VII. Corrections and Additions

Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Alternatives

The paragraph on DEIR Page VI-7 and beginning "Given this policy conflict…" will be edited to state: "Given this policy conflict, and because recreational users of JDSF and the Mendocino Woodlands would have similar experiences (e.g. CAL FIRE management for late-seral conditions and absence of even-aged management within the Mendocino Woodlands Special Treatment Area is more similar to DPR management for natural and cultural values than on many other areas of JDSF), this alternative has been eliminated from further consideration. JDSF as a working forest operates under a variety of land treatment objectives, a subset of which approach those under which the DPR routinely operates."

Aquatic Resources

Page VII.6.1-15, Microclimate;The Board agrees with DFG that the work conducted by Dr. James in the Judd Creek watershed in Tehama County may not be directly applicable to the coast redwood region in western Mendocino County. The following sentence shall be inserted at the end of the first paragraph:

> Studies such as those by Ledwith (1996) may be more likely to represent conditions found on JDSF than those reported on by James (2003).

Page VII.6.1-20, Channel Confinement and Refuge Habitat:
The Board agrees with DFG that: (1) the lack of connectively between floodplain and channel for the very limited Class I channel lengths that are unconfined and have channel gradients less than 2% are to a large extent related to legacy management impacts (i.e., historic logging practices), and (2) stream channel and riparian zone recovery will likely result in these floodplains becoming more temporally and spatially connected over long time periods. The following sentence shall replace the first paragraph:

> Stillwater Sciences (1997) found that 89% of the Class I channel length (that could be classified with air photos) was classified as confined, and that unconfined channels with gradients less than 2% (assumed to have the most valuable aquatic habitat for anadromous fishes) made up 3% of Class I channel length for the JDSF assessment area used by Stillwater Sciences.

Page VII.6.1-22: Figure VII.6.1.2, Sediment in Pools (V*) at Noyo River and Nearby Stream Sites (1992), is missing sampled stream names on the ordinate. From top to bottom they are: Hare Creek, Kass Creek, Pudding Creek, Parlin Creek, Brandon Gulch, North fork of South fork Noyo River, Little River, North Fork Caspar Creek- Lower. The Note at the bottom of the figure should be modified to remove Hare Creek and Brandon Gulch from the list of streams not in the chart.

Botanical Resources

Page VII.6.2.1, Setting:
The Board recognizes that the DEIR's description of the redwood series does not strictly conform to the CNDDB/Holland hierarchical classification or to the series described in Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf. The following will be inserted at the end of the second paragraph:

JDSF upland forest vegetation descriptions have utilized a gradient approach. The majority of these forests have a substantial disturbance history and contain a mix of conifer, hardwood and understory species. Stands that have been typed as dominated by hardwoods have either or both Douglas-fir or redwood present in the stands. The JDSF gradient approach is listed below.

Coniferous Upland Forest and Woodland:

- Redwood dominated
- Redwood /Douglas-fir
- Redwood /Douglas-fir/Hardwood
  - Redwood/Douglas-fir / Hardwood xeric

A summary of the pertinent CNDDB and Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf hierarchical classification follows:

- Coastal and Montane Douglas- Fir Forests and Woodlands
  - Douglas Fir Forests (redwood common per Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf).
    - Various associations with include species considered to be associated with costal forests (CNDDB lists no associations with redwood listed in the name)
    - Various Douglas-Fir associations including more montane species such as White Fir. (CNDDB, Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf)
  - Douglas-Fir/Tanoak Forests (redwood not common per Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf, CNDDB lists no associations with redwood listed in the name)

- Coastal and Montane Redwood Forests
  - North Coast Alluvial Redwood Forest (Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf)
  - Upland Redwood Forest
  - Various Redwood & Douglas-Fir or, tanoak or madrone CNDDB associations

Pages VII.6.2-8: Discussions of Bishop pine will include:

Bishop pine forest should include Northern Bishop Pine Forest as a sensitive vegetation type. The Northern Bishop Pine Forest is very limited in distribution and is often poorly understood when within its range.

Page VII.6.2-7: Correct spelling of *Cupressus goveniana* ssp. *Pigmaea*

Page VII.6.2-7: Add the following to the first paragraph:

Uncommon/Unique Species found in pygmy forest include; *Calamagrostis bolanderi*-Bolander's reed grass, *Ceanothus gloriosus var. exaltatus*- glory brush, *Cladina portentosa ssp. pacifica* -Pacific reindeer lichen, *Cornus Canadensis*-bunchberry,*Sphagnum* sp.- peat moss, *Veratrum fimbriatum*- corn lily.

Page VII.6.2-7: For the fifth paragraph add Northern Bishop Pine to the list of sensitive vegetation communities.

Page VII.6.2-12: & Appendix 7B Botany: Change text to note Cape ivy has undergone a taxonomic reclassification (change of genus) for (*Delairia odorata*)
Correct generic scientific name for pennyroyal (*Mentha* vs. *menthe*).

Page VII.6.2-13 In the second paragraph correct the spelling of Acacia.

Page VII.6.2-15: Table VII.6.2.2. Will be revised and updated to exclude: *Calamagrostis foliosa*, *Ceanothus gloriosus var. gloriosus*, *Collomia diversifolia*, *Hemizonia congesta ssp. tracyi*, *Linanthus acicularis*, and *Ribes victoris*; and include *Lotus formosissimus*.

Page VII.6.2-17: Add this information to the second paragraph:

> CEQA also provides for assessment of regional rare and unique species [CEQA § 15125(c)]. Also state rank is an important status factor in assessing whether a species meets the criteria of rare, threatened, or endangered under Section 15380 CEQA Guidelines.

Pages VII.6.2-17 and 18: The Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) does not exempt timber operations from the California Endangered Species Act, CEQA, or the Forest Practice Act (Weburg Case 2003). The unmitigated salvaging of a rare or endangered plant would likely be considered a significant impact under CEQA. In addition, the NPPA does not apply to species not listed by the Fish and Game Commission as threatened, rare, or endangered. Hence application of the NPPA Section 1913 is not appropriate for determining the need to adequately assess sensitive botanical resources in the THP process. The most pertinent NPPA exemptions are prohibition of take and Fish and Game Code Section 2081 take permit.

In the last paragraph the discussion of the NPPA Section 1913(c) did not specifically include notes on the Weburg Case. This was an artifact of editing. Because NPPA Section 1913(c *salvage*) may now be confusing, reference to this section will be removed (last two sentences on page 17). CAL FIRE will continue to follow all relevant statutes and regulations, as well as recognize applicable case law.

Page VII.6.2.20 Add the Special Concern Area and following text:

> Sphagnum Bog -. The Sphagnum bogs occur within the Pygmy Forest at JDSF. Though the sphagnum bogs were not highlighted specifically for protection, both the Wetland and Pygmy Forest protection measures will apply.

Page VII.6.2.20 Cypress Groups: Background: The 2002 DFMP(pg 148) recognized and defined Cypress Groups as a Special Concern Area and provided direction. This vegetation type contains pygmy cypress but often has a majority of Bishop pine present. The Department of Fish and Game, Biogeographic Data Branch-Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program, produced in September 2003 the "List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities Recognized by The California Natural Diversity Database" It listed Northern Bishop Pine Forest as a series or association considered rare and worthy of consideration by CNDDB. "Pygmy Cypress Groups" and the "Northern Bishop Pine Forest" often refer to similar if not the same vegetation on the ground. The Response to Comment from the Department of Fish and Game discussed the vegetation in detail. The FMP Special Concern direction for the Pygmy Cypress Groups along with the necessity of project/site specific analysis would insure this vegetation receives appropriate consideration. The definition of Cypress Groups will be edited to add the text in highlight:

> *Cypress Groups*
>
> Cypress Groups, elements of bishop pine/pygmy cypress forest on unproductive soils (non-timberland), will not be subject to harvest. Some of this vegetation may

> also be considered Northern Bishop Pine Forest, a series or association considered rare and worthy of consideration by California Natural Diversity Data Base (dated 9/2003). Note that both Bishop pine and pygmy cypress can occur in redwood forest. In these areas (i.e. timberland) harvest may occur. As a special status plant species, effects to individual upland pygmy cypress will be evaluated on a project basis.

