are dormant at the time of application. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, changes in light, edge effects, and potential introduction of invasive plants and noxious weeds may inform the determination of buffer width. If a no-disturbance buffer is reduced below 50 feet from a listed plant, a qualified RPF or botanist will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the buffer reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced buffer as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report) with a science-based justification for the deviation. No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within 50 feet of listed plants. For species listed under ESA or CESA, if the project proponent cannot avoid loss by implementing no-disturbance buffers, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1c. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist, in consultation with CDFW and USFWS, as appropriate depending on species status and location, that the listed plants would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some of the listed plants may be lost during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to listed special-status plants, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to listed plants, no compensatory mitigation for loss of individuals will be required.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Avoid Loss of Special-Status Plants Not Listed Under ESA or CESA If non-listed special-status plant species (i.e., species not listed under ESA or CESA, but meeting the definition of special-status as stated in Section 3.6.1 of the Program EIR) are determined to be present through application of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-7, the project proponent will implement the following measures to avoid loss of individuals and maintain habitat function of occupied habitat:	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► Physically avoid the area occupied by the special-status plants by establishing a no-disturbance buffer around the area occupied by species and marking the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). The no-disturbance buffers will generally be a minimum of 50 feet from special-status plants, but the size and shape of the buffer zone may be adjusted if a qualified RPF or botanist determines that a smaller buffer will be sufficient to avoid loss of or damaging to special-status plants or that a larger buffer is necessary to sufficiently protect plants from the treatment activity. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer zone will be determined by a qualified RPF or botanist and will depend on plant phenology at the time of treatment (e.g., whether the plants are in a dormant, vegetative, or flowering state), the individual species' vulnerability to the treatment method being used, and environmental conditions and terrain. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, changes in light, edge effects, and potential introduction of invasive plants and noxious weeds may inform an appropriate buffer size and shape. ► Treatments may be conducted within this buffer if the potentially affected special-status plant species is a geophytic, stump-sprouting, or annual species, and the treatment can be conducted outside of the growing season (e.g., after it has completed its annual life cycle) or during the dormant season using only treatment activities that would not damage the stump, root system or other underground parts of special-status plants or destroy the seedbank. ► Treatments will be designed to maintain the function of special-status plant habitat. For example, for a fuel break proposed in treatment areas occupied by special-status plants, if the removal of shade cover would degrade the special-status plant habitat despite the requirement to physically or seasonally avoid the special-status plant itself, habitat function would be diminished and the treatment would need to be modified or precluded from implementation. ► No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within the special-status plant buffer. A qualified RPF or botanist with knowledge of the special-status plant species habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment would not maintain habitat function of the special-status plant habitat (i.e., the habitat would be rendered unsuitable) or because the loss of special-status plants would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status plant species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status plants would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
that the loss of special-status plants or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-1c will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist that the special-status plants would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status plants may be killed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to non-listed special-status plants, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status plants, no compensatory mitigation will be required.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-2a: Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Listed Wildlife Species and California Fully Protected Species (All Treatment Activities) If California Fully Protected Species or species listed under ESA or CESA are observed during reconnaissance surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1) or focused or protocol-level surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10), the project proponent will avoid adverse effects to the species by implementing the following. <u>Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance of Individuals</u> The project proponent will implement one of the following 2 measures to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of individuals: 1. Treatment will not be implemented within the occupied habitat. Any treatment activities outside occupied habitat will be a sufficient distance from the occupied habitat such that mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species will not occur, as determined by a qualified RPF or biologist using the most current and commonly-accepted science and considering published agency guidance; OR 2. Treatment will be implemented outside the sensitive period of the species' life history (e.g., outside the breeding or nesting season) during which the species may be more susceptible to disturbance, or disturbance could result in loss of eggs or young. For species present year-round, CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries will be consulted to determine if there is a period of time within which treatment could occur that would avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► For species listed under ESA or CESA, if the project proponent cannot avoid mortality, injury or disturbance by implementing one of the two options listed above, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c. ► Injury or mortality of California Fully Protected Species is prohibited pursuant to Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515 of the California Fish and Game Code and will be avoided. <u>Maintain Habitat Function</u> ► The project proponent will design treatment activities to maintain the habitat function, by implementing the following: ▪ While performing review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10, a qualified RPF or biologist will identify any habitat features that are necessary for survival (e.g., habitat necessary for breeding, foraging, shelter, movement) of the affected wildlife species (e.g., trees with complex structure, trees with large cavities, trees with nesting platforms; dens; tree snags; large raptor nests [including inactive nests]; downed woody debris; food sources). These habitat features will be marked and treatments applied to the features will be designed to minimize or avoid the loss or degradation of suitable habitat for listed species during treatments. Identification and treatment of these features will be based on the life history and habitat requirements of the affected species and the most current, commonly accepted science. ▪ If it is determined during implementation of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10 that listed or fully protected wildlife with specific requirements for high canopy cover (e.g., Humboldt marten, fisher, spotted owl, coastal California gnatcatcher, riparian woodrat) are present within a treatment area, then tree or shrub canopy cover within existing suitable areas will be retained at the percentage preferred by the species (as determined by expert opinion, published habitat association information, or other documented standards that are commonly accepted [e.g., 50 percent for coastal California gnatcatcher]) such that habitat function is maintained. ► A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of the impact avoidance measures listed above, the habitat function will remain for the affected species after implementation of the treatment. Because this measure pertains to species listed under CESA or ESA or are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries regarding the determination that habitat function is maintained. If consultation determines that the treatment will not maintain habitat function for the special-status species, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Mitigation Measure BIO-2b: Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Other Special-Status Wildlife Species (All Treatment Activities) If other special-status wildlife species (i.e., species not listed under CESA or ESA or California Fully Protected, but meeting the definition of special status as stated in Section 3.6.1 of the Program EIR) are observed during reconnaissance surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1) or focused or protocol-level surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10), the project proponent will avoid or minimize adverse effects to the species by implementing the following. <u>Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance of Individuals</u> ► The project proponent will implement the following to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of individuals: For all treatment activities except prescribed burning, the project proponent will establish a no-disturbance buffer around occupied sites (e.g., nests, dens, roosts, middens, burrows, nurseries). Buffer size will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist using the most current, commonly accepted science and will consider published agency guidance; however, buffers will generally be a minimum of 100 feet, unless site conditions indicate a smaller buffer would be sufficient for protection or a larger buffer would be needed. Factors to be considered in determining buffer size will include, but not be limited to, the species' tolerance to disturbance; the presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography; nest height; locations of foraging territory; baseline levels of noise and human activity; and treatment activity. Buffer size may be adjusted if the qualified RPF or biologist determines that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect (i.e., cause mortality, injury, or disturbance to) the species within the nest, den, burrow, or other occupied site. If a no-disturbance buffer is reduced below 100 feet from an occupied site, a qualified RPF or biologist will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the buffer reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced buffer as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report). ► No-disturbance buffers will be marked with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). No activity will occur within the buffer areas until the qualified RPF or biologist has determined that the young have fledged or dispersed; the nest, den, or other occurrence is no longer active; or reducing the buffer would not likely result in disturbance, mortality, or injury. A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will be required to monitor the effectiveness of the no-disturbance buffer around the nest, den, burrow, or other occurrence during treatment. If treatment activities cause agitated behavior of the	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
