**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION**
Sonoma-Lake-Napa Unit
1199 Big Tree Road
St. Helena CA 94574-9711
Napa County
(707) 967-1400
Website: www.fire.ca.gov

July 14, 2026

Seamus Morrison-Fleming
117 Clara Avenue
Ukiah, CA 95482

# PREHARVEST INSPECTION REPORT

Harvest Document: **1-26-00076-SON**
Plan Name: **Little Pepperwood THP**
Preharvest Inspection Date(s): **07/09/2026**
Preharvest Inspection Number: **1**
CAL FIRE Inspector Name: **Tim Holliday**

CAL FIRE Field Hours: **10**
CAL FIRE Office Hours: **20**

Previous Inspection Dates:**07/09/2026**

Additional Inspector notes (weather factors, access issues, incidents on PHI, etc.):

**A preharvest Inspection (PHI) was made on the site of the proposed harvest area. Provisions of the proposed Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) have been evaluated for their compliance with the Rules and Regulations of the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulation (14 CCR) and Public Resources Code (PRC), pursuant to the Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973. The following is a summary of the observations, evaluations and recommendations made during the inspection.**

## Field Attendees

| Agency or Affiliation | Representative | Provide PHI Report | Provide Recommendations | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CGS | Hillary Adam | x | x | |
| CDFW | Kristin Garrison | x | x | |
| WQ | David Fowler | x | x | |
| Other | Olivia Hess | | | Redwood Empire Forestry Technician |
| Other | Mark Pugsley | | | GRT |
| Other | Luke Smith | | | Redwood Empire Forestry Technician |
| Other | Tomas Zavala | | | Jacobszoon and Associates RPF designee |
| Other | Seamus Morrison Flemming | | | Jacobszoon and Associates RPF |

## NOTICING

1. Did PHI scheduling require a mutually agreeable extension from the initial 10-day period from filing? [ref. 14 CCR § 1037 & PRC 4604] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

2. List any mutually agreeable representatives who did not attend the PHI:

3. Was the Notice of Intent posted at a conspicuous location on the public road nearest the Plan on colored paper or identified with colored flagging? [ref. 14 CCR § 1032.7(h)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **The NOI was observed during the PHI and clearly posted along Gualala Road 501.**

4 Does the Notice of Intent accurately describe the responsible parties of the Plan, legal description, nearest community or landmark, nearest perennial watercourse, acres to harvest, proposed silviculture and the requirements of 14 CCR § 1032.7(d)(1)-(10) and in accordance with County Rules under 14 CCR § 924.1, 925.2, & 926.3? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

5. Is the proposed Plan outside of the boundaries of any active Plan for any part of the plan area for which a Report of Satisfactory Stocking has not been issued? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(j)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

---

**PROJECT AND TIMBER STAND DESCRIPTION**

6. Does the Plan accurately disclose the responsible parties of the Plan and their contact information? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(a)-(f)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

7. Is the location and acres of proposed Timber Operations accurately described? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(g)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

8. Has the Plan accurately described the physical conditions at the Plan site including soils and topography information, vegetation and stand conditions, and watershed and Stream conditions? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(gg)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

9. Was the Plan and timber stand information visually verified by the Inspector? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

10. Have timber site classes been accurately identified and located for the determination of stocking standards to be applied, down to at least a 20-acre minimum or as specified in the district Rules (considering regeneration method limitations and differences in minimum stocking requirements)? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(x)(12)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

11. Has the Erosion Hazard Rating (EHR) been correctly calculated and mapped to ensure proper waterbreak spacing? [ref. 14 CCR § 914.6 [934.6, 954.6](e)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **During the PHI, there was agency discussion at Map Point 14.1 to enhance the proposed waterbars from the standard FPRs. See WQ PHI report.**

12. Are the Plan maps and associated diagrams accurate and sufficiently clear to allow for review and implementation of the proposed Timber Operations? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

---

## SILVICULTURE AND REGENERATION METHODS

13. Are the proposed silvicultural methods appropriate for existing timber stand conditions? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

14. Are the proposed Alternative Prescriptions appropriate and do they meet the requirements of 14 CCR § 913.6 [933.6, 956.6](a)-(b)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