Page VII.6.2-44: Table VII.6.2.1 revisions will include the State and Global ranks for the species.

Page VII.6.2-31: In Table VII.6.2.3, robust monardella (*Monardella villosa* ssp. *globosa*) can be associated with upland forest openings and will moved to the
Upland North Coast Conifer – None to Moderate Canopy Closure block.

Page VII.6.2-34: To the sixth paragraph add: Forest microclimate was listed among the secondary impacts by Sholars and Golec (draft 3-22-2004).

Page VII.6.2-21 To address concerns about the objectives for any potential use of fire in the Pygmy forest, the first paragraph is replaced by:

> Habitat Management Practices: The concept of conducting control burns in the pygmy forest originated some years ago as an idea to benefit the Lotis blue butterfly and a host species coast hosackia (*Lotus formosissimus)*. Currently it is understood that other herbaceous members of the pea family may be hosts for the butterfly and that host plant habitat is not limited to pygmy forest. The concept of manipulating the rare pygmy forest for the possible benefit of the Lotis blue butterfly is not supported at this time. Local Botanists have supported the concept of carefully reintroducing fire into pygmy forest areas on JDSF. CAL FIRE recognizes that any proposal would be: research focused on improving understanding of the pygmy forest, limited in scope, based on sound ecological and botanical knowledge, supported by experts in the field, undergo appropriate CEQA analysis, and include appropriate survey, study, and monitoring.

Page VII.6.6-30: Table VII 6.6.5 – For the Low to Moderate Habitat Capability rows, blank cells should instead have a value of 10-100% for the Canopy Cover (Pct.) column

Page VII.6.2-35: Correct the text in the second paragraph to reflect:

> The Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) designation for pygmy forest only applies to the Coastal Zone. A significant amount of pygmy forest acreage is outside the Coastal Zone and on private lands where future protection is not necessarily guaranteed.

Page VII.6.2-38**:** Change the discussion in the first paragraph to include:

> Species such as *Clintonia uniflora*, *Smilacina racemosa*, *S. stellata*, and *Trillium ovatum* have declined over 40% more in harvest areas than in retained forest aggregates (Nelson and Halpern 2005). That upon review, small sample size of old growth stands may have led to the classification of *Trillium ovatum* as a disturbance related species in the study conducted at JDSF. The more temperate climate in the redwood forests in contrast to the white fir forests studied by Jules (1997) may play a role as well. Trillium was present in clear-cut stands studied on JDSF, but did not appear to occur consistently enough to be used in the vegetation classification system.

Page VII.6.5.2 The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act should be included in the discussion under *6.5.2 Regulatory Framework for the Protection of Wetlands.* The following will be inserted:

> "**Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act**". Water Code Section 13140-13147 states that "highest priority shall be given to improving or eliminating discharges that adversely affect any of the following: (1) Wetlands, estuaries, and other biologically sensitive sites." The Act prevents unpermitted filling of wetlands as well."

Page VII 6.6-53, Marbled murrelet - Distribution: The following sentence should be added at the end of the paragraph:

> At sea surveys conducted off the Mendocino Coast in recovery Zone 5 noted approximately 290 murrelets in 2005 (J. Hunter USFWS pers. comm.. 3/29/06).

Page VII 6.6-53, Marbled murrelet – Local Distribution: The following sentence should be added at the end of the second sentence, first paragraph:

> The use of radar to detect Marbled Murrelets is dependent on several variables including flight speed of the radar target, target size, flight path, and observed flight time.

Page VII 6.6-53, Marbled murrelet – Local Distribution: The following sentence should be added at the end of the second sentence, first paragraph:

> Marbled Murrelets at inland detections have been documented using both radar and ground-based audio-visual surveys.

Page VII 6.6-54, Marbled murrelet – Local Distribution: The following correction should be made in paragraph 1: "Wheatfield Creek" should be "Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River."
Also at at the end of this sentence add, "and South Fork Eel River (California Natural Diversity Data Base)."

Page VII 6.6-55, Marbled murrelet - Distribution: The following sentence shall be added to the end of paragraph 1:

> Horsetail Gulch and Gulch 16 (1.5 miles east of Horsetail Gulch) are two known occupied sites on Campbell Timberland Management lands in the Ten Mile drainage (Middle Fork) as identified using protocol audio-visual surveys.

Pages VII.6.6-56 and 57, Table VII 6.6.8 - Regarding murrelet survey protocols, the following changes shall be added to footnote "a": This protocol has been revised several times and is currently reported in Evans and Mack (2003).

Tables VII.6.6.8, 9 and 11 footnotes text is changed to:

> No recommended USFWS protocol was available at this time. Surveys may or may not have been done to the general protocol used at the time of survey and as indicated in the Table.

Table VII.6.6.8 on page VII.6.6-57 under "Location" "Noyo, The Worm 2":

> Under "Source" column change text to: "Uncertain murrelet vocalizations were detected by surveyor. Additional year of follow-up survey resulted in no murrelet detections."

Table VII.6.6.9 on page VII.6.6-64 Under "Source" column change text to: "Uncertain murrelet vocalizations were detected by surveyor. Additional year of follow-up survey resulted in no murrelet detections."

Table VII 6.6.9, page VII.6.6-66. The following footnote is added: (c) No protocol exists for murrelet radar surveys that is endorsed by the Marble Murrelet Technical Committee.

Page VII 6.6-72, Forest Detectability Methods: To clarify the Evans Mack, et al. (2003) paper, the first sentence of the first paragraph is replaced by:

> The 2003 inland survey protocol describes 2 basic survey types: intensive auditory and visual surveys and radar surveys (Evans Mack et al. 2003).

The last sentence is added to the end of the first paragraph: No radar protocol exists for surveying murrelets.

Page V11 6.6-75, Habitat Characteristics - To clarify diameter of nest branches in California as reported in Hamer and Nelson (1995a) the fourth sentence is changed to: The average diameter of nest branches as measured at the tree trunk is 13.8 inches.

Page VII.6.6-114 – Large Woody Debris: To clarify monitoring needs, the following sentence is added at the end of the paragraph: Periodic sampling will be utilized to monitor LWD density and composition as part of the CFI Inventory System.

Page VII.6.6.115 – Species Surveys: To clarify what "project" refers to the following sentence is added to the end of the paragraph:

> "Project" in this context is loosely defined as any activity that JDSF undertakes. Scoping focus is project-specific and driven by potential habitat impact expected from the activity either individually or cumulatively.

Page VII.6.6.116: The suggested edit will be implemented by using DFG endorsed protocols when appropriate and other protocols when they address the specific survey needs. This information will added to paragraph 2 to help clarify the intent.

Page VII.6.6-123: In paragraph two the Lotus Blue Butterfly account will be edited based on CDFG comment as follows: Lotus blue butterflies have a close association with coast hosackia (*Lotus formosissimus*) and potentially other members of the pea family. "Disturbed early successional wetland habitats" is omitted and replaced with "open wetland habitats."

Page VII.6.6-126: Osprey – The third sentence: remove the reference to the USFWS.

Page VII.6.6-127: Marbled murrelet - Add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph:

> Potential mitigation measures for occupied murrelet habitat include avoidance of disturbance or habitat alteration.

Page VII 6.6-127: Marbled murrelet - Add as the fourth sentence of the first paragraph the following sentence:

> Marbled Murrelets have also been infrequently documented nesting in second-growth forest with single residual conifers with suitable nest platforms or in mature forest stands with scattered residuals with platforms.