individual(s), the buffer distance will be increased, or treatment activities modified until the agitated behavior stops. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will have the authority to stop any treatment activities that could result in mortality, injury or disturbance to special-status species. ► For prescribed burning, the project proponent will implement the treatment outside the sensitive period of the species' life history (e.g., outside the breeding or nesting season) during which the species may be more susceptible to disturbance, or disturbance could result in loss of eggs or young. For species present year-round, the qualified RPF or biologist will determine the period of time within which prescribed burning could occur that will avoid or minimize mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species. The project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding appropriate limited operating periods. <u>Maintain Habitat Function</u> ► For all treatment activities, the project proponent will design treatment activities to maintain the habitat function by implementing the following: ▪ While performing review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10, a qualified RPF or biologist will identify any habitat features that are necessary for survival (e.g., habitat necessary for breeding, foraging, shelter, movement) of the affected wildlife species (e.g., trees with complex structure, trees with large cavities, trees with nesting platforms; tree snags; large raptor nests [including inactive nests]; downed woody debris). These habitat features will be marked and treatments applied to the features will be designed to minimize or avoid the loss or degradation of suitable habitat for listed species during treatments. Identification and treatment of these features will be based on the life history and habitat requirements of the affected species and the most current, commonly accepted science. ▪ If it is determined during implementation of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10 that special-status wildlife with specific requirements for high canopy cover (e.g., northern goshawk, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare) are present within a treatment area, then tree or shrub canopy cover within existing suitable areas will be retained at the percentage preferred by the species (as determined by expert opinion, published habitat association information, or other documented standards that are commonly accepted) such that the habitat function is maintained. ► A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of the impact avoidance measures listed above, the habitat function will remain for the affected species after implementation of the treatment. The qualified RPF or biologist may				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding habitat function. A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status wildlife species habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status wildlife species' habitat or because the loss of special-status wildlife would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status wildlife species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status wildlife would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status wildlife or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the non-listed special-status wildlife would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status wildlife may be killed, injured, or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to non-listed special-status wildlife, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status wildlife, no compensatory mitigation will be required. The qualified RPF or biologist may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding the determination that a non-listed special-status species would benefit from the treatment.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-2c: Compensate for Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Loss of Habitat Function for Special-Status Wildlife if Applicable (All Treatment Activities) If the provisions of Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-2d, BIO-2e, BIO-2f, or BIO-2g cannot be implemented and the project proponent determines that additional mitigation is necessary to reduce significant impacts, the project proponent will compensate for such impacts to species or habitat by acquiring and/or protecting land that provides (or will provide in the case of restoration) habitat function for affected species that is at least equivalent to the habitat function removed or degraded as a result of the treatment.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Compensation may include: 1. Preserving existing habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity; this may entail purchasing mitigation credits and/or lands from a CDFW- or USFWS-approved entity in sufficient quantity to offset the residual significant impacts, generally at a ratio of 1:1 for habitat; and 2. Restoring or enhancing existing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area (including decommissioning roads, adding perching structures, removing existing perching structures, or removing existing movement barriers or other existing features that are adversely affecting the species). The project proponent will prepare a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that identifies the residual significant effects that require compensatory mitigation and describes the compensatory mitigation strategy being implemented to reduce residual effects, and: 1. For preserving existing habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanisms for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The project proponent will submit evidence that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the project proponent has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory habitat will be preserved in perpetuity. 2. For restoring or enhancing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored habitat. Review requirements are as follows: ► The project proponent will consult with CDFW and/or any other applicable responsible agency prior to finalizing the Compensatory Mitigation Plan in order to satisfy that responsible agency's requirements (e.g., permits, approvals) within the plan. ► For species listed under ESA or CESA or a California Fully Protected Species, the project proponent will submit the mitigation plan to CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries for review and comment.				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► For other special-status wildlife species the project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding the availability and applicability of compensatory mitigation and other related technical information. Compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through compliance with permit conditions, or other authorizations obtained by the project proponent (e.g., incidental take permit), if these requirements are equally or more effective than the mitigation identified above.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-2e: Design Treatment to Retain Special-Status Butterfly Host Plants (All Treatment Activities) If federally listed butterflies are identified as occurring or having potential to occur during review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and confirmed during protocol-level surveys per SPR BIO-10, then the following measures will be implemented: ► Treatment areas within the range of these species will be surveyed for the host plant for each species (Table 3.6-34). ► Host plants for federally listed butterflies within the occupied habitat will be marked with high-visibility flagging, fencing, or stakes, and no treatment activities will occur within 10 feet of these plants. ► Because prescribed herbivory could result in the indiscriminate removal of the host plants for federally listed butterflies, this treatment type will not be used within occupied habitat of any federally listed butterfly species, unless it is known that the host plant is unpalatable to the herbivore. ► Treatment areas that are not occupied but are within the range of the federally listed butterfly will be divided into as many treatment units as feasible such that the entirety of the habitat is not treated within the same year. ► Treatments will be conducted in a patchy pattern to the extent feasible in areas that are not occupied but are within the range of the federally listed butterfly, such that the entirety of the habitat is not burned or removed and untreated portions of suitable habitat are retained. If the project proponent cannot implement the measures above to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of federally listed butterflies or degradation of occupied habitat (host plants) such that its function would not be maintained, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c. CESA and ESA Listed Species. A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of any feasible impact avoidance measures (potentially including others not listed above), the treatment will result in mortality, injury, or disturbance, or if after implementation of the treatment, habitat function will remain for the affected species. For species listed under CESA or ESA or that are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding this determination. If consultation determines that mortality, injury, or disturbance of listed butterflies or	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
degradation of occupied habitat such that its function would not be maintained would occur, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c. Other Special-status Species. A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status species' habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA, because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status species' habitat or because the loss of special-status individuals would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status butterflies would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status butterflies or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the special-status butterfly species would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some may be killed, injured or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to special-status butterfly species, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources). If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status butterflies, no compensatory mitigation will be required.				