15. Is even-aged management proposed? **No**

a. If a "regeneration step" harvest is proposed (Clearcut, Seed Tree Seed Step, Shelterwood Seed Step), will the provisions of 14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1] be met? **NA**

b. If oversized units are proposed for the THP per 14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1] (a)(2), are they appropriate? **NA**

c. Does the plan propose evenaged management units, within an ownership, contiguous to or within 300 feet of another plan with evenaged management units without an approved report of stocking and/or that are not on average at least five feet tall or meet the required time frame for time of establishment, three years [Coast] or five years [Northern and Southern]? [ref 14 CCR § 933.1 (a)(4)] **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **The silviculture proposed is uneven aged management (selection), intermediate treatment (commercial thinning), and special prescription (variable retention).**

16. Will the proposed uneven-aged management prescription establish or maintain an uneven-aged stand structure, with a multi-aged balanced stand to promote the growth of leave trees throughout a broad range of Diameter classes, and encourage natural Reproduction? [ref. 14 CCR § 913.2 [933.2, 953.2]] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **Sample mark was evaluated during the PHI and complies with the FPRs. Selection and commercial thinning sample mark was observed as well as Variable Retention units.**

17. Should the postharvest stand comply with the following:

a. Satisfy minimum stocking requirements with Countable trees? [ref. PRC § 4528(b)] **Yes**

b. Meet the minimum basal area retention standards of 14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1]? **Yes**

c. Contain seed trees of full crown, capable of seed production and representative of the best phenotypes available in the preharvest stand for Seed Tree Seed Step Regeneration? [ref. 14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1](c)(1)(A)(2)] **Yes**

d. Contain well distributed seed trees of desired species which are left singly or in groups to restock the harvested area? [14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1](c)] **Yes**

e. Maintain and improve retained tree species diversity, genetic material and seed production with trees of each native commercial species present at the time of harvest? (in the absences of an MSP plan) [14 CCR § 913.1 [933.1, 953.1](c)(1)(F)] **Yes**

f. Maintain or increase average stand diameter of the residual crop trees, promote timber growth, and/or improve forest health, with the residual stand consisting primarily of healthy and vigorous dominant and codominant trees from the preharvest stand for Commercial thinning treatments? [ref. 14 CCR § 913.3 [933.3, 953.3] (a)] **Yes**

If "No" or proposed regeneration method is for stand health, explain:

Inspector Observations / Comments:

18. If a regeneration and/or site preparation plan has been proposed, should it be sufficient to ensure the following per 14 CCR § 913.4 [933.4, 953.4]:

a. The regeneration of the site? **Yes**

b. Protection of retention elements and maintain ground cover to the extent practicable? **Yes**

c. Provide seedling establishment on the site to encourage long term site occupancy of the regenerated trees? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

19. Was a sample area Marked prior to the PHI? **Yes**
[ref. 14 CCR §§ 913.1 [933.1, 953.1](a)(5), & 913.2 [933.2, 953.2](a)(1), 913.3 [933.3, 953.3] (a)(3) & (b)(3)], & 913.4 [933.4](d)(9) &(f)(4), & 913.6 [933.6, 953.6](d)]

Inspector Observations / Comments:

20. Stands have been Marked as follows:

Cut Tree **x** Leave Tree _ Whole Area _ Marking Waiver _

Inspector Observations:

21. Was the Mark representative and sufficient to evaluate the proposed prescription(s)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

22. Does the proposed prescription of Group B species management maintain relative site occupancy between Group A and Group B species? [ref. 14 CCR § 912.7 [932.7, 952.7](d)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

23. Does the Plan propose Aspen, and Meadows and Wet Areas restoration? [ref. 14 CCR 913.4 [933.4, 953.4](e)] **No**

a. Have each of the project types proposed for treatment been correctly stated? **NA**

b. Are each of the project types being proposed shown on the Plan map, consistent with 14 CCR § 1034(x), and at a scale that shows the locations of planned operations? **NA**

c. Are the descriptions of the extent of the area proposed for harvesting or treatment accurate and consistent with the Plan? **NA**

d. Have the conditions of the treatment been adequately described per the standards of 14 CCR 913.4 [933.4, 953.4](e)(4)(A)-(B)? **NA**

e. Does the Plan state the project goals and measures of success for the treatment? **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

24. Additional comments or general observations regarding silviculture or the timber stand:

---

**MAXIMUM SUSTAINED PRODUCTION OF HIGH QUALITY TIMBER PRODUCTS (MSP)**

25. Does the Plan comply with the goals of 14 CCR § 913.10 [933.10, 953.10] to restore, enhance, and maintain the productivity of California timberlands? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