Page VII.6.6-135: MRC - To clarify the CWHR modeling, the following sentence is added at the end of the paragraph:

> The 7% represents a large number of classes with a relatively small amount of acreage. They were modeled using the most closely associated CWHR type from the 93% that were individually modeled. This was a parsimonious approach that considered the types, resolution of modeling effort, and speculative nature of forecasting other ownership future behavior.

Page VII.6.6-219: The Total Edge Index (TECI) category and definition is changed to: Total Edge (TE) - measure of the total edge distance (in meters) from a patch to the nearest neighboring patch of the same type.

Appendix 7 B-1 page 1 Add the information: *Catoneaster lactea* is the most common species.

Appendix 7B-2 page 2: The Mendocino County USGS 7.5' quadrangles for *Boschniakia hookeri* will be updated to include for Elk the date "(CNDDB 2005)"

Appendix 7B-2, Page 2: The spelling will be corrected for Thurber's reed grass *Calamagrostis crassiglumis.*

Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

The first sentence of the paragraph under "Habitat Modification Impacts" (DEIR page VII.6.6-121) is deleted and replaced with the following:

> For determination of impact significance to listed threatened, endangered, and rare wildlife species, impacts would be considered significant if they were to result in direct mortality, permanent habitat loss, habitat modification that reduces its suitability, reduced reproductive success, or a "take" as defined under FESA or CESA. Populations of candidate, sensitive, or special-status species generally are more secure than for listed species, and therefore can tolerate somewhat greater impacts. Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive and special-status species are considered significant if they would result in population or habitat loss, detrimental habitat modification, or impairment of reproduction that would apply to a substantial portion of the population on JDSF lands or in the surrounding region.

The Central California Coast coho was upgraded from threatened to endangered in the final rule published June 28, 2005 with the effective date being August 29, 2005. DEIR pages VII.6.1-2, VII.6.1-60, and VII.6.1-88 will be updated to reflect this development.

Page VII.10-17, 4th paragraph, will reflect the following edit:

> Central California Coast Coho:
> federal endangered
> State endangered
> California Coastal Chinook:
> federal threatened

Northern California Steelhead:
federal threatened

Section 6.1.6 Regional Salmonid Population Status DEIR page VII.6.1-53 and prior to the Coho Salmon subsection will be augmented with the recommended Federal Endangered Species Act excerpts.

The Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan includes language indicating that flood prone areas within JDSF will be managed according to procedures included in the Riparian Protection Committee's Final Report, which was produced by a committee that included several fisheries biologists and licensed geologists. See response to comment 21 in the March 1, 2006 NMFS letter.

In response to comments regarding survey protocol, the RDEIR and FMP will provide this direction:

> For timber harvest plans and other large projects with the potential for negative effects on rare plants, JDSF shall follow the Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (California Department of Fish and Game 2000). In addition, JDSF will conduct periodic floristic survey in some areas to gain a better understanding of the relationships between the local plants, their distribution, and their habitats.

The Final EIR will include language indicating that the evaluation of flood prone areas within JDSF will be guided by procedures included in the Riparian Protection Committee's Final Report, which was produced by a committee that included several DFG biologists and was endorsed by DFG. This approach is incorporated into the proposed Forest Management Plan. See response to comment 5 in the Department of Fish and Game's March 1, 2006 letter

If management is proposed within a watercourse's 20-year recurrence interval event floodplain. CAL FIRE will use as a guide in the evaluation of potential flood-prone areas the procedures developed by a multi-agency team that included DFG and is described in the final report titled "Flood Prone Area Considerations in the Coast Redwood Zone (Cafferata and others 2005). This will specifically be stated in the FEIR. See response to comment 6 in the Department of Fish and Game's March 1, 2006 letter.

The FEIR will state that studies such as those by Ledwith (1996) may be more likely to represent conditions found on JDSF than those reported on by James (2003). See response to comment 9 in the Department of Fish and Game's March 1, 2006 letter.

In response to comments regarding survey protocol, the RDEIR and FMP will provide this direction:

> For timber harvest plans and other large projects with the potential for negative effects on rare plants, JDSF shall follow the Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (California Department of Fish and Game 2000). In addition, JDSF will conduct periodic floristic survey in some areas to gain a better understanding of the relationships between the local plants, their distribution, and their habitats.

The FEIR will state that studies such as those by Ledwith (1996) may be more likely to represent conditions found on JDSF than those reported on by James (2003).

The FEIR will be corrected and state that Stillwater Sciences (1999) found that 89% of the Class I channel length (that could be classified with air photos) was classified as confined, and that

unconfined channels with gradients less than 2% (assumed to have the most valuable aquatic habitat for anadromous fishes) made up 3% of Class I channel length for the JDSF assessment area used by Stillwater Sciences.

If there is field evidence of floodplain connectively for storm events with return intervals of 20 years or less in areas that are proposed for timber management, CAL FIRE will be guided by the guidelines developed by CDF, DFG, NCRWQCB, and CGS in the document titled "Flood Prone Area Considerations in the Coast Redwood Zone (November 2005).

The following correction will be added to the FEIR:

> In Figure VII.6.1.2, the indicated stream names, from top to bottom, should be Hare Creek, Kass Creek, Pudding Creek (outside of assessment area), Parlin Creek, Brandon Gulch, North Fork of the South Fork of Noyo Creek, South Fork Caspar Creek below the weir, North Fork of Caspar Creek below the weir.

The FEIR will not duplicate all the descriptive and background text from the DEIR, they are incorporated by reference. CDFG comments include extensive comments intended to make additions to the DEIR text that do not represent changes or corrections of fact. Where changes or corrections are appropriate these will be incorporated into the FMP or the Errata found in the FEIR. Some additions will occur as well to expand understanding of specific resources.

The FEIR Errata will include the description of the Douglas-fir series and explain the relationship of the JDSF types to the Sawyer & Keeler-Wolf types. This will present information to individuals who understand CNDDB/Holland hierarchical classification.

Page VII.6.2-7: note the correct spelling of *Cupressus goveniana* ssp. *pigmaea*, and sensitive plants frequently associated with Mendocino pygmy cypress forest are:

Rare Species:

1. *Arctostaphylos mendocinoensis* pygmy manzanita
2. *Boschniakia hookeri* small groundcone
3. *Campanula californica* swamp harebell
4. *Carex californica* California sedge
5. *Cupressus goveniana ssp. pigmaea* pygmy cypress
6. *Juncus supiniformis* hair-leaved rush
7. *Lilium maritimum* coast lily
8. *Pinus contorta* ssp*. bolanderi* pygmy pine
9. *Rhynchospora alba* white beaked-rush
10. *Usnea longissima* long-beard lichen

Uncommon/Unique Species:

1. *Calamagrostis bolanderi* Bolander's reed grass
2. *Ceanothus gloriosus var. exaltatus* glory brush
3. *Cladina portentosa ssp. pacifica* Pacific reindeer lichen
4. *Cornus Canadensis* bunchberry
5. *Sphagnum* sp. peat moss
6. *Veratrum fimbriatum* corn lily

Page VII.6.2-12: Reference the taxonomic reclassification (change of genus) for Cape ivy (*Delairia odorata*), this name is noted in Appendix 7B Botany. Also correct generic scientific name for pennyroyal (*Mentha* vs. *menthe*).

Page VII.6.2-104: Table VII.6.2.1 should cite the State ranks for the species as many of these species also have State sensitive status (in particular S1 and S2 ranks). Another relevant rank is the global rank, which is similarly assigned as the State rank but is reflective of the world status. The State ranking system is a separate system for assigning status and provides additional status information for a species. The FMP will contain an updated table which adds state and global rank.

Page VII.6.2-15: Table VII.6.2.2. will be revised and updated to exclude: *Calamagrostis foliosa*, *Ceanothus gloriosus var. gloriosus*, *Collomia diversifolia*, *Hemizonia congesta ssp. tracyi*, *Linanthus acicularis*, and *Ribes victoris*; and include *Lotus formosissimus*. The Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan will contain an updated table with additions and deletions.

