Print From

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: _____

Project Title: North Fork Rancheria Fuels Reduction Project

Lead Agency: County of Madera

Contact Name: Samuel J. Rashe

Email: Samuel.Rashe@maderacounty.com Phone Number: 559-675-7821

Project Location: County of Madera
City *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Project entails the preparation of a Fuels Management Plan (FMP). An FMP is required in order to undertake forest management activities to reduce the risk of wildfire on the 80 acres of individual trust allotments in accordance with BIA trust responsibilities for resource management on qualifying tribal lands. The Proposed Project would then apply the same fuel reduction actions and associated management forest management recommendations to the adjacent 92-acre Public Allotments for which an FMP is not required. The Project Site and surrounding area has been affected by a considerable number of fires over the past century, including the recent Mission Fire (2017) and the 379,882-acre Creek Fire (2020). The Project Site is also characterized

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

See Attached

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were

incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

    b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

KEY:

1 = Potentially Significant Impact

2 = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

3 = Less Than Significant Impact

4 = No Impact

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
I. AESTHETICS *Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:*						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		The Project Site is located within a rural, woodland area that includes approximately 25 residences and surrounding outbuildings. The characteristics of the Project Site would not be considered a scenic vista from off-site locations. The topography of the Project Site ranges from approximately 2,980 feet to approximately 3,450 feet, sloping to the northeast. The Project Site would be visible from portions of Mission Drive and higher elevations to the north and east. The Project Site is surrounded on all sides by the Sierra National Forest (NF), which would be considered a scenic vista. The Proposed Project would involve the clearing of vegetation and trees along the primary and secondary access roads to create fuel breaks, the thinning of vegetation to create defensible space around structures, and the thinning of vegetation within the Project Site to reduce fuel loads. While these actions would result in the removal of vegetation and trees, this would not result in a substantial change from the surrounding forest area. In addition, the Project Site does not offer a scenic vista from surrounding areas. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	Although the Proposed Project would result in the removal of trees, the Project Site is not visible from nor located near a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur. **No Impact**	1, 2
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		The Proposed Project would result in the removal of trees and other vegetation 50 feet from the primary and secondary access roads, which would be visible from public roadways and from higher elevations to the east and north. Although this would result in a change in the visual character of the Project Site, due to the limited amount of vegetation that would be removed in comparison to the surrounding forest area, this would not be considered substantial. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AES-1 Vegetation Thinning and Edge Feathering, SPR AES-2 Avoid Staging within Viewsheds, and SPR AES-3 Provide Vegetation Screening, would further reduce any degradation to the existing visual character of the Project Site from public views. Therefore, impacts on visual character of the Project Site would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 3

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		Activities associated with the Proposed Project, such as forest fuel reduction, prescribed fire, pest management, reforestation, and harvesting and transportation of biomass would occur during daytime hours and would not result in the creation of substantial light or glare. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:*						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?					The Project Site is not classified by the California Department of Conservation as Prime, Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance Farmland. In addition, there is no existing agricultural operations on the Project Site. Therefore, no conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses would occur and there would be no impact. **No Impact**	4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					The FMP Area of the Project Site is Tribal Trust Land and the Public Allotments portion of the Project Site are owned by individual tribal members. Although land uses are under the governance of the Tribe, the Madera County General Plan and Zoning Map designates the FMP Area as Public Open Space (POS). The majority of the Public Allotments are designated as Rural Mountain District (RM) and a portion near the intersection of County Road 233 and Cascadel Road is designated as Open Space (OS). In addition, the Project Site, is not under an active Williamson Act contract, as this designation is not applicable to tribal lands. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and there would be no impact. **No Impact**	5, 6
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X	The Project Site is not zoned forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production. Due to the size of the Project Site, the absence of conifer species, and the low hardwood stocking levels, tree harvesting would be limited to: fuel breaks associated with access roads, defensible space around structures, and limited hardwood removal. As described in the FMP (included in **Appendix A**), timber stocking levels are marginal for commercial timber production. Due to the lack of commercial value of woodland forest associated with the FMP Area future resource inventory is not recommended. It is expected that these same conditions apply to the Public Allotments. Therefore, forest management activities on the Project Site would not conflict with associated with forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production and there would be no impact. **No Impact**	1, 5, 6

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X		Due to the size of the Project Site, the absence of conifer species, and the low hardwood stocking levels, tree harvesting and loss of forest land would be limited to: fuel breaks associated with access roads, defensible space around structures, and limited hardwood removal. In addition, 20 acres within the Project Site would be set aside for reforestation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial loss of forest land to non-forest use. In addition, forest management activities would improve forest diversity. Therefore, impacts on forest land would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X		As described above, the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use and would result in a limited conversion of forest land to non-forest use through fuel breaks, defensible space, and limited hardwood removal. In addition, 20 acres would be set aside for reforestation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 4, 5, 6

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
III. AIR QUALITY *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:*						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X		The Project Site is located in San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), and under the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The SJVAB is currently in nonattainment for state ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in size or smaller (PM_{10}) and particulate matter 2.5 microns in size or smaller ($PM_{2.5}$) standards. Construction activities would consist of mowing, tilling, and mechanical removal of trees. Standard tree logging equipment would be utilized for the mechanical removal of trees for the creation of the fire breaks surrounding structures and access roads. Other operational procedures include chemical and manual removal of invasive species. Given the size of the intended invasive species removal (1 acre), the chemicals used during removal would have a negligible effect on the surrounding areas. Manual removal of invasive species through grazing of non-native grasses and hand pulling of weeds would benefit soil erosion in the area once restoration practices begin. The introduction of native species in areas of vegetation removal, and in particular removal of invasive species, would create a positive impact on soil and erosion. Use of mechanized tree removal equipment and chemical pesticides would result in less than significant air quality emissions. Prescribed fires would only occur on designated burn days, in line with all applicable state and local regulations, to minimize short term smoke impacts, including applicable burn permits from the SJVAPCD and CAL FIRE. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with all SJVAPCD rules and regulations for construction. In addition, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AQ-1 Comply with Air Quality Regulations; SPR AQ-2 Submit Smoke Management Plan; SPR AQ-3 Create Burn Plan; SPR AQ-4 Minimize Dust; SP AQ-6 Prescribe Burn Safety Procedures would further ensure that grading, vegetation removal, prescribed fire, and pest management activities would reduce air quality impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and impacts would be less than significant. Also refer to Section X.a), Hydrology and Water Quality regarding herbicide use. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	3, 7
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and			X		The SJVAB is currently in nonattainment for state ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ standards. The Proposed Project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	7

applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?					The Project Site and surrounding area has a significant fire history which must be addressed under the current trend of large, damaging wildfires. Wildfires emit substantial amounts of volatile and semi-volatile organic materials and nitrogen oxides that form ozone and organic particulate matter. Additionally, direct emissions of toxic pollutants from wildfires can affect first responders and residents. The Proposed Project would reduce and remove excessive forest fuels thereby reducing the potential for future catastrophic wildfire and substantial release of air pollutants. Therefore, impacts regarding a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X		No long-term impact on air quality would result from the Proposed Project. Prescribed fires would only occur on designated burn days, in line with all applicable State and local regulations, to minimize short-term smoke impacts, including applicable burn permits from the SJVAPCD and CAL FIRE. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AQ-1 Comply with Air Quality Regulations; SPR AQ-2 Submit Smoke Management Plan; SPR AQ-3 Create Burn Plan; and SP AQ-6 Prescribe Burn Safety Procedures would reduce air quality impacts from prescribed fires on sensitive receptors. Additionally, the Proposed Project would reduce and remove excessive forest fuels thereby reducing the potential for future catastrophic wildfires and the substantial release of toxic air pollutants. Therefore, impacts regarding exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from prescribed fires would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	3
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X		No significant or long-term impact on air quality or odors would result from the Proposed Project. Prescribed fires would only occur on designated burn days, in line with all applicable state and local regulations, to minimize short term smoke impacts, including applicable burn permits from the SJVAPCD and CAL FIRE. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AQ-1 Comply with Air Quality Regulations; SPR AQ-2 Submit Smoke Management Plan; SPR AQ-3 Create Burn Plan; and SP AQ-6 Prescribe Burn Safety Procedures would reduce air quality impacts from prescribed fires on sensitive receptors. Additionally, the Proposed Project would reduce and remove excessive forest fuels thereby reducing the potential for future	3

					catastrophic wildfires and the substantial release of air pollutants and odors. Therefore, air quality impacts resulting from other emissions, including odors, would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *Would the project:*						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X			A desktop review of biological databases was conducted as part of the analysis for the Proposed Project. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database, and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation were reviewed to determine special-status species that may occur within the region. For the purpose of this IS, special-status includes species that are: ▪ Ranked by CNPS as List 1 or List 2; ▪ Listed or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and/or federal Endangered Species Act; ▪ Designated as endangered, rare, or fully protected pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code; or ▪ Designated as a Species of Special Concern by CDFW. The Project Site is currently in rural residential use and is subject to irregular disturbance with areas of dense vegetation growth. The Project Site is comprised of existing residences, access roadways, and is surrounded by National Forest lands. The Project Site is largely forested and offers habitat for wildlife species. Forested habitat on and surrounding the Project Site may provide suitable habitat for four special-status species. These species include California spotted owl, great gray owl, tree anemone, and Mariposa pussypaws as identified by the FMP, desktop analysis, and the Environmental Assessment prepared for the FMP Area. Because suitable special-status raptor nesting and foraging habitat, nesting migratory bird habitat, and suitable habitat to support special-status plants may be impacted as part of the Proposed Project, **Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2** are recommended to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** includes a pre-treatment survey for special-status plants prior to Project implementation. **Mitigation Measure BIO-2** would avoid potential impacts to nesting birds by requiring a pre-construction nesting bird survey prior to construction and establishing a feasibility-based, disturbance-free buffer around active nests. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-2**, potential impacts to nesting birds, including special-status bird species, would be less than significant. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation** **Mitigation Measures:**	1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

					BIO-1: Prior to Project implementation, all impact areas within a given treatment area shall be surveyed for special-status plant species. Plant surveys shall occur when each potential plant species is in bloom or otherwise identifiable. This may require more than one survey (e.g., an early and late-season survey). The determination of timing and number of plant survey visits shall be performed by a qualified botanist. Should the presence of federally listed plant species be identified in the surveys, impacts to federally listed or candidate plant species shall be avoided. A suitable buffer distance shall be established by a qualified botanist based upon species-specific biology and the potential of specific activities to impact plant populations. Broadcast burning of areas inhabited by herbaceous annual, stump sprouting, or geophyte species may occur once the species is dormant/has completed its annual lifecycle without constituting a direct impact. **BIO-2:** Prior to Project implementation, all impact areas within a given treatment area shall be surveyed for special-status plant species. Plant surveys shall occur when each potential plant species is in bloom or otherwise identifiable. This may require more than one survey (e.g., an early and late-season survey). The determination of timing and number of plant survey visits shall be performed by a qualified botanist. Should the presence of federally listed plant species be identified in the surveys, impacts to federally listed or candidate plant species shall be avoided. A suitable buffer distance shall be established by a qualified botanist based upon species-specific biology and the potential of specific activities to impact plant populations. Broadcast burning of areas inhabited by herbaceous annual, stump sprouting, or geophyte species may occur once the species is dormant/has completed its annual lifecycle without constituting a direct impact. The Tribe shall schedule treatment activities to avoid the active nesting season, generally extending from February 1 to September 15, of common native bird species, including raptors, that could be present within or adjacent to the Project Site, if feasible. If active nesting season avoidance is not feasible, a qualified Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or biologist shall conduct a survey for common nesting birds, including raptors. Existing records should be reviewed in advance of the survey to identity the common nesting birds, including raptors, that are known to occur in the vicinity of the Project Site. The survey area shall encompass the Project Site and the immediately surrounding vicinity viewable from the Project Site. The survey area shall 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 shall be conducted at a time that balances the 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 shall be conducted during the active time of day for target species, typically close to dawn and/or dusk. 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 qualified RPF or biologist shall recommend a feasible strategy to avoid disturbance of active nests,	

					which may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following: The qualified RPF or biologist shall establish a temporary, species-appropriate buffer around the nest sufficient to reasonably expect that breeding would not be disrupted. Treatment activities shall be implemented outside of the buffer. The buffer location shall be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist. Factors to be considered for determining buffer location shall 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 shall be maintained until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. The Tribe shall 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 shall be determined by the Tribe in coordination with the qualified RPF or biologist. The Tribe shall defer the timing of treatment in the portion(s) of the Project Site that could disturb the active nest. If this avoidance strategy is implemented, treatment activity shall not commence until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. Feasible actions shall be taken by the Tribe to avoid loss of common native bird nests. The feasibility of implementing the avoidance strategies shall be determined by the Tribe based on whether implementation of this mitigation measure would preclude completing the Proposed Project within the reasonable period of time necessary to meet Proposed Project objectives. 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 Tribe shall document the reasons implementation of the avoidance strategies is infeasible. The following avoidance strategies may also be considered together with or in lieu of other actions for implementation by the Tribe to avoid disturbance to raptor nests: A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician shall 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) shall be implemented or a pause in the treatment activity shall occur until the disturbance behavior ceases. Trees with visible raptor nests, whether occupied or not, shall be retained.	