Table 3.6-34 Special-status Butterflies and Associated Host Plants				
Butterfly Species	Host Plants			
bay checkerspot butterfly	dwarf plantain (<i>Plantago virginica</i>), purple owl's clover (<i>Castilleja exserta</i>)			
Behren's silverspot butterfly	blue violet (<i>Viola adunca</i>)			
callippe silverspot butterfly	California golden violet (<i>Viola pedunculata</i>)			
Carson wandering skipper	salt grass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>)			
El Segundo blue butterfly	seacliff buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>)			
Hermes copper butterfly	spiny redberry (<i>Rhamnus crocea</i>)			

Mitigation Measures		Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Kern primrose sphinx moth	plains evening-primrose (<i>Camissonia contorta</i>), field primrose (<i>Camissonia campestris</i>)				
Laguna Mountains skipper	Cleveland's horkelia (<i>Horkelia clevelandii</i>), sticky cinquefoil (<i>Drymocallis glandulosa</i>)				
Lange's metalmark butterfly	naked-stemmed buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum nudum</i>)				
lotis blue butterfly	seaside bird's foot trefoil (<i>Hosackia gracilis</i>)				
Mission blue butterfly	lupine (<i>Lupinus</i> spp.)				
Myrtle's silverspot butterfly	blue violet				
Oregon silverspot butterfly	blue violet				
Palos Verdes blue butterfly	Santa Barbara milkvetch (<i>Astragalus trichopodus</i>), common deerweed (<i>Acmispon glaber</i>)				
San Bruno elfin butterfly	broadleaf stonecrop (<i>Sedum spathulifolium</i>), manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos</i> spp.), huckleberry (<i>Vaccinium</i> spp.)				
Smith's blue butterfly	seacliff buckwheat, seaside buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum latifolium</i>)				
Quino checkerspot butterfly	dwarf plantain, purple owl's clover				

Mitigation Measures		Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Mitigation Measure BIO-2g: Design Treatment to Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Special-Status Bumble Bees (All Treatment Activities) If special-status bumble bees are identified as occurring during review and surveys under SPR BIO-1 and confirmed during protocol-level surveys per SPR BIO-10, or if suitable habitat for special-status bumble bees is identified during review and surveys under SPR BIO-1 (e.g., wet meadow, forest meadow, riparian, grassland, or coastal scrub habitat containing sufficient floral resources within the range of the species), then the project proponent will implement the following measures, as feasible: ► Prescribed burning within occupied or suitable habitat for special-status bumble bees will occur from October through February to avoid the bumble bee flight season. ► Treatment areas in occupied or suitable habitat will be divided into a sufficient number of treatment units such that the entirety of the habitat is not treated within the same year; the objective of this measure is to provide refuge for special-status		Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment activities within occupied or suitable habitat for special-status bumble bees	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
bumble bees during treatment activities and temporary retention of suitable floral resources proximate to the treatment area. ▶ Treatments will be conducted in a patchy pattern to the extent feasible in occupied or suitable habitat, such that the entirety of the habitat is not burned or removed and untreated portions of occupied or suitable habitat are retained (e.g., fire breaks will be aligned to allow for areas of unburned floral resources for special-status bumble bees within the treatment area). ▶ Herbicides will not be applied to flowering native plants within occupied or suitable habitat to the extent feasible during the flight season (March through September). CESA and ESA Listed Species. A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of feasible avoidance measures (potentially including others not listed above), the treatment will result in mortality, injury, or disturbance to the species, or if after implementation of the treatment, habitat function will remain for the affected species. For species listed under CESA or ESA or that are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding this determination. If consultation determines that mortality, injury, or disturbance of listed bumble bees (in the event the Candidate listing is confirmed) or degradation of occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat such that its function would not be maintained would occur, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c. Other Special-status Species. A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status species' habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status species' habitat or because the loss of special-status individuals would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status bumble bees would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status bumble bees or degradation of occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the special-status bumble bee species would benefit from treatment in the occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status bumble bees may be killed, injured, or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to special-status bumble bee species, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status bumble bees, no compensatory mitigation will be required.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Design Treatments to Avoid Loss of Sensitive Natural Communities and Oak Woodlands The project proponent will implement the following measures when working in treatment areas that contain sensitive natural communities identified during surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-3: ▶ Reference the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i>, Appendix 2, Table A2, <i>Fire Characteristics</i> (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/) or other best available information to determine the natural fire regime of the specific sensitive natural community type (i.e., alliance) present. The condition class and fire return interval departure of the vegetation alliances present will also be determined. ▶ Design treatments in sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands to restore the natural fire regime and return vegetation composition and structure to their natural condition to maintain or improve habitat function of the affected sensitive natural community. Treatments will be designed to replicate the fire regime attributes for the affected sensitive natural community or oak woodland type including seasonality, fire return interval, fire size, spatial complexity, fireline intensity, severity, and fire type as described in <i>Fire in California's Ecosystems</i> (Van Wagtendonk et al. 2018) and the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i> (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/). Treatments will not be implemented in sensitive natural communities that are within their natural fire return interval (i.e., time since last burn is less than the average time required for that vegetation type to recover from fire) or within Condition Class 1. ▶ To the extent feasible, no fuel breaks will be created in sensitive natural communities with rarity ranks of S1 (critically imperiled) and S2 (imperiled). ▶ To the extent feasible, fuel breaks will not remove more than 20 percent of the native vegetation relative cover from a stand of sensitive natural community vegetation in sensitive natural communities with a rarity rank of S3 (vulnerable) or in oak woodlands. In forest and woodland sensitive natural communities with a rarity rank of S3, and in oak woodlands, only shaded fuel breaks will be installed, and they will not be installed in more than 20 percent of the stand of sensitive natural community or oak woodland vegetation (i.e., if the sensitive natural community covers 100 acres, no more than 20 acres will be converted to create the fuel break).	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to treatment. In areas that contain sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
