

## **Summary**

### **Introduction**

The Mattole Forest Futures Program has been developed by the Mattole Restoration Council (MRC) to facilitate beneficial forest management in the Mattole River Basin by providing Mattole landowners with an alternative regulatory option whereby they may engage in “light touch” timber harvest that can be approved after simplified agency review. Light touch timber harvest is defined in detail in Chapter 2 but can be summarized here as 1) generally using only selection silviculture, 2) growing larger trees and increasing the proportion of conifer to hardwood stocking, 3) retaining old-growth, 4) maintaining or enhancing late seral conditions, 5) tractor logging restrictions, 6) generous riparian buffers, and 7) road upgrade requirements. By reducing the cost of preparing and filing a Program Timber Harvesting Plan (PTHP), the Program aims to make it feasible for landowners to harvest timber at a lower intensity than if they needed to recover the higher planning costs they would incur under a conventional Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) or Nonindustrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP).

The environmental effects to the Mattole River watershed from Program implementation, as well as from three feasible alternatives to the Program, are analyzed in this Program Timberland Environmental Impact Report (PTEIR). The analysis assesses impacts to land, water, and biological resources of the Mattole basin as they might occur from implementation of the Program or alternatives to the Program, based on several factors, including: skid trail and landing construction; road construction, reconstruction, and maintenance; construction and/or use of stream crossings; prescribed burning; and treatment of slash via mastication, piling and burning, chipping, and other treatments. The Program is designed to be consistent with the requirements of the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (Forest Practice Act), utilizing the PTEIR/PTHP process detailed in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 1092.01-1092.32 of the California Forest Practice Rules (CA FPR) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines. A detailed description of the Program is found in Chapter 2.

### **Program Purpose**

The ultimate purpose of the Mattole Forest Futures Program is to facilitate beneficial forest management practices in the Mattole. Implementing the Program will provide an alternative regulatory pathway for timber harvest approval, containing extensive environmental protection measures which require less analysis (and thus cost less) than more intensive actions allowed under the California Forest Practice Rules (FPR). Landowners who agree to engage in “light touch” timber harvest may tier to this watershed-wide environmental review of the impacts of these specific practices, greatly simplifying the plan preparation process on most private parcels.

### **Use of EIR**

A PTEIR is prepared by a timberland owner or group of timberland owners and submitted to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) for a program or series of actions that can be characterized as one large project, which in this case is the ongoing

management of timberlands, including timber operations and related land management practices, on multiple ownerships [see the Forest Practice Rules (14 CCR 1092.01) for information on PTEIR content and intent] in the Mattole Basin. This PTEIR analyzes the Program's proposed "light touch" practices in detail, and once certified by CAL FIRE, landowners in the Program area may implement such practices by filing a PTHP with CAL FIRE. Program EIRs generally analyze broad environmental effects of a particular program, with the acknowledgment that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects or portions of the program (see California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15168).

This PTEIR, like other EIRs (and program EIRs), documents the environmental impacts of the Proposed Program and alternatives to the Proposed Program in order to:

- Inform decision makers and the public about a project's significant environmental effects and ways to enhance or reduce such effects
- Demonstrate to the public that the environment is being protected during Program implementation
- Adopt mitigation measures designed to minimize significant effects
- Ensure political accountability by disclosing to citizens the environmental values held by their elected and appointed public officials

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) applies only to discretionary activities by public agencies that are defined as "projects". A "project" is defined as the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment. (CEQA Guidelines sec. 15378(a); PRC 21065)

A "project" under CEQA is considered to be an activity directly undertaken by a public agency, an activity that is supported, in whole or in part, through public agency contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other assistance from a public agency, or an activity involving the public agency issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by a public agency. CEQA encourages the application of a programmatic approach where a group or series of projects are similar in activities and impacts and where potential impacts can be avoided or mitigated in a similar manner.