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or the USFWS?		X			Habitats on the Project Site consist of woodland dominated by canyon live oak, blue oak, and interior live oak, annual grassland and forbs with sporadic stands of valley oak and white oak are intermixed, and smaller areas of upper montane mixed chaparral can be found in the far northeastern corner. The Project Site is largely wooded with several residences. Three ephemeral drainages occur within the FMP Area of the Project Site and more are likely present within the Public Allotments portion of the Project Site per database review. While multiple Class III drainages and stock ponds occur, no water bodies or water courses considered waters of the U.S. are present on the Project Site. As stated in the FMP, the closest surface water body is Whisky Creek approximately 1,500 feet east from the FMP Site boundary. Surface water runoff from the Project Site generally sheet flows south into the Whisky Creek watershed and west into the Willow Creek watershed. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1** requiring a Pest Control Advisor (PCA) to develop written prescriptions for herbicides that would be applied to vegetation in accordance with the manufacturers' labels to prevent overspray and pooling, impacts on water quality from the use of herbicides would be less than significant. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	1, 3, 11. 14, 15
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X			Per desktop review of wetland resources, State or federally protected wetlands are unlikely to be present on or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, no direct conversion of aquatic habitat would occur. As stated above, and in **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**, a PCA would develop written prescriptions for herbicides. The Proposed Project does not include project components, including storage of materials, within 100 feet of aquatic habitat. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	1, 3, 11, 14, 15
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X		The Project Site is developed and subject to irregular and limited disturbance from ongoing residential and rural activities. Existing native soil and gravel roads occur within and bisect the Project Site. The Project Site does not serve as a significant wildlife corridor or nursery. Lands surrounding the Project Site contain significant and undeveloped mixed forest habitat that could provide suitable habitat for migrating animals or rearing of young. The Proposed Project would not alter or impact wildlife access to or use of these areas. The impact would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no significant biological resources present on the Project Site. FMP elements, including vegetation removal is proposed to maintain or aim to enhance the forested habitats present within the Project Site. There would be a less-than-significant impact. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	16

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X		There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans that cover the area of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with an established or proposed conservation plan. The Project Site is outside of the areas identified as wildlife corridors key to preservation of large-scale wildlife movement. As stated above, there are no riparian habitats present and no aquatic habitats on the Project Site. Additionally, although the Project Site may facilitate wildlife movement, implementation of the Proposed Project would not significantly impact wildlife use or access to nearby undeveloped NF habitat as part of project design. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	17

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES *Would the project*:						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		X			An archaeological record search at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC), Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) record search, Tribal consultation, a field survey of the 80-acre Tribal lands (FMP Area) completed in 2000, an updated archaeological survey of the FMP Area completed in 2021, and an archaeological survey of the 92-acre Public Allotments in 2021 were used to identify cultural resources. The SSJVIC record searches found that a number of resources, predominantly bedrock mortars, lithic scatters, historic debris, and mining features, had all been recorded within the surveyed portions of the FMP Area and Public Allotments (collectively the Project Site). The archaeological surveys were completed with the assistance of Tribal members, focusing on relocation of recorded sites in the Tribal Land parcel, recordation of previously unrecorded sites known to Tribal representatives, and the systematic survey of the Public Allotments, which had not been surveyed previously. Ground surface visibility varied, pedestrian transects in the Public Allotments were no more than 20 meters apart; all bedrock outcrops were systematically examined. Findings included bedrock mortars, lithic scatters, midden soils, a low rock alignment, debris scatters behind most older residences, Tribal gathering areas (identified by Tribal members rather than being defined by archaeological methods), a historic road bed, a foot trail leading to a quartz outcropping, a concrete spring box, historic residences, and mining ditches, pits, and an adit. There are a variety of resources located within the Project Site including prehistoric food processing, midden, and lithic sites, historic debris, and mining-related resources. The prehistoric resources indicate a broad use of the landscape, frequently for long enough periods that midden deposits had time to accrue. These deposits may include information that reflects subsistence, technology and landscape adaptation over time as well as social organization and trade relationships. For that reason, the sites with an identified midden component may be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) for their information value. The bedrock mortar sites and lithic scatters may not contain sufficient data values to be eligible for listing as individual resources; bedrock mortars are very common in the Proposed Project region, and the data from each of these site types may be completely captured in the initial recording. The mining resources are likely all connected as part of a small-scale, local operation. Gold claims dotted the ore belt in the Sierra Nevada foothills, and gold mining as an industry does reflect the broad pattern of California history, but there do not appear to be values within the project-area sites that would make them eligible for listing on the CRHR. Similarly, the historic debris scatters represent patterns in history and some can be traced to individual families, however none appear to include values that would make	18,19, 20