► Use prescribed burning as the primary treatment activity in sensitive natural communities that are fire dependent (e.g., closed-cone forest and woodland alliances, chaparral alliances characterized by fire-stimulated, obligate seeders), to the extent feasible and appropriate based on the fire regime attributes as described in <i>Fire in California's Ecosystems</i> (Van Wagtendonk et al. 2018) and the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i> (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/). ► Time prescribed herbivory to occur when non-target vegetation is not susceptible to damage (e.g. non-target vegetation is dormant or has completed its reproductive cycle for the year). For example, use herbivores to control invasive plants growing in sensitive habitats or sensitive natural communities when sensitive vegetation is dormant but invasive plants are growing. Timing of herbivory to avoid non-target vegetation will be determined by a qualified botanist, RPF, or biologist based on the specific vegetation alliance being treated, the life forms and life conditions of its characteristic plant species, and the sensitivity of the non-target vegetation to the effects of herbivory. The feasibility of implementing the avoidance measures will be determined by the project proponent based on whether implementation of this mitigation measure will preclude completing the treatment project within the reasonable period of time necessary to meet CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. If the avoidance measures are determined by the project proponent to be infeasible, the project proponent will document the reasons implementation of the avoidance strategies are infeasible in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any change in the feasibility of avoidance strategies from those explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report). A qualified RPF or botanist with knowledge of the affected sensitive natural community will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat functions of the sensitive natural community or oak woodland. If the project proponent determines the impact on sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss or degradation of sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-3b will be implemented.				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist that the sensitive natural community or oak woodland would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some loss may occur during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to a sensitive natural community or oak woodland, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the community (or similar community) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands, no compensatory mitigation will be required.				
Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Avoid State and Federally Protected Wetlands Impacts to wetlands will be avoided using the following measures: ▶ The qualified RPF or biologist will delineate the boundaries of federally protected wetlands according to methods established in the USACE wetlands delineation manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and the appropriate regional supplement for the ecoregion in which the treatment is being implemented. ▶ The qualified RPF or biologist will delineate the boundaries of wetlands that may not meet the definition of waters of the United States, but would qualify as waters of the state, according to the state wetland procedures (California Water Boards 2019 or current procedures).	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
▶ A qualified RPF or biologist will establish a buffer around wetlands and mark the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). The buffer will be a minimum width of 25 feet but may be larger if deemed necessary. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer zone will be determined in coordination with the qualified RPF or biologist and will depend on the type of wetland present (e.g., seasonal wetland, wet meadow, freshwater marsh, vernal pool), the timing of treatment (e.g., wet or dry time of year), whether any special-status species may occupy the wetland and the species' vulnerability to the treatment activities, environmental conditions and terrain, and the treatment activity being implemented. ▶ A qualified RPF or biological technician will periodically inspect the materials demarcating the buffer to confirm that they are intact and visible, and wetland impacts are being avoided. ▶ Within this buffer, herbicide application is prohibited.				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
▶ Within this buffer, soil disturbance is prohibited. Accordingly, the following activities are not allowed within the buffer zone: mechanical treatments, prescribed herbivory, equipment and vehicle access or staging. ▶ Only prescribed (broadcast) burning may be implemented in wetland habitats if it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that: ▪ No special-status species are present in the wetland habitat ▪ The wetland habitat function would be maintained. ▪ The prescribed burn is within the normal fire return interval for the wetland vegetation types present ▪ Fire containment lines and pile burning are prohibited within the buffer ▪ No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within the wetland buffer				
Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Retain Nursery Habitat and Implement Buffers to Avoid Nursery Sites The project proponent will implement the following measures while working in treatment areas that contain nursery sites identified in surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10: ▶ Retain Known Nursery Sites. A qualified RPF or biologist will identify the important habitat features of the wildlife nursery and, prior to treatment activities, will mark these features for avoidance and retention during treatment ▶ Establish Avoidance Buffers. The project proponent will establish a non-disturbance buffer around the nursery site if activities are required while the nursery site is active/occupied. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist, based on potential effects of project-related habitat disturbance, noise, visual disturbance, and other factors. No treatment activity will commence within the buffer area until a qualified RPF or biologist confirms that the nursery site is no longer active/occupied. Monitoring of the effectiveness of the non-disturbance buffer around the nursery site by a qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician during and after treatment activities will be required. If treatment activities cause agitated behavior of the individual(s), the buffer distance will be increased, or treatment activities modified until the agitated behavior stops. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will have the authority to stop any treatment activities that could result in potential adverse effects to special-status species.	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during treatment.	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Mitigation Measure GHG-2. Implement GHG Emission Reduction Techniques During Prescribed Burns	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to and during prescribed burn treatment activities	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