Page VII.6.2-17: add the following:

> CEQA also provides for assessment of regional rare and unique species [CEQA § 15125(c)]. Also state rank is an important status factor in assessing whether a species meets the criteria of rare, threatened, or endangered under Section 15380 CEQA Guidelines.

Pages VII.6.2-17 and 18: The Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) does not exempt timber operations from the California Endangered Species Act, CEQA, or the Forest Practice Act (Weburg Case 2003). The unmitigated salvaging of a rare or endangered plant would likely be considered a significant impact under CEQA. In addition, the NPPA does not apply to species not listed by the Fish and Game Commission as threatened, rare, or endangered. Hence application of the NPPA Section 1913 is not appropriate for determining the need to adequately assess sensitive botanical resources in the THP process. The most pertinent NPPA exemptions are prohibition of take and Fish and Game Code Section 2081 take permit.

A THP or CEQA document must still consider the potentially significant effects to any species regardless of the exemption or whether the species is listed or not. The DEIR text already alludes to this in the partial paragraph found at the top of DEIR page VII.6.2.18:

> Regardless of the exemption allowed to THPs under Fish and Game Code Section 1913, it is the stated intent of JDSF to address sensitive plants and their habitats on a project basis through scoping in consultation with CDFG, surveys according to appropriate survey guidelines where indicated by the results of scoping, assessment of potential impacts, and avoidance or mitigation to reduce impacts to a level less than significant.

To clarify the DEIR with respect to the issue raised in this comment, the FEIR Errata will note this correction and therefore modify the DEIR. Inclusion of this section without notes on the Weburg Case represents an artifact of editing, not a decision by the Board to rely on this approach for protection of rare plants. Because NPPA Section 1913(c) may now be confusing, reference to this section will be removed via corrections in the Errata. CAL FIRE will continue to follow all relevant statutes and regulations, as well as recognize applicable case law.

Sphagnum Bog -The special concern areas and unique habitats are based on those listed in the DFMP. On page 14 of the DFMP under Unique Habitat types, sphagnum bogs were listed as a sensitive community but not described in detail. The Sphagnum bogs occur within the Pygmy Forest at JDSF. A section has been added to the proposed FMP to clarify that though the sphagnum bogs were not highlighted specifically for protection, both the Wetland and Pygmy Forest protection measures will apply.

The Northern Bishop Pine Forest's status will be noted in the Final Management Plan by an addition to the discussion of Pygmy Cypress Groups. In addition, the discussion of "Cypress Groups" will note this vegetation may refer to "Northern Bishop Pine Forest". The text is shown below in context

> *Cypress Groups*
>
> Cypress Groups, elements of bishop pine/pygmy cypress forest on unproductive soils (non-timberland), will not be subject to harvest. Some of this vegetation may also be considered Northern Bishop Pine Forest, a series or association considered rare and worthy of consideration by California Natural Diversity Data Base (dated 9/2003). Note that both Bishop pine and pygmy cypress can occur in redwood forest. In these areas (i.e., timberland) harvest may occur. As a special status plant species, effects to individual upland pygmy cypress will be evaluated on a project basis.

The text of the DFMP and DEIR have been changed to clarify that the *Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities* (California Department of Fish and Game 2000) will be followed for THPs and other large projects.

Floristic surveys: for Alternative C1 and C2 the wording regarding surveys will be clarified as follows: For timber harvesting plans and other large projects with the potential for negative effects on rare plants, JDSF shall follow the *Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities* (California Department of Fish and Game 2000). This will result in floristic surveys for the effected areas. This language is contained in Chapter 3 of the proposed FMP. On smaller scale projects, the survey effort will be appropriate for the level of CEQA analysis and the risk of impact to rare plants.

Table VII.6.2.3 is a hierarchical arrangement of Functional Groups. As stated in the DEIR at page VII.6.2-30, "Species that could fall within more than one group are included within the first appropriate group in the hierarchy. The first group in the sequence has a higher potential for negative effects from disturbances such as timber harvest." The DEIR acknowledges that species can fall within more than one functional group. Cumulative effect analysis focused on the long term changes in vegetation. This table's objective was to help place the rare plants in context of potential impacts of the changes. It was not indented as an information source for specific rare plant habitat preferences; DEIR Appendix 7B-2 contains this information. Because moving robust monardella (*Monardella villosa* ssp. *globosa*) from the Closed Cone Forest or Openings Group would list one more species in the Upland North Coast Conifer Group, this change will be reflected in the errata. In Table VII.6.2.3, for the Upland North Coast Conifer Functional Group the legend includes "The plants included would be expected to found in upland actively managed porions of JDSF but may occur in other habitats as well." The Board recognizes that this "worst case" arrangement may not list that the plants also are found in more protected habitat.

Page VII.6.2-34: Forest understory species dependent on shade and moist forest microclimate are also sensitive to canopy removal. This information will be added to the FEIR via the errata.

In response to other concerns about use of fire in the pygmy forest the paragraph starting on page VII.6.2-21 is replaced by:

> Habitat Management Practices: The concept of conducting control burns in the pygmy forest originated some years ago as an idea to benefit the Lotis blue butterfly and a host species coast hosackia (*Lotus formosissimus)*. Currently it is understood that other herbaceous members of the pea family may be hosts for the butterfly and that host plant habitat is not limited to pygmy forest. The concept of manipulating the rare pygmy forest for the possible benefit of the Lotis blue butterfly is not supported at this time. Local Botanists have supported the concept of carefully reintroducing fire into pygmy forest areas on JDSF. CAL

> FIRE recognizes that any proposal would be: research focused on improving understanding of the pygmy forest, limited in scope, based on sound ecological and botanical knowledge, supported by experts in the field, undergo appropriate CEQA analysis, and include appropriate survey, study, and monitoring.

Page VII.6.2-35: The Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) designation for pygmy forest only applies to the Coastal Zone. A significant amount of pygmy forest acreage is outside the Coastal Zone and on private lands where future protection is not necessarily guaranteed.

Page VII.6.2-38: It is possible that upon review, small sample sizes of old growth stands may have led to the classification of *Trillium ovatum* as a disturbance related species in the study conducted at JDSF. The more temperate climate in the redwood forests in contrast to the white fir forests studied by Jules (1997) may play a role as well. Trillium was present in clear-cut stands studied on JDSF, but did not appear to occur consistently enough to be used in the vegetation classification system.

Page VII 6.5-2: add the following language:

> Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act Water Code Section 13140-13147 states that "highest priority shall be given to improving or eliminating discharges that adversely affect any of the following: (1) Wetlands, estuaries, and other biologically sensitive sites." Also, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act prohibits the nonpermitted filling of wetlands.

Tables VII 6.6.3 and 6.6.4 will be edited such that cells with a value of 0 will instead exhibit a dash (-).

Page VII.6.6-30, Table VII 6.6.5. Where appropriate, the table will be edited such that 10-100% appears in the currently blank cells for the Low to Moderate Habitat Capability Habitat row.

In the DEIR at page VII.6.6-53, paragraph 1, add the following at the end of the paragraph: At sea surveys conducted off the Mendocino Coast in recovery Zone 5 noted approximately 290 murrelets in 2005 (J. Hunter USFWS pers. comm.. 3/29/06).

In the DEIR at page VII.6.6-53, paragraph 2, add the following at end of the second sentence second paragraph: The use of radar to detect Marbled Murrelets is dependent on several variables including flight speed of the radar target, target size, flight path, and observed flight time.

In the DEIR at page VII.6.6-53, paragraph 2, add the following at end of sentence:
Marbled Murrelets at inland detections have been documented using both radar and ground-based audio-visual surveys.

In the DEIR, correct "Wheatfield Creek" in paragraph 1, page VII.6.6-54 to "Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River." Add at the end of this sentence "and South Fork Eel River (California Natural Diversity Data Base)."