					them eligible for listing on the CRHR. No archaeological testing program has been implemented on the midden sites; testing and evaluation would be required in order to formally assess their CRHR eligibility; if found eligible, impacts to these sites would be significant without a mitigation program. The presence of prehistoric resources indicates an increased potential for buried resources or human remains that could be uncovered during implementation of the Proposed Project. The presence of historic mining resources indicates an increased potential for others that were obscured during the 2021 surveys. If any artifacts, archaeological features, or human remains are encountered during grading or excavation, the mitigation measures below shall be implemented; with application of these mitigation measures potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation** **Mitigation Measures:** **CR-1:** Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, all construction personnel shall be trained in the protection of cultural resources, the recognition of buried cultural remains, and the notification procedures to be followed upon the discovery of archaeological materials, including Native American burials. The training shall be presented by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology and by a Native American representative and shall include recognition of both prehistoric and historic resources. **CR-2:** Prior to beginning of work, the construction contractor shall be given shapefiles or kmz locations and maps with resource locations to ensure avoidance to the extent feasible; if desired, construction fencing or flagging can be placed around avoidance areas as well. Should FMP implementation be desired within site limits, all such work shall be monitored by a either a professional archaeologist or Tribal Monitor. **CR-3:** All ground surface impacts within known resource locations shall be minimized to the degree possible; should it be necessary to disturb more than 3 inches below ground surface, a Phase II testing and evaluation program shall be implemented prior to ground disturbance to evaluate the impacts of the proposed work. **CR-4:** Should any cultural resources be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction shall halt within 50 feet of the find. The project proponent and lead agency shall be notified immediately, and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to assess the find, recommend and implement mitigation measures, and prepare a report in accordance with current professional standards. Native American consultation shall also be undertaken as part of this mitigation measure. **CR-5:** Should human remains be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction shall halt within 50 feet of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the	

					Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act shall apply.	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			Any potential impacts related to changes in significance of an archaeological resource on the site can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measures CR-1** through **CR-5**. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			Any potential impacts related to the discovery of human remains on the site during site disturbance can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CR-5**. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VI. ENERGY *Would the project:*						
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would consume energy primarily from fuel used by construction vehicles and equipment. Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other construction equipment would be used during site clearing, grading, and excavation/trenching. Fuel consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on available fuel. Furthermore, there are no unusual characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or State. After construction activities, additional energy would be consumed through vehicles and equipment associated with ongoing maintenance activities, reforestation, and biomass utilization. The use of biomass at the biomass plants located in Madera and Fresno counties, and for residential heating would result in a decreased demand for other more traditional energy resources. Therefore, no unnecessary consumption of energy resources would occur from construction or operation of the Proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X	The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would provide a source of renewable energy (biomass from cut vegetation) for local and regional use. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS *Would the project:*						
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. b. Strong seismic ground shaking? c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? d. Landslides?			X		**Earthquake Faults** Although the Project Site is located in an area that may be subject to seismic ground shaking in the future, there are no mapped surface faults on the Project Site that would have the potential to rupture. The nearest active Alquist-Priolo fault is the Ortigalita fault – a major Holocene fault in the eastern part of the San Andreas fault zone located approximately 80 miles northwest of the Project Site. The closest mapped fault to the Project Site is the Round Valley Fault, located approximately 50 miles to the northeast. The fault is actively monitored by the USGS because of its frequent seismic activity. **Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction** Faults exist throughout the County; therefore, there will always be the potential for seismic ground shaking. However, as described above, the Project Site does not contain any mapped faults. The FMP Area is located within an area of light to moderate potential shaking intensity with a Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale value between IV and V – any scale value lesser than VI determines that the shaking should not damage buildings. As described below, soils on the Project Site are generally stable and therefore, it is unlikely that ground failure or liquefaction would occur on the Project Site in the future due to the overall moderately sloped topography and distance from seismic faults. As stated above, the Project Site is not labeled as being within an earthquake fault zone based on State GIS data. **Landslides** Due to relatively stable soils, moderately sloped topography, and distance from seismic faults on the Project Site, the Proposed Project would not be significantly prone to landslides and would not result in an increased risk of landslides. While the Project Site is located in an area classified with moderate potential shaking hazards associated with seismic activity, no habitable structures would be developed. Furthermore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not create conditions that would result in the risk of loss, injury or death, from rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. Therefore, impacts associated with seismicity would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	21, 22, 23, 24, 25

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		Soils on the Project Site are classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey as Auberry-Ahwahnee and Holland-Chaix families complex and are highly susceptible to erosion. Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve grading and excavation through the removal of vegetation and creation of fuel breaks. Although the Project Site contains soil that is highly susceptible to erosion, Proposed Project activities would not create or be conducted on steep slopes or within an area that would cause erosion hazards. While the implementation of the Proposed Project would result in exposing soils as a result of developing fuel breaks, the Proposed Project includes provisions to replant various areas with native undergrowth species that would bind exposed soils limiting erosion. Some fire break areas would include exposed soils; however, these areas would be limited to those surrounding residences and roadways and would not create significant soil erosion; any minor erosion would be offset by the safety provided by the fire break and other erosion control measures described below. As described in the FMP, and applicable to the Project Site, the Tribe would also be implementing erosion control efforts through a biannual on-site review for potential erosion problems, including maintenance of low water crossings and culvert openings through the removal of sticks and vegetation that may disrupt or divert drainage crossings. Along with this, there would be annual scheduling of correction measures to address potential erosion problems prior to the rainy season, on-site examination of roads during major storm events, and community outreach to educate residents regarding their own erosion control efforts. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR GEO-1, Suspend Disturbance during Heavy Precipitation; SPR GEO-2, Limit High Ground Pressure Vehicles; SPR GEO-3 Stabilize Disturbed Soil Area; and SPR GEO-4, Erosion Monitoring; would avoid or minimize any soil erosion that may occur during implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, due to provisions to address erosion in the California Forest Practice Rules, FMP, CalVTP Standard Project Requirements, impacts related to erosion would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 3, 26
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		According to the USDA Web Soil Survey of the Project Site, soils on the Project Site include Auberry-Ahwahnee and Holland-Chaix families complex. These soils are generally well drained but are highly susceptible to erosion Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The groundwater table is over 80 inches deep; therefore, there is a low risk of liquefaction at the Project Site. Based on the soil types present, the impacts would be less than significant as they related to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse as a result of the Proposed Project. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 26, 27