When planning for and conducting a prescribed burn, project proponents implementing a prescribed burn will incorporate feasible methods for reducing GHG emissions, including the following, which are identified in the National Wildfire Coordinating Group Smoke Management Guide for Prescribed Fire (NWCG 2018): ▶ reduce the total area burned by isolating and leaving large fuels (e.g., large logs, snags) unburned; ▶ reduce the total area burned through mosaic burning; ▶ burn when fuels have a higher fuel moisture content; ▶ reduce fuel loading by removing fuels before ignition. Methods to remove fuels include mechanical treatments, manual treatments, prescribed herbivory, and biomass utilization; and ▶ schedule burns before new fuels appear. As the science evolves, other feasible methods or technologies to sequester carbon could be incorporated, such as conservation burning, a technique for burning woody material that reduces the production of smoke particulates and carbon released into the atmosphere and generates more biochar. Biochar is produced from the material left over after the burn and spread with compost to increase soil organic matter and soil carbon sequestration. Technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions may also include portable units that perform gasification to produce electricity or pyrolysis that produces biooil that can be used as liquid fuel and/or syngas that can be used to generate electricity. The project proponent will document in the Burn Plan required pursuant to SPR AQ-3 which methods for reducing GHG emissions can feasibly be integrated into the treatment design.				
Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety				
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Identify and Avoid Known Hazardous Waste Sites Prior to the start of vegetation treatment activities requiring soil disturbance (i.e., mechanical treatments) or prescribed burning, CAL FIRE and other project proponents will make reasonable efforts to check with the landowner or other entity with jurisdiction (e.g., California Department of Parks and Recreation) to determine if there are any sites known to have previously used, stored, or disposed of hazardous materials. If it is determined that hazardous materials sites could be located within the boundary of a treatment site, the project proponent will conduct a DTSC EnviroStor web search (https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/) and consult DTSC's Cortese List to identify any known contamination sites within the project site. If a proposed mechanical treatment or prescribed burn is located on a site included on the DTSC Cortese List as containing potential soil contamination that has not been cleaned up and deemed closed by DTSC,	Initial Treatment: Y Treatment Maintenance: Y	Prior to the start of treatment activities requiring soil disturbance or prescribed burning	Fire Safe Council of Siskiyou County	Shasta Valley RCD

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
the area will be marked and no prescribed burning or soil disturbing treatment activities will occur within 100 feet of the site boundaries. If it is determined through coordination with landowners or after review of the Cortese List that no potential or known contamination is located on a project site, the project may proceed as planned.				

ATTACHMENT B - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/ Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
BIRDS				
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	FP/SE/FD	Near open water, nesting habitat consists of large trees usually within riparian forest near lakes and rivers	Known to occur. Observed nesting within the project area. Potential for nesting in all habitat types within 1 miles of Lake Shastina or Shasta River.
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	FP/--/--	Rolling foothills, mountain areas, sage-juniper flats, and desert. Cliff-walled canyons provide nesting habitat in most parts of range; also, large trees in open areas.	May occur. The range of golden eagle includes the entire project area. The nearest documented golden eagle nesting occurrence is approximately 8.5 miles north of the project area near Cedar Lake (CNDDDB 2024). Large trees in the project area may provide nesting habitat suitable for this species.
Bank swallow	<i>Riparia riparia</i>	--/ST/--	Breeds and nests in burrows or cavities in steep earthen banks or bluffs up to 7,000 feet elevation. Can be found during migration in open lowlands areas such as meadows, farmland, sewage ponds, freshwater lakes, rivers, and marshes.	Known to occur. Nesting bank swallows have been documented adjacent to Lake Shastina (CNDDDB 2024). Potential for nesting on vertical unvegetated sandy banks of Shasta River and Lake Shastina.
California gull	<i>Larus californicus</i>	WL/--/--	Breed in colonies on islands within lakes and ponds. Forage in meadows, scrublands, yards, orchards, and pastures, also seen in developed areas such as parking lots	Known to occur. Observed within the project area; known to occur on/around Lake Shastina. Foraging opportunities present in all habitats within the project area.
Greater sandhill crane	<i>Antigone canadensis tabida</i>	FP/--/--	Emergent wetlands, wet meadows, irrigated pasture	May occur. Potential foraging or nesting habitat near Shasta River, Lake Shastina, Wet Meadow or Cropland habitats. Nearest known occurrence is 1 mile west near the intersection

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/ Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
				of Mills Rd. and Slough Rd. (CNDDDB 2024).
Northern spotted owl	<i>Strix occidentalis caurina</i>	SSC/ST/FT	North coast coniferous forest, old growth, redwood. High, multistory canopy dominated by big trees.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range and lacks suitable habitat. Nearest population center is 8.5 miles southwest near Hammond Ranch (CNDDDB 2024).
Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	--/SE/FT	Deciduous forests near water source, often riparian corridors; uncommon in California	Not expected to occur. Species considered extirpated from range north of Tehama County, CA.
Prairie falcon	<i>Falco mexicanus</i>	WL	Ranges from southeastern deserts northwest throughout the Central Valley and along the inner Coast Ranges and Sierra Nevada. Distributed from annual grasslands to alpine meadows, but associated primarily with perennial grasslands, savannas, rangeland, some agricultural fields, and desert scrub areas.	May occur. Nesting and foraging potential in all habitats within project area. Documented in surrounding quadrants, nearest occurrence is 4 miles west (CNDDDB 2024).