Add to the DEIR at page VII.6.6-55, paragraph 1 the following sentence: Horsetail Gulch and Gulch 16 (1.5 miles east of Horsetail Gulch) are two known occupied sites on Campbell Timberland Management lands in the Ten Mile drainage (Middle Fork) as identified using protocol audio-visual surveys.

Under footnote "a" to Table VII.6.6.8 add the following text: This protocol has been revised several times and is currently reported in Evans and Mack (2003).

Change the text of footnotes in Tables VII.6.6.8, 9 and 11: Change “No USFWS protocol was available at this time” to “No recommended USFWS protocol was available at this time. Surveys may or may not have been done to the general protocol used at the time of survey and as indicated in the Table.”

Make Correction to Table VII.6.6.8 on page VII.6.6-57 under “Location” “Noyo, The Worm 2”: Under “Source” column change * text to: “Uncertain murrelet vocalizations were detected by surveyor. Additional year of follow-up survey resulted in no murrelet detections.”

Make same correction as above to the same entry in Table VII.6.6.9 on page VII.6.6-64.

Add footnote to Table VII.6.6.9 to indicate that “No protocol exists for radar surveys that is endorsed by the Marble Murrelet Technical Committee.”

Page VII 6.6-72, Par.1: The first sentence of the first paragraph will be edited to remove “recommends” and replaced with “describes”. The sentence, “No radar protocol exists for surveying murrelets,” will be added to the paragraph.

Page VII.6.6-123: edit as follows: Lotis blue butterflies have a close association with coast hosackia (*Lotus formosissimus*) and potentially other members of the pea family. “Disturbed early successional wetland habitats” is omitted and replaced with “open wetland habitats.”

Page VII.6.6-126: Regarding osprey, remove statement to the effect that the USFWS exerts specific jurisdiction of this species relative to the FPRs.

Page VII.6.6-127: The sentence: “Potential mitigation measures for occupied murrelet habitat include avoidance of disturbance or habitat alteration” will be added to the second paragraph.

Page VII 6.6-127, Par.3: The sentence, ”Marbled Murrelets have also been infrequently documented nesting in second-growth forest with single residual conifers with suitable nest platforms or in mature forest stands with scattered residuals with platforms,” will be added as the fourth sentence of the paragraph.

Page VII.6.6-135: add the following text to the DEIR to clarify the paragraph: The 7% represents a large number of classes with a relatively small amount of acreage. They were modeled using the most closely associated CWHR type from the 93% that were individually modeled. This was a parsimonious approach that considered the types, resolution of modeling effort, and speculative nature of forecasting other ownership future behavior.

Page VII.6.6-219: The edge measure TECI indicated in the DEIR is incorrect; it should be Total Edge (TE) and is expressed in meters.

Appendix 7B-2, Page 2: the Mendocino County USGS 7.5’ quadrangles for *Boschniakia hookeri* will be updated to include Elk (CNDDB 2005)

Appendix 7B-2, Page 2: the “s” on the species scientific name has been dropped for Thurber's reed grass (*Calamagrostis crassiglumis*) in miscellaneous locations in the body of the DEIR.

Add the following table to section VII.6.6 in order to explain more directly why certain species were not analyzed: Table. Rationale for Identifying Species with No Potential for Significance Effects Under Any Alternative and Therefore Not Addressed in Detail in the JDSF EIR.

Species	**Project Area Occurrence and Habitats**	**Basis for Determination of Effects**	**Impacts and Significance of Plan Alternatives**
Pomo bronze shoulderband snail	Found on lands adjacent to JDSF. Associated with dense redwood forest in riparian habitats and other mesic areas.	All current old growth forest habitats protected. Riparian habitats to be managed to increase late successional character.	Minor or no direct effects. Potential for habitat enhancement. Overall effects less than significant
Fringed myotis Long-legged myotis Pacific big-eared bat	No reported occurrences on or adjacent to JDSF. Breeding and roosting uses are mostly associated with building, caves, but may use hollow trees and other substrates	Breeding and roosting habitat will not be affected. Rangewide declines likely associated with disturbance at roosting and nesting sites (Williams (1986). Species are not likely to be sensitive to vegetation treatment with protection and creation of large snags. Old growth habitat with large snags to be protected and extent of late successional forest to be increased on JDSF	Little or no effects on species or habitat. Impacts less than significant, likely beneficial over long term
Great Blue Heron Great Egret, Double-crested Cormorant	Species are not known to regularly occur, but are observed occasionally onsite or are present on adjacent lands.	Species populations are stable or increasing in the state. If they occur at JDSF, they are localized. Existing FPR nest site protections applied on a project level during timber harvest are effective. Nesting habitat may improve through riparian management	Less-than significant; potentially beneficial in the long-term
Northern Harrier	Primarily a species of wetlands and grasslands. Seldom use shrub or forested areas, even following even aged timber harvest. No known occurrences on or adjacent to JDSF, but winters and may breed in grasslands on nearby Coastal plain.	Likely occurs only as an irregular or localized migrant or wintering species. Uses grassland and other very open areas (e.g Keiffer 1993) generally on flatter terrain, which are limited at JDSF JSDF of low importance to species.	No impacts

Species	Project Area Occurrence and Habitats	Basis for Determination of Effects	Impacts and Significance of Plan Alternatives
Sharp-shinned Hawk	Known to occur	Species has increased substantially through most of its range (Sauer et al. 2005). Not considered a state species of special concern (SSC) in draft revision of SSC list (Shuford, in prep.). Readily uses younger forest stands.	Less than significant or no impact
Merlin	No reported occurrences of the species on or adjacent to JDSF, although likely occurs in low density. Uses open areas and edge habitats for foraging. A wintering species only.	Former threat was pesticide contamination (Remsen 1978). Species has increased over most of breeding range (Sauer et al. 2005), so likely has increased as a wintering species in California. Not considered a SSC in draft revision of list (Shuford, in prep.) Likely not limited by wintering habitat	No impact.
Tricolored Blackbird	No occurrences; found locally on adjacent lands. Requires combination of marsh or wet meadow with dense cover (frequently blackberry) for nesting with grassland for foraging	Limited marsh and meadow habitat at JDSF will not affected by management actions. Not known to forage in forested habitat, even recently cleared areas. Few breeding records in Mendocino County (Keiffer 1993, Beedy and Hamilton	Less than significant or no impact
Yellow-breasted Chat	Known to occur on adjacent lands. Uses well-developed riparian areas dominated by hardwoods. Likely to be locally distributed if present	Suitable habitats will be protected through riparian management	Less than significant or no impact

References

Beedy, E.C. and W. J. Hamilton III. 1997. Tricolored blackbird status update and management guidelines. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR, and California Department of Fish and Game , Sacramento, CA.

Keiffer, R. J. 1993. Field checklist of the bires of Mendocino County, California. Hopland, CA.

Remsen, J. V., Jr. Bird Species of Sepcial Concern in California. Wildlife Managemnt Branch Admin. Rept. 78-1. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento CA.

Sauer, J. R., J. E. Hines, and J. Fallon. 2005. The North American Breeding Bird Survey, Results and Analysis 1966 - 2004. Version 2005.2. USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, MD.

Shuford, D. (Ed.) in preparation. Bird Species of Special Concern in California. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA.

Williams, D. F. 1986. Mammalian Species of Special Concern in California. Wildlife Management Division Admin. Rept. 86-1.California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento CA.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan has added these additional objectives to Goal #3:

Protect all beneficial uses of water, comply with water quality objectives in accordance with the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (Basin Plan), and implement required TMDL measures.

Comply with other relevant regulations of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, including the Anti-degradation Policy, TMDL Implementation Policy statement, the Nonpoint Source Policy, and other relevant current regulations, as well as any additional relevant regulations that may be implemented over time.