26. Does the Plan assure that growing stock will be harvested in a manner which prevents significant delays in reaching or maintaining MSP per 14 CCR § 913 [933, 953](a)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

27. How does the Plan propose to comply with the MSP requirements of 14 CCR § 913.11 [933.11, 953.11]?

Option A _ Option B _ Option C **x** Does not comply _

Inspector Observations / Comments:

28. Are the timber stands accurately described and consistent with those proposed in the Plan, before and after harvesting, including: volume, growth projection, stocking, and species composition for THPs that do not reference an approved Sustained Yield Plan, or do not demonstrate achievement of MSP pursuant to 913.11(c)? [ref. 14 CCR §1034(m)(1)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

29. Additional comments or general observations regarding MSP:

## HARVESTING OPERATIONS

30. Is the proposed yarding type appropriate and has the logging system and equipment to be used been adequately described? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(n)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

31. Are the Alternative Practices proposed by the RPF appropriate on a site-specific basis, and do they achieve environmental protection at least equal to that of the standards of 14 CCR § 914.9 [934.9, 954.9]], and have they been fully explained and justified? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

32. Are the proposed tractor operations and heavy equipment use:

a. Appropriate on slopes >65%, slopes >50% with high or extreme EHR, or slopes >50% that lead without flattening to sufficiently dissipate waterflow and trap sediment before reaching a Watercourse or Lake? [ref. 14 CCR § 914.2 [934.2, 954.2](f)(1)-(2)] **Yes**

b. Adequately mapped and disclosed if proposed on unstable areas, or on areas for which tractor use is proposed beyond the limitations of the standard forest practice Rules? [ref. 14 CCR 1034 (x)(15)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **Exception skid trails proposed in the THP were evaluated during the PHI and comply with the FPRs.**

33. Are the proposed tractor operations appropriate on slopes between 50% - 65% with moderate EHR and are they limited to existing tractor roads that do not require reconstruction, or to new tractor roads which have been mapped and flagged by an RPF or supervised designed prior to the PHI? [ref. 14 CCR § 914.2 [934.2, 954.2](f)(3)(A)-(B)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **Exception skid trails proposed in the THP were evaluated during the PHI and comply with the FPRs.**

34. Are the proposed exceptions to limitations of Tractor Operations appropriate and has the RPF met the standards of 14 CCR § 914.2 [934.2, 954.2](f)(5) with a clear explanation and justification as to why the application of the standard rule is either not feasible, or would otherwise not comply with 14 CCR § 914 [934, 954]? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

35. Have Special Treatment Areas (STAs) been adequately disclosed and do the specific silvicultural and logging practices assure the integrity of any designated historical and archaeological sites and ecological reserves? [ref. 14 CCR § 895.1 and 14 CCR § 913.4 [933.4, 953.4](a)] (STA prescriptions are considered a silviculture to be included in Item #14 of the THP). **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

36. Is ground-based equipment proposed for use in areas designated for Cable Yarding adequately disclosed and documented? [ref. 14 CCR §§ 914.2 [934.2, 954.2](f)(4), & 1034(x)(17)] **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

37. Additional comments or general observations regarding harvesting operations:

## ROADS AND LANDINGS

38. Have all Logging Roads and Landings (including Appurtenant Roads) to be used for, or potentially Impacted by, Timber Operations been adequately located and classified per 14 CCR § 1034(x)(4)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

39. Are proposed Logging Road and Landing construction, reconstruction, and/or abandonment methods, as described in the Plan, flagged or otherwise identified on the ground, and meet the standards of 14 CCR § 923.3 [943.3, 963.3](b)-(c)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

40. Have Logging Road and Landing construction and reconstruction been proposed to hydrologically disconnect from Watercourses and lakes to the extent feasible to minimize sediment delivery from road runoff, and meet the standards of 14 CCR § 923.4 [943.4, 963.4](a)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

41. Additional comments or general observations regarding Logging Roads and Landings: **The road system was evaluated during the PHI. Map points were also evaluated throughout the PHI. See PHI recommendations in this report for recommendations made during the PHI to specific road points. Also see agency PHI reports.**

## WATERCOURSE PROTECTION

42. Have Watercourses and lakes been adequately located, described and classified within the Plan? [ref. 1034(x)(9)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