As required by regulation, CAL FIRE is the lead agency for this project. The Mattole Restoration Council (MRC) is preparing the PTEIR for CAL FIRE under letter agreement. The PTEIR process and CEQA require the preparation and circulation of a draft PTEIR. The certification of a final PTEIR by the CAL FIRE Director may occur once comments on the draft PTEIR have been addressed and specific findings are made with regard to the potentially significant effects of the project. At the time of Program approval, the lead agency will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (PRC 21081.6; MMRP). The monitoring plan is an important component of the PTEIR process. It ensures that the FPRs and mitigation measures contained in the PTEIR are in fact carried out in future PTHPs tied to the PTEIR.

The Forest Practice Rules require that PTHPs be accompanied by a checklist developed in the PTEIR to determine whether practices within individual PTHPs are within the scope of the analysis of the PTEIR. CAL FIRE will use this checklist as the agency evaluates these

individual projects.

### **How the Proposed Program will be Accomplished**

Critical steps necessary for accomplishment of the proposed Program include:

- Develop a set of Program goals that are realistic, practical, and achievable;
- Conduct public scoping and outreach to adequately inform the community about the project, and incorporate community values and knowledge into the array of practices that will be included in the Program;
- Design and base the Program on an array of forest management practices that are environmentally, economically, technically, scientifically, and socially sound;
- Prepare a PTEIR that can be certified by CAL FIRE;
- Develop a Program-specific checklist to accompany all PTHP filings that is cost-effective to submit and facilitates agency approval;
- Implement the Program land management practices across significant timbered acreage in the basin;
- Verify, through monitoring, that the goals of the Program are being met.

CAL FIRE regulates commercial timber harvesting on non-federal timberlands in California. Harvesting for commercial purposes is defined as: “(1) the cutting or removal of trees which are processed into logs, lumber, or other wood products and offered for sale, barter, exchange, or trade, or; (2) the cutting or removal of trees or other forest products during the conversion of timberlands to land uses other than the growing of timber which are subject to the provisions of Section 4621, including, but not limited to, residential or commercial developments, production of other agricultural crops, recreational developments, ski developments, water development projects, and transportation projects.” (PRC 4527) The Mattole basin is within a state responsibility area where CAL FIRE has wildland fire suppression responsibility. CAL FIRE depends on the voluntary cooperation of private landowners to implement local fuel reduction measures. (For areas immediately around structures, state law PRC 4291 requires fuels management.)

Individual landowners who are interested in harvesting timber and in mitigating environmental impacts from such harvest by complying with the prescribed practices in the proposed Program are key to implementing the Mattole Forest Futures Project. In order to commercially harvest timber, California landowners must obtain approval from CAL FIRE through either:

- A THP (14 CCR 1032)
- An approved Modified THP (14 CCR 1051)
- A NTMP (14 CCR 1090)
- An Emergency Notice (14 CCR 1052)
- A Notice of Conversion Exemption Timber Operations (14 CCR 1104.1)
- A THP exemption (14 CCR 1038)
- An approved Program THP (PTHP) (14 CCR 1092)

PTHPs filed by individual landowners or groups of landowners are tiered to the PTEIR, which analyzes the consequences of the proposed action at the landscape scale. The Program contains

an array of forest management practices developed to be applied and analyzed at the landscape level. Once the PTEIR is certified, individual landowners may, at their discretion, submit a PTHP to CAL FIRE in lieu of a standard THP, and it may be approved by CAL FIRE as long as it is within the scope of the PTEIR. In such a case, landowners are potentially afforded a significantly simplified approval process, including potentially reduced costs for preparation of the PTHP, compared to a THP that is not tiered to the PTEIR. Landowners would still have the option of filing any of the other CAL FIRE permits listed above.

### **Alternatives Analyzed, Including the Proposed Program**

One measure of comparison between alternatives (including the Proposed Program) is acreage of effects, particularly acreage of logging activities. Two measures are utilized in this regard in the PTEIR: the “footprint” landbase, which represents each individual acre of forest land upon which harvest operations are projected to occur, at least once, under activities prescribed under the Program (or alternatives); and the projected total area of logging plans implemented over the 50-year analysis period, which may include multiple entries within the same footprint landbase.