Section VII.10.5: add the following table to section VII.10.5 of the DEIR to provide a listing of beneficial uses within the DEIR:

Table VII.10.4A. Basin Plan Designated Beneficial Uses for the Noyo and Big Rivers.

Beneficial Use	Basin	
	Noyo River	Big River
Municipal and Domestic Supply	E	E
Agricultural Supply	E	E
Industrial Service Supply	E	E
Industrial Process Supply	P	P
Groundwater Recharge	E	E
Freshwater Replenishment	E	E
Navigation	E	E
Hydropower Generation	E	P
Water Contact Recreation	E	E
Non-Contact Water Recreation	E	E
Commercial and Sport Fishing	E	E
Cold Freshwater Habitat	E	E
Wildlife Habitat	E	E
Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species	E	E
Migration of Aquatic Organisms	E	E
Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development	E	E
Estuarine Habitat	E	E
Aquaculture	E	P
E = existing; P = potential		

Add the following to Appendix 11:

> We agree with the comments of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board staff, per the TMDL documents for the Noyo and Big Rivers, that both legacy practices and current practices contribute sediment that is delivered to stream channels during a given period of time. That being said, it appears that a major portion of this comment relates to disagreement over the conclusions of the South Fork Noyo River sediment study produced by Koehler and others (2001). Dr. Lee Benda, Graham Matthews, and Rich Koehler all agree that sediment trapped in long-term storage along the South Fork Noyo River channel is transported downstream in high-discharge events, and that this sediment increases the overall suspended sediment load. If the source is not properly accounted for, this suspended sediment could be incorrectly attributed to recent upslope sources, which would lead to an overestimation of the sediment generated by contemporary upslope management practices. This distinction is important, particularly because some scientists believe that remobilized historic or legacy sediment-derived increases in suspended sediment load are likely to be a significant, unrecognized sediment source. This view is shared by Graham Matthews, who wrote the sediment source area analysis reports that the Big and Noyo River TMDL documents were based on, and was a co-author of the South Fork Noyo Report (Koehler and others 2001).

After review of the document, the Board agrees with the NCRWQCB staff that there are some places in Appendix 11 where there is inaccurate usage of terms. The Board does not believe that the inconsistent use of terms resulted in incorrect findings being made.

Table 3, Appendix 12, MWAT Thresholds and Standards. After reviewing the literature the Board has made corrections to the table as follows:

MWAT Thresholds and Standards		
Temperature (C)	Descriptions	Temperature (F)
26	Upper end of range of acute thresholds (considered lethal to salmonids)	78.8
25		77.0
24	Lower end of range of acute thresholds (considered lethal to salmonids)	75.2
23		73.4
22		71.6
21		69.8
20		68.0
19	Steelhead growth reduced 20% from maximum (Sullivan and others, 2000).MWAT metric USEPA (1977) growth MWAT for rainbow trout Coho growth reduced 20% from maximum (Sullivan and others, 2000), MWAT metric	66.2
18	USEPA (1977) growth MWAT for coho	64.4
17	Steelhead growth reduced 10% from maximum.	62.6
16.8	NMFS MWAT threshold.	62.2
16.7	Welsh and others (2001) MWAT threshold for coho presence/absence in the Mattole	62.1
16	Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality Standard for salmonids (equivalent MWAT calculated from 7-day max.)	60.8
15	EPA Region 10 Recommended MWAT. Threshold for Coldwater Salmonid Rearing	59.0
14.8	Coho growth reduced 10% from maximum (Sullivan and others, 2000), MWAT metric	58.6
14.6	Upper end of preferred rearing range of coho	58.3
14.3	Washington Dept. of Ecology standard (equivalent MWAT calculated from annual max.)	57.7
14		57.2
13	Upper end of preferred rearing range for steelhead.	55.4
Note: A 16.5 C MWMT corresponds with a 10% reduction in growth of coho.		

References

The table below contains added literature references that were missing in the DEIR, or corrections to references.

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
V	12	online Database http://cain.nbii.gov/calwater/	Calwater (version 2.2)
V	15	Rutland, Robert. 2003. Big River Watershed Assessment Report for the North Coast Watershed Assessment Program (DRAFT). California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento.	Rutland, 2003
VII.5	11	This is The Toxic Air Contaminant Identification and Control Act (AB 1807), and should be cited as such. Tanner introduced the bill to the assembly in 1983.	Tanner, 1983
VII.6.1	6	Welsh, H.H., A.J. Lind, L.M. Ollivier, G.R. Hodgson and N.E. Karraker. 1998. Comments on the PALCO HCP/SYP and EIS/EIR with regard to the maintenance of riparian, aquatic and late seral ecosystems and their associated amphibian and reptile species. Unpublished.	Welsh, 1998 (listed as et al.)
VII.6.1	6	Williams. R.N. J.A. Stanford, J.A. Lichatowich, M.S., W.J. Liss, C.C. Coutant, W.E. McConnaha, R.R. Whitney, P.R. Mundy, P.A. Bisson and M.S. Powell. 2006. Return to the river: strategies for salmon restoration in the Columbia River basin. p 629-666. In Return to the River. R. Williams (ed). Elsevier Inc. 720p.	Williams et al, 1999 CORRECT YEAR TO THAT BELOW Williams et al, 2006
VII.6.1	13	Brazier, J.R. and G.W. Brown. 1973. Buffer strips for stream temperature control. Research Paper 15, Oregon State University Forest Research Lab, Corvallis, OR. 9 p.	Brazier and Brown, 1973
VII.6.1	15	James, C.E. 2003. Southern exposure research project: a study evaluating the effectiveness of riparian buffers in minimizing impacts of clearcut timber harvest operations on shade-producing canopy cover, microclimate, and water temperature along a headwater stream in northern California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley. 382 p.	James, 2003
VII.6.1	16	Ambrose, R.F. 2000. Wetland mitigation in the United States: Assessing the success of mitigation policies. Wetlands (Australia) 19:1-27.	Ambrose, 2000
VII.6.1	16	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 1999. Draft habitat conservation plan and sustained yield plan for Jackson Demonstration State Forest. Prepared by Stillwater Sciences, Berkeley, California.	CDF, 1999

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
VII.6.1	25	Shirazi, M. A., and W. K. Seim. 1979. A stream system evaluation - an emphasis on spawning habitat for salmonids. U.S. Environ. Prot. Agency, EPA -600/3-79-109, 36 p. Corvallis Res. Lab. Corvallis, Oreg.	Shirazi & Seiu, 1979
VII.6.1	29	Valentine, B. 1996. Stream temperatures on Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mendocino County, California during summer of 1995. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Santa Rosa.	Valentine, 1996
VII.6.1	32	North Coast Regional Quality Control Board. 2004 (preliminary draft). Big River Water Quality Assessment. Report compiled for the North Coast Watershed Assessment Program. North Coast Regional Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa. Draft utilized with permission of R. Klamt, Chief of Timber Harvest Division, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.	NCWAP, 2004
VII.6.1	34	M Berbach, P Cafferata, T Robards, B Valentine. 1999. Forest Canopy Measurements in Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones: A Literature Review. California Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento, CA. 23 p.	Berbach, 1999
VII.6.1	42	Welsh, H.H., G.R. Hodgson, B.K. Harvey and M.E. Roche. 2001. Distribution of juvenile coho salmon in relation to water temperatures in tributaries of the Mattole River, California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:464-470.	Welsh, 2001
VII.6.1	46	Mendocino Redwood Company, 2003	Mendocino Redwood Company, 2002
VII.6.1	54	Federal register notice.	Schiewe, 1996a fide NOAA, 2003
VII.6.1	57	Anderson, J.J. 1995. Decline and Recovery of Snake River Salmon. Information based on the CRiSP research project. Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatitives Subcommittee on Power and Water, June 3.	Anderson, 1995
VII.6.1	57	Fry, D. H., Jr. 1973. Anadromous fishes of California. California Department of Fish and Game. 111 pp.	Fry, 1973
VII.6.1	57	Leidy, R. and G. Becker. 2001. Letter to Dennis McEwan, California Department of Fish and Game. FIDE http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nafwb/pubs/2002/2002_04_coho_status.pdf Status Review of California Coho Salmon North Of San Francisco	Leidy and Becker, 2001
VII.6.1	57	Lucoff, W. 1980. The distribution of six selected species from the genera Oncorhynchus, Salmo, and Salvelinus in California. Unpublished M.S. Project, California State University, Hayward.	Lucoff, 1980
VII.6.1	57	Snyder, J.O. 1931. Salmon of the Klamath River, California. Division of Fish and Game, Bulletin No. 34.	Snyder, 1931