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X		The soils on the Project Site are generally stable and are classified as having a low shrink-swell potential. Soils on the Project Site are not highly expansive and the linear extensibility of the soils is low. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from expansive soil. Impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	27
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	Soil types on the Project Site primarily consist of Auberry-Ahwahnee and Holland-Chaix families complex, which is mostly comprised of coarse sandy loam. Coarse sandy loam soils are typically suitable for on-site wastewater disposal systems. However, because new on-site septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system are being proposed. No impact would occur. **No Impact**	26
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X			Over 600 fossils specimens are listed in the University of California Museum of Paleontology database from the County, almost all of which are Pleistocene mammals from the Fairmead Landfill locality, which is located in the Central Valley approximately 40 miles to the west of the Project Site. However, there are no known paleontological or unique geological features present on the Project Site. There is always a possibility that previously unknown unique paleontological resources or sites could be encountered during subsurface grading and excavation activities. This is a potentially significant impact. In the event that paleontological resources or sites are found, **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would ensure that the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. After implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1**, impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation** **Mitigation Measure:** **GEO-1:** In the event of any inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources, all work within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be halted and the BIA and Tribe shall be notified. Workers shall avoid altering the materials until a professional paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find and recommendation measures to be implemented to protect, record, or remove the discovered resources, in compliance with professional standards.	27, 29

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS *Would the project:*						
a) Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		The Proposed Project would result in the removal of ladder fuels including understory shrubs and suppressed trees. This would result in a residual stand of dominant and co-dominant trees. Removal of competing vegetation in the understory would increase growing space for residual trees, which would improve their ability to sequester carbon. Carbon on the Project Site should stay near current levels over time, however the stand dynamic would change in such a way that carbon would be stored in larger diameter trees rather than small trees and shrubs. The Proposed Project would make the residual stands more resistant and resilient to catastrophic, stand-replacing fires and the release of carbon dioxide. Equipment use on the Project Site would produce negligible GHG emissions from combustion engines, which includes diesel equipment as well as chainsaws. GHG emissions from equipment use and pile burning would be less than significant due to the temporary nature of emissions from construction equipment and prescribed burning. The Proposed Project would result in the net benefit of preventing catastrophic wildfire and subsequent significant releases of GHG by maintaining sequestered carbon onsite through fuel reduction and fire resiliency treatments. Additionally, the Proposed Project would result in the net benefit of encouraging higher rates of sequestration from increased residual tree vitality and subsequent growth rates. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG emissions are considered less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	31, 32
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?			X		California wildfires produce so much carbon dioxide that in any given year they can wipe out the emissions cuts that the California Air Resources Board is trying to achieve. From 2013-2015, California's estimated emissions from fires on federal land alone were greater than the cuts achieved across the state's economy (Baker, 2017). The Proposed Project is designed to reduce the chance of a large catastrophic wildfire emitting significant volumes of GHGs. In addition, residual tree growth would increase thereby shifting carbon storage from small trees and shrubs to larger overstory trees. In addition, the Proposed Project would implement CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR GHG-1 Contribute to the AB 1504 Carbon Inventory Process to fulfill carbon inventory requirement and measure the effectiveness of carbon sequestering from treatment activity. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of GHG emissions and impacts would be less than significant.	3, 31, 32

					Less-Than-Significant Impact	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS *Would the project:*						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		X			Implementation of the Proposed Project would require use of vehicles and machinery and therefore oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid hazardous materials could be used. If spilled, these substances could pose a risk to the environment or human health. The Proposed Project would also involve the use of herbicides for pest management and maintaining brush clearance, which has the potential to pose a risk to the public. These risks would be less than significant with adherence to regulatory requirements and the incorporation of the following CalVTP Administrative Standard Project Requirements: SPR HAZ-1 Maintain All Equipment, SPR HAZ-5, Spill Prevention and Response Plan, SPR HAZ-6 Comply with Herbicide Application Regulations, SPR HAZ-7 Triple Rinse Herbicide Containers, SPR HAZ-8 Minimize Herbicide Drift to Public Areas, and SPR HAZ-7 Notification of Herbicide Use in the Vicinity of Public Areas. In addition, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**, the potential of the Proposed Project to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials involving the release of hazardous materials would be less than significant. Also refer to Section X. a), Hydrology. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	3
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		X			All fertilizers, pesticides, and other hazardous materials shall be properly stored in their manufacturer's original containers and used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. The Project Site is located within an area of potential flood hazard but is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project Site is not in area mapped as having unstable soils according to the USDA Web Soil Survey. As described above, risks to the public and environment due to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant with adherence to regulatory requirements and the incorporation of the following CalVTP Administrative Standard Project Requirements: SPR HAZ-1 Maintain All Equipment, SPR HAZ-5, Spill Prevention and Response Plan, SPR HAZ-6 Comply with Herbicide Application Regulations, SPR HAZ-7 Triple Rinse Herbicide Containers, SPR HAZ-8 Minimize Herbicide Drift to Public Areas, SPR HAZ-7. Notification of Herbicide Use in the Vicinity of Public Areas. In addition, with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-01**, impacts related to herbicide applications would result in less-than-significant impacts related to potential releases of hazardous materials. Also refer to Sections VII. c), Geology and Soils and X. a) and d), Hydrology and Water Quality.	3, 27, 37

					Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	The Proposed Project is in a rural location and is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	The Project Site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials on the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database; the closest known hazard is the North Fork Lumber Mill, located approximately 1.2 miles to the northwest. The property was subject to a cleanup program under the RWQCB 5F – Central Valley and the case was closed in 2017. The North Fork Lumber Mill is not a Recognized Environmental Condition which would affect the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	33
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X	The Proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport is Johnston Field, approximately 4 miles south of the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X			Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve brush clearance around primary and secondary access roads and structures, as well as annual prescribed fire practices. These activities would occur adjacent to or within the Project Site and are not expected to result in lane closures. In the event of temporary lane closures within the Project Site, **Mitigation Measure TR-1**, would be implemented to ensure staging areas do not inhibit roadway use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in lane closures that would affect emergency response or evacuation. Emergency access through Rainbow Drive would be maintained. Therefore, impacts on emergency response plans or evacuations would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-1**. Also refer to Section XX a), Wildfire. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The Project Site is located within a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area and is designated as a High to Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a State Responsibility Area. The majority of the Project Site is gently sloped to the northeast. Forest management activities associated with the Proposed Project, such as use of mechanized logging equipment for fuel breaks and	3, 34, 35