Proposed Program: The Mattole Forest Futures Project: The Program footprint area is estimated at 15,038 acres, and the total logging area over the 50-year analysis period at 41,718 acres.

The Program encourages landowners who are interested in timber harvest to opt for long-term, sustainable timber management practices on their properties. Stands brought under sustainable management as envisioned in the Program are expected to produce timber in approximately 15-20 year re-entry cycles, with increasing inventory and growth over time as stands are managed for larger, more mature trees.

Under the Program, private forest landowners within the Program area would implement a range of treatments designed to improve forest conditions in the Mattole basin. These treatments would vary depending on existing vegetation, slope stability, and proximity to streams or improvements. The range of permitted prescriptions under the Program is limited to those that are considered “light touch”. Intensive silvicultural systems such as Clearcut, Rehabilitation, Variable Retention, Shelterwood (all steps) and Seed Tree (all steps), are not included in the range of acceptable prescriptions. Three standard prescriptions: Selection, Group Selection, and Commercial Thinning (as described in Section 913.2 & 3 of the Forest Practice Rules (FPR)), are considered suitably “light touch”, once appropriate “sideboards” particular to this Program are added. Aside from these three standard prescriptions, the Program also includes an Alternative Prescription customized to the forest conditions of the Mattole that is termed the All-Aged prescription. These prescriptions are described in detail in Chapter 2 of the PTEIR.

The Program includes special requirements for all included prescriptions, as described in Section 2.1.A.2 of the PTEIR. These include provisions for growing larger trees and developing higher conifer densities over time, special requirements for stocking standards under the All-Aged prescription, and development of stand tables by the Plan Preparer that must be presented during filing of a PTHP. The Program also specifies particular restrictions on logging methods, upgrades to culverts and roadways, avoidance and protection of unstable geological features, restrictions on operations during wet conditions, and limits on new road construction.

Geological Checklists are utilized under the Program to evaluate needs for protection of geological features, application of operational constraints, and consultation with a Registered Geologist.

The Program does not allow for the use of silvicultural herbicides during the term of the PTHP nor the harvest of old growth trees (>150 years old). Standard Watercourse and Lake Protection buffer widths apply to areas harvested under the Program, but with increased retention requirements.

Standard CA Forest Practice requirements, such as completion of an Archaeological Reconnaissance Report, implementation of T&E species protocols and practices and standards for Sudden Oak Death, and preparation of an Erosion Control Plan apply as in standard timber harvest plans.

Alternative 1: No Program. Under the No Program alternative, the Program/PTEIR/PTHP process would not be used to implement commercial timber harvest in the Mattole. The process used to estimate acres of harvest under Alternative 1 is described in detail in Section 2.4 of the PTEIR. The footprint harvest area for Alternative 1 is estimated at 14,715 acres and the total logging area over the 50-year analysis period is estimated at 24,051 acres.

Alternative 2: Broader Buffers While Allowing Even-Aged Management: Alternative 2 increases the size of stream buffers, disallows harvest on extreme erosion hazard-rated soils and within inner gorges, and places additional limits on road building; in return, even-aged prescriptions are allowed outside of no-harvest areas. The footprint harvest area for Alternative 1 is estimated at 15,157 acres and the total logging area over the 50-year analysis period is estimated at 28,157 acres.

Alternative 3: Fire and Fuels Alternative: Alternative 3 includes treatments similar to the Program but requires retention of at least 60% canopy cover in all harvested areas in order to maintain shaded conditions, and additional reduction of logging slash in areas at risk from wildfire; but allows for limited harvest within some riparian buffer zones as a method of reducing fire hazard. The footprint harvest area for Alternative 1 is estimated at 20,228 acres and the total logging acres over the 50-year analysis period is estimated at 21,889 acres.

Table S-1 shows the acres by silvicultural treatment for the Program and Alternatives.