43. Are proposed Watercourse and lake protection measures adequate for the following? **Yes**

a. Maintenance, protection, and contribution towards the restoration of the quality and beneficial uses of water during the planning, review, and proposed Timber Operations? [ref. 14 CCR § 916 [936, 956](b)] **Yes**

b. To protect and restore native aquatic and Riparian-associated species, the beneficial functions of Riparian zones, and the quality and beneficial uses of water? [ref. 14 CCR § 916 [936, 956](c)] **Yes**

c. Areas near and areas with the potential to directly impact Watercourses and lakes for sensitive conditions as described in 14 CCR § 916.4 [936.4, 956.4](a)(1)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

44. Are the proposed in-lieu or alternative prescriptions appropriate and do they meet the standards of 14 CCR § 916.1 [936.1, 956.1] and 14 CCR § 916.6 [936.6, 956.6]? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

45. Does the Plan sufficiently provide the following for Logging Road crossings? [ref. 14 CCR § 923.9 [943.9, 963.9]] **Yes**

a. Description, design, and correct location? **Yes**

b. Stabilized with treatment to avoid downstream impacts? **Yes**

c. Prescription to protect the integrity of the crossing (e.g. installation of critical dips where diversion potential exists, armoring inlet, outlet and/or fill material etc.)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

46. Are locations of the areas of heavy equipment use in any ELZ clearly described in the plan, or flagged or marked on the ground before the preharvest inspection (including Class III crossings)? [ref. 14 CCR § 916.4 [936.4, 956.4](c)(1)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **The centerline of Class III watercourses were observed during the PHI**

47. Have all domestic water supplies been accurately identified and sufficiently protected per 14 CCR § 1032.10? **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **Item 28 of the THP states that there are no landowners within 1000 feet downstream of the THP boundary.**

48. Additional comments or general observations regarding watercourse protection:

---

## WINTER OPERATIONS

49. If winter operations are proposed, are they appropriate and consistent with the standards of 14 § CCR 914.7 [934.7, 954.7]? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

50. Will the specific measures taken in the winter operating period avoid or substantially lessen erosion, soil movement into Watercourses and soil compaction from Timber Operations? [ref. 14 CCR § 914.7 [934.7, 954.7](b)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

51. Additional comments or general observations regarding winter operations:

---

## GEOLOGY AND EROSION

52. Has the erosion hazard rating for soils within the harvest area been correctly calculated, as outlined in Technical Rule Addendum No. 1? **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

53. Have erosion hazard rating areas been adequately described and located, per 14 CCR § 1034(x)(8)? **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

54. Are the proposed erosion control methods (e.g. waterbreak spacing and/or treatments for exposed soil) adequate to reduce soil loss? [ref. 14 CCR § 923.5 [943.5, 963.5]] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

55. Have any known Unstable Areas or slides been adequately described and located? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(x)(10)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

56. If operations on proposed Unstable Areas are unavoidable, has the RPF developed appropriate specific measures to minimize the effect of operations on slope instability? [ref. 14 CCR § 914.2 [934.2, 954.2](d)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

57. Additional comments or general observations regarding geology or erosion: **Unstable areas described in THP Item 38 were evaluated during the PHI. CGS attended the PHI and also evaluated the unstable areas within the THP units; see CGS PHI report for recommendations.**

---

## HAZARD REDUCTION

58. Does the Plan accurately disclose any current forest insect or disease problems? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034 (v)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

59. Are the proposed Timber Operations planned so as to minimize the build-up of destructive insect populations or the spread of forest diseases with feasible measures to mitigate adverse Impacts from the timber operation.? [ref. 14 CCR § 917.9 [937.9, 957.9] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

60. Will the proposed treatments be sufficient to reduce fire hazard and provide increased protection around structures and along roads considering the areas fire hazard severity rating, fire history, expected fire behavior, and resources at risk? [ref. 14 CCR § 917 [937, 957]] **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

61. If Timber Operations are proposed for the purposes of specifically reducing fire hazard or risk of ignition (fuelbreaks, biomass removal, Modified THP for Fuel Hazard Reduction), do the proposed hazard reduction methods: [ref. 14 CCR §§ 913.4 [933.4. 953.4(c)], & 917.2 [937.2, 957.2] - 917.7 [937.7, 957.7], & 1051.3-1051.7]

a. Include an appropriate description of vegetation, fuel treatment and timing? **Yes**

b. Support the creation of fire resilient conditions? **Yes**

c. Reduce the threat of wildfire by the reduction or spatial rearrangement of surface and ladder fuels? **Yes**

d. Provide thinning to reduce stocking levels and increase vertical and horizontal spacing? **Yes**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