					brush clearance (which could spark and ignite vegetation) and prescribed fire have the potential to exacerbate wildland fire risks. However, one of the elements of the Proposed Project is to reduce the risk of wildland fires on the Project Site and adjacent properties through the reduction of forest fuels and prescribed fire. The creation of fuel breaks and defensible space around structures and roads would facilitate the safe application of a prescribed fire event. Therefore, after the completion of the Proposed Project, wildland fire risks would be substantially reduced. In addition, the following CalVTP Administrative Standard Project Requirements would further reduce wildland fire risks associated with prescribed fire: SPR AD-1 Project Proponent Coordination, SPR AD-4 Public Notifications for Prescribed Burning, SPR HAZ-2 Require Spark Arrestors, SPR HAZ-3 Require Fire Extinguishers, and SPR HAZ-4 Prohibit Smoking in Vegetated Areas. Therefore, the exposure of people or structures to risk from wildland fires would be reduced with implementation of the Proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY *Would the project:*						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		X			The Project Site includes several watercourses that are tributary to Willow or Whisky Creek. The FMP Area also includes two stock ponds. The closest surface water body is Whisky Creek which is located approximately 1,500 feet east from the FMP portion of the Project Site boundary. Surface water runoff from the Project Site generally sheet flows south into the Whisky Creek watershed and west into the Willow Creek watershed. Grading, excavation, and brush clearance, associated with the Proposed Project could potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, as construction vehicles and equipment have the potential to result in accidental discharge of pollutants into water resources. In addition, the use of herbicides has the potential to affect water quality, from runoff, leaching, drift, or spills. While the Tribe is required to adhere to the provisions of the Clean Water Act (CWA), due to the size and development of the Project Site, effects would not be considered significant and the Tribe would not be required to apply for coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit as the size of the Project Site would not be considered cumulatively considerable and no pollutants would be emitted into waterways. Ongoing maintenance activities would result in impacts similar to existing conditions. Current management activities are not presently affecting water quality on the Project Site. Treatment of invasive plant species would occur over approximately 1 acre and would include IPM: chemical, biological, and mechanical. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**, which requires that a PCA develop written prescriptions for herbicides that would be applied to vegetation in accordance with the manufacturers' labels to prevent overspray and pooling, impacts on water quality from the use of herbicides would be less than significant. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR HYD-1 Comply with Water Quality Regulations; SPR HYD-2 Avoid Construction of New Roads; SPR HYD-3 Water Quality Protections for Prescribed Herbivory; SPR HYD-4 Identify and Protect Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones; SPR HYD-5 Protect Non-Target Vegetation and Special-Status Species from Herbicides; and SPR HYD-6 Protect Existing Drainage Systems would further reduce impacts on surface and ground water quality to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the potential of the Proposed Project to violate and water quality standard or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**.	1, 3

					Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation **Mitigation Measure:** **HYD-1:** A PCA shall develop written prescriptions for herbicide use which shall require herbicides be applied in accordance with the manufacturers' labels and in such a manner as to prevent overspray and pooling within the application areas.	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		The Project Site is located nearest to the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin. The Basin is estimated to be in a groundwater overdraft of about 1.8 million-acre feet per year. Although the removal of vegetation may result in a slight short-term increase in groundwater recharge, the Proposed Project would not generate new water demands. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1, 36
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X		Grading, excavation, and brush clearance associated with the Proposed Project have the potential to result in minor effects on existing drainage patterns and erosion. The Proposed Project is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation; substantially increase rate or amount of surface runoff; exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system; provide substantial sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows. Fuel breaks would be contoured such that they do not create avenues for increased erosion, vegetation removal would cause limited and localized soil disturbance, and would be sufficiently minimal that drainage patterns within the Project Site and surrounding off-site locations would be unaffected. Surface water runoff would drain to on-site streams and ponds and off-site creeks and therefore, would not impact the stormwater drainage system. Based on the existing topography and Proposed Project features to minimize erosion and polluted runoff, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to drainage patterns of the Project Site or area. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP SPR HYD-1 Comply with Water Quality Regulations; SPR HYD-2 Avoid Construction of New Roads; SPR HYD-3 Water Quality Protections for Prescribed Herbivory; SPR HYD-4 Identify and Protect Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones; and SPR HYD-6 Protect Existing Drainage Systems would further reduce impacts on existing drainage patterns to a less-than-significant level. In addition, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR GEO-1 Suspend Disturbance during Heavy Precipitation; SPR GEO-2 Limit High Ground Pressure Vehicles; SPR GEO-3 Stabilize Disturbed Soil Area; and SPR GEO-4 Erosion Monitoring; would further reduce erosion impacts to a less-than-significant level.	1, 3

					Refer to Response X. a) regarding polluted runoff. Refer to Response VII. b) regarding erosion. **Less-than-Significant Impact**	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X		The Proposed Project is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Hazard Zone D, defined by FEMA as an "Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard," meaning that no analysis of flood hazards has been conducted but a potential flood hazard may exist. The Project Site is not located within a FEMA defined Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year floodplain). The Project Site is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area as classified by County GIS data. Furthermore, due to the existing topography and the distance of the Project Site from the ocean or any large water body, the Project Site would not be susceptible to a tsunami or seiche. In addition, the Proposed Project would not include the storage of hazardous substances which may become inundated and released during a natural disaster. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	37
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X		The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plans due to the Project's incremental effect on water quality and groundwater, as described in Responses X. a) and b), respectively. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING *Would the project:*						
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	The Project Site includes approximately 22 scattered residential uses surrounded by USFS lands within the Sierra NF. The Project Site is not located within the established communities of North Fork or South Fork. In addition, the Proposed Project does not include components that have the potential to physically divide an established community, such as new freeways and highways, major arterial streets, and railroad lines. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community and no impact would occur. **No Impact**	19, 20, 38
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		The FMP Area of the Project Site is Tribal Trust Land and the Public Allotments portion of the Project Site are owned by individual tribal members. Although land uses are under the governance of the Tribe, the Madera County General Plan and Zoning Map designates the FMP Area as POS. The majority of the Public Allotments are designated as RM and a portion near the intersection of County Road 233 and Cascadel Road is designated as OS. The Proposed Project would reduce the risk of fire hazards and fuel loading by implementing forest fire reduction measures, prescribed fires (annually), pest management (1 acre), reforestation (20 acres), and biomass utilization. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with, and would further the implementation of federal, State, and local plans that address wildfire hazards and forest management, watershed improvement, and climate change. Furthermore, none of the actions associated with forestry management near lands designated by the County as POS, RM, and OS would conflict with the County's POS, RM, and OS designations due to the limited nature of forest fuel reduction, prescribed fire, pest management, reforestation, and biomass utilization activities that are consistent with surrounding land use designations. These activities would include providing fuel breaks of 50 feet along primary and secondary access roads, defensible space of up to 300 feet around structures, prescribed fires, grazing, pest management, forest restoration, and biomass utilization by transport to a local biomass generation facility or for residential heating. The actions the would be implemented as a result of the Proposed Project would not prevent the County from continuing to implement existing land use policies outside of the Project Site boundaries. Furthermore, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AD-3 Consistency with Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances; SPR AD-4 Public Notifications for Prescribed Burning; and SPR AD-6 Public Notifications for Treatment Projects would avoid or minimize any potential conflicts with adjacent County land uses.	3, 6, 39

