

Favero Ranch CALVTP

CalVTP Project-Specific Analysis & Addendum
Project ID: 2023-26

Prepared for:



Yolo County Resource Conservation District
221 West Court Street, Suite 1
Woodland, CA 95695

Prepared by:



117 Clara Ave, Ukiah, CA 95482 • (707) 485-5544 tel (707) 485-5577 fax • jaforestry.com

Favero Ranch CalVTP
CalVTP Project-Specific Analysis
Project ID: 2023-26

Prepared for:

Yolo County Resource Conservation District
221 West Court St, Suite 1,
Woodland, CA 95695

Prepared by:

Mark Pugsley, RPF #3097
Jacobszoon & Associates, Inc.
117 Clara Ave, Ukiah, CA 95482
(707) 485-5544 ext. 115
Mark@jeforestry.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	1
INTRODUCTION	2
VEGETATION TREATMENT PROJECT INFORMATION	4
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DETERMINATION	10
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	11
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	13
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	16
Air Quality	18
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources	21
Biological Resources	24
Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resources	33
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	36
Energy Resources	38
Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety	39
Hydrology and Water Quality	41
Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing	44
Noise	46
Recreation	48
Transportation	49
Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems	51
Wildfire	53
CONTRIBUTORS	55
ATTACHMENT A – STANDARD PROJECT REQUIREMENTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES CHECKLIST	56
Project Maps	115

This page was intentionally left blank.



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Board or BOF	California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CalVTP	California Vegetation Treatment Program
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
DBH	Diameter at breast height
EEZ	Equipment Exclusion Zone
EHR	Erosion hazard rating
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
GHG	Greenhouse gas
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PSA	Project-Specific Analysis
RCD	Resource Conservation District
RPF	Registered Professional Forester
SENL	Single event noise levels
SPR	Standard Project Requirements
SR	State Route
SRA	State Responsibility Area
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geologic Survey
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled
WLPZ	Watercourse and lake protection zone

Introduction

BACKGROUND

The California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP) was developed by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection in 2019 to expedite the implementation of qualifying vegetation treatment activities within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The CalVTP was designed for use by the State, special districts, and local agencies to streamline the CEQA review process for projects that fit within the scope of the CalVTP Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). The CalVTP PEIR evaluated the environmental impacts of various vegetation treatment activities across a broad geographic area and developed standard project requirements (SPRs) for mitigating potential adverse environmental impacts.

Proposed projects must demonstrate conformity within the scope of the PEIR by being located within the “treatable landscape,” meeting the definition of at least one of three “treatment types”, and complying with applicable SPRs. The finding that the proposed project is within the scope of the PEIR must be supported by a project-specific analysis (PSA).

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Yolo County Resource Conservation District proposes a vegetation treatment project using the CalVTP process to conduct fuel treatments in the wildland area west of Williams, California (see Project Maps, Appendix A). Treatment activities have been designed to fit the description of the Fuel Break Treatment and Ecological Restoration Treatment types as defined by the CalVTP PEIR. The project in its entirety is approximately 7,768 acres.

Ecological Restoration

The intent of this 7,768-acre treatment activity is to reintroduce fire on the landscape to reduce fuel loads, improve rangeland forage, reduce invasive species populations, and provide training opportunities to local fire agencies. It is expected that broadcast burning will be utilized to treat a majority of the acreage in this treatment type. Mechanical treatments will consist of dozer line construction and re-establishment and brush mastication/crushing. Manual treatments will include handline installation and brush/tree cutting. Herbicide applications are expected to occur on a small portion of this treatment area for targeted treatments of invasive species, primarily starthistle, and shall be conducted under the guidance of a licensed Pest Control Advisor (PCA).

Fuel Break

Approximately 137 acres of Cortina Ridge will be treated to establish and maintain a fuel break along a trending ridge utilized during past fire suppression activities. The intent of this treatment is to aid local fire agencies in regional pre-fire planning and emergency response. Much of this fuel break is located along existing seasonal ranch roads. Once initial treatment is implemented the area will be accessible for future activities, including prescribed fire. At times it will be necessary for the fuel to break to leave the ridge due to the topography of the area. The primary treatment activity will be mechanical treatments with the intent of creating a fire break. The mastication and crushing of brush may occur where permitted. Manual treatments are expected to comprise brush cutting and hand line installation. Prescribed fire, both broadcast and pile, may be implemented to reduce fuel loads adjacent to the fuel break and treat activities fuels.

Yolo County RCD has designed the project to conform with the scope of the CalVTP PEIR. Potential adverse impacts resulting from the treatment activities proposed in this project will be mitigated by implementing applicable SPRs. Project implementation and mitigation success will be tracked and measured using the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP).



CEQA LEAD AGENCY

Yolo County RCD will function as the CEQA lead agency for this project and will be responsible for assuring CEQA compliance through implementation of SPRs. Treatment scope and activities were selected by the project proponent. Implementation of treatment activities, mitigations, and post-treatment monitoring is the responsibility of the project proponent. Jacobszoon and Associates, Inc. has provided the environmental assessment for this project and prepared the following PSA. Evans and DeShazo, Inc. was contracted to complete the archaeological records check. The archaeological records check will be submitted as a **confidential** addendum to this PSA. Before conducting any treatment activities that may impact cultural resources in unsurveyed portions of the project area, pedestrian surveys shall occur. The results of these surveys shall be amended into this document as an attachment.

TREATABLE LANDSCAPE

Approximately 20.3 million acres within the 31 million-acre SRA were identified that may be appropriate for vegetation treatments. CalVTP PEIR refers to this geographic area as the “treatable landscape.” The Favero Ranch CalVTP project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. 4630 acres of this project are within areas mapped as treatable under the PEIR; an additional 3138 acres are proposed for inclusion that are not mapped as treatable under the PEIR. The entire project area is within the SRA, and the site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the treatable landscape within the project area are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the lands within the geographic scope, and the proposed treatments are identical between the two lands, the impacts will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts will occur.

Purpose of Project Specific Analysis

This document serves the purpose of evaluating if the project as proposed is consistent with the CalVTP Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). A copy of this PEIR may be found at <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/calvtp/calvtp-programmatic-eir/>. If the project is found to be consistent with the approved PIER, it may be approved pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(2).

Environmental Checklist

VEGETATION TREATMENT PROJECT INFORMATION

1. **Project Title:** Favero Ranch CalVTP
2. **Project Proponent Name and Address:** Yolo County Resource Conservation District
221 West Court Street, Suite 1
Woodland, CA 95695
3. **Contact Person Information and Phone Number:** Heather Nichols (530) 661-1688 Ext. 3
4. **Project Location:**

Project Address: 1958 Spring Valley RD & 1961 Spring Valley RD Williams CA 95987

Legal Description: Sections 1,2,3,4,5,8,9,10,11,14,15,16,17,19,20,21,22,23,26,27 T14N R04W & Section 33 T15N R04W, MDBM, Colusa County, CA

APN:


Lands of Paul Favero: 016-180-024-000, 016-180-011-000,018-040-005-000, 018-040-006-000, 018-040-007-000,018-040-008-000, 018-040-009-000 ,018-040-010-000, 018-040-011-000, 08-050-002-000, 018-050-004-000, 018-130-005-000, 018-130-009-000, 018-130-012-000, 018-130-013-000, 018-130-014-000, 018-130-015-000,018-130-016-000, 018-130-025-000,018-130-026-000,018-140-001-000,018-140-002-000,018-140-003-000, 018-140-004-000, 018-0140-005, 018-0140-006, 018-140-007, 018-140-009, 018-220-011-000,018-230-009-000, 018-230-010-000, & 018-230-011-000

Lands of Randy Sparks: 018-040-004-000, & 018-130-006-0005.

Total Area to be Treated (acres)

This project footprint is approximately 7,768 acres.

4630 acres of this project are within areas mapped as treatable under the PEIR; an additional 3,138 acres are proposed for inclusion that are not mapped as treatable under the PEIR. A majority of the excluded lands in this project area are mapped as having CWHR that is related to agriculture. PD2.4 of the Programmatic EIR discloses that the treatable acreage model excluded agricultural lands as these lands occur primarily outside of the State Responsibility Area (SRA); however, all agricultural lands on this project are located within the SRA. All excluded lands have been inspected by an RPF and qualified biologists with experience in habitat typing. The determination drawn from the reconnaissance survey as required by SPR BIO-1 is that these lands are identical in character to the lands that are mapped as treatable by the PEIR therefore the inclusion of the lands does not constitute a change to the PEIR.



- 6. Description of Project:** This project occurs in western Colusa County and seeks to aid fire suppression, reduce fuel loads, and reintroduce fire to the landscape on mixed vegetation types within the pre-contact fire return intervals. This project will use the fuel break and ecological restoration treatment types. The non-shaded fuel break will be constructed along Cortina Ridge; much of this fuel break treatment area is along an existing ranch road. The fuel break will widen the road and create new portions of fuel break to enable the creation of fire control points and staging areas. The width of the fuel break and adjacent brush retention will be determined by the minimum necessary width to create a fire fighter safety zone as measured from the center of the fuel break that seeks to provide sufficient distance from the radiant heat of a wildfire to enable safe and effective use of the fuel break during a fire event. Although much of the fuel break will be along the ridge top, it is necessary at times to deviate from the ridge because of the geology and topography of the treatment area. The area was assessed for the potential of shaded fuel break by an RPF, and it was determined that given the vegetation types in the project area this was not feasible. Ecological Restoration is proposed throughout the entire project area and is intended to reintroduce low/moderate intensity fires into the project area to promote biodiversity and reduce fuel loads. Prescribed fire and targeted herbicide applications may also be utilized to reduce invasive species populations, particularly yellow starthistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*).

Treatment activities in both the fuel break and ecological restoration areas will consist of mechanical, manual, prescribed fire (both pile and broadcast), and herbicide treatments. This region has seen frequent large fires including the Sixteen Complex (2012) which burned the southern half of the project area. By establishing a fuel break on this ridge, the project proponent, in consultation with local fire officials, intends to enhance regional pre-fire planning and emergency response. The location of this fuel break is consistent with page 2-7 of the PEIR. The utilization of ecological restoration will reduce fuel loads and restore a fire regime that is more consistent with historical regime for the various natural communities in the project footprint. Although the southern end of the property burned in 2012, much of this project area has not seen fire since 1966 and portions of the property have no recorded fire history. This constitutes a substantial deviation from historic fire return intervals for much of the property. The lack of fire has resulted in substantial buildup of dead fuels in the chaparral ecosystem. Additionally, in the areas that burned in 2012, a substantial buildup of dead coarse woody debris has been noted by the RPF, with the densest fuel buildups occurring in the chaparral ecosystems. By reintroducing fire within the historic fire return interval, the intent of the project is to enhance ecosystem resilience to low/moderate intensity

disturbance. The eastern portion of this project is comprised of rangeland that been extensively grazed and has a substantial quantity of starthistle and nonnative grasses throughout. The utilization of prescribed fire is intended to increase the quantity of native grasses and reduce the population of starthistle. This is consistent with the intent of Ecological Restoration on page 2-15 of the PEIR. This project proposed the inclusion of lands that are outside of the lands mapped as treatable in the PEIR. These lands share nearly identical characteristics with lands that are within the lands mapped under the PEIR. Implementation of the project is expected to begin late 2024, depending on the availability of funding and contractors/agencies. Treatments may occur at any time of year, barring SPR restrictions listed in the PSA.

a. Initial Treatment

Mechanical treatments will consist of mastication of brush and trees, grass mowing, creation of fire control lines, fuel break creation, and road maintenance. Masticated material may either be spread on site or piled and burned in accordance with the SPRs listed under PD 3.4. Mechanical treatments will comply with SPR GEO-7 and SPR GEO-8 as described in PD 3.7. Manual treatments will consist of removal of brush and trees, pruning of brush and trees, digging handlines, and other actions needed for the creation of a fuel break. Trees proposed for removal are trees that present a safety hazard, may present a safety hazard during future fire suppression activities, trees in poor health, and trees that create crown continuity. Prescribed burning will consist of both pile and broadcast burning of wildland fuels. Herbicide treatments will consist of targeted applications to control invasive species pursuant to SPR HAZ-6.

Equipment to be used during the initial treatment may include but is not limited to the following:

Heavy equipment: dozer, loader, grader, excavators, masticators, chippers, skid-steers equipped with tracks, and tracked or rubber-tired skidders may be used. Masticators may be boom-mounted, drum, or skid steer-mounted.

Heavy equipment utilized on this project are subject to the SPRs listed in PD 3.4, PD 3.10, and PD 3.13.

Vehicles: Pickup trucks, low boy trucks, water tenders, ATVs, UTVs, fire crew carriers, and fire engines.

Hand-operated equipment: hand tools such as McLeods or fire rakes, Pulaskis, mattocks, axes, brush axes, pruning saws, shovels, drip torches, and hand-operated power tools such as chainsaws, pole saws and blowers.

Treatment Types

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

Treatment Activities

- Prescribed Burning (Broadcast), 7768 acres
- Prescribed Burning (Pile Burning), 7768 acres
- Mechanical Treatment, 7768 acres
- Manual Treatment, 7768 acres
- Prescribed Herbivory, 0 acres
- Herbicide Application, 7768 acres



Fuel Type

- Grass Fuel Type
- Shrub Fuel Type
- Tree Fuel Type

b. Treatment Maintenance

Fuel Break: Maintenance of fuel breaks is expected to occur at irregular intervals as necessary to maintain the accessibility of the fuel break and reduce fuel loads to maintain the usefulness of the fuel break. Treatment maintenance activities are mechanical, manual, prescribed fire (both broadcast and pile burning), and herbicide application. Herbicide application may be used within the fuel break to control vegetation growth that may reduce efficacy of the fuel break. Equipment used will be the same as the initial treatments.

Ecological Restoration: Maintenance of ecological restoration areas is expected to occur at irregular intervals necessary to reduce fuel loads and restore a pre-contact fire regime for these areas. Within grass ecosystems treatments may also be conducted at a frequency necessary to lower star thistle populations through prescribed burning. These treatment intervals are dependent on vegetation types and growth rates. SPR BIO-5 sets limitations on treatment intervals of sensitive vegetation types. Table 3.6.1 in the programmatic EIR includes a description of fire return intervals for chaparral communities. Treatment maintenance activities are mechanical, manual, prescribed fire (both broadcast and pile burning), and targeted herbicide application.

Use of the PSA for Treatment Maintenance

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

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

Treatment Types

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

Treatment Activities

- Prescribed Burning (Broadcast), 7768 acres
- Prescribed Burning (Pile Burning) 7768 acres

- Mechanical Treatment, 7768 acres
- Manual Treatment, 7768 acres
- Prescribed Herbivory, 7768 acres
- Herbicide Application, 7768 acres

Fuel Type

- Grass Fuel Type
- Shrub Fuel Type
- Tree Fuel Type

7. Regional Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

This project is located in western Colusa County roughly 6 miles west of the city of Williams entirely on privately owned lands. Major highways in the area include Highway 20 (adjacent to project) and Interstate 5 (7 miles east). The surrounding land use is entirely agriculture with some rural residential development. The project area is sparsely populated, and no sensitive receptors are known to occur near the project area.

8. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

When required the following may apply:

Lake and Stream Bed Alteration Agreement- California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Pesticide Application- Colusa County Agricultural Commissioner

Smoke Management Plan/Burn Permit- Colusa County Air Pollution District

Burn Permit- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Coastal Act Compliance

- The proposed project is NOT within the Coastal Zone
- The proposed project is within the Coastal Zone (*check one of the following boxes*)
 - A coastal development permit been applied for or obtained from the local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified Local Coastal Plan, as applicable.
 - The local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified Local Coastal Plan (in consultation with the local Coastal Commission district office) has determined that a coastal development permit is not required.



9. Native American Consultation.

The following tribal entities were contacted by the Yolo County RCD on 11/3/23. Tribal notifications were sent via USPS on 11/3/23. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded on 12/15/23 requesting a formal consultation:

"The Cultural Resources Department has reviewed the project and concluded that it is within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Therefore, we have a cultural interest and authority in the proposed project area and would like to initiate a formal consultation with the lead agency. At the time of consultation, please provide our Cultural Resources Department with a project timeline, detailed project information and the latest cultural study for the proposed project."

Yolo County RCD is in the process of scheduling a consultation with the Tribe.

Contact Person	Tribe Name	Cultural Affiliation
Jennie Mitchum, Cultural Preservation Director	Cachil Dehe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community	Wintun
Wayne Mitchum Jr., Chairman	Cachil Dehe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community	Wintun
Charlie Wright, Chairperson	Cortina Rancheria - Kletsel Dehe Band of Wintun Indians	Wintun
Glenda Nelson, Chairperson	Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria	Maidu
Ronald Kirk, Chairperson	Grindstone Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki	Nomlaki
Andrew Alejandro, Chairperson	Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Southern Wintun
Laverne Bill, THPO	Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Wailaki
Yvonne Perkins, THPO, Cultural Resources Chairman	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation	Nomlaki
Anthony Roberts, Chairperson	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation	Wintun

DETERMINATION

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

- I find that all of the effects of the proposed project (a) have been covered in the CalVTP PEIR, and (b) all applicable Standard Project Requirements and mitigation measures identified in the CalVTP PEIR will be implemented. The proposed project is, therefore, **WITHIN THE SCOPE** of the CalVTP PEIR. **NO ADDITIONAL CEQA DOCUMENTATION** is required.
- I find that the proposed project will have effects that were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR. These effects are less than significant without any mitigation beyond what is already required pursuant to the CalVTP PEIR. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project will have effects that were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR or will have effects that are substantially more severe than those covered in the CalVTP PEIR. Although these effects may be significant in the absence of additional mitigation beyond the CalVTP PEIR’s measures, revisions to the proposed project or additional mitigation measures have been agreed to by the project proponent that would avoid or reduce the effects so that clearly no significant effects would occur. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project will have significant environmental effects that are (a) new and were not covered in the CalVTP PEIR and/or (b) substantially more severe than those covered in the CalVTP PEIR. Because one or more effects may be significant and cannot be clearly mitigated to less than significant, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared.



Signature

7/18/2024

Date

Heather Nichols

Printed Name

Executive Director

Title

Yolo County Resource Conservation District
Agency



EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. Refer to the applicable resource analysis section in the CalVTP PEIR for relevant information on each environmental topic.
2. A brief explanation is required for each impact, including impacts that have been identified in the PEIR as well as any “new impacts”.
3. The discussion of each impact identified in the PEIR that is also applicable to the proposed treatment project should generally include the following information:
 - ▶ Briefly describe the impact of the proposed vegetation treatment project.
 - ▶ Summarize the impact as it was presented in the PEIR, including a statement that the impact is covered in PEIR.
 - ▶ Provide evidence that (explain why) the project impact is covered in PEIR, considering whether the proposed treatment is consistent with the treatment types and activities addressed in the PEIR as well as the associated intensity (i.e., duration).
 - ▶ Identify SPRs and MMs applicable to the treatment project.
 - ▶ (If applicable) Explain which components of the MM or SPR would be applied. This circumstance exists if the MM or SPR allows for deviation from requirements (e.g., minimum buffer distances), identification of parameters (e.g., tree size for retention), and determinations of feasibility. A site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the planned deviation, identified parameter, or feasibility determination must be provided in the PSA.
 - ▶ (If applicable) Explain why the impact significance in the PSA is different than that found in the PEIR; substantiate the different (new) significance conclusion.
 - ▶ (If applicable) Explain why MM or SPRs identified for this impact in PEIR do not apply to this project. This circumstance may exist where a PS impact was identified in the PEIR, but the impact severity would be less for the treatment project or the MM does not otherwise apply.
4. If the project proponent has determined that a new impact would occur, then the checklist answers for the new impact must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant without the need for mitigation.
5. “Potentially Significant” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that a new impact may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant” new impacts identified, or if any impact would constitute a substantially more severe significant impact than was covered in the PEIR, an EIR is required unless one or more mitigation measures incorporated into the project would mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, in which case an MND would be appropriate. AND could be prepared, if the new impact would be less than significant, or MND, if the new impact could be clearly mitigated to less than significant. The analysis of any new impact to support adoption of an ND or MND, along with the analysis of impacts that are within the scope, would be documented in the PSA checklist. If a later EIR is prepared, it could be limited in its scope to the new significant impact(s) or substantially more severe significant impact(s), with the remainder of the impacts that are within the scope of the PEIR being documented in the PSA checklist and attached to the EIR as an appendix. When preparing any environmental document, the environmental

analysis should incorporate by reference pertinent portions of the analysis from the CalVTP PEIR and focus the environmental analysis solely on issues that were not addressed in the CalVTP PEIR.

6. Project proponents should incorporate into the PSA checklist references to information sources for potential impacts. Include a list of references cited in the PSA and make copies of such references available to the public upon request.