62. Have snags over 20 ft. in height and 16 in. dbh, in the logging area identified to be felled, been evaluated that require felling per 14 CCR § 919.1 [939.1, 959.1](a)? **NA**

Inspector Observations/Comments:

63. Additional comments or general observations regarding hazard reduction:

---

## ARCHAEOLOGY

**NOTE: Archaeological information is confidential and not available to the public or other review agencies. This information is included in the Confidential Archaeological Addendum (CAA) in Section VI of the Plan for CAL FIRE review.**

64. Does the archaeological survey appear to be adequate and appropriate for the area to be harvested? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(s)] **Yes**

Non-confidential Inspector Observations / Comments:

---

## LISTED SPECIES

65. Is the information and description on the presence and protection of known habitat or individuals of any listed or non-listed species which may be significantly impacted by the timber operation appropriate? [ref. 14 CCR § 1034(w)]: **Yes**

Inspector ObservationsComments:

66. Have any required CESA or FESA consultations occurred or have any been planned? **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

67. Is the Plan located within the range of the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO)? [ref. 14 CCR § 919.9 [939.9]] **Yes**

Take avoidance option: "a" _ "b" _ "c" _ "d" **x**

a. Do the NSO habitat definitions (USFWS or FPR) used in the Plan accurately reflect vegetation conditions? **Yes**

b. Are the Plan maps accurately depicting the proposed retained NSO habitat quantities? **Yes**

c. Do the protection measures for the NSO activity center(s) appear adequate and in conformance? **Yes**

d. Is the distribution and location information for the proposed or current NSO call point(s) adequate? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

68. If Late Succession Forest Stands are present and proposed for harvesting, have they been adequately disclosed, and do observations support that harvesting would not significantly reduce the amount and distribution of these stands or their functional wildlife habitat value such that it constitutes a significant adverse impact of the environment as defined in 14 CCR § 895.1? [ref. 14 CCR § 919.16 [939.16, 959.16]] **NA**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

69. Will the post-harvest Mark in the WLPZ create a stand that provides the following:

a. Satisfy all the stocking and retention requirements outlined within 14 CCR § 916.9 [936.9, 956.9] for the protection and restoration of the beneficial functions of the Riparian Zone in watersheds with listed anadromous salmonids? **Yes**

b. Encourage large wood recruitment that improves or maintains salmonid habitat? [14 CCR § 916.9, [936.9, 956.9](c)] **Yes**

c. Retain the 13 largest conifer trees (live or dead) on each acre that encompasses the Core and Inner Zones? [14 CCR § 916.9, [936.9, 956.9](f)] **Yes**

d. Maintain the minimum canopy retention requirements of 14 CCR § 916.9 [936.9, 956.9]? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

70. Estimated percentage of canopy cover in the Plan:

| Zone | Pre-harvest | Post-harvest |
|---|---|---|
| Class I core zone | | |
| Class I inner zone | | |
| Class I outer zone | | |
| Class II core zone | | |
| Class II inner zone | | |

71. Are protection measures adequate to prevent adverse effects to fish and wildlife resources on downstream flows from water drafting operations? [ref. 14 § CCR 923.7 [943.7, 963.7](l)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments: **CDFW evaluated the drafting sites described in the THP during the PHI. See CDFW PHI report.**

72. Are Timber Operations planned to protect, maintain, and contribute to the restoration of properly functioning salmonid habitat and listed salmonid species? [ref. 14 CCR § 916.9 [936.9, 956.9](a)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

73. Comments or general observations regarding listed species:

---

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**
**(Optional for Modified THP)**

74. Does the Plan accurately list all known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects within the assessment area, including other CEQA projects that have a similar effect on the environment? [ref. 14 CCR § 912.9 [932.9, 952.9](f) "Technical Rule Addendum No. 2"(d)] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

75. Are the defined resource assessment areas appropriate and properly described? [ref. 14 CCR § 912.9(c) "Technical Rule Addendum No. 2 (b)"] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

76. Does the Plan adequately assess the potential for significant Cumulative Impacts upon resource values within the defined assessment areas? [ref. 14 CCR § 912.9(c) "Technical Rule Addendum No. 2 (c)"] **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