MAMMALS				
Gray Wolf	<i>Canis lupus</i>	--/SE/FE	Occupy diverse habitats including tundra, forests, grasslands, and deserts. Require a hole, rock crevice, hollow log, or overturned stump for denning (~April-August), and meadow habitat near a water source for rendezvous habitat (~April-September).	May occur. Project area does not overlap with known range of Whaleback wolf pack, but there is potential for dispersal of one or multiple wolves in the area. Denning and rendezvous habitat unlikely due to proximity to urban/residential development.
Ringtail	<i>Bassariscus astutus</i>	FP /--/--	Riparian habitats, forest habitats, and shrub habitats in lower to middle elevations. Usually found within 0.6 mile of a permanent water source. Potential denning habitat includes rock outcrops, crevices, snags, large	May occur. Potential to occur within riparian or adjacent habitats within 0.6 miles of Lake Shastina or Shasta River.

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
			hardwoods, large conifers, and shrubs.	
Townsend's Big-eared Bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	SSC/--/--	Hibernacula and maternity roosts are in caves, abandoned mines, buildings, concrete bunkers, tunnels, and bridges. Terrestrial foragers: prey on moths.	May occur. Potential roost habitat in rock outcrops, lava flows onsite. Potential foraging habitat widespread in forested areas.
Wolverine	<i>Gulo gulo</i>	FP/ST/PT	Alpine, Moist forested areas, North coast conifer forests	Not expected to occur. Project area lacks suitable habitat.
American badger	<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	SSC/--/--	Most abundant in drier open stages of most shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats, with friable soils.	May occur. Potential to occur in Bitterbrush, Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush, Annual Grassland, Perennial Grassland, and Juniper habitats. Historical occurrence documented 2 miles west near Highway 5 (CNDDDB 2024).
Sierra Nevada red fox - southern Cascades DPS	<i>Vulpes vulpes necator pop. 1</i>	--/ST/--	Open areas are used for hunting, forested habitats for cover and reproduction. Edges are utilized extensively. In lowlands, uses fence lines, hedgerows, woodlots, and other brushy, wooded areas for cover and reproduction, and hunts in cropland, wetland, urban habitats and other open areas.	Not expected to occur. Site is unlikely to support fox dens or foraging opportunities due to poor habitat quality, proximity to commercial locations, and proximity to I-5. Possibly extirpated, historical occurrence documented southeast on Mt. Shasta (CNDDDB 2024).
REPTILES				
Western Pond Turtle	<i>Emys marmorata</i>	SSC/--/PT	Found in quiet water habitats such as ponds, lakes, marshes, broad rivers, and irrigation ditches with mud and vegetation. Also may be found hibernating in mud/sand/burrows in terrestrial grassland, cropland, and forest habitats near watercourses.	Known to occur. Potential to occur in slow-moving perennial waters such as Lake Shastina and Shasta River. May nest in surrounding habitats near water. Western pond turtle has been observed near Lake Shastina (CNDDDB 2024).
FISH				
Lower Klamath	<i>Cottus klamathensis polyporus</i>	SSC/--/--	Lower Klamath River (downstream of Klamath Falls), its larger tributaries,	Known to occur. Occurs in Shasta River and potentially

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/ Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
marbled sculpin			and possibly in the Trinity River system	other perennial or intermittent streams onsite.
INVERTEBRATES				
Monarch Butterfly	<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	--/--/FC	Forages on nectar producing plants, Milkweed required for reproduction	May occur. Milkweed present throughout project area. Potential to occur from Apr-Oct when species is most likely to be migrating/ breeding in Siskiyou County.
Conservancy Fairy Shrimp	<i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>	--/--/FE	Vernal pools	Not expected to occur. Project area lacks suitable habitat and is outside of known species range.
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp	<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	--/--/FT	Vernal pools	Not expected to occur. Project area lacks suitable habitat.
Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp	<i>Shrimp Lepidurus packardii</i>	--/--/FE	Vernal pools	Not expected to occur. Project area lacks suitable habitat.
Franklin's Bumble Bee	<i>Bombus franklini</i>	--/--/FC	This species has precipitously declined since 1998 and is now found only in southern Oregon and northern California between the Coast and Sierra-Cascade Ranges.	May occur. Potential to occur in Wet Meadow or Grassland habitats with adequate floral abundance and presence of burrows, grass clumps.
Western bumble bee	<i>Bombus occidentalis</i>	--/SC/--	Found in mixed woodlands, farmlands, urban areas, montane meadows, and prairie grasslands often utilizing rodent burrows for nesting habitat	May occur. Potential to occur in Wet Meadow or Grassland habitats with adequate floral abundance and presence of burrows, grass clumps.
PROTECTED HABITATS				
Salmon Essential Fish Habitat (Chinook, Coho)	<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> , <i>O. tshawytscha</i>	--/--/EFH	Shasta River Watershed upstream to Dwinnell Dam	Known to occur. Occurs in Shasta River below Dwinnell Dam.
PLANTS				
Rosy Orthocarpus	<i>Orthocarpus bracteosus</i>	2B.2	Annual herb occurring in wet meadows and seeps. Present at elevations between 1030-1850 meters, blooms Jun-Sep.	Known to occur. Documented within the southeast portion of the project area (CNDDDB 2024). Potential to occur within Wetland or Wet Meadow habitats within the project area.

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
Lare-Flowered Tritelia	<i>Triteleia grandiflora</i>	2B.1	Perennial herb occurring in Great Basin scrub, pinyon-juniper woodland. In rocky areas in sagebrush scrub, and in woodland between 2297 to 4921 feet in elevation. Blooms April-June.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats include Sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Perennial Grassland, and Juniper habitats.