Aesthetics and Visual Resources

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

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

<p>New Aesthetic and Visual Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to aesthetics and visual resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

The proposed project area is located on private property that is surrounded by other private lands in Colusa County. The most visible part of the project is along Cortina Ridge that runs roughly north-south paralleling State Route 20 at a distance of a $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ miles and a small part of the property that is adjacent to State Route 20. The project area is bisected by Spring Valley Road, a lightly traveled 2-lane county road. The project area is accessed by a private gated road that intersects with Spring Valley Road. The nearest eligible scenic highway is the intersection of State Route (SR) 20 and 16, located approximately 2.8 miles southwest of the proposed project area (CALTRANS 2022). The project will not be visible from this stretch of highway. The community of Williams, CA has a very distant view of some of the project from over 6 miles away. The primary foreseeable impact to aesthetic resources resulting from project implementation will be associated with smoke production during prescribed fire. Given the nature of prescribed fire, the aesthetic impacts from smoke will be short-lived. SPR AES-3 is not applicable along public roads as the dominant vegetation type is grass which does not provide a visual screen from treatment activities.

The topography and vegetation in the surrounding area create view blockages that will obstruct the view of the project from much of the surrounding area, particularly along State Route 20 and in the Central Valley floor. The proposed project includes manual and mechanical treatments, herbicide applications, and prescribed burning. This project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR and will result in the short-term presence of vehicles and equipment that could contrast with the surrounding visual setting. However, given the distance at which the project is viewable, it is unlikely the vehicles will be distinguishable. Much of the project is not currently forested because of natural ecosystem types that comprise the project area, therefore the use of shaded fuel break is not appropriate. Although not proposed as a shaded fuel break, only select trees are proposed for removal in the project area. This retained vegetation will create areas of shaded fuel breaks dispersed throughout the project area and thus will lessen visual impacts.

Impact AES-1

No listed scenic highways exist near the project area. Two highways eligible for listing (SR 20 & 16) occur 2.8 miles southwest of the project boundaries. View blockages created by the topography of the region interrupts the public viewshed of the project making any potential impacts difficult to discern. Smoke from prescribed fire will likely be the most visible impact to aesthetic and visual resources; this is a short-lived impact. To minimize the potential impacts, the following SPRs are proposed: AQ-2, AQ-3, AD-4, and AES-2. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AES-1. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact AES-2

This project proposes ecological restoration as a treatment. The topography and vegetation in the surrounding area create view blockages that will obstruct the view of the project from much of the surrounding area, particularly along State Route 20 and in the Central Valley floor. The proposed project includes manual and mechanical treatments, herbicide applications, and prescribed burning. This project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR and will result in the short-term presence of vehicles and equipment that could contrast with the surrounding visual setting. However, given the distance at which the project is viewable it is unlikely the vehicles will be distinguishable. The intent of ecological restoration is to restore natural processes, primarily through the utilization of prescribed fire. Aesthetically, this will result in visual changes to the grass and shrub ecosystems within the project area by converting treated areas from green/brown to black/gray after Burning. These impacts will be short-lived as the ecosystem rapidly revegetates



after fire disturbances. The use of prescribed fire will result in an overall healthier environment that may improve aesthetics in the long term.

Smoke from prescribed fire will likely be the most visible impact to aesthetic and visual resources that result from ecological restoration. To minimize the potential impacts, the following the SPRs are proposed: AQ-2, AQ-3, and AD-4. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AES-2. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact AES-3

The project location was selected as it provides a tactically crucial fuel break along Cortina Ridge, which is a dominant trending ridge in the region, therefore, it is not feasible to move the project to another location. The project intends to create shaded fuel breaks in areas of the project where this is feasible in compliance with MM AES-3. Much of the ridge is open grassland with only a minor component of trees and brush, therefore the creation of a shaded fuel break in these areas is not feasible. This project exists on a ridgetop that is inaccessible to the public, as a result this project is largely only visible from distant vantage points. As the result of adherence to MM AES-3, retention of dispersed vegetation throughout the project area, the distance of public views, and numerous view blockages, the project will be difficult to discern long-term from public views. The project is not visible from scenic highways; therefore, no long-term impacts will occur to those highways because of this project. To minimize the potential impacts the following SPRs are proposed: AES-1. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres, therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AES-3. To minimize long-term impacts MM AES-3 is proposed. Impact AES-3 is determined to be less than significant.

New Aesthetic and Visual Resource Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the lands that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical, the impacts to aesthetic and visual resources will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to aesthetic and visual resources will occur.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact AG-1: Directly Result in the Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forest Land to a Non-Forest Use or Involve Other Changes in the Existing Environment Which, Due to Their Location or Nature, Could Result in Conversion of Forest Land to Non-Forest Use	LTS	Impact AG-1, pp. 3.3-7 – 3.3-8	NA	-	-	-	-	-

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

New Agriculture and Forestry Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to agriculture and forestry resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

This project occurs entirely within lands zoned for agriculture. No changes to land use will occur because of the project as proposed. Pockets of forestland exist within drainages and other microsites.

Impact AG-1

Not Applicable. The project proposes the removal of non-vigorous trees and trees that present fire and safety hazards throughout the project area; however, the healthiest and most vigorous trees will be retained. By reducing fuel loads, creating canopy separation, and retaining the healthiest trees this project may enable the long-term persistence of forestland within the project area by creating forest stands that are more resilient to low/moderate intensity disturbance events. As no impacts to forestland will occur no applicable SPRs were identified. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AG-1. The project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR. As the project proposes the retention of trees within forested areas, no loss of forestland is expected to occur as a result of this project.

New Agriculture and Forestry Resource Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands



within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the lands that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two lands the impacts to agricultural and forestry resources will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to agricultural and forestry resources will occur.

Air Quality

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

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

<p>New Air Quality Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to air quality that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--



Discussion

Impact AQ-1

The project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. Colusa Air Pollution Control District (APCD) does not have any emissions thresholds. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AQ-1. The following SPRs are proposed: AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, AQ-5 and AQ-6. As emissions from prescribed fire and use of machinery/vehicles will occur and no further mitigations are feasible; this impact is determined to be potentially significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-2

This project occurs in a remote area with no public access. The nearest public access is Spring Valley Road, which bisects the project area. Public access is limited to the road right of way. Spring Valley Road has been observed to be sparsely traveled. The nearest community is Williams, which is located over 5 air miles from the project area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AQ-2. The project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR. The following SPR is proposed: HAZ-1. Due to the geographically isolated nature of the project, the short duration of treatment activities, and because treatment activity would not take place near the same people for an extended period, diesel particulate matter generated by treatment activities would not be significant with adherence to the proposed SPR. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact AQ-3

No known sources of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) occur within the project area, soils within the project area are not known to contain ultramafic rock.

Impact AQ-4

This project proposes the use of prescribed fire. The use of prescribed fire treatments under this project are consistent with the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AQ-4. The following SPRs are proposed: AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-6. Adherence to these SPRs will lessen the risk of exposure to toxic air contaminants emitted as the result of prescribed fire treatments, however, the risk of exposure to toxic air may still occur. As no further feasible mitigation measures are available to incorporate into the plan, the impact is determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-5

The use of diesel equipment can, at times, expose people to objectional odors as the result of their operations. This project occurs in an area with no public access. The nearest public access is Spring Valley Road right of way. Spring Valley Road has been observed to be sparsely traveled. Due to the geographically isolated nature of the project, the short duration of treatment activities, and because treatment activity would not take place near the same people for

an extended period, odors generated from the use of diesel equipment during treatment activities would not be significant. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AQ-5. This project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. Given the remote nature of the project, no SPRs are proposed for Impact AQ-5. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact AQ-6

The use of prescribed fire can expose people to objectionable odors. The use of prescribed fire treatments under this project is consistent with the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact AQ-6. The project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR. The following SPRs are proposed: AD-4, AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-6. These SPRs will lessen exposure to toxic air emitted as the result of the deliberate burning of wildland fuels, however, the risk of exposure to objectionable odors from prescribed fire may still occur. As no further feasible mitigation measures are available to incorporate into the plan, the impact is determined to be significant and unavoidable.

New Air Quality Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the lands that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two lands the impacts to Air Quality will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Air Quality will occur.



Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources

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

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

<p>New Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Pedestrian surveys of the treatment areas did not occur during the preparation of this PSA due to lack of available resources. A records search was conducted and pertinent SPRs will be completed prior to treatment operations.

Letters were sent by the Yolo County RCD to geographically affiliated tribal governments obtained from the NAHC, these letters and received correspondence are included in Attachment C.

Impact CUL-1

Historic resources are known to occur within the project boundary. Treatments will be designed in a manner that avoids impacts to historic cultural resources. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in terms of cultural resources within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact CUL-1. This project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. The following SPRs are proposed: CUL-1, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-7, and CUL-8. Additionally, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is proposed to protect any cultural resources that may be uncovered during treatment. With adherence to these SPRs and MM Cul-2, Impact CUL-1 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact CUL-2

Certain activities proposed in the PSA, primarily mechanical treatments, have the potential to impact cultural resources located under the surface of the soil. This may occur in areas that have been previously surveyed due to limitations inherent to archeological surveys. The known historic and prehistoric cultural resources are likely to have subsurface components. Treatment activities near known cultural resources will be conducted in a manner that seeks to avoid subsurface soil disturbances within site boundaries when feasible. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in terms of cultural resources within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact CUL-2. This project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. The following SPRs are proposed: CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6, CUL-7, and CUL-8. Additionally, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is proposed to protect any cultural resources that may be uncovered during treatment. With adherence to these SPRs and MM CUL-2, Impact CUL-2 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact CUL-3

Tribal cultural resources are known to occur within the project area. Treatments will be designed in a manner that avoids impacts to tribal cultural resources. As discussed above (Native American Consultation), on 11/3/2023 the Yolo County RCD mailed tribal consultation letters to geographically affiliated tribal governments. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in terms of cultural resources within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact CUL-3. This project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. The following SPRs are proposed: CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6 and CUL-8. Additionally, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is proposed to protect any cultural resources that may be uncovered during treatment. With adherence to these SPRs and MM Cul-2, Impact CUL-3 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact CUL-4

No known human remains exist within the project area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are identical to those within the PEIR treatable acres in terms of probability of the



presence of human remains; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact CUL-4. This project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. No SPRs are proposed, however, compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052, and PRC Section 5097 would avoid disturbing human remains. With adherence to state regulation, Impact CUL-4 is determined to be less than significant.

New Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the lands that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two lands the impacts Archeological, Historical, and Cultural Resources will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Archeological, Historical, and Cultural Resources will occur.

Biological Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact BIO-1: Substantially Affect Special-Status Plant Species Either Directly or Through Habitat Modifications	LTS	Impact BIO-1, pp 3.6-131–3.6.138	Yes	AQ-3 BIO-1 BIO-2 BIO-5 BIO-6 BIO-7 BIO-9 GEO-1 GEO-3 GEO-4 GEO-5 GEO-7 HYD-4 HYD-5	BIO-1a BIO-1b BIO-1c	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-2: Substantially Affect Special-Status Wildlife Species Either Directly or Through Habitat Modifications	LTS (all wildlife species except bumble bees) S&U (bumble bees)	Impact BIO-2, pp 3.6-138–3.6-184	Yes	BIO-1 BIO-2 BIO-3 BIO-4 BIO-5 BIO-9 BIO-10 BIO-12 HYD-4	BIO-2a BIO-2b BIO-2c BIO-2d BIO-2e BIO-2g BIO-5	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-3: Substantially Affect Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community Through Direct Loss or Degradation that Leads to Loss of Habitat Function	LTS	Impact BIO-3, pp 3.6-186–3.6-191	Yes	BIO-1 BIO-2 BIO-3 BIO-4 BIO-5 BIO-6 BIO-9 BIO-10 HYD-4 HYD-5	BIO-3a BIO-3B BIO-3c	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-4: Substantially Affect State or Federally Protected Wetlands	LTS	Impact BIO-4, pp 3.6-191–3.6-192	Yes	BIO-1, HYD-1 HYD-3 HYD-4	BIO-4	LTSM	No	Yes
Impact BIO-5: Interfere Substantially with Wildlife	LTS	Impact BIO-5, pp 3.6-192–3.6-196	YES	BIO-1 BIO-4 BIO-5	-	LTS	No	Yes



Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Movement Corridors or Impede Use of Nurseries				BIO-10 HYD-1 HYD-4				
Impact BIO-6: Substantially Reduce Habitat or Abundance of Common Wildlife	LTS	Impact BIO-6, pp 3.6-197–3.6-198	Yes	BIO-1 BIO-2 BIO-12	BIO-5	LTS	No	Yes
Impact BIO-7: Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	No Impact	Impact BIO-7, pp 3.6-198–3.6-199	NA	-	-	-	-	Yes
Impact BIO-8: Conflict with the Provisions of an Adopted Natural Community Conservation Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan, or Other Approved Habitat Plan	No Impact	Impact BIO-8, pp 3.6-199–3.6-200	NA	-	-	-	-	Yes

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

New Biological Resources Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to biological resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
---	------------------------------	--

Discussion

Jacobszoon and Associates Inc. performed a reconnaissance-level survey, in accordance with SPR BIO-1, on July 25, 2023 for Yolo County Resource Conservation District at 1958 Spring Valley Rd & 1961 Spring Valley Rd, Williams, CA 95987 for the proposed development of a California Vegetation Treatment Program (VTP). The purpose of the survey was to identify the natural communities within the property boundary to help determine the environmental setting of the project site. Before the survey, potential vegetative communities for the project site were reviewed using the USDA Forest Service Classification and Assessment with Landsat of Visible Ecological Groupings (CALVEG) data, the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) system, and CDFW’s Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). Potential sensitive plants and animals were reviewed using CNDDDB, California Native Plant Society (CNPS), and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) System.

Biological communities observed were classified using the Manual of California Vegetation Online Edition (MCV2). Eight (8) MCV2 Alliances were observed on site: 1.) *Avena* spp. - *Bromus* spp. Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance: Wild oats and annual brome grasslands, 2.) *Adenostoma fasciculatum* Shrubland Alliance: Chamise chaparral, 3.) *Ceanothus cuneatus* Shrubland Alliance: Wedge leaf ceanothus chaparral, Buck brush chaparral, 4.) *Brassica nigra* - *Centaurea (solstitialis, melitensis)* Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance: Upland mustards or star-thistle fields, 5.) *Quercus douglasii* Forest & Woodland Alliance: Blue oak woodland and forest, 6.) *Salix goodingii*-*Salix laevigata* Forest and Woodland Alliance, 7.) planted common wheat fields, and 8.) *Pinus sabiniana* Woodland Alliance: Foothill pine woodland. While none of these alliances are classified as sensitive under the MCV2 classification system, all oak woodlands and chaparral communities are considered sensitive habitat types under Section 3.6.1 of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Final Program EIR for the California VTP.

Aquatic resources, communities, and habitats (e.g., watercourses, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, etc.) are considered sensitive biological communities and are afforded special protections under CEQA and other Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances. Wet areas are areas with observed hydrophytic vegetation and/or other hydrologic indicators that suggest the area is influenced by ponding or flooding for a significant amount of time throughout the growing season. Wet areas may provide habitat for special-status plants and wildlife as well as for nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

Numerous watercourses, ponds, and potential vernal pools were observed during the Reconnaissance Survey and will require special protection. In addition to these protections, it is recommended that these areas be surveyed intensely for Rare and Special-Status Plant species.

Impact BIO-1

The treatment activities as proposed have the potential to directly or indirectly adversely affect special status plant species that may occur in the project area. A qualified biologist with Jacobszoon and Associates, Inc. has assessed the potential presence of sensitive plant species in the project area and a reconnaissance level survey was conducted by two qualified biologists and an RPF on 07/23/2023. Thirty-two (32) special status plants have a moderate or high probability of occurring within the project. Of these 32 plants, Keck's checkerbloom (*Sidalcea keckii*) and Colusa grass (*Neostapfia colusana*) are plant species listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act. Should treatments be in suitable habitat where adverse effects to special status plants may occur, then SPR-7 will require protocol-level surveys in those areas and consultation with relevant public agencies may be necessary. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-1.

Please refer to the Biological Assessment Addendum attached to this PSA for a table of special status plant species with the potential to occur within the project area. The following SPRs are proposed: AQ-3, BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-9, GEO-1, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-7, HYD-4, HYD-5. Additionally, the following mitigation measures are proposed: BIO-1a, BIO-1b, & BIO-1c. Should special status plants be observed during botanical surveys then additional site-specific recommendations may be developed by an RPF or qualified biologist. With adherence to the SPRs and MMs, this impact is determined to be Less Than Significant Mitigated.



Impact BIO-2

The treatment activities proposed have the potential to directly or indirectly adversely affect special status wildlife species that may occur in the project area. A qualified biologist with Jacobszoon and Associates, Inc has assessed the potential presence of sensitive wildlife species in the project area and a reconnaissance level survey was conducted by two qualified biologist and an RPF on 07/23/2023. Twenty-eight (28) special status wildlife species have a moderate or high probability of occurring within the project. Of these wildlife species, eight (8) are listed or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act. The species listed as threatened or endangered include: Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), Conservancy fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta conservation*), vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), vernal tadpool shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*), Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), monarch-California overwintering pop. 1 (*Danaus plexipupus pop. 1*), valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), and northwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*).

Avifauna

Eight (8) special-status avian species: Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), Great Blue Heron (*Ardea herodias*), Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), White-tailed Kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Prairie Falcon (*Falco mexicanus*), and Black-crowned Night Heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*) have a moderate or high potential to occur within the Study Area based on habitat types present. Additionally, most non-game bird species in California are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which prohibits the deliberate destruction of active nests belonging to protected species. Groundbreaking activities within the Study Area during avian breeding periods have the potential to significantly impact nesting migratory bird species. Prior to conducting treatments, site-specific protection measures will be developed by an RPF or qualified biologist pursuant to **SPR Bio-12** and **MM Bio-2b**.

Insects

Four (4) special-status insect species, Wawona riffle beetle (*Atractelmis wawona*), Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), monarch-California overwintering population (*Danaus plexippus pop. 1*), and valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), have a moderate or high potential to occur within the Study Area. Valley elderberry longhorn beetle is protected under **MM Bio-2d**. Crotch's bumble bee is protected under **MM Bio-2g**. Monarch-California overwintering populations are protected under **MM Bio-2e**. Wawona riffle beetle is protected through the various SPRs & MMs listed under Impact BIO-2 through the protection of sensitive habitats and **MM Bio-2b**. If Mitigation Measures cannot avoid significant impacts, then **MM Bio-2c** applies.

Mammals

Three (3) special-status mammal species: western red bat (*Lasiurus frantzii*), San Joaquin pocket mouse (*Perognathus inornatus*), and American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) have moderate or high potential to occur within the Study Area. None of these species is listed or a candidate for listing under the federal or state endangered species acts. Protection for the three special-status mammals is through the various SPRs listed under Impact BIO-2, **MM Bio-2b**, and **MM Bio-5**. If Mitigation Measures cannot avoid significant impacts, then **MM Bio-2c** applies.

Amphibian and Reptiles

Three (3) special-status amphibian and reptile species, western spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*), western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*), and San Joaquin coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum ruddocki*) have a moderate or high potential to occur within the Study Area. None of these species is listed or a candidate for listing under the federal or state endangered species acts, however, Western Spadefoot, Western Pond Turtle, and San Joaquin Coachwhip are listed as California Species of Special Concern. Protection for the three special-status reptile and amphibian species will be achieved through the various SPRs listed under Impact BIO-2 and **MM Bio-2b**. If Mitigation Measures cannot avoid significant impacts, then **MM Bio-2c** applies.

Crustaceans, Fish, and Mollusks

Four (4) crustaceans, fish, or mollusks have a high or moderate potential of occurring within the project due to the presence of habitat that meets the requirements for these species. The species are all associated with vernal pool habitat. By adhering to the multitude of SPRs and MMs listed above that protect watercourses, lakes, and other sensitive habitat (vernal pools) these species are inherently protected. Additionally, **MM Bio-4** will avoid impacts to State and federally protected wetlands. If Mitigation Measures cannot avoid significant impacts, then **MM BIO-2c** applies.

This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-2. Please refer to the Biological Assessment Addendum attached to this PSA for a table of special status Wildlife and Bee species with the potential to occur within the project area. The following SPRs are proposed: BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-9, BIO-10, and HYD-4. Additionally, the following mitigation measures are proposed: BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-2c., BIO-2d, BIO-2e, BIO-2g. With adherence to the SPRs and MMs this impact is determined to be Less Than Significant Mitigated.

Impact BIO-3

The treatment activities as proposed have the potential to directly or indirectly adversely affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities through direct loss or degradation that leads to loss of habitat function in the project area. Jacobszoon and Associates, Inc has assessed the project area for the presence of sensitive natural communities in the project area. Sensitive natural communities that occur within the project area include oak woodland, chaparral, and riparian ecosystems. The utilization of prescribed fire out of sync with the normal fire return interval can degrade these ecosystems; this is of particular concern within the chaparral ecosystems. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-3.