77. How were the resource subjects evaluated and has a reasonable potential to cause or add to significant adverse Cumulative Impacts been adequately addressed ? [ref. 14 CCR § 912.9 "Appendix - Technical Rule Addendum No. 2 (c) Cumulative Impacts Assessment Guidelines"]

(A) Watershed: **Cumulative watershed impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(B) Soil Productivity: **Cumulative soil productivity impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(C) Biological: **Cumulative biological impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(D) Recreation: **Cumulative recreational impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(E) Visual: **Cumulative visual impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(F) Traffic: **Cumulative traffic impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(G) Greenhouse Gases (GHG): **Cumulative GHG impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(H) Wildfire Risk and Hazard: **Cumulative wildfire risk and hazard impacts appear to be appropriately assessed based upon the methodology described in Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2.**

(I) Other:

78. If there are waterbodies within or downstream of the proposed Plan that are listed as water quality limited under Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act: [ref. 14 CCR § 898]

a. Has the RPF adequately assessed the proposed Timber Operation impacts that may combine with existing listed stressors to impair beneficial uses of waterbodies? **Yes**

b. Does the Plan provide feasible mitigation measures to reduce any Impacts from the plan to a level of insignificance, and provide measures, insofar as feasible, to help attain water quality standards? **Yes**

Inspector Observations / Comments:

79. Additional comments or general observations regarding Cumulative Impacts:

## OTHER COMMENTS

80. Additional comments or concerns not covered elsewhere in the report:

81. Response to any Public Comment received prior to the conclusion of the PHI, if any: **No public comment received prior to the conclusion of the PHI report.**

82. Are other agency recommendations in agreement with this report? **Yes**

If "No", explain: :

83. Additional comments or general observations to other and public concerns:

## CAL FIRE PHI RECOMMENDATIONS

84. Plan conformance determination with the provisions of PRC 4582.75 & 14 CCR § 898.1:

**In conformance if recommendations are agreed upon**

85. Is a PHI map attached as part of the recommendation? **No**

86. Are supplemental materials provided? **No**

If "Yes", describe:

**NOTE: Any additional documentation to be uploaded to CalTREES or attached to this report by the Inspector or in coordination with Region Review office.**

**The RPF shall respond to each recommendation provided below and indicate the following:**
**(1) Whether or not they concur with the recommendation.**
**(2) Provide any necessary revisions or documentation to the Plan.**

| No. | Review Agency | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | CAL FIRE | At Map Point 4, a harebell was observed. Please identify if the plant is swamp or California harebell. If the species is swamp harebell, please revise THP Item 32 Section II, provide appropriate protection measures and map location for the LTO. |
| 2 | CAL FIRE | On the appurtenant road in between Map Points 6 and 6.1, it was observed during the PHI that a rusted culvert needs replacement. Please include this point as a new Map Point and provide protection measures indicating a new culvert replacement appropriately sized. |
| 3 | CAL FIRE | Please revise the language in Section II for Map Point 14.1 to include slash packing of the landing utilizing the existing slash on site as well as utilizing the existing redwood logs on site for water diversion. |
| 4 | CALFIRE | The Plan exists within the same planning watershed as THP 1-26-00021-SON. The THP appears to be disclosed as a Reasonably Foreseeable Future Project on page 124, however it is not mapped as such in Section V on page 223. Please revise page 124 to update the known conditions of THP 1-26-00021-SON, and please revise page 223 map the location, boundaries, and silvicultural methods for this Reasonably Foreseeable Probable Future Project in compliance with 14 CCR Section 912.9 Addendum D.1. |
| 5 | CDFW | Prior to 2nd review, CDFW recommends Item 14(d) be revised to include a visual check for and retention of raptor nests, Sonoma tree vole nests, and trees with suitable basal hollows for Townsend's big-eared bat roosting, as well as retention of screen trees. |
| 6 | CDFW | Prior to 2nd review, CDFW recommends Item 14(d) be revised to include retention of wildlife trees and a list of wildlife tree characteristics including abnormal limb structure, large cavities, redwoods with goose pens, branches equal to or greater than 6-inches in diameter located just outside of the branch collar, extensively decayed wood as evidenced by large and/or extensive fungal fruiting bodies, trees with multiple tops, broken tops, or snag tops, redwoods with boles having at least 75% defect, and granary trees having at least 100 small holes on the tree. |
| 7 | CDFW/CAL FIRE | Prior to 2nd review, please revise Item 32(a) to remove all northern spotted owl measures pertaining to helicopter operations. |
| 8 | CDFW | Prior to 2nd review, CDFW recommends Item 32(a) be revised to state that a 500-foot no-operations buffer shall be established if a gray wolf den or rendezvous site is detected. |
| 9 | CDFW | Prior to 2nd review, CDFW recommends the Map Point Table be revised for Map Point D to state in the Description column, "Existing human-made water hole, hydrologically disconnected from and not within the WLPZ of any watercourses", or similar language, the Treatment column for Map Point D be revised to state, "Water drafting using pump and water truck", or similar language, and Map Point D be mapped within the Map Points map. |
| 10 | CGS | a. Revise Section II of the THP to disclose CGS-1 (Figure 2 [of CGS PHI Report-CAL FIRE]) as an unstable area on the relevant THP pages and maps.<br>b. Flag CGS-1 in the field with pink DO NOT CUT flagging and designate as a no harvest aggregate.<br>c. Limit timber operations within this feature to cable corridor placement. Cable corridors placed across the unstable area shall be limited to no more than 2 corridors which shall not exceed 15' in width and must be full suspension. |