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
VII.6.1	60	Federal register notice.	NOAA Fisheries, 2001
VII.6.1	60	Federal register notice.	NOAA, 2003
VII.6.1	63	Smith, J.J. 1992. "Distribution and abundance of juvenile coho and steelhead in Waddell, Scott and Gazos Creeks in 1992." Department of Biological Sciences, San Jose State University. Unpublished report, 8 pp.	Smith, 2001
VII.6.1	64	Busby, P. J, T. C. Wainwright, G. J. Bryant, L. J. Lierheimer, R. S. Waples, F. W. Waknitz, and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo NMFS-NWFSC-27, 261 p. (Available online at: http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/publications/techmemos/tm27/tm27.htm).	Busby et al., 1996
VII.6.1	68	Healey, M.C. 1991. Life history of chinook salmon (Orncorhynchus tshawytscha). Pp 311-393 in C. Groot and L. Margois (eds.) Pacific salmon life histories. Univeristy of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.	Healey, 1991
VII.6.1	71	Wahle, R. J., and R. E. Pearson. 1987. A listing of Pacific coast spawning streams and hatcheries producing chinook and coho salmon. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS F/NWC-122, 109 p.	Wahle and Pearson, 1989
VII.6.1	79		USFS, 1996
VII.6.1	81	Everest, F.H. 1987. Salmonids of western forested watersheds. Pages 3-8 in E.O. Salo and T.W. Cundy. editors. Streamside management: forestry and fishery interactions.	Everest, 1987
VII.6.1	84	Gallagher, S. P. 2000. DRAFT. Results of the winter steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) spawning survey on the Noyo River, California with comparison to some historic habitat information. California Department of Fish and Game. Steelhead Research and Monitoring Program. Fort Bragg, CA. 29 pp	Gallagher et al, 2000
VII.6.1	85	Keithley, C. 1999. Evaluating Stream and Watershed Conditions in Northern California. Prepared for the California Department of Forestry, Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Sacramento, CA. 17 pp.	Keithley, 1999
VII.6.1	86	Federal register notice.	NOAA Fisheries, May 5, 1999
VII.6.1	87	Federal register notice.	NOAA Fisheries, September 2, 2005
VII.6.1	104	Valentine, B. 1994 Stream temperatures on Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mendocino County, California during summer of 1994.California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection,	Valentine, 1994 Unpublished

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
		Santa Rosa.	
VII.6.1	22,	Brown, L. R., P. B. Moyle, and R. M. Yoshiyama. 1994. Historical decline and current status of coho salmon in California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 14(2):237-261. [426kb]**	Brown, 1994 (page 22 states Brown et al. 1994)
VII.6.2	13	RareFind is an on-line computerized inventory of California's rarest species and natural communities maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/rarefind.asp	CDFG, 2001
VII.6.2	40	Halpern, Charles B. and Thomas A. Spies. 1995. Plant Species Diversity in Natural and Managed Forests of the Pacific Northwest. Ecological Applications 5 4:913-934.	Halpen and Spies', 1995 (Halpern [spelling])
VII.6.3	3	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire and Resource Assessment Program, 2003. The changing California: Forest and Range 2003 Assessment.	CDF, 2003
VII.6.4	21	Sanborn, S.R. 1997. Tree Notes, Number 3. July 1996. Controlling Bark Beetles in Wood Residue and Firewood.	Sanford, 1996
VII.6.6	2	Mayer, K.E. and W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr., eds. 1988. A guide to Wildlife Habitats of California. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento.	Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988
VII.6.6	14	Evans, D.M. and D.M. Finch. 1994. Relationships between forest songbird populations and managed forests in Idaho. Pp. 308-314 in W.W. Covington and L.F. DeBano (tech. cords.) Sustainable ecological systems: implementing an ecological approach to land management. USDA For Serv. Gen. Tech. Rept. RM-247. 363 pp.	Evans and Finch 1994
VII.6.6	18	U.S. Forest Service and BLM. 1994. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of land Management, Portland.	USFS and BLM 1994
VII.6.6	19	Barbour, M. G., and J. Major, eds. 1977. *Terrestrial Vegetation of California.* Wiley- Interscience, reprinted by the California Native Plant Society 1988, Sacramento, California.	Barbour and Major 1977
VII.6.6	19	Cafferata, P.H. and F.A. Yee. 1991. A comparison of techniques to control sprouting hardwoods on harsh sites in western Mendocino County. California Forestry Note No. 105. California Department of Forestry, Sacramento, CA. 15 p.	Cafferata and Yee 1991
VII.6.6	21	Laudenslayer, W. F., Jr. 1991. A check-list of the amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals of California. Calif. Fish & Game 77: 109-141.	Laudenslayer 1991
VII.6.6	29	Beardsley, D.E. and B. Schwind, 2000. Vegetation map accuracy report. USDA Forest Service, Region 5 Remote Sensing Lab, Sacramento, CA.	Beardsley and Schwind 2000

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
VII.6.6	30	Department of Fish and Game Northern Spotted Owl database:	Gould 2000
VII.6.6	41	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; determination of threatened status for the California red-legged frog, final rule. Federal Register 61:25813-25833. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.	USFWS 1996a
VII.6.6	43	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Endangered and threatened wildlife; notice of 1-year petition finding on the western pond turtle. Federal Register 58:153. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.	USFWS 1993
VII.6.6	44	Harris, S. 1996. Wildlife surveys. California Department of Fish & Game.	Harris 1996
VII.6.6	44	Town, Pamela. 2000. Distribution, Habitat Requirements, and Movements of Western Pond Turtles on Jackson Demonstration State Forest	Town's 2000a (spell TOWN not TOWN's 2000a and 2000 same)
VII.6.6	44	US Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998a. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: notice of 12-month finding on a petition to list the northern goshawk in the contiguous United States west of the 100th meridian. Federal Register 63:35183-35184.	USFWS 1998a
VII.6.6	45	Pious, M. 1995 Home range and habitat use of spotted owls in managed Redwood/Douglas fir forests, California. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, Forestry Department, Calpella, CA.	Reynolds 1992
VII.6.6	47	Boal C W; Mannan R W . 1998. Nest site selection by Cooper's hawks in an urban environment. The Journal of Wildlife Management; 62(3): 864-871.	Boal and Mannan 1998
VII.6.6	49	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1986. Pacific Bald Eagle Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR.	USFWS 1986
VII.6.6	49	California Department of Fish and Game. 2001. The Status of Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Animals of California. Combined CDFG Annual Report for 2000. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento,	CDFG 2001
VII.6.6	52	US Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: final designation of critical habitat for the marbled murrelet. Federal Register 61:26256-26320.	USFWS 1996b
VII.6.6	89	US Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. Recovery plan for the threatened marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) in Washington, Oregon and California. Portland, Oregon.	USFWS 1997
VII.6.6	91	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Draft Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland.	USFWS 1992c
VII.6.6	91	Resource Management International (RMI). 1996. Jackson Demonstration State Forest northern spotted owl timber sale area survey results - 1994-1995. Final report prepared for California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Fort Bragg.	RMI 1996
VII.6.6	91	Roberts, K.N., S. Bunnell and T. W. Wooster. 1991. The activities and distribution of the northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina) in managed second-growth redwood/Douglas-fir forests at	Roberts et al. 1991