<b>Table S-1</b>					
<b>Comparison Of Treatment Acreages by Prescription by Alternative</b>					
<b>Alternative</b>	<b>ACRES BY PRESCRIPTION TYPE</b>				
	<b>All-Aged</b>	<b>Program Selection, Group Selection, Commercial Thinning<sup>1/</sup></b>	<b>FPR Uneven-aged<sup>2/</sup></b>	<b>FPR Even-Aged<sup>3/</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>
Proposed Program	12,766	28,952 <sup>1/</sup>			41,718
ALT. 1	0	0	16,836	7,215	24,051
ALT. 2	0	0	19,710	8,447 <sup>4/</sup>	28,157
ALT. 3	8,328	18,561			26,889

<sup>1/</sup> Prescriptions as defined in the Proposed Project, with additional restrictions over and above FPR requirements for these prescriptions.

<sup>2/</sup> Includes Selection, Group Selection, and Commercial Thinning as defined in the Forest Practice Rules.

<sup>3/</sup> Includes all FPR prescriptions except those listed under FPR selection.

<sup>4/</sup> In Alternative 2, clearcut prescriptions are limited to 10 acres, seed tree and shelterwood to 40 acres; no acreage limit on other even-aged prescriptions.

Table S-2 shows the footprint and total acreage for the Proposed Program and the Alternatives.

<b>Table S-2</b>				
<b>Comparison Of Footprint and Total Acreage By Alternative</b>				
	<b>ALTERNATIVE</b>			
	<b>Proposed Program</b>	<b>Alt. 1: Status Quo</b>	<b>Alt. 2: Broader buffers, even-aged</b>	<b>Alt. 3: Fire and Fuels</b>
<b>Footprint Acreage</b>	<b>15,038</b>	<b>14,715</b>	<b>15,400</b>	<b>10,228</b>
<b>Total Acreage<sup>1/</sup></b>	<b>41,718</b>	<b>24,051</b>	<b>28,157</b>	<b>26,889</b>

<sup>1/</sup> Including multiple entries on same footprint acres over 50 years.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative:** CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e)(2) require a lead agency in an EIR to identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative. For the Mattole PTEIR the Proposed Program is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it treats the most acres with "light touch" prescriptions compared to any of the alternatives and helps to achieve more of the goals identified by the MRC during development of the Program. In addition, overt efforts would be made to bring maturing timber stands under management while incorporating measures to encourage development of mature and late-successional stands, improve stocking of conifers, increase the average size of trees in managed stands, and improve water quality through reduction of controllable sediment sources. The Program encourages attempts to bring hardwood-dominated stands into commercial management through application of special prescriptions, without the use of herbicides or broad-scale clearing of forest stands.

For those utilizing the Program, filing of timber harvest plans would be easier and more cost-effective (for the limited range of prescriptions allowed under the Program) compared to the normal THP submission process. The Program does the most of any of the alternatives to set a course for future forest management in the Mattole Basin that is conservation-oriented but economically viable over the long term.

### **Potentially Significant Impacts Generated During Scoping**

The Program is designed to improve a number of resources within the basin, including improving the drainage of existing haul roads as well as installation of larger culverts, and limiting harvest and expanding requirements for leave trees and residual basal area, measures intended to improve wildlife habitat and accelerate the progression to late-seral characteristics.

However, timber harvest has the potential to significantly impact a number of resources in the watershed. Although the Program is designed to keep these effects within more-than-acceptable limits, they must still be analyzed and evaluated. The following potentially significant impacts that might result from Program implementation were generated during public scoping:

- Landslides resulting from the loss of vegetation
- Impacts to treated areas from wildfire
- Potential for cumulative watershed effects due to timber harvest and road construction
- Impacts to water quality.

The analysis of the environmental impacts that might result from Program implementation on the above issue areas is described in detail in Chapter III; in summary, implementing the Program would have a less-than-significant impact on these issue areas.