Vegetation and Habitat Types within the Treatable Landscape for the Northern California Interior and Coast Ranges
Ecological Section (not all Alliances occur within the project area)

CWHR Classification	MCV Alliances	
Woodland and Forest Habitats		
Blue Oak Woodland	▶ Blue oak woodland	
Blue Oak-Foothill Pine	▶ Foothill pine woodland	▶ Blue oak woodland
Closed-Cone Pine-Cypress	▶ Knobcone pine forest	
Coastal Oak Woodland	▶ Coast live oak woodland	▶ California bay forest*
Douglas Fir	▶ Douglas fir forest	
Eucalyptus	▶ Eucalyptus - tree of heaven - black locust groves ^N	
Montane Hardwood	▶ California buckeye grove* ▶ Canyon live oak forest	▶ Oregon white oak woodland* ▶ Interior live oak woodland
Montane Hardwood-Conifer	▶ Bigleaf maple forest*	
Montane Riparian	▶ White alder grove ▶ Fremont cottonwood forest*	▶ Sandbar willow thicket ▶ Wild grape shrubland*
Ponderosa Pine	▶ Ponderosa pine forest	
Sierran Mixed Conifer	▶ Mixed conifer forest	
Valley Foothill Riparian	▶ Box-elder forest* ▶ Button willow thicket* ▶ Fremont cottonwood forest* ▶ Himalayan blackberry - rattlebox - edible fig riparian scrub ^N	▶ Sandbar willow thicket ▶ Red willow thicket* ▶ Wild grape shrubland*
Valley Oak Woodland	▶ Valley oak woodland*	
Chaparral and Scrub Habitats		
Chamise-Redshank Chaparral	▶ Chamise chaparral	▶ Wedge leaf ceanothus chaparral/Buck brush chaparral
Coastal Scrub	▶ Live-forever - lichen/moss sparse herbaceous rock outcrop ▶ California yerba santa scrub ▶ Wright's buckwheat - Heerman's buckwheat - Utah butterfly-bush scrub*	▶ California coffee berry scrub ▶ Goldenaster patch* ▶ Deer weed scrub ▶ Silver bush lupine scrub

CWHR Classification	MCV Alliances	
Mixed Chaparral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Hoary, common, and Stanford manzanita chaparral* ▶ Whiteleaf manzanita chaparral ▶ Wedge leaf ceanothus chaparral, Buck brush chaparral ▶ Hairy leaf - woolly leaf ceanothus chaparral* ▶ Birch leaf mountain mahogany chaparral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Bush poppy scrub ▶ California yerba santa scrub ▶ California coffee berry scrub ▶ Deer weed scrub ▶ Silver bush lupine scrub ▶ Scrub oak chaparral ▶ Leather oak chaparral ▶ Interior live oak chaparral
Montane Chaparral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Whiteleaf manzanita chaparral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Birch leaf mountain mahogany chaparral
Herbaceous Habitats		
Annual Grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Fiddleneck - phacelia field ▶ Wild oat grassland^N ▶ Annual brome grassland^N ▶ Red brome or mediterranean grass grassland^N ▶ Cheatgrass - medusahead grassland^N ▶ Yellow star-thistle field^N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Annual dogtail grassland ▶ Goldenaster patch* ▶ California goldfields - dwarf plantain - small fescue flower fields ▶ Popcorn flower field ▶ White-tip clover swales* ▶ California yerba santa scrub
Perennial Grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Water foxtail meadow* ▶ Needle grass - melic grass grassland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Curly blue grass grassland*

*These are designated sensitive natural communities with a state rarity rank of S1 (critically imperiled), S2 (imperiled), or S3 (vulnerable).

^N These alliances are dominated by nonnative vegetation.

Source: CWHR 2019, CNPS 2019, Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2019

Please refer to the Biological Assessment Addendum attached to this PSA for a table of sensitive natural communities with the potential to occur within the project area. The following SPRs are proposed: BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-10, and HYD-4. Additionally, the following mitigation measures are proposed when necessary: BIO-3a, BIO-3b, & BIO-3c. With adherence to the SPRs and MMs, this impact is determined to be Less Than Significant Mitigated.

Impact BIO-4

The treatment activities as proposed have the potential to substantially affect State or Federally Protected Wetlands that may occur in the project area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-4.

The following SPRs are proposed: BIO-1, HYD-1, HYD-3, HYD-4. Additionally, the following mitigation measure is proposed: BIO-4. With adherence to the SPRs and MMs, this impact is determined to be Less Than Significant Mitigated.

Impact BIO-5

The treatment activities as proposed have the potential to substantially affect State or Federally Protected Wetlands that may occur in the project area. The use of heavy machinery and prescribed fire will temporarily displace wildlife



and have a short-term adverse effect in the Study Area. The use of machinery and prescribed fire treatments under this project are consistent with the PEIR. By reducing fuel loads and retaining the healthiest trees, this project may enable the long-term persistence of critical habitat components within the Study Area by creating an environment that is more resilient to low/moderate intensity disturbance events. Preserving the healthiest trees will also ensure there is substantial habitat for migratory species that may nest in the Study Area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-4.

The following SPRs are proposed: BIO-1, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-10, HYD-1, HYD-3, HYD-4. Additionally, the following mitigation measure is proposed: BIO-4. With adherence to the SPRs and MMs, this impact is determined to be Less Than Significant Mitigated.

Impact BIO-6

The treatment activities as proposed have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat or abundance of common wildlife that may occur in the project area. The project will retain substantial portions of vegetation throughout the project area and by utilizing a mosaic approach to fuel treatments in the ecological restoration portions, a variety of habitat types will be generated that may provide a wider diversity of habitat types throughout the project footprint. The greatest potential impact is in the fuel break portions of the project area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact BIO-4.

To mitigate adverse impacts on wildlife species and wildlife habitat, workers will attend a (Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training lead by an RPF or qualified biologist (SPR BIO-2). Tree nesting habitat was found throughout the Study Area and common nesting birds are expected to be present. If project activities occur during the nesting season, a nesting bird survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to the commencement of any treatment activity. The appropriate protection measures (e.g., protective buffer, nest monitoring, defer treatment) will be established to avoid disturbance of active nests during project activities (SPR BIO-12). The following SPRs are proposed: BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-12. Additionally, the following mitigation measure is proposed: BIO-5 With implementation of appropriate SPRs there will be less than significant impact to common wildlife species. The impact on common wildlife species is within the scope of the PEIR.

Impact BIO-7

This project, including lands mapped as outside the geographic scope of the PEIR, are consistent with local ordinances on protections of biological resources, therefore this impact is not applicable.

Impact BIO-8

Within the project area APNs 018-040-004-000 & 018-130-006-000 are under a conservation easement held by the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF). This easement prohibits the construction of new roads and trails on this property without the approval of the easement holder. As the fuel break treatment can be considered similar in character to a road or trail approval of the easement holder (RMEF) is necessary prior to the construction of a fuel

break on these parcels. By engaging with the RMELF and obtaining permission from the easement holder prior to the utilization of mechanical fuel break treatments, no impact will occur.

New Biological Resource Impacts

This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter the Biological Impacts listed above. No new impact related to biological resources would occur that is not covered in the PEIR.



Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resources

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

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

<p>New Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

This project occurs in the Northern Coastal Range of the Coastal Ranges. The California Geologic Survey Map Sheet 58: Deep-Seated Landslide Susceptibility map classifies the project area that ranges from 0 to 68. The project is underlain by the following soils:

Soils Code	Soil Name	Acreage	% of Project Area	Erosion Hazard Rating
102	Capay clay loam, 0 percent slopes, low precip, MLRA 17	207.1	2.7%	Low
144	Hillgate clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	336.1	4.3%	Low
145	Hillgate loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, MLRA 17	12.7	0.2%	Low
200	Clear Lake clay, drained, 0 to 8 percent slopes, MLRA 15	11.3	0.1%	Low
206	Capay clay, 5 to 9 percent slopes	0.4	0.0%	Low
210	Corval loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	31.6	0.4%	Low
212	Ayar clay, 5 to 15 percent slopes	68.8	0.9%	Low
213	Ayar clay, 15 to 30 percent slopes	688.2	8.9%	Low
220	Altamont silty clay, 5 to 9 percent slopes	304.5	3.9%	Low
230	Corning clay loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	250.0	3.2%	Low
253	Millsholm-Altamont-Rock outcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes	41.4	0.5%	Low
270	Balcom-Ayar complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes	405.6	5.2%	Low
275	Goldeagle-Positas-Balcom complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes	31.4	0.4%	Low
312	Saltcanyon loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	111.1	1.4%	Low
334	Millsholm-Contra Costa association, 30 to 75 percent slopes	5,265.8	67.8%	Medium
652	Water	2.2	0.0%	Low

Refer to Soils Map for location of soils.

To estimate the erosion hazard rating (EHR) for the soils that occur on this project area the Board of Forestry Technical Rule Addendum No. 1, Procedures for Estimating Surface Soils Erosion Hazard Rating was utilized.



Impact GEO-1

The treatments proposed in this project may result in soil disturbances that can contribute to erosion or the loss of topsoil. The proposed project is consistent with the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact Geo-1. The following SPRs are proposed to mitigate potential substantial erosion or loss of topsoil: GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-6, GEO-7, GEO-8, HYD-4, AQ-3, and AQ-4. With the utilization of these SPRs, Impact GEO-1 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact GEO-2

This project proposes actions that can result in disturbances to soil and root structure that may increase the risk of slope instability within the project boundary. Large portions of this project occur on slopes over 50% (Refer to Slopes Map for locations). Prior to treatment activities the area will be assessed for potential unstable areas by a qualified individual, and avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be developed when necessary. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact Geo-2. The project as proposed is consistent with the PEIR. To reduce the risks of landsliding the following SPRs are proposed: GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-6, GEO-7, GEO-8, HYD-4, AQ-3. With the utilization of these SPRs, Impact GEO-2 is determined to be less than significant.

New Geology, Soils, Paleontology, and Mineral Resource Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from the geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to geology, soils, paleontology, and mineral resources will occur.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

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

New GHG Emissions Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to GHG emissions that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact GHG-1

The project will result in GHG emissions as the result of using heavy equipment, vehicles, various gasoline-powered hand tools, and prescribed fire. The GHG emission associated with this project are within the scope of the PEIR which found that CalVTP projects are consistent with the following policies: California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, the California Forest Carbon Plan, and the Draft California 2030 Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact GHG-1. The emissions generated by this project are done with the intent of lessening future emissions associated with large wildfires. No SPRs are proposed for this impact. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact GHG-2

The project will result in GHG emissions as the result of using heavy equipment, vehicles, various gasoline-powered hand tools, and prescribed fire. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact GHG-2. All activities



proposed are within the scope of the PEIR. The following SPRs are proposed which may reduce the generation of GHG emissions under this project: AD-3 and AQ-3 along with Mitigation Measure GHG-2. Although long-term reductions of GHG emissions may be obtained through this project, the GHG emissions that result from this project are potentially significant and unavoidable.

New Impacts Related to GHG Emissions

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to GHG emissions will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to GHG emissions will occur.

Energy Resources

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact ENG-1: Result in Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy	LTS	Impact ENG-1, pp. 3.9-7 – 3.9-8	Yes	NA	NA	LTS	No	Yes

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

New Energy Resource Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to energy resources that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact ENG-1

Utilization of energy resources will occur primarily in the form of consumption of fossil fuels to power heavy equipment, gas-powered hand tools, and vehicles. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact ENG-1. No applicable SPRs exist for Impact Eng-1. The energy consumption necessary for this project is within the scope of the PEIR. This impact is determined to be less than significant.

New Energy Resource Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. The lands that fall outside of the treatable acreage are immediately adjacent to lands that are within the treatable acreage; therefore, treatment of lands outside the geographic scope will require the same amount of energy to access and treat the site. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two area the impacts to Energy Resources will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Energy Resources will occur.



Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety

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

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

New Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts related to hazardous materials, public health and safety that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact HAZ-1

This project proposes manual and mechanical treatments, prescribed fire, and herbicide treatments. All these treatments require hazardous materials to be utilized. The types of treatments and the hazardous materials are consistent with those examined under the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HAZ-1. The following SPRs are proposed: HAZ-1 and HAZ-2. The types of treatments and the hazardous materials are consistent with those examined under the PEIR. The impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-2

This project proposes the use of targeted herbicide applications. The herbicides applied in the treatment area are limited to those covered under the PEIR and no aerial application is permissible under this project. Stretches of this plan occurs along public road right of ways. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HAZ-2. The following SPRs are proposed: HAZ-5, HAZ-6, HAZ-7, HAZ-8, and HAZ-9. The impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact HAZ-3

No known hazardous materials sites occur within the project boundary. A review of Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor did not disclose any recorded hazardous materials sites within or adjacent to the project area. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HAZ-3. As no known Hazardous material sites occur on this project this impact is not applicable. Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 is proposed to ensure no known hazardous material sites occur within the project boundaries.

New Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two area the impacts to Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety Impacts will occur.



Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact in the PEIR			Project-Specific Checklist					
Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact HYD-1: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Implementation of Prescribed Burning	LTS	Impact HYD-1, pp. 3.11-25 – 3.11-27	Yes	HYD-1 HYD-2 HYD-4 HYD-6 BIO-4 GEO-4 GEO-6 AQ-3	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HYD-2: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Implementation of Manual or Mechanical Treatment Activities	LTS	Impact HYD-2, pp. 3.11-27 – 3.11-29	Yes	HYD-1 HYD-2 HYD-4 HYD-5 HYD-6 GEO-1 GEO-2 GEO-3 GEO-4 GEO-5 GEO-7 GEO-8 BIO-4 HAZ-1 HAZ-5	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HYD-3: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through Prescribed Herbivory	LTS	Impact HYD-3, p. 3.11-29	No	-	-	-	-	-

Environmental Impact Covered In the PEIR	Identify Impact Significance in the PEIR	Identify Location of Impact Analysis in the PEIR	Does the Impact Apply to the Treatment Project?	List SPRs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	List MMs Applicable to the Treatment Project ¹	Identify Impact Significance for Treatment Project	Would this be a Substantially More Severe Significant Impact than Identified in the PEIR?	Is this Impact Within the Scope of the PEIR?
Would the project:								
Impact HYD-4: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements, Substantially Degrade Surface or Ground Water Quality, or Conflict with or Obstruct the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan Through the Ground Application of Herbicides	LTS	Impact HYD-4, pp. 3.11-30 – 3.11-31	Yes	HYD-1 HYD-5 BIO-4 HAZ-5 HAZ-7	NA	LTS	No	Yes
Impact HYD-5: Substantially Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern of a Treatment Site or Area	LTS	Impact HYD-5, p. 3.11-31	Yes	HYD-1 HYD-4 HYD-6 GEO-1 GEO-2 GEO-5	NA	LTS	No	Yes

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

New Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to hydrology and water quality that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
---	------------------------------	--

Discussion

Impact HYD-1

The proposed treatment activities are within the scope of the PEIR and approved General Waste Discharge Requirement (GWDR) for CalVTP projects. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HYD-1. It is feasible, in the absence of protection measures, that ash or debris generated through prescribed fire may impact surface waters and drainages. The following SPRs are proposed to protect water quality during the use of prescribed fire: HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-4, HYD-6, BIO-4, GEO-4, GEO-6, and AQ-3. With adherence to these SPRs, Impact HYD-1 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact HYD-2

The proposed treatment activities are within the scope of the PEIR and approved GWDR for CalVTP projects. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in



character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HYD-2. It is feasible, in the absence of protection measures, that sediment or debris generated through mechanical treatments may impact surface waters and drainages. The following SPRs are proposed to protect water quality during the utilization of mechanical treatments: HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-4, HYD-5, HYD-6, GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, GEO-7, GEO-8, BIO-4, HAZ-1, and HAZ-5. With adherence to these SPRs, Impact HYD-2 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact HYD-3

NA

Impact HYD-4

The proposed treatment activities are within the scope of the PEIR and approved GWDR for CalVTP projects. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HYD-4. No aerial spraying of herbicides is permitted under the PEIR. It is feasible, in the absence of protection measures, that herbicide treatments may impact surface waters and drainages. The following SPRs are proposed to protect water quality during the use of herbicide treatments: HYD-1, HYD-5, BIO-4, HAZ-5, and HAZ-7. With adherence to these SPRs, Impact HYD-4 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact HYD-5

The proposed treatment activities are within the scope of the PEIR and approved GWDR for CalVTP projects. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact HYD-5. It is feasible, in the absence of protection measures, that treatments may alter the existing drainage pattern in the area. The following SPRs are proposed to protect drainage patterns during this project: HYD-1, HYD-4, HYD-6, GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-5. With adherence to these SPRs, Impact HYD-5 is determined to be less than significant.

New Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas the impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Hydrology and Water Quality will occur.

Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing

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

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

New Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to land use and planning, population and housing that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

This Project occurs on the following Assessor’s Parcels Numbers:

Lands of Paul Favero: 016-180-024-000, 016-180-011-000,018-040-005-000, 018-040-006-000, 018-040-007-000,018-040-008-000, 018-040-009-000 ,018-040-010-000, 018-040-011-000, 08-050-002-000, 018-050-004-000, 018-130-005-000, 018-130-009-000, 018-130-012-000, 018-130-013-000, 018-130-014-000, 018-130-015-000,018-130-016-000, 018-130-025-000,018-130-026-000,018-140-001-000,018-140-002-000,018-140-003-000, 018-140-004-000, 018-0140-005, 018-0140-006, 018-140-007, 018-140-009, 018-220-011-000,018-230-009-000, 018-230-010-000, & 018-230-011-000

Lands of Randy Sparks: 018-040-004-000, & 018-130-006-0005.

All these parcels are zoned for agricultural purposes.

Impact LU-1

NA



Impact LU-2

NA

New Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics and zoning of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. The lands that fall outside of the treatable acreage are immediately adjacent to lands that are within the treatable acreage. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to Land Use Planning, Populations and Housing impacts will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Land Use Planning, Populations and Housing will occur.

Noise

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

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

New Noise Impacts: Would the treatment result in other noise-related impacts that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact NOI-1

This project is located on private property in a rural portion of Colusa County with limited public access within 1 mile of the project that is restricted to road right of way. The nearest community, Williams, is over 5 air miles from the project boundaries. A review of satellite imagery found the area within 1 mile of the project boundary is sparsely populated. Land use adjacent to the project is entirely agricultural lands. No noise-sensitive receptors are known to exist within 1500 feet of the project. Colusa County Code, Chapter 13, Section 8 regulates construction noises within the county. Noise from equipment is permitted between the hours of 7 am and 7 pm Monday-Friday and 8am to 8pm Saturday-Sunday. Although the project occurs in a remote area, the proposed treatments will result in substantial short-term increases in noise that are within the scope covered by the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact NOI-1. The following SPRs are proposed: AD-3, NOI-1, NOI-2, NOI-3, and NOI-5. The impact is determined to be less than significant.



Impact NOI-2

This project is located on private property in a rural portion of Colusa County. The only known public access points within the 1-mile assessment area are road right of ways (Spring Valley Road and State HWY 20). The nearest community, Williams, is over 5 air miles from the project boundaries. A review of satellite imagery reveals the area within 1-mile of the project boundary to be sparsely populated. Land use adjacent to the project is entirely agricultural lands. No noise-sensitive receptors are known to exist within 1500 feet of the project. Colusa County Code, Chapter 13, Section 8 regulates construction noises within the county. Nevertheless, the proposed treatments may result in increased truck-generated Single Event Noise Levels (SENL) when equipment is brought into the project area. SENL from trucks are expected along Walnut Drive and Spring Valley Road, which are both rural roads that pass by multiple residences. Large trucks associated with agriculture have been observed using this road throughout the day. The truck-generated SENLs that are expected to result from this project are within the scope covered by the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact NOI-2. The following SPR is proposed: AD-3. The impact is determined to be less than significant.

New Noise Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, any noise generated by treatment on lands outside the geographic scope of the PEIR will be identical to lands within the PEIR scope. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to noise impacts will occur.

Recreation

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

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

New Recreation Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to recreation that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

This project occurs entirely on private lands and is surrounded by private lands. Access to the project is strictly controlled by the landowners. No known designated recreational areas exist in the project area.

Impact REC-1

NA

New Recreation Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two area the effects to recreation impacts will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to recreation impacts will occur.



Transportation

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

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

New Transportation Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to transportation that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	If yes, complete row(s) below and discussion
---	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact TRAN-1

The project is not expected to result in impacts to traffic or road closures.

Impact TRAN-2

The project is accessed via county-maintained Spring Valley Road. Although the project will not directly impact Spring Valley Road, this sparsely traveled road may see temporary increases in vehicle traffic during treatment activities. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two area the impacts to TRAN-2 will be identical. The following SPRs are proposed: AD-3 and TRAN-1. The impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact TRAN-3

Given the remote location of the project, it is expected that the proposed treatments will result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from crews traveling to and from the project area. The increased VMT is temporary in nature and as covered in the PEIR is expected to generate less than 110 trips per day. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter VMT. No mitigation exists to reduce VMT for this project. The impact is determined to be potentially significant and unavoidable.

New Transportation Impacts

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics and travel requirements of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. The lands that fall outside of the treatable acreage are immediately adjacent to lands that are within the treatable acreage. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to transportation will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to transportation will occur.



Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems

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

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

New Public Services, Utilities and Service System Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts to public services, utilities and service systems that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
--	------------------------------	--	--

Discussion

Impact UTIL-1

This project will require the utilization of water supplies to obtain water for activities such as road dusting and prescribed burning. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter Impact UTL-1. Impacts to water supply that result from this project are consistent with the PEIR and no mitigations exist. The impact is determined to be less than significant.

Impact UTIL-2

NA

Impact UTIL-3

NA

New Impacts to Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics and public services, utilities, and service system demands of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. The lands that fall outside of the treatable acreage are immediately adjacent to lands that are within the treatable acreage. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to transportation will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Public Services, Utilities, and Service System Impacts will occur.