| No. | Review Agency | Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | CGS | a. Extend unstable area S2 to encompass CGS-2 (Figure 2 [of CGS PHI Report-CAL FIRE]). Section II of the THP shall be revised to disclose the expanded unstable area on the relevant THP pages and maps.<br>b. Flag CGS-2 in the field with pink DO NOT CUT flagging and designate as a no harvest aggregate.<br>c. Limit timber operations within this feature to cable corridor placement. Cable corridors placed across the unstable area shall be limited to no more than 3 corridors which shall not exceed 15' in width and must be full suspension. |
| 12 | CGS | a. Revise Section II of the THP to disclose CGS-3 (Figure 3 [of CGS PHI Report - CAL FIRE]) as an unstable area on the relevant THP pages and maps.<br>b. Enclose the feature within a special treatment zone (STZ) that extends laterally around the boundary of the unstable area and is flagged 25-feet from the extents of the unstable feature. The STZ zone shall be designated for no harvest and no ground based equipment use. The portion of the Exception Skid Trail Area on the THP Yarding Map located within CGS-3 shall be relocated to be outside the limits of CGS-3.<br>c. Flag the entire unstable area of CGS-3 in the field with pink DO NOT CUT flagging and designate as a no harvest aggregate. |
| 13 | WQ | THP Map Point 9 is described in the THP Map Point Table on THP page 85 as a Class III watercourse crossing with a 36-inch CMP culvert. The table states that the "culvert outlet is completely plugged and buried." The proposed treatment is to "Either remove and replace with new 36" pipe or clean outlet to regain function if culvert is salvageable." The culvert outlet was found during the PHI. It was partially buried by material from road grading, but it was not plugged or damaged. The culvert appeared to be clear and functioning except for debris at the outlet.<br><br>The RPF shall revise the THP Map Point Table treatment for Map Point 9 to state only that the debris shall be cleared from the outlet of the culvert and the channel below the outlet. |
| 14 | WQ | THP Map Point 14.1 is a waterbar at the lower end of a landing. The waterbar has filled with sediment from the landing which fas rendered the waterbar nonfunctional. This has allowed excess water to flow down a seasonal road and onto THP Map Point 14, an active debris slide. The treatment for THP Map Point 14.1 is to repair the waterbar and to install an additional waterbar on the seasonal road. The treatment should describe in more detail how the waterbar on the landing should be repaired.<br><br>The RPF shall revise the Map Point Table treatment for THP Map Point 14.1 to describe the depth of the waterbar and the height of the berm on the lower edge of the waterbar. The waterbar shall be of sufficient size to accommodate sediment from the landing without compromising the function of the waterbar. |
| 15 | WQ | The description of THP Map Point 15 appears to be truncated in the THP Map Point Table. The description ends with "There is adequate road width for hauling, however" with nothing visible after the "however."<br><br>The RPF shall reformat the THP Map Point Table to show the full description for THP Map Point 15. |

cc: RPF, PS
To view harvesting documents, please visit: https://caltreesplans.resources.ca.gov/caltrees/