					Therefore, impacts due to a conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES *Would the project:*						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	The USGS Mineral Resources Data System does not identify a source of minerals at the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	40
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X	The County of Madera's General Plan (Section 6.4. Mineral Resources) does not designate the Project Site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	41

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XIII. NOISE *Would the project result in:*						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X		The Proposed Project would be located on tribal lands held in trust by the Department of the Interior, BIA and owned by individual tribal members. Land use controls are under the jurisdiction of the Tribe and there are currently no approved noise standards approved by the Tribal Council. For comparison, the Madera County General Plan includes Policy 7.A.5, which limits non-transportation noises to a maximum noise exposure of 70 dBA during daytime conditions. The major noise source associated with the Proposed Project would be mechanical equipment, such as a chainsaw, that would be used during tree removal and preparation for downed trees for transport to biomass facilities. A chainsaw typically emits a noise level of approximately 110 decibels at an A rating (dBA), at 3 feet from the chainsaw. Stationary point sources of noise attenuate (lessen) at a rate of 0 to 10 dBA per doubling of distance from the source, depending on the environmental characteristics of the site (i.e., topography, type of ground surfaces, noise barriers, etc.). An attenuation factor of 7.0 dBA per doubling of distance is appropriate given the topography and ground cover (e.g., trees) surrounding the sensitive receptors. Creating a defensive space of 100 feet from the residences would result in the highest noise exposures during use of a chainsaw. Using the attenuation above, starting at 110 dBA at 3 feet, the residences would experience a sound level of 75 dBA at the exterior structure. Assuming plywood is utilized on the residences, the sound is further attenuated by 21 decibels, resulting in an exposure to the indoor residents of 54 dBA, which is equivalent to the sound of a household refrigerator. Accordingly, the highest potential noise exposure at 54 dBA during implementation of the Proposed Project, would be below the County noise criteria. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact in relation to noise generation. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	3, 41, 42, 43, 44
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in tree removal and vegetation removal activities within 100 feet of residential structures. These activities would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels as the largest groundborne noise activity would be the felling of the trees within the defensible areas within 100 feet of residential structures. As noted in the FMP (Appendix A), the tree species are non-commercial species and are generally too small to generate substantial ground borne vibration and noise when felled. The greatest noise generator would be the use of chainsaws as assessed above. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts from groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	As noted in Section IX. e), the Proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport where a land use plan has not been adopted. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING *Would the project:*						
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X	The Proposed Project does not involve the construction of homes or extension of facilities that would directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No people or housing would be displaced as a result of the Propose Project. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES *Would the project:*						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other Public Facilities?			X		The Proposed Project does not involve housing or other uses that would increase population and therefore require the provision of new or altered government facilities. The additional number of workers and the use of mechanized logging equipment (which has the potential to spark and ignite vegetation) could result in an incremental increase in the number of calls for law enforcement and fire protection services. However, this would represent a less than significant increase in demand and therefore, is not expected to result in unacceptable service ratios or response times or construction of new facilities. The potential increase risk of fire during implementation of the Proposed Project would be minimal because fire breaks are being created. After the completion of the Proposed Project, fire protection services would be positively affected as the risk of wildfires would be reduced. Impacts to schools, parks, or other public facilities are not anticipated due to the lack of additional population to the Project Site. Therefore, impacts on government facilities would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVI. RECREATION *Would the project:*						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X	The Proposed Project does not include components that would increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	The Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVII. TRANSPORTATION *Would the project:*						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?		X			Access to the Project Site would be provided from Cascadel Road to Mission Drive. Grading, excavation, and brush clearance activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate new trips from construction and worker vehicles, estimated to be approximately 15 trips per day. Vehicle trips would be intermittent and construction activities would be conducted within the Project Site. Although, no roadway closures are anticipated, **Mitigation Measure TR-1** would ensure staging areas do not inhibit roadway use and implement flagging should activities require temporary lane closures. After initial construction activities, ongoing maintenance of cleared areas and transportation of biomass materials would generate a negligible increase in vehicle trips that would not affect the traffic flow on adjacent roadways. The Proposed Project would not have an effect on transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, due to the limited extent of grading, excavation, and brush clearance activities. Therefore, there would be no conflict with plans or policies addressing such facilities. As described above, because the Proposed Project could temporarily impact roadway circulation, **Mitigation Measure TR-1** is recommended. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-1**, impacts would be less than significant. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation** **Mitigation Measure:** **TR-1:** Implementation of the FMP shall avoid lane closures to the extent possible. Should lane closures be required, flagging shall be provided when necessary to assist with traffic control.	1
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory contains screening thresholds for land use projects and suggests lead agencies may screen out vehicle miles travelled (VMT) impacts using project size, maps, and transit availability. For small land use projects, absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, and projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally, may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant impact. As described above, the Proposed Project would generate a maximum of 15 trips per day from construction vehicles associated with grading and excavation, brush clearance, and worker trips. Therefore, as the number of additional trips generated by the Proposed Project is below the 110-trip screening threshold for VMT impacts contained in the OPR Technical Advisory, the Proposed	1