Wildfire

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

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

New Wildfire Impacts: Would the treatment result in other impacts related to wildfire that are not evaluated in the CalVTP PEIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
---	------------------------------	--

Discussion

This project occurs in Moderate and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (CAL FIRE FRAP).

Impact WIL-1

This project involves manual treatments, mechanical treatments, herbicide treatments and prescribed burning. All these actions may result in new wildfire starts or escaped fires as the result of treatment activities. The project as proposed seeks to lessen fire risk for the surrounding area through the reduction of fuel levels. The proposed treatment is within the scope of the PEIR. This project proposes the inclusion of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter wildfire risk. The following SPRs are proposed to reduce wildfire risk: AQ-3, HAZ-2, HAZ-3 and HAZ-4. With adherence to the SPRs Impact WIL-1 is determined to be less than significant.

Impact WIL-2

This project proposes the removal of vegetation, herbicide treatments, and use of prescribed fire. The project as proposed is within the scope of the PEIR. All treatments are subject to SPRS and mitigation measures that protect watercourses and require erosion control measures after soil disturbing activities. This project proposes the inclusion

of lands that are outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR, this constitutes a change in the geographic scope of the PEIR. The lands outside of the mapped treatable acres are essentially identical in character and proposed treatments to lands within the PEIR treatable acres; therefore, the inclusion of these lands within the project will not significantly alter post-fire risk of flooding or landslide. The following SPRs are proposed: AQ-3, GEO-3, GEO-4, GEO-5, and GEO-8. With adherence to these SPRs Impact WIL-2 is determined to be less than significant.

New Impacts to Wildfire

The project proposes inclusion of lands outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR. The site-specific characteristics of the lands within and outside of the geographic scope of the PEIR are functionally identical. Given that the lands within the project that fall outside of the scope of the PEIR are indistinguishable from areas that fall within the geographic scope and the proposed treatments are identical between the two areas, the impacts to Wildfire Impacts will be identical. No changed conditions to the PEIR occur as the result of including lands outside of the geographic scope; therefore, no new impacts pertaining to Wildfire Impacts will occur.



Contributors

Yolo County Resource Conservation District (Lead Agency)

Heather Nichols	Executive Director
Kate Reza	Program Manager
Bailey Adams	Project Manager

Favero Ranch

Brian Nannini

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Miguel Watson	Battalion Chief
Ian Hosbien	Forestry Assistant II

Jacobszoon & Associates, Inc.

Mark Pugsley	Registered Professional Forester
Seamus Fleming	Registered Professional Forester
Airica Gallaspy	Forestry Technician
Evan Carlson	Wildlife Biologist
Katie Busch	Wildlife Biologist
Alicia Ives Ringstad	Lead Wildlife Biologist

Attachment A – Standard Project Requirements and Mitigation Measures Checklist

Instructions: Review the standard project requirements and mitigation measures and verify that those that are applicable will be implemented. Provide information for each column as follows:

- ▶ **Applicable (Yes/No).** Document whether the SPR or mitigation measure is applicable to the initial treatment and/or treatment maintenance (Yes or No), and whether it is applicable to initial treatment and/or treatment maintenance. The applicability should be substantiated in the Environmental Checklist Discussion.
- ▶ **Timing.** This column identifies the time frame in which the SPR or mitigation measure will be implemented (e.g., prior to treatment, during treatment, etc.).
- ▶ **Implementing Entity.** The implementing entity is the agency or organization responsible for carrying out the requirement. This could include the project proponent’s project manager, a technical specialist (e.g., archeologist or biologist), a vegetation management contractor, a partner agency or organization, or other entities that are primarily responsible for carrying out each project requirement.
- ▶ **Verifying/Monitoring Entity.** The verifying/monitoring entity is the agency or organization responsible for ensuring that the requirement is implemented. The verifying/monitoring entity may be different from the implementing entity.

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

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR AD-5 Maintain Site Cleanliness: If trash receptacles are used on-site, the project proponent will use fully covered trash receptacles with secure lids (wildlife proof) to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverages, and other worker generated miscellaneous trash. Remove all temporary non-biodegradable flagging, trash, debris, and barriers from the project site upon completion of project activities. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During initial treatments and treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AD-6 Public Notifications for Treatment Projects. One to three days prior to the commencement of a treatment activity, the project proponent will post signs in a conspicuous location near the treatment area describing the activity and timing, and requesting persons in the area to contact a designated representative of the project proponent (contact information will be provided with the notice) if they have questions or concerns. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance. Prescribed burning is subject to the additional notification requirements of SPR AD-4.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to any treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AD-7 Provide Information on Proposed, Approved, and Completed Treatment Projects. For any vegetation treatment project using the CalVTP PEIR for CEQA compliance, the project proponent will provide the information listed below to the Board or CAL FIRE during the proposed, approved, and completed stages of the project. The Board or CAL FIRE will make this information available to the public via an online database or other mechanism.</p> <p>Information on proposed projects (PSA in progress):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GIS data that include project location (as a point); ▶ project size (typically acres); ▶ treatment types and activities; and ▶ contact information for a representative of the project proponent. <p>The project proponent will provide information on the proposed project to the Board or CAL FIRE as early as feasible in the planning phase. The project proponent will provide this information to the Board or CAL FIRE with sufficient lead time to allow those agencies to make the information available to the public no later than two weeks prior to project approval. The project proponent may also make information available to the public via other mechanisms (e.g., the proponent’s own website).</p> <p>Information on approved projects (PSA complete):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A completed PSA Environmental Checklist; ▶ A completed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (using Attachment A to the Environmental Checklist); 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatment</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>► GIS data that include a polygon(s) of the project area, showing the extent of each treatment type included in the project (ecological restoration, fuel break, WUI fuel reduction).</p> <p>Information on completed projects:</p> <p>► GIS data that include a polygon(s) of the treated area, showing the extent of each treatment type implemented (ecological restoration, fuel break, WUI fuel reduction)</p> <p>► A post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report) that includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Size of treated area (typically acres); ▪ Treatment types and activities; ▪ Dates of work; ▪ A list of the SPRs and mitigation measures that were implemented ▪ Any explanations regarding implementation if required by SPRs and mitigation measures (e.g., explanation for feasibility determination required by SPR BIO-12; explanation for reduction of a no-disturbance buffer below the general minimum size described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-2b). <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR AD-8 Request Access for Post-Treatment Assessment. For CAL FIRE projects, during contract development, CAL FIRE will include access to the treated area over a prescribed period (usually up to three years) to assess treatment effectiveness in achieving desired fuel conditions and other CalVTP objectives as well as any necessary maintenance, as a contract term for consideration by the landowner. For public landowners, access to the treated area over a prescribed period will be a requirement of the executed contract. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>SPR AD-9: Obtain a Coastal Development Permit for Proposed Treatment Within the Coastal Zone Where Required. When planning a treatment project within the Coastal Zone, the project proponent will contact the local Coastal Commission district office, or applicable local government to determine if the project area is within the jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission, a local government with a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), or both. All treatment projects in the Coastal Zone will be reviewed by the local Coastal Commission district office or local government with a certified LCP (in consultation with the local Coastal Commission district office regarding whether a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) is required). If a CDP is required, the treatment project will be designed to meet the following conditions:</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>i. The treatment project will be designed in compliance with applicable provisions of the Coastal Act that provide substantive performance standards for the protection of potentially affected coastal resources, if the treatment activity will occur within the original jurisdiction of the Commission or an area of a local coastal government without a certified LCP; and</p> <p>ii. The treatment project will be designed in compliance with the applicable provisions of the certified LCP, specifically the substantive performance standards for the protection of potentially affected coastal resources, if the treatment activity will occur within the jurisdiction of a local coastal government with a certified LCP.</p> <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
Aesthetic and Visual Resource Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR AES-1 Vegetation Thinning and Edge Feathering: The project proponent will thin and feather adjacent vegetation to break up or screen linear edges of the clearing and mimic forms of natural clearings as reasonable or appropriate for vegetation conditions. In general, thinning and feathering in irregular patches of varying densities, as well as a gradation of tall to short vegetation at the clearing edge, will achieve a natural transitional appearance. The contrast of a distinct clearing edge will be faded into this transitional band. This SPR only applies to mechanical and manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During initial treatments and treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AES-2 Avoid Staging within Viewsheds: The project proponent will store all treatment-related materials, including vehicles, vegetation treatment debris, and equipment, outside of the viewshed of public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways to the extent feasible. The project proponent will also locate materials staging and storage areas outside of the viewshed of public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways to the extent feasible. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During initial treatments and treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AES-3 Provide Vegetation Screening: The project proponent will preserve sufficient vegetation within, at the edge of, or adjacent to treatment areas to screen views from public trails, parks, recreation areas, and roadways as reasonable or appropriate for vegetation conditions. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Air Quality Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR AQ-1 Comply with Air Quality Regulations: The project proponent will comply with the applicable air quality requirements of air districts within whose jurisdiction the project is located. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During initial treatments and treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AQ-2 Submit Smoke Management Plan: The project proponent will submit a smoke management plan for all prescribed burns to the applicable air district, in accordance with 17 CCR Section 80160. Pursuant to this regulation a smoke management plan will not be required for burns less than 10 acres that also will not be conducted near smoke sensitive areas, unless otherwise directed by the air district. Burning will only be conducted in compliance with the burn authorization program of the applicable air district(s) having jurisdiction over the treatment area. Example of a smoke management plan is in Appendix PD-2. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to conducting prescribed burning during initial treatment or treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AQ-3 Create Burn Plan: The implementing entity will create a burn plan using the CAL FIRE burn plan template for all prescribed burns. The burn plan will include a fire behavior model output of First Order Fire Effects Model and BEHAVE or other fire behavior modeling simulation and that is performed by a qualified fire behavior technical specialist that predicts fire behavior, calculates consumption of fuels, tree mortality, predicted emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and soil heating. The implementing entity will minimize soil burn severity from broadcast burning to reduce the potential for runoff and soil erosion. The burn plan will be created with input from a qualified technician or certified State burn boss. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to conducting prescribed burning during initial treatment or treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR AQ-4 Minimize Dust: To minimize dust during treatment activities, the project proponent will implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Limit the speed of vehicles and equipment traveling on unpaved areas to 15 miles per hour to reduce fugitive dust emissions, in accordance with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Fugitive Dust protocol. ▶ If road use creates excessive dust, the project proponent will wet appurtenant, unpaved, dirt roads using water trucks or treat roads with a non-toxic chemical dust suppressant (e.g., emulsion polymers, organic material) during dry, dusty conditions. Any dust suppressant product used will be environmentally benign (i.e., non-toxic to plants and will not negatively impact water quality) and its use will not be prohibited by ARB, EPA, or the 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During initial treatments and treatment maintenance</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project proponent will not over-water exposed areas such that the water results in runoff. The type of dust suppression method will be selected by the project proponent based on soil, traffic, site-specific conditions, and air quality regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Remove visible dust, silt, or mud tracked-out on to public paved roadways where sufficient water supplies and access to water is available. The project proponent will remove dust, silt, and mud from vehicles at the conclusion of each workday, or at a minimum of every 24 hours for continuous treatment activities, in accordance with Vehicle Code Section 23113. ▶ Suspend ground-disturbing treatment activities, including land clearing and bulldozer lines, when there is visible dust transport (particulate pollution) outside the treatment boundary, if the particulate emissions may “cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any of those persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property,” per Health and Safety Code Section 41700. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR AQ-5 Avoid Naturally Occurring Asbestos: The project proponent will avoid ground-disturbing treatment activities in areas identified as likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) per maps and guidance published by the California Geological Survey, unless an Asbestos Dust Control Plan (17 CCR Section 93105) is prepared and approved by the air district(s) with jurisdiction over the treatment area. Any NOA-related guidance provided by the applicable air district will be followed. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>SPR AQ-6: Prescribed Burn Safety Procedures. Prescribed burns planned and managed by non-CAL FIRE crews will follow all safety procedures required of CAL FIRE crew, including the implementation of an approved Incident Action Plan (IAP). The IAP will include the burn dates; burn hours; weather limitations; the specific burn prescription; a communications plan; a medical plan; a traffic plan; and special instructions such as minimizing smoke impacts to specific local roadways. The IAP will also assign responsibilities for coordination with the appropriate air district, such as conducting onsite briefings, posting notifications, weather monitoring during burning, and other burn related preparations. This SPR applies only to prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to conducting prescribed burning during initial treatment or treatment maintenance</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>N/A</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR CUL-1 Conduct Record Search: An archaeological and historical resource record search will be conducted per the applicable state or local agency procedures. Instead of conducting a new search, the project proponent may use recent record searches containing the treatment area requested by a landowner or other public agency in accordance applicable agency guidance. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Records Search has been conducted and is attached to the PSA</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>SPR CUL-2 Contact Geographically Affiliated Native American Tribes: The project proponent will obtain the latest Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided Native Americans Contact List. Using the appropriate Native Americans Contact List, the project proponent will notify the California Native American Tribes in the counties where the treatment activity is located. The notification will contain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A written description of the treatment location and boundaries. ▶ Brief narrative of the treatment objectives. ▶ A description of the activities used (e.g., prescribed burning, mastication) and associated acreages. ▶ A map of the treatment area at a sufficient scale to indicate the spatial extent of activities. ▶ A request for information regarding potential impacts to cultural resources from the proposed treatment. ▶ A detailed description of the depth of excavation, if ground disturbance is expected. <p>In addition, the project proponent will contact the NAHC for a review of their Sacred Lands File. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Notification has been conducted and letters are attached to PSA</p> <p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR-CUL-3 Pre-field Research: The project proponent will conduct research prior to implementing treatments as part of the cultural resource investigation. The purpose of this research is to properly inform survey design, based on the types of resources likely to be encountered within the treatment area, and to be prepared to interpret, record, and evaluate these findings within the context of local history and prehistory. The qualified archaeologist and/or archaeologically-trained resource professional will review records, study maps, read pertinent ethnographic, archaeological, and historical literature specific to the area being studied, and conduct other tasks to maximize the effectiveness of the survey. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to Initial Treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, archaeological professional</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR CUL-4 Archaeological Surveys: The project proponent will coordinate with an archaeologically-trained resource professional and/or qualified archaeologist to conduct a site-specific survey of the treatment area. The survey methodology (e.g., pedestrian survey, subsurface investigation)</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to Initial Treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

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

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>area, they will similarly be avoided. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR CUL-8 Cultural Resource Training: The project proponent will train all crew members and contractors implementing treatment activities on the protection of sensitive archaeological, historical, or tribal cultural resources. Workers will be trained to halt work if archaeological resources are encountered on a treatment site and the treatment method consists of physical disturbance of land surfaces (e.g., soil disturbance). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, archaeological professional</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>Biological Resources Standard Project Requirements</p>				
<p>SPR BIO-1: Review and Survey Project-Specific Biological Resources. The project proponent will require a qualified RPF or biologist to conduct a data review and reconnaissance-level survey prior to treatment, no more than one year prior to the submittal of the PSA, and no more than one year between completion of the PSA and implementation of the treatment project. The data reviewed will include the biological resources setting, species and sensitive natural communities tables, and habitat information in this PEIR for the ecoregion(s) where the treatment will occur. It will also include review of the best available, current data for the area, including vegetation mapping data, species distribution/range information, CNDDDB, California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, relevant BIOS queries, and relevant general and regional plans. Reconnaissance-level biological surveys will be general surveys that include visual and auditory inspection for biological resources to help determine the environmental setting of a project site. The qualified surveyor will 1.) identify and document sensitive resources, such as riparian or other sensitive habitats, sensitive natural community, wetlands, or wildlife nursery site or habitat (including bird nests), and 2.) assess the suitability of habitat for special-status plant and animal species. The surveyor will also record any incidental wildlife observations. For each treatment project, habitat assessments will be completed at a time of year that is appropriate for identifying habitat and no more than one year prior to the submittal of the PSA, unless it can be demonstrated in the PSA that habitat assessments older than one year remain valid (e.g., site conditions are unchanged and no treatment activity has occurred since the assessment). If more than one year passes between completion of the PSA and initiation of the treatment project, the project proponent will verify the continued accuracy of the PSA prior to beginning the treatment project by reviewing for any data updates and/or visiting the site to verify conditions. Based on the results of the data review and reconnaissance-level survey, the project proponent, in consultation with a qualified RPF or biologist, will determine which one of the following best characterizes the treatment:</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>1. Suitable Habitat Is Present but Adverse Effects Can Be Clearly Avoided. If, based on the data review and reconnaissance-level survey, the qualified RPF or biologist determines that suitable habitat for sensitive biological resources is present but adverse effects on the suitable habitat can clearly be avoided through one of the following methods, the avoidance mechanism will be implemented prior to initiating treatment and will remain in effect throughout the treatment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. by physically avoiding the suitable habitat, or b. by conducting treatment outside of the season when a sensitive resource could be present within the suitable habitat or outside the season of sensitivity (e.g., outside of special-status bird nesting season, during dormant season of sensitive annual or geophytic plant species, or outside of maternity and rearing season at wildlife nursery sites). <p>Physical avoidance will include flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway) to delineate the boundary of the avoidance area around the suitable habitat. For physical avoidance, a buffer may be implemented as determined necessary by the qualified RPF or biologist.</p> <p>2. Suitable Habitat is Present and Adverse Effects Cannot Be Clearly Avoided. Further review and surveys will be conducted to determine presence/absence of sensitive biological resources that may be affected, as described in the SPRs below. Further review may include contacting USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, CDFW, CNPS, or local resource agencies as necessary to determine the potential for special-status species or other sensitive biological resources to be affected by the treatment activity. Focused or protocol-level surveys will be conducted as necessary to determine presence/absence. If protocol surveys are conducted, survey procedures will adhere to methodologies approved by resource agencies and the scientific community, such as those that are available on the CDFW webpage at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols. Specific survey requirements are addressed for each resource type in relevant SPRs (e.g., additional survey requirements are presented for special-status plants in SPR BIO-7).</p> <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR BIO-2: Require Biological Resource Training for Workers. The project proponent will require crew members and contractors to receive training from a qualified RPF or biologist prior to beginning a treatment project. The training will describe the appropriate work practices necessary to effectively implement the biological SPRs and mitigation measures and to comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations. The training will include the identification, relevant life history information, and avoidance of pertinent special-status species; identification</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>and avoidance of sensitive natural communities and habitats with the potential to occur in the treatment area; impact minimization procedures; and reporting requirements. The training will instruct workers when it is appropriate to stop work and allow wildlife encountered during treatment activities to leave the area unharmed and when it is necessary to report encounters to a qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will immediately contact CDFW or USFWS, as appropriate, if any wildlife protected by the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) is encountered and cannot leave the site on its own (without being handled). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
Sensitive Natural Communities and Other Sensitive Habitats				
<p>SPR BIO-3: Survey Sensitive Natural Communities and Other Sensitive Habitats. If SPR BIO-1 determines that sensitive natural communities or sensitive habitats may be present and adverse effects cannot be avoided, the project proponent will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ require a qualified RPF or biologist to perform a protocol-level survey following the CDFW “Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities” (current version dated March 20, 2018) of the treatment area prior to the start of treatment activities for sensitive natural communities and sensitive habitats. Sensitive natural communities will be identified using the best means possible, including keying them out using the most current edition of <i>A Manual of California Vegetation</i> (including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/), or referring to relevant reports (e.g., reports found on the VegCAMP website). ▶ map and digitally record, using a Global Positioning System (GPS), the limits of any potential sensitive habitat and sensitive natural community identified in the treatment area. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR BIO-4: Design Treatment to Avoid Loss or Degradation of Riparian Habitat Function. Project proponents, in consultation with a qualified RPF or qualified biologist, will design treatments in riparian habitats to retain or improve habitat functions by implementing the following within riparian habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Retain at least 75 percent of the overstory and 50 percent of the understory canopy of native riparian vegetation within the limits of riparian habitat identified and mapped during surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-3. Native riparian vegetation will be retained in a well-distributed multi-storied stand composed of a diversity of species similar to that found before the start of treatment activities. 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Treatments will be limited to removal of uncharacteristic fuel loads (e.g., removing dead or dying vegetation), trimming/limbing of woody species as necessary to reduce ladder fuels, and select thinning of vegetation to restore densities that are characteristic of healthy stands of the riparian vegetation types characteristic of the region. This includes hand removal (or mechanized removal where topography allows) of dead or dying riparian trees and shrubs, invasive plant removal, selective thinning, and removal of encroaching upland species. ▶ Removal of large, native riparian hardwood trees (e.g., willow, ash, maple, oak, alder, sycamore, cottonwood) will be minimized to the extent feasible and 75 percent of the pretreatment native riparian hardwood tree canopy will be retained. Because tree size varies depending on vegetation type present and site conditions, the tree size retention parameter will be determined on a site-specific basis depending on vegetation type present and setting; however, live, healthy, native trees that are considered large for that type of tree and large relative to other trees in that location will be retained. A scientifically-based, project-specific explanation substantiating the retention size parameter for native riparian hardwood tree removal will be provided in the Biological Resources Discussion of the PSA. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, erosion potential, suitability of wildlife habitat, presence of sufficient seed trees, light availability, and changes in stream shading may inform the tree size retention requirements. ▶ Removed trees will be felled away from adjacent streams or waterbodies and piled outside of the riparian vegetation zone (unless there is an ecological reason to do otherwise that is approved by applicable regulatory agencies, such as adding large woody material to a stream to enhance fish habitat, e.g., see Accelerated Wood Recruitment and Timber Operations: Process Guidance from the California Timber Harvest Review Team Agencies and National Marine Fisheries Service). ▶ Vegetation removal that could reduce stream shading and increase stream temperatures will be avoided. ▶ Ground disturbance within riparian habitats will be limited to the minimum necessary to implement effective treatments. This will consist of the minimum disturbance area necessary to reduce hazardous fuels and return the riparian community to a natural fire regime (i.e., Condition Class 1) considering historic fire return intervals, climate change, and land use constraints. ▶ Only hand application of herbicides approved for use in aquatic environments will be allowed and only during low-flow periods or when seasonal streams are dry. ▶ The project proponent will notify CDFW when required by California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 prior to implementing any treatment activities in riparian habitats. 				