Yreka Phlox	<i>Phlox hirsuta</i>	1B.2*	Perennial herb occurring in open slopes and grasslands, on serpentine gravel within lower montane coniferous forest, upper montane coniferous forest from 2723 to 4199 feet in elevation. Blooms April-June.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Juniper, Eastside Pine, Ponderosa Pine, Jeffrey Pine, Montane-Hardwood Conifer, Sierran Mixed Conifer, or Montane Hardwood habitats.
Oregon Polemonium	<i>Polemonium carneum</i>	1B.2*	Perennial herb occurring in Coastal prairie, Coastal scrub, Lower montane coniferous forest; blooms April-Sept.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Juniper, Eastside Pine, Ponderosa Pine, Jeffrey Pine, Montane-Hardwood Conifer, Sierran Mixed Conifer, Montane Chaparral, or Montane Hardwood habitats.
Modoc Green-Gentian	<i>Frasera albicaulis</i> var. <i>modocensis</i>	2B.3	Perennial herb occurring in openings in Great Basin grassland, Upper montane coniferous forest from 900 to 1600 meters elevation. Blooms May through July.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Juniper Woodland, Annual Grassland, Sagebrush habitats.
Shasta Ageratina	<i>Ageratina shastensis</i>	1B.2	Perennial herb occurring on limestone and metavolcanic outcrops, chaparral, and conifer forest. 1310 to 5905 feet. Blooms June-October.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Montane Chaparral, Eastside Pine, Montane-Hardwood Conifer, Montane Hardwood habitats
Cook's Phacelia	<i>Phacelia cookei</i>	1B.1	Annual herb occurring in areas of loose, ashy volcanic sand at the edges of old roads within Great Basin scrub, lower montane coniferous forest from 3593 to 5577 feet in elevation. Blooms June through July.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Juniper, Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush or Eastside Pine habitats.

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
Pallid Bird's-Beak	<i>Cordylanthus tenuis</i> ssp. <i>pallidus</i>	1B.2	Parasitic annual herb occurring in gravelly volcanic alluvium in lower montane forest. 2280 to 5395 feet. Blooms July through September	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Annual Grassland, Juniper, Montane Chaparral, Perennial Grassland, Sagebrush or Eastside Pine habitats.
Peck's Lomatium	<i>Lomatium peckianum</i>	2B.2	Perennial herb occurring in volcanic soils in chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest from 2247 to 3871 ft in elevation. Blooms April through May.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Annual Grassland, Juniper, Montane Chaparral, Montane-Hardwood Conifer, Montane Hardwood, Perennial Grassland, Sagebrush or Eastside Pine habitats.
Alkali Hymenoxys	<i>Hymenoxys lemmonii</i>	2B.2	Perennial herb occurring in Great Basin scrub, Lower montane coniferous forest, Meadows and seeps (subalkaline) from 2641 to 9006 feet in elevation. Blooms June-August.	Known to occur. Documented within the project area along Jackson ranch Rd. (CNDDDB 2024). Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Annual Grassland, Juniper, Montane Chaparral, Perennial Grassland, Sagebrush or Eastside Pine habitats.
Pickering's Ivesia	<i>Ivesia pickeringii</i>	1B.2	Perennial herb occurring in meadows and seeps in lower montane coniferous forest from 2789 to 5003 ft in elevation. Blooms April-May.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Aquatic, Montane Riparian, or Wet Meadow habitats.
Horned Butterwort	<i>Pinguicula macroceras</i>	2B.2	Perennial herb (carnivorous) occurring in bogs and fens (serpentine). Present at elevations between 40-1920 meters, blooms Apr-Jun.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Aquatic, Montane Riparian, or Wet Meadow habitats.
Water Bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus subterminalis</i>	2B.3	Grass-like perennial herb occurring in fresh lakes, bogs, marshes, swamps and low-nutrient streams. 750 to 2250 meters.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Aquatic, Montane Riparian, or Wet Meadow (with emergent wetlands present).
Pendulous Bulrush	<i>Scirpus pendulus</i>	2B.2	Grass-like perennial herb occurring in marshes and	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
			swamps (freshwater), Meadows and seeps (mesic) from 2625 to 3281 ft in elevation. Blooms June-August.	area include Aquatic, Montane Riparian, or Wet Meadow (with emergent wetlands present).
Siskiyou Clover	<i>Trifolium siskiyouense</i>	1B.1	Perennial herb occurring in meadows, seeps, and streambanks. Present at elevations between 880-1500 meters, blooms Jun-Jul.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Aquatic, Montane Riparian, or Wet Meadow habitats.
Woolly Balsamroot	<i>Balsamorhiza lanata</i>	1B.2	Perennial herb occurring in open cismontane woodland and grassy slopes of the Shasta valley in volcanic soil. 2625 to 6215 feet. Blooms April through June.	Known to occur. Documented within project area along Jackson Ranch Rd. (CNDDDB 2024). Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Bitterbrush, Annual Grassland, Juniper, Montane Chaparral, Perennial Grassland, Sagebrush or Eastside Pine habitats.
Waldo Daisy	<i>Erigeron bloomeri</i> var. <i>nudatus</i>	2B.3	Perennial herb occurring in serpentinite microhabitats within upper and lower montane coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 1975 to 7550 feet, blooms June-July.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Chaparral, Annual Grassland, or Barren habitats.
Broad-Nerved Hump Moss	<i>Meesia uliginosa</i>	2B.2	Moss occurring in wet meadows and fens within coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 1210-2804 meters, identifiable Jul-Oct.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range and below the known elevation range.
Subalpine Aster	<i>Eurybia merita</i>	2B.3	Perennial herb occurring in montane forests from 1300--2000 meters; blooms July-August	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Hardwood Conifer, Montane Hardwood, Montane Riparian habitats.
Peck's Lomatium	<i>Lomatium peckianum</i>	2B.3	Perennial herb occurring in volcanic microhabitats within chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest, Pinyon and juniper woodland. Present at	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Chaparral, Bitterbrush, Juniper, Sagebrush, Eastside Pine, Jeffrey Pine, Montane

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
			elevations between 700-1800 meters, blooms Apr-Jun.	Hardwood, Montane Hardwood-Conifer, Ponderosa Pine, and Sierran Mixed Conifer.