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
		Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mendocino County, California, 1989-1992. Progress report. California Department of Fish and Game, Environmental Services Division.	
VII.6.6	91	Roberts, K.N., S. Bunnell and T. W. Wooster. 1992. The activities and distribution of the northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina) in managed second-growth redwood/Douglas-fir forests at Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mendocino County, California, 1989-1992. California Department of Fish and Game, Environmental Services Division.	Roberts et al. 1992
VII.6.6	91	US Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: determination of critical habitat for the northern spotted owl. Federal Register 57:1796-1837.	USFWS 1994b
VII.6.6	94	Robert, K.N., S. Bunnell, and T. Wooster. 1993. The Activities and Distribution of the Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) in Managed Second-Growth Redwood/Douglas-fir Forest of Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Mendocino County, California—1989-1992 Progress Report. Environmental Services Division, California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA.	Roberts et al. 1994
VII.6.6	97	Martin, T. E. 1996. Life history evolution in tropical and south temperate birds: what do we really know? Journal of Avian Biology 27:263–272. or Martin, J.S. 1996. Analysis of Bell's Vireo in southern South Dakota. University of South Dakota. Vermillion, SD.	Martin 1996
VII.6.6	98	Pious, M. 1994. Nesting and roosting habitat of spotted owls in managed Redwood/Douglas-fir forests, California. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, Forestry Department, Calpella, CA. Pious, M. 1995 Home range and habitat use of spotted owls in managed Redwood/Douglas fir forests, California. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, Forestry Department, Calpella, CA.	Pious 1994, 1995
VII.6.6	100	Shuford, W.D. 1993. The Marin County breeding bird atlas: a distributional and natural history of coastal California birds. Bushtit Books, Bolinas, CA.	Shuford 1993
VII.6.6	106	Golightly, R.T. Jr, 1997. Fisher (Martes pennanti) ecology, conservation and management. Pages 7-16 in J.E. Harris and C.V. Ogan, editors. Mesocarnivores of northern California: biology, management and survey techniques. Workshop manual. The Wildlife Society, California North Coast Chapter, Arcata.	Golightly 1997
VII.6.6	109	Zielinski, W.J., and R.T. Golightly. 1996. The status of marten in redwoods: is the Humboldt marten extinct? Pages 115-119 in: LeBlanc, John, ed., Conference on Coast Redwood Forest Ecology and Management, 1996 June 18-20, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA.	Zielinski and Golightly 1996
VII.6.6	116	Wildlife Science Committee. 1994. Approaches to wildlife cumulative effects assessment and analysis. A report prepared for the California Board of Forestry, September 2, 1994. 13p.	Wildlife/Science Committee 1994

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
VII.6.6	216	Freemark, K. E., J. B. Dunning, S. J Hejl, and J. R. Probst. 1995. A landscape ecology perspective for research, conservation and Management. Pages 381-427 in T. E. Martin and D. M. Finch, eds. Ecology and management of Neotropical migratory birds: A synthesis and review of critical issues. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, N. Y.	Freemark et al. 1995
VII.7	3	Kilbourne, R. T. (1986) Geology and slope stability of the Fort Bragg area. California Geol. 39(3), 58-68.	Kilbourne 1986
VII.10	23	Merrill, B.R. and E. Casaday. 2003. Best management practices for road rehabilitation. Final Report. California State Parks, North Coast Redwoods District. Eureka, California. 25 p.	Merrill and Cassaday 2003
VII.11	8	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2002. California Forest Practice Rules.	CDF 2002
VIII	47	Benda, L.E., Bigalow, P., and Worsley, W. 2002. Recruitment of instream large wood in old-growth and second-growth redwood forests, northern California, U.S.A. Can. J. For. Res. **32**: 1460–1477.	Benda et al. 2002
VIII	52	Ligon, F., A. Rich, G. Rynearson, D. Thornburgh, W. Trush. 1999. Report of the Scientific Review Panel on California Forest Practice Rules and Salmonid Habitat. Prepared for the Resource Agency of California and the National marine Fisheries Service, Sacramento, CA. 92 p. + 7 appendices.	The Scientific Review Panel 1999
VIII	54	See: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 1999.	CDF 1999
VIII	54	Ligon, F., A. Rich, G. Rynearson, D. Thornburgh, W. Trush. 1999. Report of the Scientific Review Panel on California Forest Practice Rules and Salmonid Habitat. Prepared for the Resource Agency of California and the National marine Fisheries Service, Sacramento, CA. 92 p. + 7 appendices.	SRP 1999
VIII	62	Hill, Norm and Wendy Wickizer. 2002. Environmental Effects of Herbicide Related to Timber Harvesting. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Sacramento, California.	Hill and Wickizer 2002
VIII	73	Flosi, G., S. Downie, J. Hopelain, M. Bird, R. Coey, and B. Collins. 1998. California salmonid stream habitat restoration manual. 3rd edition. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.	Flosi et al. 1998
VIII	76	Rutland, Robert. 2003. Big River Watershed Assessment Report for the North Coast Watershed Assessment Program (DRAFT). California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento.	Rutland 2003
VIII	77	California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1959. Big River stream survey, 27 July 1959. CDFG unpublished file memo by S.N. Nye or J. Morehouse. Yountville, CA. 5 pp.	CDFG 1959

Section	Page	Reference Correction, Explanation	Reference Used in Document
VIII	77	California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1959b. Daugherty Creek (South Fork Big River tributary) stream survey, 10 August 1959. CDFG unpublished file memo by J. Morehouse. Yountville, CA. 6 pp California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1966c. Snuffins Creek (Daugherty Creek tributary) stream survey, 9 June 1966. CDFG unpublished file memo by J.L. Thomas. Yountville, CA. 7 pp.	CDFG 1959b, 1966c
VIII	77	Taylor, S.N. 1978. The status of salmon populations in California coastal rivers. California Department of Fish and Game. Salmon/Steelhead Program, Anadromous Fisheries Branch. 14 pp.	Taylor 1978
VIII	78	Mangelsdorf, A. and L. Clyde. 2000. Draft Assessment of Aquatic Conditions in the Mendocino Coast Hydrologic Unit. Chapter 4: Ten Mile River.	Mangelsdorf and Clyde 2000
VIII	79	Barnard K., and S. McBain. 1994. Standpipe to determine permeability, dissolved oxygen, and vertical particle size distribution in salmonid spawning gravels. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Fish Habitat Relationships Technical Bulletin *Currents* 15:1-12	Barnard and McBain 1994
VIII	80	Kondolf, G.M. 2000. Assessing Salmonid Spawning Gravel Quality. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 129:262-281.	Kondolf 2000
VIII	80	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1998. (Final) Garcia River sediment total maximum daily load. Dated 16 March 1998 . USEPA, Region IX . San Francisco, CA . 51 pp	US EPA 1998
VIII	80	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. Big River Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment. Region IX, San Francisco, CA. http://www.epa.gov/region09/water/tmdl/big/bigfinaltmdl.pdf	US EPA 2001
VIII	81	North Coast Regional Quality Control Board. 2004 (preliminary draft). Big River Water Quality Assessment. Report compiled for the North Coast Watershed Assessment Program. North Coast Regional Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa. Draft utilized with permission of R. Klamt, Chief of Timber Harvest Division, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.	NCWAP 2004, Appendix B
VIII	82	North Coast Watershed Assessment Program. 2003. Big River Watershed Assessment Report for the North Coast Watershed Assessment Program (DRAFT). California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Sacramento.	NCWAP 2003

Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR)

Executive Summary, page I-5, second bullet point:

The correct size of the additional area devoted to development of late-seral forest habitat primarily for the benefit of the marbled murrelet is 1,549 acres.