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

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

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>minimum 35 percent relative cover retention include but are not limited to soil moisture requirements, increased soil temperatures, changes in light/shading, presence of sufficient seed plants and nurse plants, erosion potential, and site hydrology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If the stand within the treatment area consists of multiple age classes, patches representing a range of middle to old age classes will be retained to maintain and improve heterogeneity. <p>These SPR requirements apply to all treatment activities and only the ecosystem restoration treatment type, including treatment maintenance.</p> <p>A determination of compliance with the SB 1260 prohibition of type conversion in chaparral and coastal sage scrub is a statutory issue separate from CEQA compliance that may involve factors additional to the ecological definition and habitat functions presented in the PEIR, such as geographic context. It is beyond the legal scope of the PEIR to define SB 1260 type conversion and statutory compliance. The project proponent, acting as lead agency for the proposed later treatment project, will be responsible for defining type conversion in the context of the project and making the finding that type conversion would not occur, as required by SB 1260. The project proponent will determine its criteria for defining and avoiding type conversion and, in making its findings, may draw upon information presented in this PEIR.</p>				
<p>SPR BIO-6: Prevent Spread of Plant Pathogens. When working in sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, or oak woodlands that are at risk from plant pathogens (e.g., lone chaparral, blue oak woodland), the project proponent will implement the following best management practices to prevent the spread of <i>Phytophthora</i> and other plant pathogens (e.g., pitch canker (<i>Fusarium</i>), goldspotted oak borer, shot hole borer, bark beetle):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ clean and sanitize vehicles, equipment, tools, footwear, and clothes before arriving at a treatment site and when leaving a contaminated site, or a site in a county where contamination is a risk; ▶ include training on <i>Phytophthora</i> diseases and other plant pathogens in the worker awareness training; ▶ minimize soil disturbance as much as possible by limiting the number of vehicles, avoiding off-road travel as much as possible, and limiting use of mechanized equipment; ▶ minimize movement of soil and plant material within the site, especially between areas with high and low risk of contamination; ▶ clean soil and debris from equipment and sanitize hand tools, buckets, gloves, and footwear when moving from high risk to low risk areas or between widely separated portions of a treatment area; and ▶ follow the procedures listed in Guidance for plant pathogen prevention when working at contaminated restoration sites or with rare plants and sensitive habitat (Working Group for <i>Phytoptheras</i> in Native Habitats 2016). 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to, during, and following treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
Special-Status Plants				
<p>SPR BIO-7: Survey for Special-Status Plants. If SPR BIO-1 determines that suitable habitat for special-status plant species is present and cannot be avoided, the project proponent will require a qualified RPF or botanist to conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plant species with the potential to be affected by a treatment prior to initiation of the treatment. The survey will follow the methods in the current version of CDFW’s “Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities.”</p> <p>Surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status plant species will be conducted in suitable habitat that could be affected by the treatment and timed to coincide with the blooming or other appropriate phenological period of the target species (as determined by a qualified RPF or botanist), or all species in the same genus as the target species will be assumed to be special-status.</p> <p>If potentially occurring special-status plants are listed under CESA or ESA, protocol-level surveys to determine presence/absence of the listed species will be conducted in all circumstances, unless determined otherwise by CDFW or USFWS.</p> <p>For other special-status plants not listed under CESA or ESA, as defined in Section 3.6.1 of this PEIR, surveys will not be required under the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If protocol-level surveys, consisting of at least two survey visits (e.g., early blooming season and later blooming season) during a normal weather year, have been completed in the 5 years before implementation of the treatment project and no special-status plants were found, and no treatment activity has occurred following the protocol-level survey, treatment may proceed without additional plant surveys. ▶ If the target special-status plant species is an herbaceous annual, stump-sprouting, or geophyte species, the treatment may be carried out during the dormant season for that species or when the species has completed its annual lifecycle without conducting presence/absence surveys provided the treatment will not alter habitat or destroy seeds, stumps, or roots, rhizomes, bulbs and other underground parts in a way that would make it unsuitable for the target species to reestablish following treatment. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p> <p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR BIO-8: Identify and Avoid or Minimize Impacts in Coastal Zone ESHAs. When planning a treatment project within the Coastal Zone, the project proponent will, in consultation with the Coastal Commission or a local government with a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) (as applicable), identify the habitat types and species present to determine if the area qualifies as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). If the area is an ESHA, the treatment project may be allowed pursuant to this PEIR, if it meets the following conditions. If a project requires a CDP by the Coastal Commission or a local government with a certified LCP (as applicable), the CDP approval may require modification to these conditions to further avoid and minimize impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The treatment will be designed, in compliance with the Coastal Act or LCP if a site is within a certified LCP area, to protect the habitat function of the affected ESHA, protect habitat values, and prevent loss or type conversion of habitat and vegetation types that define the ESHA, or loss of special-status species that inhabit the ESHA. ▶ Treatment actions will be limited to eradication or control of invasive plants, removal of uncharacteristic fuel loads (e.g., removing dead, diseased, or dying vegetation), trimming/limbing of woody species as necessary to reduce ladder fuels, and select thinning of vegetation to restore densities that are characteristic of healthy stands of the vegetation types present in the ESHA. ▶ A qualified biologist or RPF familiar with the ecology of the treatment area will monitor all treatment activities in ESHAs. ▶ Appropriate no-disturbance buffers will be developed in compliance with the Coastal Act or relevant LCP policies for treatment activities in the vicinity of ESHAs to avoid adverse direct and indirect effects to ESHAs. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
Invasive Plants and Wildlife				
<p>SPR BIO-9: Prevent Spread of Invasive Plants, Noxious Weeds, and Invasive Wildlife. The project proponent will take the following actions to prevent the spread of invasive plants, noxious weeds, and invasive wildlife (e.g., New Zealand mudsnail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ clean clothing, footwear, and equipment used during treatments of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, other debris or seed-bearing material, or water (e.g., rivers, streams, creeks, lakes) before entering the treatment area or when leaving an area with infestations of invasive plants, noxious weeds, or invasive wildlife; ▶ for all heavy equipment and vehicles traveling off road, pressure wash, if feasible, or otherwise appropriately decontaminate equipment at a designated weed-cleaning station prior to entering the treatment area from an area with infestations of invasive plants, 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to, during, and following treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>noxious weeds, or invasive wildlife. Anti-fungal wash agents will be specified if the equipment has been exposed to any pathogen that could affect native species;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ inspect all heavy equipment, vehicles, tools, or other treatment-related materials for sand, mud, or other signs that weed seeds or propagules could be present prior to use in the treatment area. If the equipment is not clean, the qualified RPF or biological technician will deny entry to the work areas; ▶ stage equipment in areas free of invasive plant infestations unless there are no uninfested areas present within a reasonable proximity to the treatment area; ▶ identify significant infestations of invasive plant species (i.e., those rated as invasive by Cal-IPC or designated as noxious weeds by California Department of Food and Agriculture) during reconnaissance-level surveys and target them for removal during treatment activities. Treatment methods will be selected based on the invasive species present and may include herbicide application, manual or mechanical treatments, prescribed burning, and/or herbivory, and will be designed to maximize success in killing or removing the invasive plants and preventing reestablishment based on the life history characteristics of the invasive plant species present. Treatments will be focused on removing invasive plant species that cause ecological harm to native vegetation types, especially those that can alter fire cycles; ▶ treat invasive plant biomass onsite to eliminate seeds and propagules and prevent reestablishment or dispose of invasive plant biomass offsite at an appropriate waste collection facility (if not kept on site); transport invasive plant materials in a closed container or bag to prevent the spread of propagules during transport; and ▶ implement Fire and Fuel Management BMPs outlined in the “Preventing the Spread of Invasive Plants: Best Management Practices for Land Mangers” (Cal-IPC 2012, or current version). <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
Wildlife				
<p>SPR BIO-10: Survey for Special-Status Wildlife and Nursery Sites. If SPR BIO-1 determines that suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species or nurseries of any wildlife species is present and cannot be avoided, the project proponent will require a qualified RPF or biologist to conduct focused or protocol-level surveys for special-status wildlife species or nursery sites (e.g., bat maternity roosts, deer fawning areas, heron or egret rookeries, monarch overwintering sites) with potential to be directly or indirectly affected by a treatment activity. The survey area will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist based on the species and habitats and any recommended buffer distances in agency protocols.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>The qualified RPF or biologist will determine if following an established protocol is required, and the project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding appropriate survey protocols. Unless otherwise specified in a protocol, the survey will be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the beginning of treatment activities. Focused or protocol surveys for a special-status species with potential to occur in the treatment area may not be required if presence of the species is assumed. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR BIO-11. Install Wildlife-Friendly Fencing (Prescribed Herbivory). If temporary fencing is required for prescribed herbivory treatment, a wildlife-friendly fencing design will be used. The project proponent will require a qualified RPF or biologist to review and approve the design before installation to minimize the risk of wildlife entanglement. The fencing design will meet the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Minimize the chance of wildlife entanglement by avoiding barbed wire, loose or broken wires, or any material that could impale or snag a leaping animal; and, if feasible, keeping electric netting-type fencing electrified at all times or laid down while not in use. ▶ Charge temporary electric fencing with intermittent pulse energizers; continuous output fence chargers will not be permitted. ▶ Allow wildlife to jump over easily without injury by installing fencing that can flex as animals pass over it and installing the top wire low enough (no more than approximately 40 inches high on flat ground) to allow adult ungulates to jump over it. The determination of appropriate fence height will consider slope, as steep slopes are more difficult for wildlife to pass. ▶ Be highly visible to birds and mammals by using high-visibility tape or wire, flagging, or other markers. <p>This SPR applies only to prescribed herbivory and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>			
<p>SPR BIO-12. Protect Common Nesting Birds, Including Raptors. The project proponent will schedule treatment activities to avoid the active nesting season of common native bird species, including raptors, that could be present within or adjacent to the treatment site, if feasible. Common native birds are species not otherwise treated as special status in the CalVTP PEIR. The active nesting season will be defined by the qualified RPF or biologist.</p> <p>If active nesting season avoidance is not feasible, a qualified RPF or biologist will conduct a survey for common nesting birds, including raptors. Existing records (e.g., CNDDDB, eBird database, State Wildlife Action Plan) will be reviewed in advance of the survey to identify the common nesting birds, including raptors, that are known to occur in the vicinity of the treatment site. The survey area will encompass reasonably accessible areas of the treatment</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Before and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity; Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>site and the immediately surrounding vicinity viewable from the treatment site. The survey area will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist, based on the potential species in the area, location of suitable nesting habitat, and type of treatment. For vegetation removal or project activities that would occur during the nesting season, the survey will be conducted at a time that balances the effectiveness of detecting nests and the reasonable consideration of potential avoidance strategies. Typically, this timeframe would be up to 3 weeks before treatment. The survey will occur in a single survey period of sufficient duration to reasonably detect nesting birds, including raptors, typically one day for most treatment projects (depending on the size, configuration, and vegetation density in the treatment site), and conducted during the active time of day for target species, typically close to dawn and/or dusk. The survey may be conducted concurrently with other biological surveys, if they are required by other SPRs. Survey methods will be tailored by the qualified RPF or biologist to site and habitat conditions, typically involving walking throughout the survey area, visually searching for nests and birds exhibiting behavior that is typical of breeding (e.g., delivering food).</p> <p>If an active nest is observed (i.e., presence of eggs and/or chicks) or determined to likely be present based on nesting bird behavior, the project proponent will implement a feasible strategy to avoid disturbance of active nests, which may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Establish Buffer. The project proponent will establish a temporary, species-appropriate buffer around the nest sufficient to reasonably expect that breeding would not be disrupted. Treatment activities will be implemented outside of the buffer. The buffer location will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist. Factors to be considered for determining buffer location will include: presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography, nest height above ground, baseline levels of noise and human activity, species sensitivity, and expected treatment activities. Nests of common birds within the buffer need not be monitored during treatment. However, buffers will be maintained until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. ▶ Modify Treatment. The project proponent will modify the treatment in the vicinity of an active nest to avoid disturbance of active nests (e.g., by implementing manual treatment methods, rather than mechanical treatment methods). Treatment modifications will be determined by the project proponent in coordination with the qualified RPF or biologist. ▶ Defer Treatment. The project proponent will defer the timing of treatment in the portion(s) of the treatment site that could disturb the active nest. If this avoidance strategy is implemented, treatment activity will not commence until young fledge or the nest becomes inactive, as determined by the qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician. 				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>Feasible actions will be taken by the project proponent to avoid loss of common native bird nests. The feasibility of implementing the avoidance strategies will be determined by the project proponent based on whether implementation of this SPR will preclude completing the treatment project within the reasonable period of time necessary to meet CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. Considerations may include limitations on the presence of environmental and atmospheric conditions necessary to execute treatment prescriptions (e.g., the limited seasonal windows during which prescribed burning can occur when vegetation moisture, weather, wind, and other physical conditions are suitable). If it is infeasible to avoid loss of common bird nests (not including raptor nests), the project proponent will document the reasons implementation of the avoidance strategies is infeasible in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any change in the feasibility of avoidance strategies from those explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report).</p> <p>The following avoidance strategies may also be considered together with or in lieu of other actions for implementation by a project proponent to avoid disturbance to raptor nests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Monitor Active Raptor Nest During Treatment. A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will monitor an active raptor nest during treatment activities to identify signs of agitation, nest defense, or other behaviors that signal disturbance of the active nest is likely (e.g., standing up from a brooding position, flying off the nest). If breeding raptors are showing signs of nest disturbance, one of the other avoidance strategies (establish buffer, modify treatment or defer treatment) will be implemented or a pause in the treatment activity will occur until the disturbance behavior ceases. ▶ Retention of Raptor Nest Trees. Trees with visible raptor nests, whether occupied or not, will be retained. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resource Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR GEO-1 Suspend Disturbance during Heavy Precipitation: The project proponent will suspend mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and herbicide treatments if the National Weather Service forecast is a “chance” (30 percent or more) of rain within the next 24 hours. Activities that cause mechanical soil disturbance may resume when precipitation stops and soils are no longer saturated (i.e., when soil and/or surface material pore spaces are filled with water to such an extent that runoff is likely to occur). Indicators of saturated soil conditions may include, but are not limited to: (1) areas of ponded water, (2) pumping of fines from the soil or road surfacing, (3) loss of bearing strength resulting in the deflection of soil or road surfaces under a load, such as the creation of wheel ruts, (4) spinning or churning of wheels or tracks</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>that produces a wet slurry, or (5) inadequate traction without blading wet soil or surfacing materials. This SPR applies only to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR GEO-2 Limit High Ground Pressure Vehicles: The project proponent will limit heavy equipment that could cause soil disturbance or compaction to be driven through treatment areas when soils are wet and saturated to avoid compaction and/or damage to soil structure. Saturated soil means that soil and/or surface material pore spaces are filled with water to such an extent that runoff is likely to occur. If use of heavy equipment is required in saturated areas, other measures such as operating on organic debris, using low ground pressure vehicles, or operating on frozen soils/snow covered soils will be implemented to minimize soil compaction. Existing compacted road surfaces are exempted as they are already compacted from use. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR GEO-3 Stabilize Disturbed Soil Areas: The project proponent will stabilize soil disturbed during mechanical, prescribed herbivory treatments, and prescribed burns that result in exposure of bare soil over 50 percent or more of the treatment area with mulch or equivalent immediately after treatment activities, to the maximum extent practicable, to minimize the potential for substantial sediment discharge. If mechanical, prescribed herbivory, or prescribed burn treatment activities could result in substantial sediment discharge from soil disturbed by machinery, animal hooves, or being bare, organic material from mastication or mulch will be incorporated onto at least 75 percent of the disturbed soil surface where the soil erosion hazard is moderate or high, and 50 percent of the disturbed soil surface where soil erosion hazard is low to help prevent erosion. Where slash mulch is used, it will be packed into the ground surface with heavy equipment so that it is sufficiently in contact with the soil surface. This SPR only applies to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and prescribed burns that result in exposure of bare soil over 50 percent of the project area treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Following treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR GEO-4 Erosion Monitoring: The project proponent will inspect treatment areas for the proper implementation of erosion control SPRs and mitigations prior to the rainy season. If erosion control measures are not properly implemented, they will be remediated prior to the first rainfall event per SPR GEO-3 and GEO-8. Additionally, the project proponent will inspect for evidence of erosion after the first large storm or rainfall event (i.e., ≥ 1.5 inches in 24 hours) as soon as is feasible after the event. Any area of erosion that will result in substantial sediment discharge will be remediated within 48 hours per the methods stated in SPRs GEO-3 and GEO-8. This SPR applies only to mechanical, prescribed herbivory, and prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Following treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR GEO-5 Drain Stormwater via Water Breaks: The project proponent will drain compacted and/or bare linear treatment areas capable of generating storm runoff via water breaks using the spacing and erosion control guidelines contained in Sections 914.6, 934.6, and 954.6(c) of the California Forest Practice Rules (February 2019 version). Where waterbreaks cannot effectively disperse surface runoff, including where waterbreaks cause surface run-off to be concentrated on downslopes, other erosion controls will be installed as needed to maintain site productivity by minimizing soil loss. This SPR applies only to mechanical, manual, and prescribed burn treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During and following treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR GEO-6 Minimize Burn Pile Size: The project proponent will not create burn piles that exceed 20 feet in length, width, or diameter, except when on landings, road surfaces, or on contour to minimize the spatial extent of soil damage. In addition, burn piles will not occupy more than 15 percent of the total treatment area (Busse et al. 2014). The project proponent will not locate burn piles in a Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone as defined in SPR HYD-4. This SPR applies to mechanical, manual, and prescribed burning treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR GEO-7 Minimize Erosion: To minimize erosion, the project proponent will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Prohibit use of heavy equipment where any of the following conditions are present: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Slopes steeper than 65 percent. (ii) Slopes steeper than 50 percent where the erosion hazard rating is high or extreme. (iii) Slopes steeper than 50 percent that lead without flattening to sufficiently dissipate water flow and trap sediment before it reaches a watercourse or lake. (2) On slopes between 50 percent and 65 percent where the erosion hazard rating is moderate, and all slope percentages are for average slope steepness based on sample areas that are 20 acres, or less, heavy equipment will be limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Existing tractor roads that do not require reconstruction, or (ii) New tractor roads flagged by the project proponent prior to the treatment activity. (3) Prescribed herbivory treatments will not be used in areas with over 50 percent slope. <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR GEO-8 Steep Slopes: The project proponent will require a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) or licensed geologist to evaluate treatment areas with slopes greater than 50 percent for unstable areas (areas with potential for landslide) and unstable soils (soil with moderate to high erosion hazard). If unstable areas or soils are identified within the treatment area, are unavoidable, and will be potentially directly or indirectly affected by the treatment, a licensed geologist (P.G. or C.E.G.) will determine the potential for landslide, erosion, of other issue related to unstable soils and identity measures (e.g., those in SPR GEO-7) that will be implemented by the project proponent such that substantial erosion or loss of topsoil would not occur. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and WUI fuel reduction, non-shaded fuel breaks, and ecological restoration treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standard Project Requirements</p>				
<p>SPR GHG-1 Contribute to the AB 1504 Carbon Inventory Process: The project proponent of treatment projects subject to the AB 1504 process will provide all necessary data about the treatment that is needed by the U.S. Forest Service and FRAP to fulfill requirements of the AB 1504 carbon inventory, and to aid in the ongoing research about the long-term net change in carbon sequestration resulting from treatment activity. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Hazardous Material and Public Health and Safety Standard Project Requirements</p>				
<p>SPR HAZ-1 Maintain All Equipment: The project proponent will maintain all diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment per manufacturer’s specifications, and in compliance with all state and federal emissions requirements. Maintenance records will be available for verification. Prior to the start of treatment activities, the project proponent will inspect all equipment for leaks and inspect everyday thereafter until equipment is removed from the site. Any equipment found leaking will be promptly removed. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-2 Require Spark Arrestors: The project proponent will require mechanized hand tools to have federal- or state-approved spark arrestors. This SPR applies only to manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-3 Require Fire Extinguishers: The project proponent will require tree cutting crews to carry one fire extinguisher per chainsaw. Each vehicle would be equipped with one long-</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>handled shovel and one axe or Pulaski consistent with PRC Section 4428. This SPR applies only to manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>			
<p>SPR HAZ-4 Prohibit Smoking in Vegetated Areas: The project proponent will require that smoking is only permitted in designated smoking areas barren or cleared to mineral soil at least 3 feet in diameter (PRC Section 4423.4). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-5 Spill Prevention and Response Plan: The project proponent or licensed Pest Control Advisor (PCA) will prepare a Spill Prevention and Response Plan (SPRP) prior to beginning any herbicide treatment activities to provide protection to onsite workers, the public, and the environment from accidental leaks or spills of herbicides, adjuvants, or other potential contaminants. The SPRP will include (but not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ a map that delineates staging areas, and storage, loading, and mixing areas for herbicides; ▶ a list of items required in an onsite spill kit that will be maintained throughout the life of the activity; ▶ procedures for the proper storage, use, and disposal of any herbicides, adjuvants, or other chemicals used in vegetation treatment. <p>This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-6 Comply with Herbicide Application Regulations: The project proponent will coordinate pesticide use with the applicable County Agricultural Commissioner(s), and all required licenses and permits will be obtained prior to herbicide application. The project proponent will prepare all herbicide applications to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Be implemented consistent with recommendations prepared annually by a licensed PCA. ▶ Comply with all appropriate laws and regulations pertaining to the use of pesticides and safety standards for employees and the public, as governed by the EPA, DPR, and applicable local jurisdictions. ▶ Adhere to label directions for application rates and methods, storage, transportation, mixing, container disposal, and weather limitations to application such as wind speed, humidity, temperature, and precipitation. ▶ Be applied by an applicator appropriately licensed by the State. <p>This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR HAZ-7 Triple Rinse Herbicide Containers: The project proponent will triple rinse all herbicide and adjuvant containers with clean water at an approved site, and dispose of rinsate by placing it in the batch tank for application per 3 CCR Section 6684. The project proponent will puncture used containers on the top and bottom to render them unusable, unless said containers are part of a manufacturer’s container recycling program, in which case the manufacturer’s instructions will be followed. Disposal of non-recyclable containers will be at legal dumpsites. Equipment will not be cleaned, and personnel will not be washed in a manner that would allow contaminated water to directly enter any body of water within the treatment area or adjacent watersheds. Disposal of all herbicides will follow label requirements and waste disposal regulations.</p> <p>This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-8 Minimize Herbicide Drift to Public Areas: The project proponent will employ the following herbicide application parameters during herbicide application to minimize drift into public areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ application will cease when weather parameters exceed label specifications or when sustained winds at the site of application exceeds 7 miles per hour (whichever is more conservative); ▶ spray nozzles will be configured to produce the largest appropriate droplet size to minimize drift; ▶ low nozzle pressures (30-70 pounds per square inch) will be utilized to minimize drift; and ▶ spray nozzles will be kept within 24 inches of vegetation during spraying. <p>This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HAZ-9 Notification of Herbicide Use in the Vicinity of Public Areas: For herbicide applications occurring within or adjacent to public recreation areas, residential areas, schools, or any other public areas within 500 feet, the project proponent will post signs at each end of herbicide treatment areas and any intersecting trails notifying the public of the use of herbicides. The signs will include the signal word (i.e., Danger, Warning or Caution), product name, and manufacturer; active ingredient; EPA registration number; target pest; treatment location; date and time of application; restricted entry interval, if applicable per the label requirements; date which notification sign may be removed; and a contact person with a telephone number. Signs will be posted prior to the start of treatment and notification will remain in place for at least 72 hours after treatment ceases. This SPR applies only to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Hydrology and Water Quality Standard Project Requirements