### **Environmental Impacts and Mitigations Measures**

Table S-3 below summarizes the environmental impacts and any mitigation measures that were developed during analysis of the Program's effects. There are three levels of significance used in Table S-3 below: Significant and Unavoidable, an impact that exceeds the defined threshold(s) of significance and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures; Less-than-Significant, which is an impact that does not exceed the defined threshold(s) of significance or an impact for which mitigation measure(s) can reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level; and No Impact, which means the project would result in no discernable impact. A complete discussion of each impact and associated mitigation measure is provided in Chapter III, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

<b>TABLE S-3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND DETERMINATIONS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>		
<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Level of Significance (After Mitigation Measure)</b>
<b>Air Quality</b>		
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people;	None Recommended	No Impact
f. Otherwise degrade the atmospheric environment; or	None Recommended	No Impact
g. Expose workers or the public to hazardous toxic emissions or substantial pollutant concentrations.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Aquatic Resources Including Fish and Amphibians</b>		
a) Have an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
d) Conflict with any City or County adopted General Plan policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as water quality regulations applicable to a particular stream system;	None Recommended	No Impact
e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
f) Cause a reduction in the quality of water by an increase in sediment, temperature, bacteria, or chemical contamination;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant

g) Modify existing vegetation so as to reduce future critical habitat development, including retention of woody species that will eventually comprise habitat elements;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
h) Adversely or positively affect the input of large wood components into a stream system;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
i) Reduce the quantity of water available to species of concern, by water withdrawal for program-related fire or dust control purposes;	None Recommended	No Impact
j) Cause a decrease in the quantity or quality of botanical or animal food necessary to maintain a healthy and diverse biological component of a water body.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Cultural, Archaeological and Historical Resources</b>		
a) Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines (Bass et al 1999);	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;	None Recommended	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Greenhouse Gases</b>		
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly that conflict with the State goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020, as set forth in AB 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Geology and Soils</b>		
a) Soil erosion rates, loss of topsoil, or soil quality;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Exposure of people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides;	None Recommended	No Impact
c) In a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Program or Alternatives, potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
<b>Noise</b>		
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards; established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;	None Recommended	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground-borne vibration	None Recommended	No Impact

or ground-borne noise levels;		
c) Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the program vicinity (above levels existing without the program);	None Recommended	No Impact
d) Substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the program vicinity (above levels existing without the program).	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
<b>Population and Housing</b>		
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Recreation</b>		
a) Would the program increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	None Recommended	No Impact
b) Does the program include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
a) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;	None Recommended	No Impact
c) Create hazardous emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive receptors (existing or proposed schools, hospitals, assisted living facilities, etc.);	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
d) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving escape of prescribed fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands; or	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
e) Create a public nuisance.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Traffic and Transportation</b>		
a) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
<b>Utilities and Energy</b>		
a.) Cause substantial alterations to water, wastewater, or power systems.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b.) Cause substantial disruption in utility service or access to public facilities.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c.) Cause substantial damage to utilities, utility service or public facilities	None Recommended	Less Than Significant

within the Program area.		
<b>Vegetation</b>		
a) Have an adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status plant species or any of its life forms in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Have an adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Have a substantial adverse impact on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool coastal, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
d) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Visual/Aesthetic Resources</b>		
a) Have an adverse effect on a scenic vista;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
<b>Water Quality</b>		
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted);	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area,	None Recommended	Less Than Significant

including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map;	None Recommended	No Impact
h) Place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows;	None Recommended	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or	None Recommended	No Impact
j) [Cause] Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Wildfire</b>		
a) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
<b>Wildlife</b>		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
b) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;	None Recommended	Less Than Significant
c) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; or	None Recommended	No Impact
d) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.	None Recommended	No Impact
<b>Timberland Resources</b>		
a) Would the program result in a conflict with the Forest Practice Rules, Public Resource Code or other applicable rules and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects relating to Maximum Sustained Productivity of high quality timber products.	None Recommended	Less Than Significant