Yellow Avens	<i>Geum aleppicum</i>	2B.2	Perennial herb occurring in meadows adjacent to scrubland and montane coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 450-1500 meters, blooms Jun-Aug.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include wet meadows.
Mt. Eddy Draba	<i>Draba carnosula</i>	1B.3	Perennial herb occurring in rocky or serpentinite microhabitats within subalpine or upper coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 6350 to 9850 feet, blooms Jul-Aug.	Not expected to occur. Project area is below the known elevation range.
Klamath Fawn Lily	<i>Erythronium klamathense</i>	2B.2	Perennial bulbiferous herb occurring in meadows, seeps, and upper montane coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 1200-1850 meters, blooms Apr-Jul.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range and below the known elevation range.
Little Hulsea	<i>Hulsea nana</i>	2B.3	Perennial herb occurring in rocky or gravelly volcanic soils of high elevation boulder and rock fields as well as subalpine forest. Present at elevations between 2400-3000 meters, blooms Jul-Aug.	Not expected to occur. Project area is below the known elevation range.
Green Yellow Sedge	<i>Carex viridula</i> ssp. <i>viridula</i>	2B.3	Grass-like perennial herb occurring in mesic sites within, bogs and fens, marshes and swamps (freshwater), north coast coniferous forest from 0 to 5594 ft in elevation. Blooms July-September.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Shasta Chaenactis	<i>Chaenactis suffrutescens</i>	1B.3	Perennial herb occurring in unstable, sandy to rocky, generally serpentine soils, scree, drainages within upper and lower montane	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Eastside Pine, Jeffrey Pine, Montane Hardwood, Montane

Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/ Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
			coniferous forest habitats. Present at elevations between 700-2300 meters and blooms May-Aug.	Hardwood-Conifer, Ponderosa Pine, and Sierran Mixed Conifer.
Coast Fawn Lily	<i>Erythronium revolutum</i>	2B.2	Perennial bulbiferous herb occurring in mesic and streambank microhabitats within bogs, fens, broad-leaved upland forest, and North Coast coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 0-1600 meters, blooms Mar-Aug.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Shasta Orthocarpus	<i>Orthocarpus pachystachyus</i>	1B.1	Annual herb occurring in alluvial plains, or hillsides within Great Basin scrub, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland from 2740 to 5003 ft in elevation. Blooms May.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Perennial Grassland, Annual Grassland, Sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Juniper, and Wet Meadows.
Scott Valley Phacelia	<i>Phacelia greenei</i>	1B.1	Annual herb occurring in ultramafic soils in closed-cone coniferous forest, Lower montane coniferous forest, Subalpine coniferous forest, Upper montane coniferous forest; blooms April-June	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Henderson's Triteleia	<i>Triteleia hendersonii</i>	2B.2	Perennial bulbiferous herb occurring in cismontane woodland. Present at elevations between 760-1200 meters, blooms May-Jul.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Scott Mountain bedstraw	<i>Galium serpicum</i> ssp. <i>scotticum</i>	1B.2	Perennial herb occurring in lower montane coniferous forest (serpentine). Present at elevations between 1000-2075 meters, blooms May-Aug.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Baker's globe mallow	<i>Iliamna bakeri</i>	1B.2	Perennial herb occurring chaparral, great basin scrub, lower montane coniferous forest, pinyon, and juniper woodland. Present at elevations between 1000-	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Juniper, and Montane Hardwood-Conifer.

Table B-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status (CDFW/State/ Fed or CRPR)	Habitat Description	Potential to Occur in Project Area
			2500 meters, blooms Jun-Sept.	
Brittle prickly-pear	<i>Opuntia fragilis</i>	2B.1	A stem succulent that occurs in Northern Juniper Woodland around 880 meters.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush, Bitterbrush, and Juniper.
Hairy marsh hedge-nettle	<i>Stachys pilosa</i>	2B.3	Perennial rhizomatous herb occurring in Great Basin scrub (mesic), meadows and seeps. Present at elevations between 1200-1770 meters, blooms Jun-Aug.	May occur. Potentially suitable habitats within the project area include Montane Chaparral, Sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Juniper, Perennial Grassland, Annual Grassland, and Wet Meadow habitats.
Lassics Lupine	<i>Lupinus constancei</i>	FE/1B.1	Perennial herb endemic to Trinity and Humboldt Counties, near Mad River. Occurs in serpentine barrens and openings in lower montane coniferous forest. Present at elevations between 1500-2000 meters, flowers in July.	Not expected to occur. Project area is outside known range.
Notes: CNDDDB – California Natural Diversity Database; CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act; CRPR: California Rare Plant Rank; ESA –Endangered Species Act; NPPA – Native Plant Protection Act <u>Listing Status Definitions</u> Federal: FE – Federally listed as Endangered (legally protected) FT – Federally listed as Threatened (legally protected) FD – Federally Delisted FP – Proposed for listing under the federal ESA FC – Federal Candidate for Listing WL – Watch List CRPR Ranks: 1B – Plant species considered rare or endangered in CA and elsewhere (protected under CEQA but not legally protected under ESA/CESA; 2B – Plant species considered rare or endangered in CA but more common elsewhere (protected under CEQA but not legally protected under ESA/CESA CRPR Threat Ranks: 0.1 Seriously threatened in CA (over 80% of occurrences threatened) high degree and immediacy of threat) 0.2 Moderately threatened in CA (20-80% of occurrences threatened; moderate degree and immediacy of threat 0.3 Not very threatened in CA (less than 20% of occurrences threatened/low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known) Sources: CNPS 2024, CNDDDB 2024a, CNDDDB 2024b, USFWS 2024a				