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR HYD-1 Comply with Water Quality Regulations: Project proponents must also conduct proposed vegetation treatments in conformance with appropriate RWQCB timber, vegetation and land disturbance related Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and/or related Conditional Waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements (Waivers), and appropriate Basin Plan Prohibitions. Where these regulatory requirements differ, the most restrictive will apply. If applicable, this includes compliance with the conditions of general waste discharge requirements (WDR) and waste discharge requirement waivers for timber or silviculture activities where these waivers are designed to apply to non-commercial fuel reduction and forest health projects. In general, WDR and Waivers of waste discharge requirements for fuel reduction and forest health activities require that wastes, including but not limited to petroleum products, soil, silt, sand, clay, rock, felled trees, slash, sawdust, bark, ash, and pesticides must not be discharged to surface waters or placed where it may be carried into surface waters; and that Water Board staff must be allowed reasonable access to the property in order to determine compliance with the waiver conditions. The specifications for each WDR and Waiver vary by region. Regions 2 (San Francisco Bay), 4 (Los Angeles), 8 (Santa Ana), and 7 (Colorado River) are highly urban or minimally forested and do not offer WDRs or Waivers for fuel reduction or vegetation management activities. The current applicable WDRs and Waivers for timber and vegetation management activities are included in Appendix HYD-1. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HYD-2 Avoid Construction of New Roads: The project proponent will not construct or reconstruct (i.e., cutting or filling involving less than 50 cubic yards/0.25 linear road miles) any new roads (including temporary roads). This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR HYD-3 Water Quality Protections for Prescribed Herbivory: The project proponent will include the following water quality protections for all prescribed herbivory treatments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Environmentally sensitive areas such as waterbodies, wetlands, or riparian areas will be identified in the treatment prescription and excluded from prescribed herbivory project areas using temporary fencing or active herding. A buffer of approximately 50 feet will be maintained between sensitive and actively grazed areas. ▶ Water will be provided for grazing animals in the form of an on-site stock pond or a portable water source located outside of environmentally sensitive areas. ▶ Treatment prescriptions will be designed to protect soil stability. Grazing animals will be herded out of an area if accelerated soil erosion is observed. <p>This SPR applies to prescribed herbivory treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>			

Standard Project Requirements					Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity																								
<p>SPR HYD-4 Identify and Protect Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones: The project proponent will establish Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones (WLPZs) on either side of watercourses as defined in the table below, which is based on 14 CCR Section 916 .5 of the California Forest Practice Rules (February 2019 version). WLPZ's are classified based on the uses of the stream and the presence of aquatic life. Wider WLPZs are required for steep slopes.</p> <p>Procedures for Determining Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone (WLPZ) widths</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Water Class</th> <th>Class I</th> <th>Class II</th> <th>Class III</th> <th>Class IV</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Water Class Characteristics or Key Indicator Beneficial Use</td> <td>1) Domestic supplies, including springs, on site and/or within 100 feet downstream of the operations area and/or 2) Fish always or seasonally present onsite, includes habitat to sustain fish migration and spawning.</td> <td>1) Fish always or seasonally present offsite within 1000 feet downstream and/or 2) Aquatic habitat for nonfish aquatic species. 3) Excludes Class III waters that are tributary to Class I waters.</td> <td>No aquatic life present, watercourse showing evidence of being capable of sediment transport to Class I and II waters under normal high-water flow conditions after completion of timber operations.</td> <td>Man-made watercourses, usually downstream, established domestic, agricultural, hydroelectric supply or other beneficial use.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">WLPZ Width (ft) – Distance from top of bank to the edge of WLPZ</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>< 30 % Slope</td> <td>75</td> <td>50</td> <td rowspan="3">Sufficient to prevent the degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water. Determined on a site-specific basis.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30-50 % Slope</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>50 % Slope</td> <td>150</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Water Class	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Water Class Characteristics or Key Indicator Beneficial Use	1) Domestic supplies, including springs, on site and/or within 100 feet downstream of the operations area and/or 2) Fish always or seasonally present onsite, includes habitat to sustain fish migration and spawning.	1) Fish always or seasonally present offsite within 1000 feet downstream and/or 2) Aquatic habitat for nonfish aquatic species. 3) Excludes Class III waters that are tributary to Class I waters.	No aquatic life present, watercourse showing evidence of being capable of sediment transport to Class I and II waters under normal high-water flow conditions after completion of timber operations.	Man-made watercourses, usually downstream, established domestic, agricultural, hydroelectric supply or other beneficial use.	WLPZ Width (ft) – Distance from top of bank to the edge of WLPZ				< 30 % Slope	75	50	Sufficient to prevent the degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water. Determined on a site-specific basis.	30-50 % Slope	100	75	>50 % Slope	150	100	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	Prior to and during treatments	CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity	Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity
Water Class	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV																												
Water Class Characteristics or Key Indicator Beneficial Use	1) Domestic supplies, including springs, on site and/or within 100 feet downstream of the operations area and/or 2) Fish always or seasonally present onsite, includes habitat to sustain fish migration and spawning.	1) Fish always or seasonally present offsite within 1000 feet downstream and/or 2) Aquatic habitat for nonfish aquatic species. 3) Excludes Class III waters that are tributary to Class I waters.	No aquatic life present, watercourse showing evidence of being capable of sediment transport to Class I and II waters under normal high-water flow conditions after completion of timber operations.	Man-made watercourses, usually downstream, established domestic, agricultural, hydroelectric supply or other beneficial use.																												
WLPZ Width (ft) – Distance from top of bank to the edge of WLPZ																																
< 30 % Slope	75	50	Sufficient to prevent the degradation of downstream beneficial uses of water. Determined on a site-specific basis.																													
30-50 % Slope	100	75																														
>50 % Slope	150	100																														

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>Source: 14 CCR Section 916.5 [936.5, 956.5] (February 2019 version)</p> <p>The following WLPZ protections will be applied for all treatments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Treatment activities with WLPZs will retain at least 75 percent surface cover and undisturbed area to act as a filter strip for raindrop energy dissipation and for wildlife habitat. If this percentage is reduced a qualified RPF will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the percent surface cover reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced percent as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report). This requirement is based on 14 CCR Section 916.4 [936.4, 956.4] Subsection (b)(6) (February 2019 version) and 14 CCR Section 916.5 (February 2019 version). ▶ Equipment, including tractors and vehicles, must not be driven in wet areas or WLPZs, except over existing roads or watercourse crossings where vehicle tires or tracks remain dry. ▶ Equipment used in vegetation removal operations will not be serviced in WLPZs, within wet meadows or other wet areas, or in locations that would allow grease, oil, or fuel to pass into lakes, watercourses, or wet areas. ▶ WLPZs will be kept free of slash, debris, and other material that harm the beneficial uses of water. Accidental deposits will be removed immediately. ▶ Burn piles will be located outside of WLPZs. ▶ No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within WLPZs however low intensity backing fires may be allowed to enter or spread into WLPZs. ▶ Within Class I and Class II WLPZs, locations where project operations expose a continuous area of mineral soil 800 square feet or larger shall be treated for reduction of soil loss. Treatment shall occur prior to October 15th and disturbances that are created after October 15th shall be treated within 10 days. Stabilization measures shall be selected that will prevent significant movement of soil into water bodies and may include but are not limited to mulching, rip-rap, grass seeding, or chemical soil stabilizers. ▶ Where mineral soil has been exposed by project operations on approaches to watercourse crossings of Class I, II, or III within a WLPZ, the disturbed area shall be stabilized to the extent necessary to prevent the discharge of soil into watercourses or lakes in amounts that would adversely affect the quality and beneficial uses of the watercourse. ▶ Where necessary to protect beneficial uses of water from project operations, protection measures such as seeding, mulching, or replanting shall be used to retain and improve the natural ability of the ground cover within the WLPZ to filter sediment, minimize soil erosion, and stabilize banks of watercourses and lakes. 				

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>► Equipment limitation zones (ELZs) will be designated adjacent to Class III and Class IV watercourses with minimum widths of 25 feet where side-slope is less than 30 percent and 50 feet where side-slope is 30 percent or greater. An RPF will describe the limitations of heavy equipment within the ELZ and, where appropriate, will include additional measures to protect the beneficial uses of water.</p> <p>This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>				
<p>SPR HYD-5 Protect Non-Target Vegetation and Special-status Species from Herbicides: The project proponent will implement the following measures when applying herbicides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► Locate herbicide mixing sites in areas devoid of vegetation and where there is no potential of a spill reaching non-target vegetation or a waterway. ► Use only herbicides labeled for use in aquatic environments when working in riparian habitats or other areas where there is a possibility the herbicide could come into direct contact with water. Only hand application of herbicides will be allowed in riparian habitats and only during low-flow periods or when seasonal streams are dry. ► No terrestrial or aquatic herbicides will be applied within WLPZs of Class I and II watercourses, if feasible. If this is not feasible, hand application of herbicides labeled for use in aquatic environments may be used within the WLPZ provided that the project proponent notifies the applicable regional water quality control board no fewer than 15 days prior to herbicide application. The feasibility of avoiding herbicide application within WLPZ of Class I and II watercourses will be determined by the project proponent and may be based on whether doing so will preclude achieving CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. The reasons for infeasibility will be documented in the PSA. ► No herbicides will be applied within a 50-foot buffer of ESA or CESA listed plant species or within 50 feet of dry vernal pools. ► For spray applications in and adjacent to habitats suitable for special-status species, use herbicides containing dye (registered for aquatic use by DPR, if warranted) to prevent overspray. ► Application will cease when weather parameters exceed label specifications or when sustained winds at the site of application exceeds 7 miles per hour (whichever is more conservative); ► No herbicide will be applied during precipitation events or if precipitation is forecast 24 hours before or after project activities. <p>This SPR applies to herbicide treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR HYD-6 Protect Existing Drainage Systems: If a treatment activity is adjacent to a roadway with stormwater drainage infrastructure, the existing stormwater drainage infrastructure will be marked prior to ground disturbing activities. If a drainage structure or infiltration system is inadvertently disturbed or modified during project activities, the project proponent will coordinate with owner of the system or feature to repair any damage and restore pre-project drainage conditions. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
Noise Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR NOI-1 Limit Heavy Equipment Use to Daytime Hours: The project proponent will require that operation of heavy equipment associated with treatment activities (heavy off-road equipment, tools, and delivery of equipment and materials) will occur during daytime hours if such noise would be audible to receptors (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship). Cities and counties in the treatable landscape typically restrict construction-noise (which would apply to vegetation treatment noise) to particular daytime hours. If the project proponent is subject to local noise ordinance, it will adhere to those to the extent the project is subject to them. If the applicable jurisdiction does not have a noise ordinance or policy restricting the time-of-day when noise-generating activity can occur noise-generating vegetation treatment activity will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday and federal holidays. If the project proponent is not subject to local ordinances (e.g., CAL FIRE), it will adhere to the restrictions stated above or may elect to adhere to the restrictions identified by the local ordinance encompassing the treatment area. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR NOI-2 Equipment Maintenance: The project proponent will require that all powered treatment equipment and power tools will be used and maintained according to manufacturer specifications. All diesel- and gasoline-powered treatment equipment will be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers’ recommendations. This SPR applies to all activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>SPR NOI-3 Engine Shroud Closure: The project proponent will require that engine shrouds be closed during equipment operation. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>SPR NOI-4 Locate Staging Areas Away from Noise-Sensitive Land Uses: The project proponent will locate treatment activities, equipment, and equipment staging areas away from nearby noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship), to the extent feasible, to minimize noise exposure. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>SPR NOI-5 Restrict Equipment Idle Time: The project proponent will require that all motorized equipment be shut down when not in use. Idling of equipment and haul trucks will be limited to 5 minutes. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	During treatments	CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity	Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity
<p>SPR NOI-6 Notify Nearby Off-Site Noise-Sensitive Receptors: For treatment activities utilizing heavy equipment, the project proponent will notify noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., residential land uses, schools, hospitals, places of worship) located within 1,500 feet of the treatment activity. Notification will include anticipated dates and hours during which treatment activities are anticipated to occur and contact information, including a daytime telephone number, of the project representative. Recommendations to assist noise-sensitive land uses in reducing interior noise levels (e.g., closing windows and doors) will also be included in the notification. This SPR applies only to mechanical treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
Recreation Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR REC-1 Notify Recreational Users of Temporary Closures. If a treatment activity would require temporary closure of a public recreation area or facility, the project proponent to will coordinate with the owner/manager of that recreation area or facility. If temporary closure of a recreation area or facility is required, the project proponent will work with the owner/manager to post notifications of the closure at least 2 weeks prior to the commencement of the treatment activities. Additionally, notification of the treatment activity will be provided to the Administrative Officer (or equivalent official responsible for distribution of public information) of the county(ies) in which the affected recreation area or facility is located. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
Transportation Standard Project Requirements				
<p>SPR TRAN-1 Implement Traffic Control during Treatments: Prior to initiating vegetation treatment activities the project proponent will work with the agency(ies) with jurisdiction over affected roadways to determine if a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is needed. A TMP will be</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p>	Prior to and during treatments	CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity	Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity

Standard Project Requirements	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>needed if traffic generated by the project would result in obstructions, hazards, or delays exceeding applicable jurisdictional standards along access routes for individual vegetation treatments. If needed, a TMP will be prepared to provide measures to reduce potential traffic obstructions, hazards, and service level degradation along affected roadway facilities. The scope of the TMP will depend on the type, intensity, and duration of the specific treatment activities under the CalVTP. Measures included in the TMP could include (but are not be limited to) construction signage to provide motorists with notification and information when approaching or traveling along the affected roadway facilities, flaggers for lane closures to provide temporary traffic control along affected roadway facilities, treatment schedule restrictions to avoid seasons or time periods of peak vehicle traffic, haul-trip, delivery, and/or commute time restrictions that would be implemented to avoid peak traffic days and times along affected roadway facilities. If the TMP identifies impacts on transportation facilities outside of the jurisdiction of the project proponent, the TMP will be submitted to the agency with jurisdiction over the affected roadways prior to commencement of vegetation treatment projects. This SPR applies to all treatment activities and treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>			
<p>Smoke generated during prescribed burn operations could potentially affect driver visibility and traffic operations along nearby roadways. Direct smoke impacts to roadway visibility and indirect impacts related to driver distraction will be considered during the planning phase of burning operations. Smoke impacts and smoke management practices specific to traffic operations during prescribed fire operations will be identified and addressed within the TMP. The TMP will include measures to monitor smoke dispersion onto public roadways, and traffic control operations will be initiated in the event burning operations could affect traffic safety along any roadways. This SPR applies only to prescribed burn treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>Public Services and Utilities Standard Project Requirements</p>				
<p>SPR UTIL-1: Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan. For projects requiring the disposal of material outside of the treatment area, the project proponent will prepare an Organic Waste Disposition Plan prior to initiating treatment activities. The Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan will include the amount (e.g., tons) of solid organic waste to be managed onsite (i.e., scattering of wood materials, generating unburned piles, and pile burning) and transported offsite for processing (i.e., biomass power plant, wood product processing facility, composting). If the project proponent intends to transport solid organic waste offsite, the Solid Organic Waste Disposition Plan will clearly identify the location and capacity of the intended processing facility, consistent with local and state regulations to demonstrate that adequate capacity exists to accept the treated materials. This SPR applies only to mechanical and manual treatment activities and all treatment types, including treatment maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
<p>Mitigation Measure AES-3: Conduct Visual Reconnaissance for Non-Shaded Fuel Breaks and Relocate or Feather and Screen Publicly Visible Non-Shaded Fuel Breaks</p> <p>The project proponent will conduct a visual reconnaissance of the treatment area prior to implementing non-shaded fuel breaks to observe the surrounding landscape and determine if public viewing locations, including scenic vistas, public trails, and state scenic highways, have views of the proposed treatment area. If none are identified, the non-shaded fuel break may be implemented without additional visual mitigation.</p> <p>If the project proponent identifies public viewing points, including heavily used scenic vistas, public trails, recreation areas, and state scenic highways with lengthy views (i.e., longer than a few seconds) of a proposed non-shaded fuel break treatment area, the project proponent will, prior to implementation, attempt to identify any feasible change in location of the fuel break to reduce its visibility from public viewpoints. If no feasible location changes exist that would reduce impacts to public viewers and achieve the intended wildfire risk reduction objectives of the proposed non-shaded fuel break, the project proponent will implement, where feasible, a shaded fuel break rather than a non-shaded fuel break, if the shaded fuel break would achieve the intended wildfire risk reduction objectives. With the shaded fuel break, the project proponent will thin and feather adjacent vegetation to break up the linear edges of the fuel break and strategically preserve vegetation at the edge of the fuel break, as feasible, to help screen public views and minimize the contrast between the fuel break and surrounding vegetation.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
Air Quality				
<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement On-Road Vehicle and Off-Road Equipment Exhaust Emission Reduction Techniques</p> <p>Where feasible, project proponents will implement emission reduction techniques to reduce exhaust emissions from off-road equipment. It is acknowledged that due to cost, availability, and the limits of current technology, there may be circumstances where implementation of certain emission reduction techniques will not be feasible. The project proponent will document the emission reduction techniques that will be applied and will explain the reasons other techniques that could reduce emissions are infeasible.</p> <p>Techniques for reducing emissions may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Diesel-powered off-road equipment used in construction will meet EPA’s Tier 4 emission standards as defined in 40 CFR 1039 and comply with the exhaust emission test procedures and provisions of 40 CFR Parts 1065 and 1068. Tier 3 models can be used if a Tier 4 version of the equipment type is not yet produced by manufacturers. This measure 	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>can also be achieved by using battery-electric off-road equipment as it becomes available. Prior to implementation of treatment activities, the project proponent will demonstrate the ability to supply the compliant equipment. A copy of each unit’s certified tier specification or model year specification and operating permit (if applicable) will be available upon request at the time of mobilization of each unit of equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Use renewable diesel fuel in diesel-powered construction equipment. Renewable diesel fuel must meet the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ meet California’s Low Carbon Fuel Standards and be certified by CARB Executive Officer; ▪ be hydrogenation-derived (reaction with hydrogen at high temperatures) from 100 percent biomass material (i.e., non-petroleum sources), such as animal fats and vegetables; ▪ contain no fatty acids or functionalized fatty acid esters; and ▪ have a chemical structure that is identical to petroleum-based diesel and complies with American Society for Testing and Materials D975 requirements for diesel fuels to ensure compatibility with all existing diesel engines. ▶ Electric- and gasoline-powered equipment will be substituted for diesel-powered equipment. ▶ Workers will be encouraged to carpool to work sites, and/or use public transportation for their commutes. ▶ Off-road equipment, diesel trucks, and generators will be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NO_x and PM. 				
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources				
<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Protect Inadvertent Discoveries of Unique Archaeological Resources or Subsurface Historical Resources</p> <p>If any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil (“midden”), that could conceal cultural deposits, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources will be halted and a qualified archaeologist will assess the significance of the find. The qualified archaeologist will work with the project proponent to develop a primary records report that will comply with applicable state or local agency procedures. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, a data recovery plan will be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find constitutes a unique archaeological resource, subsurface historical resource, or tribal cultural resource), the archaeologist will work with the project proponent to develop appropriate procedures to protect the integrity of the resource. Procedures could include preservation in place (which is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>sites), archival research, subsurface testing, or recovery of scientifically consequential information from and about the resource. Any find will be recorded standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) will be submitted to the appropriate regional information center.</p>				
Biological Resources				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Avoid Loss of Special-Status Plants Listed under ESA or CESA If listed plants such as Keck’s checkerbloom (<i>Sidalcea keckii</i>) are determined to be present through application of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-7, the project proponent will avoid and protect these species by establishing a no-disturbance buffer around the area occupied by listed plants and marking the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway), exceptions to this requirement are listed later in this measure. The no-disturbance buffers will generally be a minimum of 50 feet from listed plants, but the size and shape of the buffer zone may be adjusted if a qualified RPF or botanist determines that a smaller buffer will be sufficient to avoid killing or damaging listed plants or that a larger buffer is necessary to sufficiently protect plants from the treatment activity. The appropriate buffer size will be determined based on plant phenology at the time of treatment (e.g., whether the plants are in a dormant, vegetative, or flowering state), the individual species’ vulnerability to the treatment method being used, and environmental conditions and terrain. For example, paint-on or wicking application of herbicides to invasive plants may be implemented within 50 feet of listed plant species without posing a risk, especially if the listed plants are dormant at the time of application. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, changes in light, edge effects, and potential introduction of invasive plants and noxious weeds may inform the determination of buffer width. If a no-disturbance buffer is reduced below 50 feet from a listed plant, a qualified RPF or botanist will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the buffer reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced buffer as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report) with a science-based justification for the deviation. No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within 50 feet of listed plants.</p> <p>For species listed under ESA or CESA, if the project proponent cannot avoid loss by implementing no-disturbance buffers, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.</p> <p>The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist, in consultation with CDFW and USFWS, as appropriate depending on species status and location, that the listed plants would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p> <p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p> <p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>area even though some of the listed plants may be lost during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to listed special-status plants, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to listed plants, no compensatory mitigation for loss of individuals will be required.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Avoid Loss of Special-Status Plants Not Listed Under ESA or CESA</p> <p>If non-listed special-status plant species (i.e., species not listed under ESA or CESA, but meeting the definition of special-status as stated in Section 3.6.1 of the Program EIR) are determined to be present through application of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-7, the project proponent will implement the following measures to avoid loss of individuals and maintain habitat function of occupied habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Physically avoid the area occupied by the special-status plants by establishing a no-disturbance buffer around the area occupied by species and marking the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). The no-disturbance buffers will generally be a minimum of 50 feet from special-status plants, but the size and shape of the buffer zone may be adjusted if a qualified RPF or botanist determines that a smaller buffer will be sufficient to avoid loss of or damaging to special-status plants or that a larger buffer is necessary to sufficiently protect plants from the treatment activity. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer zone will be determined by a qualified RPF or botanist and will depend on plant phenology at the time of treatment (e.g., whether the plants are in a dormant, vegetative, or flowering state), the individual species’ vulnerability to the treatment method being used, and environmental conditions and terrain. Consideration of factors such as site hydrology, changes in light, edge effects, and potential introduction of invasive plants and noxious weeds may inform an appropriate buffer size and shape. ▶ Treatments may be conducted within this buffer if the potentially affected special-status plant species is a geophytic, stump-sprouting, or annual species, and the treatment can be conducted outside of the growing season (e.g., after it has completed its annual life cycle) or during the dormant season using only treatment activities that would not damage the stump, root system or other underground parts of special-status plants or destroy the seedbank. ▶ Treatments will be designed to maintain the function of special-status plant habitat. For example, for a fuel break proposed in treatment areas occupied by special-status plants, if 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>the removal of shade cover would degrade the special-status plant habitat despite the requirement to physically or seasonally avoid the special-status plant itself, habitat function would be diminished and the treatment would need to be modified or precluded from implementation.</p> <p>▶ No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within the special-status plant buffer.</p> <p>A qualified RPF or botanist with knowledge of the special-status plant species habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment would not maintain habitat function of the special-status plant habitat (i.e., the habitat would be rendered unsuitable) or because the loss of special-status plants would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status plant species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status plants would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status plants or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-1c will be implemented.</p> <p>The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist that the special-status plants would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status plants may be killed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to non-listed special-status plants, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status plants, no compensatory mitigation will be required.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Special-Status Plants</p> <p>If significant impacts on listed or non-listed special-status plants cannot feasibly be avoided as specified under the circumstances described under Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and 1b, the project proponent will prepare a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that identifies the residual significant impacts that require compensatory mitigation and describes the compensatory mitigation strategy being implemented and how unavoidable losses of special-status plants will be compensated. The project proponent will consult with CDFW and/or any other applicable responsible agency prior to finalizing the Compensatory Mitigation Plan to satisfy that responsible agency’s requirements (e.g., permits, approvals) within the plan. If the</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments (IF NECESSARY)</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>special-status plant taxa are listed under ESA or CESA, the plan will be submitted to CDFW and/or USFWS (as appropriate) for review and comment.</p> <p>The first priority for compensatory mitigation will be preserving and enhancing existing populations outside of the treatment area in perpetuity, or if that is not an option because existing populations that can be preserved in perpetuity are not available, one of the following mitigation options will be implemented by the project proponent instead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ creating populations on mitigation sites outside of the treatment area through seed collection and dispersal (annual species) or transplantation (perennial species); ▶ purchasing mitigation credits from a CDFW- or USFWS-approved conservation or mitigation bank in sufficient quantities to offset the loss of occupied habitat; and ▶ if the affected special-status plants are not listed under ESA or CESA, compensatory mitigation may include restoring or enhancing degraded habitats so that they are made suitable to support special-status plant species in the future. <p>If relocation efforts are part of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan, the plan will include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor site preparation, installation, long-term protection and management, monitoring and reporting requirements, success criteria, and remedial action responsibilities should the initial effort fail to meet long-term monitoring requirements. The following performance standards will be applied for relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the extent of occupied area will be substantially similar to the affected occupied habitat and will be suitable for self-producing populations. Re-located/re-established populations will be considered suitable for self-producing when: ▶ habitat conditions allow for plants to reestablish annually for a minimum of 5 years with no human intervention, such as supplemental seeding; and ▶ reestablished habitats contain an occupied area comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the region. <p>If preservation of existing populations or creation of new populations is part of the mitigation plan, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a summary of the proposed compensation lands and actions (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement, restoration or enhancement actions), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanisms (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The project proponent will submit evidence that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the project proponent has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory plant populations will be preserved in perpetuity.</p> <p>If mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other offsite conservation measures, the details of these measures will be included in the</p>				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>mitigation plan, including information on responsible parties for long-term management, conservation easement holders, long-term management requirements, funding assurances, and success criteria such as those listed above and other details, as appropriate to target the preservation of long term viable populations.</p> <p>If mitigation includes restoring or enhancing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored habitat.</p> <p>If the loss of occupied habitat cannot be offset (e.g., if preservation of existing populations or creation of new populations through relocation efforts are not available for a certain species), and as a result treatment activities would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of listed plant species, then the treatment will not qualify as within the scope of this PEIR.</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through compliance with permit conditions, or other authorizations obtained by the project proponent (e.g., incidental take permit for state-listed plants), if these requirements are equally or more effective than the mitigation identified above.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2a: Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Listed Wildlife Species and California Fully Protected Species (All Treatment Activities)</p> <p>If California Fully Protected Species or species listed under ESA or CESA are observed during reconnaissance surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1) or focused or protocol-level surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10), the project proponent will avoid adverse effects to the species by implementing the following.</p> <p><u>Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance of Individuals</u></p> <p>The project proponent will implement one of the following 2 measures to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of individuals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Treatment will not be implemented within the occupied habitat such as badger dens. Any treatment activities outside occupied habitat will be a sufficient distance from the occupied habitat such that mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species will not occur, as determined by a qualified RPF or biologist using the most current and commonly-accepted science and considering published agency guidance; OR 2. Treatment will be implemented outside the sensitive period of the species' life history (e.g., outside the breeding or nesting season of special status birds including Swainson's hawk) during which the species may be more susceptible to disturbance, or disturbance could result in loss of eggs or young. If nesting Swainson's Hawk are documented, a 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>suitable buffer will be implemented in consultation with a qualified biologist or work will occur after July 31 or fledglings leave the nest. For species present year-round, CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries will be consulted to determine if there is a period of time within which treatment could occur that would avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For species listed under ESA or CESA, if the project proponent cannot avoid mortality, injury or disturbance by implementing one of the two options listed above, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c. ▶ Injury or mortality of California Fully Protected Species is prohibited pursuant to Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515 of the California Fish and Game Code and will be avoided. <p><u>Maintain Habitat Function</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project proponent will design treatment activities to maintain the habitat function, by implementing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While performing review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10, a qualified RPF or biologist will identify any habitat features that are necessary for survival (e.g., habitat necessary for breeding, foraging, shelter, movement) of the affected wildlife species (e.g., trees with complex structure, trees with large cavities, trees with nesting platforms; dens; tree snags; large raptor nests [including inactive nests]; downed woody debris; food sources). These habitat features will be marked and treatments applied to the features will be designed to minimize or avoid the loss or degradation of suitable habitat for listed species during treatments. Identification and treatment of these features will be based on the life history and habitat requirements of the affected species and the most current, commonly accepted science. ▪ If it is determined during implementation of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10 that listed or fully protected wildlife with specific requirements for high canopy cover (e.g., Humboldt marten, fisher, spotted owl, coastal California gnatcatcher, riparian woodrat) are present within a treatment area, then tree or shrub canopy cover within existing suitable areas will be retained at the percentage preferred by the species (as determined by expert opinion, published habitat association information, or other documented standards that are commonly accepted [e.g., 50 percent for coastal California gnatcatcher]) such that habitat function is maintained. ▶ A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of the impact avoidance measures listed above, the habitat function will remain for the affected species after implementation of the treatment. Because this measure pertains to species listed under CESA or ESA or are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries regarding the determination that habitat function is maintained. If consultation determines that the treatment will not maintain habitat 				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>function for the special-status species, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2b: Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Other Special-Status Wildlife Species (All Treatment Activities) If other special-status wildlife species (i.e., species not listed under CESA or ESA or California Fully Protected, but meeting the definition of special status as stated in Section 3.6.1 of the Program EIR) are observed during reconnaissance surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-1) or focused or protocol-level surveys (conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10), the project proponent will avoid or minimize adverse effects to the species by implementing the following.</p> <p><u>Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance of Individuals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project proponent will implement the following to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of individuals: <p>For all treatment activities except prescribed burning, the project proponent will establish a no-disturbance buffer around occupied sites (e.g., nests, dens, roosts, middens, burrows, nurseries). Buffer size will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist using the most current, commonly accepted science and will consider published agency guidance; however, buffers will generally be a minimum of 100 feet, unless site conditions indicate a smaller buffer would be sufficient for protection or a larger buffer would be needed. Factors to be considered in determining buffer size will include, but not be limited to, the species’ tolerance to disturbance; the presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography; nest height; locations of foraging territory; baseline levels of noise and human activity; and treatment activity. Buffer size may be adjusted if the qualified RPF or biologist determines that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect (i.e., cause mortality, injury, or disturbance to) the species within the nest, den, burrow, or other occupied site. If a no-disturbance buffer is reduced below 100 feet from an occupied site, a qualified RPF or biologist will provide the project proponent with a site- and/or treatment activity-specific explanation for the buffer reduction, which will be included in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any deviation (e.g., further reduction) from the reduced buffer as explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No-disturbance buffers will be marked with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). No activity will occur within the buffer areas until the qualified RPF or biologist has determined that the young have fledged or dispersed; the nest, den, or other occurrence is no longer active; or reducing the buffer would not likely result in disturbance, mortality, or injury. A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will be required to monitor the effectiveness of the no-disturbance buffer around the nest, den, burrow, or other occurrence during treatment. If 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>treatment activities cause agitated behavior of the individual(s), the buffer distance will be increased, or treatment activities modified until the agitated behavior stops. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will have the authority to stop any treatment activities that could result in mortality, injury or disturbance to special-status species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For prescribed burning, the project proponent will implement the treatment outside the sensitive period of the species' life history (e.g., outside the breeding or nesting season) during which the species may be more susceptible to disturbance, or disturbance could result in loss of eggs or young. For species present year-round, the qualified RPF or biologist will determine the period of time within which prescribed burning could occur that will avoid or minimize mortality, injury, or disturbance of the species. The project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding appropriate limited operating periods. <p><u>Maintain Habitat Function</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ For all treatment activities, the project proponent will design treatment activities to maintain the habitat function by implementing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While performing review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10, a qualified RPF or biologist will identify any habitat features that are necessary for survival (e.g., habitat necessary for breeding, foraging, shelter, movement) of the affected wildlife species (e.g., trees with complex structure, trees with large cavities, trees with nesting platforms; tree snags; large raptor nests [including inactive nests]; downed woody debris). These habitat features will be marked and treatments applied to the features will be designed to minimize or avoid the loss or degradation of suitable habitat for listed species during treatments. Identification and treatment of these features will be based on the life history and habitat requirements of the affected species and the most current, commonly accepted science. ▪ If it is determined during implementation of SPR BIO-1 and SPR BIO-10 that special-status wildlife with specific requirements for high canopy cover (e.g., northern goshawk, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare) are present within a treatment area, then tree or shrub canopy cover within existing suitable areas will be retained at the percentage preferred by the species (as determined by expert opinion, published habitat association information, or other documented standards that are commonly accepted) such that the habitat function is maintained. ▶ A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of the impact avoidance measures listed above, the habitat function will remain for the affected species after implementation of the treatment. The qualified RPF or biologist may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding habitat function. 				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status wildlife species habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status wildlife species' habitat or because the loss of special-status wildlife would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status wildlife species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status wildlife would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status wildlife or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented.</p> <p>The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the non-listed special-status wildlife would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status wildlife may be killed, injured, or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to non-listed special-status wildlife, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status wildlife, no compensatory mitigation will be required. The qualified RPF or biologist may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS for technical information regarding the determination that a non-listed special-status species would benefit from the treatment.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2c: Compensate for Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Loss of Habitat Function for Special-Status Wildlife if Applicable (All Treatment Activities)</p> <p>If the provisions of Mitigation Measure BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-2d, BIO-2e, BIO-2f, or BIO-2g cannot be implemented and the project proponent determines that additional mitigation is necessary to reduce significant impacts, the project proponent will compensate for such impacts to species or habitat by acquiring and/or protecting land that provides (or will provide in the case of restoration) habitat function for affected species that is at least equivalent to the habitat function removed or degraded as a result of the treatment. Compensation may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserving existing habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity; this may entail purchasing mitigation credits and/or lands from a CDFW- or USFWS-approved entity in 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments (IF NECESSARY)</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>sufficient quantity to offset the residual significant impacts, generally at a ratio of 1:1 for habitat; and</p> <p>2. Restoring or enhancing existing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area (including decommissioning roads, adding perching structures, removing existing perching structures, or removing existing movement barriers or other existing features that are adversely affecting the species).</p> <p>The project proponent will prepare a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that identifies the residual significant effects that require compensatory mitigation and describes the compensatory mitigation strategy being implemented to reduce residual effects, and:</p> <p>1. For preserving existing habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanisms for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The project proponent will submit evidence that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the project proponent has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory habitat will be preserved in perpetuity.</p> <p>2. For restoring or enhancing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored habitat.</p> <p>Review requirements are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project proponent will consult with CDFW and/or any other applicable responsible agency prior to finalizing the Compensatory Mitigation Plan in order to satisfy that responsible agency's requirements (e.g., permits, approvals) within the plan. ▶ For species listed under ESA or CESA or a California Fully Protected Species, the project proponent will submit the mitigation plan to CDFW and/or USFWS/NOAA Fisheries for review and comment. ▶ For other special-status wildlife species the project proponent may consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding the availability and applicability of compensatory mitigation and other related technical information. <p>Compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through compliance with permit conditions, or other authorizations obtained by the project proponent (e.g., incidental take permit), if these requirements are equally or more effective than the mitigation identified above.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2d: Implement Protective Measures for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (All Treatment Activities)</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>If elderberry shrubs within the documented range of valley elderberry longhorn beetle are identified during review and surveys for SPR BIO-1, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle or likely occupied suitable elderberry habitat (e.g., within riparian, within historic riparian, containing exit holes) is confirmed to be present during protocol-level surveys following the protocol outlined in USFWS Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS 2017) per SPR BIO-10, the following protective measures will be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If elderberry shrubs are 165 feet or more from the treatment area, and treatment activities would not encroach within this distance, direct or indirect impacts are not expected and further mitigation is not required. ▶ If elderberry shrubs are located within 165 feet of the treatment area, the following measures will be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A minimum avoidance area of at least 20 feet from the dripline of each elderberry plant will be fenced or flagged and maintained to avoid direct impacts (e.g., damage to root system) that could damage or kill the plant, with the exception of the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Manual trimming of elderberry shrubs will only occur between November and February and will avoid removal of any branches or stems that are greater than or equal to 1 inch in diameter to avoid and minimize adverse effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle. – Manual or mechanical vegetation treatment within the drip-line of any elderberry shrub will be limited to the season when adults are not active (August - February), will be limited to methods that do not cause ground disturbance, and will avoid damaging the elderberry. ▪ A qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician familiar with valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its life history will monitor the work area to verify the avoidance and minimization measures are implemented. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will have the authority to stop any treatment activities that could result in potential adverse effects to valley elderberry longhorn beetle. <p>If the project proponent cannot implement the measures above to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of VELB or degradation of occupied habitat such that its function would not be maintained, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p>	<p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>		<p>entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2e: Design Treatment to Retain Special-Status Butterfly Host Plants (All Treatment Activities)</p> <p>If federally listed butterflies are identified as occurring or having potential to occur during review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and confirmed during protocol-level surveys per SPR BIO-10, then the following measures will be implemented:</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance:</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Treatment areas within the range of these species will be surveyed for the host plant for each species (Table 3.6-34). ▶ Host plants for federally listed butterflies within the occupied habitat will be marked with high-visibility flagging, fencing, or stakes, and no treatment activities will occur within 10 feet of these plants. ▶ Because prescribed herbivory could result in the indiscriminate removal of the host plants for federally listed butterflies, this treatment type will not be used within occupied habitat of any federally listed butterfly species, unless it is known that the host plant is unpalatable to the herbivore. ▶ Treatment areas that are not occupied but are within the range of the federally listed butterfly will be divided into as many treatment units as feasible such that the entirety of the habitat is not treated within the same year. ▶ Treatments will be conducted in a patchy pattern to the extent feasible in areas that are not occupied but are within the range of the federally listed butterfly, such that the entirety of the habitat is not burned or removed and untreated portions of suitable habitat are retained. <p>If the project proponent cannot implement the measures above to avoid mortality, injury, or disturbance of federally listed butterflies or degradation of occupied habitat (host plants) such that its function would not be maintained, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p> <p>CESA and ESA Listed Species. A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of any feasible impact avoidance measures (potentially including others not listed above), the treatment will result in mortality, injury, or disturbance, or if after implementation of the treatment, habitat function will remain for the affected species. For species listed under CESA or ESA or that are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding this determination. If consultation determines that mortality, injury, or disturbance of listed butterflies or degradation of occupied habitat such that its function would not be maintained would occur, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p> <p>Other Special-status Species. A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status species’ habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA, because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status species’ habitat or because the loss of special-status individuals would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status butterflies would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status</p>	<p>Yes</p>			

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity																				
<p>butterflies or degradation of occupied habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented.</p> <p>The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the special-status butterfly species would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some may be killed, injured or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to special-status butterfly species, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources). If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status butterflies, no compensatory mitigation will be required.</p> <p>Table 3.6-34 Special-status Butterflies and Associated Host Plants</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Butterfly Species</th> <th>Host Plants</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>bay checkerspot butterfly</td> <td>dwarf plantain (<i>Plantago virginica</i>), purple owl's clover (<i>Castilleja exserta</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Behren's silverspot butterfly</td> <td>blue violet (<i>Viola adunca</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Callippe silverspot butterfly</td> <td>California golden violet (<i>Viola pedunculata</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carson wandering skipper</td> <td>salt grass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>El Segundo blue butterfly</td> <td>seacliff buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hermes copper butterfly</td> <td>spiny redberry (<i>Rhamnus crocea</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kern primrose sphinx moth</td> <td>plains evening-primrose (<i>Camissonia contorta</i>), field primrose (<i>Camissonia campestris</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Laguna Mountains skipper</td> <td>Cleveland's horkelia (<i>Horkelia clevelandii</i>), sticky cinquefoil (<i>Dryocallis glandulosa</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lange's metalmark butterfly</td> <td>naked-stemmed buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum nudum</i>)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Butterfly Species	Host Plants	bay checkerspot butterfly	dwarf plantain (<i>Plantago virginica</i>), purple owl's clover (<i>Castilleja exserta</i>)	Behren's silverspot butterfly	blue violet (<i>Viola adunca</i>)	Callippe silverspot butterfly	California golden violet (<i>Viola pedunculata</i>)	Carson wandering skipper	salt grass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>)	El Segundo blue butterfly	seacliff buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>)	Hermes copper butterfly	spiny redberry (<i>Rhamnus crocea</i>)	Kern primrose sphinx moth	plains evening-primrose (<i>Camissonia contorta</i>), field primrose (<i>Camissonia campestris</i>)	Laguna Mountains skipper	Cleveland's horkelia (<i>Horkelia clevelandii</i>), sticky cinquefoil (<i>Dryocallis glandulosa</i>)	Lange's metalmark butterfly	naked-stemmed buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum nudum</i>)				
Butterfly Species	Host Plants																							
bay checkerspot butterfly	dwarf plantain (<i>Plantago virginica</i>), purple owl's clover (<i>Castilleja exserta</i>)																							
Behren's silverspot butterfly	blue violet (<i>Viola adunca</i>)																							
Callippe silverspot butterfly	California golden violet (<i>Viola pedunculata</i>)																							
Carson wandering skipper	salt grass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>)																							
El Segundo blue butterfly	seacliff buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>)																							
Hermes copper butterfly	spiny redberry (<i>Rhamnus crocea</i>)																							
Kern primrose sphinx moth	plains evening-primrose (<i>Camissonia contorta</i>), field primrose (<i>Camissonia campestris</i>)																							
Laguna Mountains skipper	Cleveland's horkelia (<i>Horkelia clevelandii</i>), sticky cinquefoil (<i>Dryocallis glandulosa</i>)																							
Lange's metalmark butterfly	naked-stemmed buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum nudum</i>)																							

Mitigation Measures		Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
lotis blue butterfly	seaside bird's foot trefoil (<i>Hosackia gracilis</i>)				
Mission blue butterfly	lupine (<i>Lupinus</i> spp.)				
Myrtle's silverspot butterfly	blue violet				
Oregon silverspot butterfly	blue violet				
Palos Verdes blue butterfly	Santa Barbara milkvetch (<i>Astragalus trichopodus</i>), common deerweed (<i>Acemison glaber</i>)				
San Bruno elfin butterfly	broadleaf stonecrop (<i>Sedum spathulifolium</i>), manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos</i> spp.), huckleberry (<i>Vaccinium</i> spp.)				
Smith's blue butterfly	seacliff buckwheat, seaside buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum latifolium</i>)				
Quino checkerspot butterfly	dwarf plantain, purple owl's clover				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2f: Avoid Habitat for Special-Status Beetles, Flies, Grasshoppers, and Snails (All Treatment Activities)</p> <p>If treatment activities would occur within the limited range of any state or federally listed beetle, fly, grasshopper, or snail, and these species are identified as occurring or having potential to occur due to the presence of potentially suitable habitat during review and surveys for SPR BIO-1 and surveys for SPR BIO-10, then the following measures will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To avoid and minimize impacts to Mount Hermon June beetle and Zayante band-winged grasshopper, treatment activities will not occur within "Sandhills" habitat in Santa Cruz County, the only suitable habitat for these species. ▶ To avoid and minimize impacts to Casey's June beetle, Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (<i>Rhaphiomidas terminates abdominalis</i>), Delta green ground beetle (<i>Elaphrus virisis</i>), Morro shoulderband snail, Ohlone tiger beetle (<i>Cicindela ohlone</i>), and Trinity bristle snail, 	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>treatment activities will not occur within habitat in the range of these species that is deemed suitable by a qualified RPF or biologist with familiarity of the species.</p> <p>If the project proponent cannot implement the measures above to avoid mortality, injury or disturbance to listed beetles, flies, grasshoppers, and snails, or degradation of suitable habitat such that its function would not be maintained, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2g: Design Treatment to Avoid Mortality, Injury, or Disturbance and Maintain Habitat Function for Special-Status Bumble Bees (All Treatment Activities)</p> <p>If special-status bumble bees are identified as occurring during review and surveys under SPR BIO-1 and confirmed during protocol-level surveys per SPR BIO-10, or if suitable habitat for special-status bumble bees is identified during review and surveys under SPR BIO-1 (e.g., wet meadow, forest meadow, riparian, grassland, or coastal scrub habitat containing sufficient floral resources within the range of the species), then the project proponent will implement the following measures, as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before any prescribed burns, floristic surveys for Crotch’s bumble bees (<i>Bombus crotchii</i>) will be conducted. ▶ Prescribed burning within occupied or suitable habitat for special-status bumble bees will occur from October through February to avoid the bumble bee flight season. ▶ Treatment areas in occupied or suitable habitat will be divided into a sufficient number of treatment units such that the entirety of the habitat is not treated within the same year; the objective of this measure is to provide refuge for special-status bumble bees during treatment activities and temporary retention of suitable floral resources proximate to the treatment area. ▶ Treatments will be conducted in a patchy pattern to the extent feasible in occupied or suitable habitat, such that the entirety of the habitat is not burned or removed and untreated portions of occupied or suitable habitat are retained (e.g., fire breaks will be aligned to allow for areas of unburned floral resources for special-status bumble bees within the treatment area). ▶ Herbicides will not be applied to flowering native plants within occupied or suitable habitat to the extent feasible during the flight season (March through September). <p>CESA and ESA Listed Species. A qualified RPF or biologist will determine if, after implementation of feasible avoidance measures (potentially including others not listed above), the treatment will result in mortality, injury, or disturbance to the species, or if after implementation of the treatment, habitat function will remain for the affected species. For species listed under CESA or ESA or that are fully protected, the qualified RPF or biologist will consult with CDFW and/or USFWS regarding this determination. If consultation determines that mortality, injury, or disturbance of listed bumble bees (in the event the Candidate listing is confirmed) or degradation of occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat such that its</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>function would not be maintained would occur, the project proponent will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c.</p> <p>Other Special-status Species. A qualified RPF or biologist with knowledge of the special-status species’ habitat and life history will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat function of the special-status species’ habitat or because the loss of special-status individuals would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a special-status species. If the project proponent determines the impact on special-status bumble bees would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss of special-status bumble bees or degradation of occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2c will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that the special-status bumble bee species would benefit from treatment in the occupied (or assumed to be occupied) habitat area even though some of the non-listed special-status bumble bees may be killed, injured, or disturbed during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to special-status bumble bee species, the qualified RPF or biologist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the species (or similar species) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to special-status bumble bees, no compensatory mitigation will be required.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2h: Avoid Potential Disease Transmission Between Domestic Livestock and Special-Status Ungulates (Prescribed Herbivory)</p> <p>The project proponent will implement the following measure if treatment activities are planned within the range of desert bighorn sheep, peninsular bighorn sheep, Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep, or pronghorn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Prescribed herbivory activities will be prohibited within a 14-mile buffer around suitable habitat for any species of bighorn sheep within the range of these species consistent with the more stringent recommendations in the Recovery Plan for Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep (USFWS 2007). ▶ Prescribed herbivory activities will be avoided within the range of pronghorn where feasible (where this range does not overlap with the range of any species of bighorn sheep). 	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Design Treatments to Avoid Loss of Sensitive Natural Communities and Oak Woodlands</p> <p>The project proponent will implement the following measures when working in treatment areas that contain sensitive natural communities identified during surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reference the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i>, Appendix 2, Table A2, <i>Fire Characteristics</i> (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities' data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/) or other best available information to determine the natural fire regime of the specific sensitive natural community type (i.e., alliance) present. The condition class and fire return interval departure of the vegetation alliances present will also be determined. ▶ Design treatments in sensitive natural communities and oak woodlands to restore the natural fire regime and return vegetation composition and structure to their natural condition to maintain or improve habitat function of the affected sensitive natural community. Treatments will be designed to replicate the fire regime attributes for the affected sensitive natural community or oak woodland type including seasonality, fire return interval, fire size, spatial complexity, fireline intensity, severity, and fire type as described in <i>Fire in California's Ecosystems</i> (Van Wagtendonk et al. 2018) and the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i> (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities' data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/). Treatments will not be implemented in sensitive natural communities that are within their natural fire return interval (i.e., time since last burn is less than the average time required for that vegetation type to recover from fire) or within Condition Class 1. ▶ To the extent feasible, no fuel breaks will be created in sensitive natural communities with rarity ranks of S1 (critically imperiled) and S2 (imperiled). ▶ To the extent feasible, fuel breaks will not remove more than 20 percent of the native vegetation relative cover from a stand of sensitive natural community vegetation in sensitive natural communities with a rarity rank of S3 (vulnerable) or in oak woodlands. In forest and woodland sensitive natural communities with a rarity rank of S3, and in oak woodlands, only shaded fuel breaks will be installed, and they will not be installed in more than 20 percent of the stand of sensitive natural community or oak woodland vegetation (i.e., if the sensitive natural community covers 100 acres, no more than 20 acres will be converted to create the fuel break). ▶ Use prescribed burning as the primary treatment activity in sensitive natural communities that are fire dependent (e.g., closed-cone forest and woodland alliances, chaparral alliances characterized by fire-stimulated, obligate seeders), to the extent feasible and appropriate based on the fire regime attributes as described in <i>Fire in California's Ecosystems</i> (Van Wagtendonk et al. 2018) and the <i>Manual of California Vegetation</i> 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>(Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/).</p> <p>► Time prescribed herbivory to occur when non-target vegetation is not susceptible to damage (e.g. non-target vegetation is dormant or has completed its reproductive cycle for the year). For example, use herbivores to control invasive plants growing in sensitive habitats or sensitive natural communities when sensitive vegetation is dormant but invasive plants are growing. Timing of herbivory to avoid non-target vegetation will be determined by a qualified botanist, RPF, or biologist based on the specific vegetation alliance being treated, the life forms and life conditions of its characteristic plant species, and the sensitivity of the non-target vegetation to the effects of herbivory.</p> <p>The feasibility of implementing the avoidance measures will be determined by the project proponent based on whether implementation of this mitigation measure will preclude completing the treatment project within the reasonable period of time necessary to meet CalVTP program objectives, including, but not limited to, protection of vulnerable communities. If the avoidance measures are determined by the project proponent to be infeasible, the project proponent will document the reasons implementation of the avoidance strategies are infeasible in the PSA. After completion of the PSA and prior to or during treatment implementation, if there is any change in the feasibility of avoidance strategies from those explained in the PSA, this will be documented in the post-project implementation report (referred to by CAL FIRE as a Completion Report).</p> <p>A qualified RPF or botanist with knowledge of the affected sensitive natural community will review the treatment design and applicable impact minimization measures (potentially including others not listed above) to determine if the anticipated residual effects of the treatment would be significant under CEQA because implementation of the treatment will not maintain habitat functions of the sensitive natural community or oak woodland. If the project proponent determines the impact on sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands would be less than significant, no further mitigation will be required. If the project proponent determines that the loss or degradation of sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands would be significant under CEQA after implementing feasible treatment design alternatives and impact minimization measures, then Mitigation Measure BIO-3b will be implemented. The only exception to this mitigation approach is in cases where it is determined by a qualified RPF or botanist that the sensitive natural community or oak woodland would benefit from treatment in the occupied habitat area even though some loss may occur during treatment activities. For a treatment to be considered beneficial to a sensitive natural community or oak woodland, the qualified RPF or botanist will demonstrate with substantial evidence that habitat function is reasonably expected to improve with implementation of the treatment (e.g., by citing scientific studies demonstrating that the community (or similar community) has benefitted from increased sunlight due to canopy opening, eradication of</p>				

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>invasive species, or otherwise reduced competition for resources), and the substantial evidence will be included in the PSA. If it is determined that treatment activities would be beneficial to sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands, no compensatory mitigation will be required.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Compensate for Loss of Sensitive Natural Communities and Oak Woodlands</p> <p>If significant impacts on sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands cannot feasibly be avoided or reduced as specified under Mitigation Measure BIO-3a, the project proponent will implement the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Compensate for unavoidable losses of sensitive natural community and oak woodland acreage and function by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ restoring sensitive natural community or oak woodland functions and acreage within the treatment area; ▪ restoring degraded sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands outside of the treatment area at a sufficient ratio to offset the loss of acreage and habitat function; or ▪ preserving existing sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands of equal or better value to the sensitive natural community lost through a conservation easement at a sufficient ratio to offset the loss of acreage and habitat function. ▶ The project proponent will prepare a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that identifies the residual significant effects on sensitive natural communities or oak woodlands that require compensatory mitigation and describes the compensatory mitigation strategy being implemented to reduce residual effects, and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For preserving existing habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanism for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The project proponent will submit evidence that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the project proponent has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory habitat will be preserved in perpetuity. 2. For restoring or enhancing habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored or enhanced habitat. 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments (IF NECESSARY)</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>The project proponent will consult with CDFW and/or any other applicable responsible agency prior to finalizing the Compensatory Mitigation Plan in order to satisfy that responsible agency's requirements (e.g., permits, approvals) within the plan.</p>				
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3c: Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Riparian Habitat If, after implementation of SPR BIO-4, impacts to riparian habitat remain significant under CEQA, the project proponent will implement the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Compensate for unavoidable losses of riparian habitat acreage and function by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ restoring riparian habitat functions and acreage within the treatment area; ▪ restoring degraded riparian habitat outside of the treatment area; ▪ purchasing riparian habitat credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank; or ▪ preserving existing riparian habitat of equal or better value to the riparian habitat lost through a conservation easement at a sufficient ratio to offset the loss of riparian habitat function and value. ▶ The project proponent will prepare a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that identifies the residual significant effects on riparian habitat that require compensatory mitigation and describes the compensatory mitigation strategy being implemented to reduce residual effects, and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For preserving existing riparian habitat outside of the treatment area in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanism for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The project proponent will submit evidence that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the project proponent has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory plant populations will be preserved in perpetuity. 2. For restoring or enhancing riparian habitat within the treatment area or outside of the treatment area, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan will include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored or enhanced habitat. <p>The project proponent will consult with CDFW and/or any other applicable responsible agency prior to finalizing the Compensatory Mitigation Plan to satisfy that responsible agency's requirements (e.g., permits, approvals) within the plan. Compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through compliance with permit conditions, or other authorizations obtained by the project proponent (e.g., Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement), if these requirements are equally or more effective than the mitigation identified above.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments (IF NECESSARY)</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Avoid State and Federally Protected Wetlands Impacts to wetlands will be avoided using the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The qualified RPF or biologist will delineate the boundaries of federally protected wetlands according to methods established in the USACE wetlands delineation manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and the appropriate regional supplement for the ecoregion in which the treatment is being implemented. ▶ The qualified RPF or biologist will delineate the boundaries of wetlands that may not meet the definition of waters of the United States, but would qualify as waters of the state, according to the state wetland procedures (California Water Boards 2019 or current procedures). 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A qualified RPF or biologist will establish a buffer around wetlands including vernal pools and mark the buffer boundary with high-visibility flagging, fencing, stakes, or clear, existing landscape demarcations (e.g., edge of a roadway). The buffer will be a minimum width of 25 feet but may be larger if deemed necessary. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer zone will be determined in coordination with the qualified RPF or biologist and will depend on the type of wetland present (e.g., seasonal wetland, wet meadow, freshwater marsh, vernal pool), the timing of treatment (e.g., wet or dry time of year), whether any special-status species such as Western spadefoot and Western pond turtle may occupy the wetland and the species' vulnerability to the treatment activities, environmental conditions and terrain, and the treatment activity being implemented. ▶ A qualified RPF or biological technician will periodically inspect the materials demarcating the buffer to confirm that they are intact and visible, and wetland impacts are being avoided. ▶ Within this buffer, herbicide application is prohibited. ▶ Within this buffer, soil disturbance is prohibited. Accordingly, the following activities are not allowed within the buffer zone: mechanical treatments, prescribed herbivory, equipment and vehicle access or staging. ▶ Only prescribed (broadcast) burning may be implemented in wetland habitats if it is determined by a qualified RPF or biologist that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No special-status species are present in the wetland habitat ▪ The wetland habitat function would be maintained. ▪ The prescribed burn is within the normal fire return interval for the wetland vegetation types present ▪ Fire containment lines and pile burning are prohibited within the buffer ▪ No fire ignition (nor use of associated accelerants) will occur within the wetland buffer 	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Retain Nursery Habitat and Implement Buffers to Avoid Nursery Sites</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p>	<p>Prior to and during treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>The project proponent will implement the following measures while working in treatment areas that contain nursery sites identified in surveys conducted pursuant to SPR BIO-10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Retain Known Nursery Sites. A qualified RPF or biologist will identify the important habitat features of the wildlife nursery and, prior to treatment activities, will mark these features for avoidance and retention during treatment ▶ Establish Avoidance Buffers. The project proponent will establish a non-disturbance buffer around the nursery site if activities are required while the nursery site is active/occupied. The appropriate size and shape of the buffer will be determined by a qualified RPF or biologist, based on potential effects of project-related habitat disturbance, noise, visual disturbance, and other factors. No treatment activity will commence within the buffer area until a qualified RPF or biologist confirms that the nursery site is no longer active/occupied. Monitoring of the effectiveness of the non-disturbance buffer around the nursery site by a qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician during and after treatment activities will be required. If treatment activities cause agitated behavior of the individual(s), the buffer distance will be increased, or treatment activities modified until the agitated behavior stops. The qualified RPF, biologist, or biological technician will have the authority to stop any treatment activities that could result in potential adverse effects to special-status species. 	<p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>		<p>entity, Technical Specialist (Qualified Biologist)</p>	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
<p>Mitigation Measure GHG-2. Implement GHG Emission Reduction Techniques During Prescribed Burns</p> <p>When planning for and conducting a prescribed burn, project proponents implementing a prescribed burn will incorporate feasible methods for reducing GHG emissions, including the following, which are identified in the National Wildfire Coordinating Group Smoke Management Guide for Prescribed Fire (NWCG 2018):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ reduce the total area burned by isolating and leaving large fuels (e.g., large logs, snags) unburned; ▶ reduce the total area burned through mosaic burning; ▶ burn when fuels have a higher fuel moisture content; ▶ reduce fuel loading by removing fuels before ignition. Methods to remove fuels include mechanical treatments, manual treatments, prescribed herbivory, and biomass utilization; and ▶ schedule burns before new fuels appear. <p>As the science evolves, other feasible methods or technologies to sequester carbon could be incorporated, such as conservation burning, a technique for burning woody material that reduces the production of smoke particulates and carbon released into the atmosphere and generates more biochar. Biochar is produced from the material left over after the burn and</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: Yes</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: Yes</p>	<p>During treatments</p>	<p>CAL FIRE, Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>	<p>Yolo County RCD, or other qualified entity</p>

Mitigation Measures	Applicable? (Y/N)	Timing	Implementing Entity	Verifying/Monitoring Entity
<p>spread with compost to increase soil organic matter and soil carbon sequestration. Technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions may also include portable units that perform gasification to produce electricity or pyrolysis that produces biooil that can be used as liquid fuel and/or syngas that can be used to generate electricity. The project proponent will document in the Burn Plan required pursuant to SPR AQ-3 which methods for reducing GHG emissions can feasibly be integrated into the treatment design.</p>				
Hazardous Materials, Public Health and Safety				
<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Identify and Avoid Known Hazardous Waste Sites Prior to the start of vegetation treatment activities requiring soil disturbance (i.e., mechanical treatments) or prescribed burning, CAL FIRE and other project proponents will make reasonable efforts to check with the landowner or other entity with jurisdiction (e.g., California Department of Parks and Recreation) to determine if there are any sites known to have previously used, stored, or disposed of hazardous materials. If it is determined that hazardous materials sites could be located within the boundary of a treatment site, the project proponent will conduct a DTSC EnviroStor web search (https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/) and consult DTSC’s Cortese List to identify any known contamination sites within the project site. If a proposed mechanical treatment or prescribed burn is located on a site included on the DTSC Cortese List as containing potential soil contamination that has not been cleaned up and deemed closed by DTSC, the area will be marked and no prescribed burning or soil disturbing treatment activities will occur within 100 feet of the site boundaries. If it is determined through coordination with landowners or after review of the Cortese List that no potential or known contamination is located on a project site, the project may proceed as planned.</p>	<p>Initial Treatment: No</p> <p>Treatment Maintenance: No</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>