					Project would cause a less-than-significant transportation impact related to vehicle miles traveled. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X	The Proposed Project would include fuel breaks on each side of primary and secondary access roads. The fuel breaks and associated brush clearance and grading activity would not increase hazards or create incompatible uses. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X			As described above, grading, excavation, and brush clearance activities associated with the Proposed Project have the potential to temporarily impede access. Although no roadway closures are anticipated, **Mitigation Measure TR-1** would ensure staging areas do not inhibit emergency access. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-1**, impacts would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		X			Tribal consultation was undertaken prior to the FMP Area field surveys; Montrose coordinated with Tribal Vice-Chairperson Christina McDonald, who identified the locations of several unrecorded resources. Two Tribal members assisted with the Public Allotments survey. The Project Site includes a number of bedrock mortar, lithic scatter, and midden sites, none of which were identified as tribal cultural resources during consultation. **Mitigation Measures CR-1** through **CR-5** would reduce any tribal-cultural related sites or features that might be unearthed during site disturbance to a less-than-significant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	19, 20
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X			The Archaeological Study undertaken for the Project Site yielded evidence of historic and prehistoric tribal usage, however no significant sites, features, or artifacts were discovered. **Mitigation Measures CR-1** through **CR-5** would reduce any tribal-cultural related sites or features that might be unearthed during site disturbance to a less-than-significant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	18, 19, 20

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS *Would the project:*						
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	The implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a greater need for or expansion of existing utilities. No existing utilities would be affected by fuel break and brush clearance activities. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X	Although the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin is in overdraft, no new water demand would result from implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1, 36
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X	The Proposed Project would not require wastewater treatment. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X	The Proposed Project would not generate any solid waste that would be disposed of at municipal solid waste facilities. Vegetative waste from the creation of fire breaks and tree logging would either be transported to a biomass facility or used for residential heating. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X	The Proposed Project would not generate solid waste that would need to be disposed of at a solid waste facility. Therefore, no impact would occur. **No Impact**	1

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XX. WILDFIRE *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:*						
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X			The Madera County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan establishes multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination and response during emergency situations within the County. The Proposed Project would involve brush clearance around primary and secondary access roads and structures, as well as annual prescribed fire practices. These activities would occur adjacent to or within the Project Site and are not expected to require lane closures. In the event of temporary lane closures within the Project Site, **Mitigation Measure TR-1**, would be implemented to ensure staging areas do not inhibit roadway use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in lane closures that would affect emergency response or evacuation. Emergency access through Rainbow Drive would be maintained. The Proposed Project would adhere to all State, federal, and local fire requirements regulations. In addition, implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements SPR AD-3 Consistency with Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances and SPR AD-4 Public Notifications for Prescribed Burning would reduce any potential conflicts with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts on emergency response plans or evacuations would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure TR-1**. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	1, 3, 45
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X		The Project Site is located within a WUI area bordering the Sierra National Forest and is designated as a moderate to high fire hazard within a State Responsibility Area. The topography of the Project Site ranges from approximately 2,980 feet to approximately 3,450 feet, sloping to the northeast. The majority of the Project Site has gentle slopes with the steepest sloes (>35%) located in the northeastern portions of the FMP Area of the Project Site. There are approximately 25 residences and numerous outbuildings located on the Project Site. Forest management activities associated with the Proposed Project, such as use of mechanized logging equipment for fuel breaks and brush clearance (which could spark and ignite vegetation) and prescribed fire have the potential to exacerbate wildfire risks. However, one of the elements of the Proposed Project is to reduce the risk of wildfire on the Project Site and adjacent properties through the reduction of forest fuels and prescribed fire. The creation of fuel breaks and defensible space around structures and roads would facilitate the safe application of a prescribed fire event. Therefore, after the completion of the Proposed Project, wildfire risks would be substantially reduced. In addition, the following CalVTP Administrative Standard Project Requirements	1, 2, 3, 34, 35

					would further reduce wildfire risks associated with prescribed fire: SPR AD-1 Project Proponent Coordination, SPR AD-4 Public Notifications for Prescribed Burning, SPR HAZ-2 Require Spark Arrestors, SPR HAZ-3 Require Fire Extinguishers, and SPR HAZ-4 Prohibit Smoking in Vegetated Areas. Therefore, wildfire risk would not be exacerbated but would be reduced with implementation of the Proposed Project and the potential to expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire is less than significant. Also refer to Section III, regarding pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X		The Proposed Project would require fuel breaks associated with the primary and secondary access roads and ongoing maintenance of the fuel breaks. While the removal of vegetation and grading would result in impacts on biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, hazards, hydrology and water quality, transportation, and tribal cultural resources, these impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Refer to Sections IV, Biological Resources; V, Cultural Resources; VII, Geology and Soils; X, Hydrology and Water Quality; XVII, Transportation; and XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources regarding these resources. Implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce fire risk and restore forest health through forest fuel reduction, prescribed fire, pest management, and reforestation. Therefore, impacts associated with exacerbated fire risks or ongoing impact to the environment would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	1
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X		As discussed in Section VII, Geology and Soils, the Project Site has a very high runoff potential and is highly susceptible to erosion. The Project Site is not susceptible to landslides due to its moderately sloped topography. As discussed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Project Site may have a potential flood hazard. Due to the limited areas of grading, associated with fuel breaks and brush clearance and the relatively flat topography where these activities would occur, the Proposed Project would not significantly alter drainage patterns. In addition, implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce the risks of people and structures to risks from wildfires and associated post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. As part of the FMP and applicable to the Public Allotments, erosion control measures on gravel and dirt roads would include: on-site review on at least a biannual basis for potential erosion problems, annual scheduling of corrective measures prior to winter rains, onsite examination of road surfaces during major storm events, education to prevent erosion damage.	1

					Furthermore, impacts associated with water runoff and erosion would be less than significant with implementation of CalVTP Standard Project Requirements and regulatory requirements referenced in Sections VII, Geology and Soils and X, Hydrology and Water Quality. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts associated with these risks would be less than significant. **Less-Than-Significant Impact**	

Impact Categories*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X			As discussed in the previous sections, the Proposed Project could potentially have significant environmental effects with respect to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire. However, the impacts of the Proposed Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the sections. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	ALL
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X			Cumulative impacts have been considered within the analysis of each resource area; in particular where significant impacts have been identified for the Proposed Project (Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire). Where appropriate, CalVTP Standard Project Requirements and/or mitigation measures have been identified to reduce all potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			The potential direct environmental effects of the Proposed Project for each resource area, but in particular where significant impacts have been identified for the Proposed Project (Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire). Where appropriate, CalVTP Standard Project Requirements and/or mitigation measures have been identified to reduce all potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporation**	ALL

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA