

Proposition 84 (13-14 Grant Round)

Project Proposal Form
EGID# (Insert number here)

Choose Either: **Category One Site Improvement**

Project Title: **Amador Calaveras Consensus Group - Bailey Plantation Health Improvement**
(Limit to 10 words or less. If CEQA/NEPA has been completed for this project, please use the same name as on the environmental documents.)

County: **Calaveras**

SNC Subregion: **South Central Sierra**

SNC Area Representative: **Brandon Sanders**

Area Manager: **Julie Bear**

ORGANIZATION INFORMATION

Organization: **Stanislaus National Forest,
Calaveras Ranger District
5519 Highway 4
Hathaway Pines, CA 95233**
(Including legal name, address and zip code)

Organization Type: **Government (U.S. Forest Service)**
(Either: Non-profit Organization; Government (specify agency); Tribal Organization)

Organization Website: **N/A**

Has the organization successfully completed similar project(s)?: **Yes**

If yes, please describe the project(s): **The Stanislaus National Forest has successfully implemented numerous restoration projects similar to the proposed project. The Granite Stewardship Project area, located on the Groveland Ranger District is an excellent example. Approximately a dozen meadows and stream channels were restored through utilizing treatments such as filling and recontouring of gullied channels and meadows, streambank stabilization, vegetation planting, and fencing.**

If applicant is a Non-Profit, do we currently have Articles of Incorporation and Non Profit Status on file? **N/A**

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

Authorized Representative/Title: **Teresa McClung, District Ranger**
(Authorized to sign grant agreement, requests for payment and other formal documents as required)

Email: **tmclung@fs.fed.us**

Address: **P.O. Box 500, 5519 Highway 4**

City, State, Zip: **Hathaway Pines, CA 95233**

Proposition 84 (13-14 Grant Round)

Project Proposal Form

EGID# (Insert number here)

Phone Number: 209-795-1381, ext 314

Fax Number: 209-795-6849

Day-to-Day Grant Project Manager (Person/Title): Jim Junette, Resource Management Program Area Leader

(Only include if different than the Authorized Representative)

Email: jjunette@fs.fed.us

Address: P.O. Box 500, 5519 Highway 4

City, State, Zip: Hathaway Pines, CA 95233

Phone Number: 209-795-1381, ext 333

Fax Number: 209-795-6849

PROJECT DETAILS

Project Description (Provided by applicant, to be attached as a word document)

information will be gathered as the project is developed; the final project description must address:

- project design and readiness,
- desired outcomes or tangible results,
- the degree to which a forest health project builds on existing partnerships or collaborations which may include SNC's involvement or support,
- the degree to which an abandoned mine land project aligns with purposes of the AML Initiative
- likelihood of success based on applicants capacity and experience implementing similar projects
- the degree to which the project leverages other resources
- community support
- a plan for long term management (if applicable)
- a plan for future implementation and necessary resources (if a Cat. II Project)

Is there any known opposition to this project?: **No**

If yes, provide details:

If the project addresses AML issues is there an identified Responsible Party? If not, what is the agency/organization's role?: **N/A**

Has this project been previously considered by the SNC?: **Yes**

If so, list the name, project number and outcome. [The project was considered in 2011 by SNC \(project title: Bailey Plantation Health Improvement and Ecosystem Restoration, project number: 647\). The original proposal also included 302 acres of plantation thinning. The proposal was not funded due to NEPA/CEQA considerations.](#)

Does the project build upon another project previously funded or supported by the SNC? **No**

If so, list the name, project number and outcome, or identify non-grant SNC support.

Is this project resulting from a collaborative effort? **Yes**

Proposition 84 (13-14 Grant Round)

Project Proposal Form

EGID# (Insert number here)

If so, identify the partners and whether or not the SNC has played a role.

Yes, the project is a result of collaborative effort with the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG). SNC is an active member of ACCG.

Approximate beginning and ending project dates (project must be completed by March 1, 2017): Project Implementation would occur between September 2014 and October 2014.

Amount requested: \$70,000

Total project cost: \$75,000

Source(s) of other project funds: Forest Service, Cornerstone CFLR
(If applicable, list funding source with anticipated amount.)

Project location: Near West Point, CA 95255
(List specific project location, city (list nearest), county, zip code and APN#)

Project latitude and longitude: 38.392801, -120.297546
(List specific project coordinates using the "Find Your Coordinates" tool on the [SNC Regional Map](#) page.)

CEQA/NEPA PROJECT INFORMATION

Is this a project under CEQA? **No**

If **No**, please describe why you believe the activity proposed is not a project under CEQA: Project location is on US Forest Service land. As such, NEPA was completed for project activities. CEQA would need to be completed for implementation with the SNC grant. Supplemental analysis has been completed on green house gasses and recreational use.

Has CEQA been completed? **No**

If **Yes**, please provide information as to the CEQA compliance and the CEQA Lead Agency

What supporting documents and permits have been created (or what is the expected timeframe for the creation of these documents?)

This project would require a 404 permit from Army Corps and 401 water quality certification from the state water board. The US Forest Service would obtain all necessary permits prior to project implementation.

Do you propose that SNC acts as lead agency in determining that the project is exempt under CEQA? **Yes**

If **Yes**, what exemption do you believe applies? -- The small footprint (1.7 acres) of riparian restoration work should be categorically exempted using Class 7 "actions to assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of a natural resource." The Forest Service would consult with SNC to determine the appropriate Categorical Exemption.

Is NEPA compliance required for this project? **Yes**
(If yes, please complete the NEPA Questionnaire.)

The NEPA Questionnaire has been completed.

NEPA Lead Agency: U.S. Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group - Bailey Plantation Health Improvement

Riparian Restoration - Project Details

Project design and readiness

The Bailey Plantation Health Improvement project is a SNC Category 1 site improvement project to restore approximately 1.7 acres of riparian habitat. Project environmental documentation (NEPA) has been completed. Specific project design would occur prior to proposal submittal.

Riparian rehabilitation work would be performed in approximately 1.7 acres where a culvert on a short spur of 6N03G has initiated a headcut in an intermittent channel, creating a gully up to 8 feet deep that ranges from 6 feet to 30 feet wide. The gully is approximately 900-1,000 feet long. Approximately 10% of the obligate riparian vegetation remains along the stream. Gravel or larger substrate is absent along the stream bed, with current substrates consisting primarily of sand and silt. The existing condition makes this stream vulnerable to further degradation from erosion and down-cutting.

The culvert on the 6N03G spur would be removed from the stream channel. The stream banks and channel would be reshaped to a more stable and lower gradient alignment and held in place through the installation of rock grade control structures. Riparian vegetation would be planted to hold the new stream bank.

Road 6N03G would be decommissioned through a combination of techniques including subsoiling the road bed, pulling fill where it is slumping into the channel and re-contouring the slope, adding slash for erosion control, planting with native species, and installing waterbars.

Desired outcomes or tangible results

Implementation of these restoration measures should stabilize the stream channel, improve the functionality of the floodplain, improve riparian habitat, and eliminate a considerable source of current and potential future sediment, thereby moving the stream channel toward the desired condition.

The degree to which a forest health project builds on existing partnerships or collaborations which may include SNC's involvement or support

Project planning and implementation would be developed in collaboration with the Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG), which is a local collaborative that works to create healthy forests and watersheds, fire-safe communities, and sustainable local economies. ACCG fosters partnerships among private, nonprofit, state, and federal entities with a common interest in the health and well-being of the landscape and communities in the Mokelumne and Calaveras watersheds. The group is advancing an All-Lands strategy to create a heightened degree of environmental stewardship, local jobs, greater local economic stability, healthy forests and communities. ACCG principles reflect the group's emphases on balancing environmental, social and economic goals. SNC is an active member in ACCG.

The degree to which an abandoned mine land project aligns with purposes of the AML Initiative

This project does not contain an abandoned mine project.

Likelihood of success based on applicants capacity and experience implementing similar projects

The Stanislaus National Forest has successfully implemented numerous restoration projects similar to the proposed project. The Granite Stewardship Project area, located on the Groveland Ranger District is an excellent example. Approximately a dozen meadows and stream channels were restored through utilizing treatments such as filling and recontouring of gullied channels and meadows, streambank stabilization, vegetation planting, and fencing.

The degree to which the project leverages other resources

Restoration work on road maintenance and decommission, and plantation treatments has been funded through the Cornerstone CFLR. Additional leverage and match funds would occur from ACCG, and the US Forest Service (project planning and implementation). Efforts related to the Mokelumne Watershed Environmental Benefits Program may also provide leveraged funds.

Community support

Coordination with ACCG and Private landowner, indicate that these projects have broad community support. During public scoping, the project only received letters of support. Letters of support would be submitted with the full proposal.

A plan for long term management (if applicable)

This project would fund the restoration actions needed to allow this riparian area to improve watershed conditions such as water quality and quantity, reduced sediment in riparian habitat, and improved biological characteristics. Without restoration action, this riparian area would continue a slow transition to dryer environments and transport sediment into water supplies.

A plan for future implementation and necessary resources (if a Cat. II Project)

N/A



AUBURN OFFICE
11521 Blocker Drive, Ste. 205
Auburn, CA 95603
p (530)823-4670 f (530)823-4665

NEPA Questionnaire

If you are working with a Federal Land Manager as an applicant or the proposed project is located on federally managed lands, and the proposed project is most likely not exempt from CEQA and a CEQA lead agency has not been identified, please make sure to provide comprehensive answers to all of the applicable questions below in addition to the information required by the GAP.

A. What NEPA document has been prepared or approved?

Environmental Assessment

What is the proposed action addressed by the document?

- 1) Mechanical Thinning of Plantations
- 2) Prescribed Fire
- 3) Removal of Hazard and Danger Trees
- 4) Riparian, Meadow, and Hardwood Rehabilitation Activities

Specifically related to this proposal-

Riparian rehabilitation work would be performed in approximately 1.7 acres where a culvert on a short spur of 6N03G has initiated a headcut in an intermittent channel, creating a gully up to 8 feet deep that ranges from 6 feet to 30 feet wide. The gully is approximately 900-1,000 feet long. Approximately 10% of the obligate riparian vegetation remains along the stream. Gravel or larger substrate is absent along the stream bed, with current substrates consisting primarily of sand and silt. The existing condition makes this stream vulnerable to further degradation from erosion and down-cutting.

The culvert on the 6N03G spur would be removed from the stream channel. The stream banks and channel would be reshaped to a more stable and lower gradient alignment and held in place through the installation of rock grade control structures. Riparian vegetation would be planted to hold the new stream bank.

Road 6N03G would be decommissioned through a combination of techniques including subsoiling the road bed, pulling fill where it is slumping into the channel and re-contouring the slope, adding slash for erosion control, planting with native species, and installing waterbars. Implementation of these restoration measures should stabilize the stream channel, improve the functionality of the floodplain, improve riparian habitat, and eliminate a considerable source of current and potential future sediment, thereby moving the stream channel toward the desired condition.

What is the scope of the environmental analysis in the document – e.g., for a NEPA environmental assessment – is the analysis large-scale (as for plans) or project specific?

Project Specific

WWW.SIERRANEVADA.CA.GOV
TOLL FREE (877)257-1212



B. If a NEPA EA/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or EIS was prepared and approved:

1. When was the NEPA document approved?

May 27, 2011

2. Is the proposed project clearly described within the NEPA document? Does it indicate the project location, project objectives, and all activities considered to be part of the project? Where in the document is the pertinent information located?

Yes,

Page 1, 10 - Project Location

Page 2-3 – Purpose and Need (Objectives)

Page 10-15 -- Riparian Restoration activities.

3. Describe what was included in the public participation/notification process.

The Forest Service first listed the Bailey Plantation Health Improvement project (formerly the Bailey Plantation Thin) in the October 2009 issue of the Stanislaus National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). The Forest distributes the SOPA to about 160 parties and it is available on the internet [<http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/stanislaus/projects/sopa>].

On January 22, 2010 the Forest sent a scoping letter to 57 individuals, organizations, agencies, and Tribes interested in this project. The letter requested comments on the Proposed Action March 1, 2010. Two interested parties submitted letters, e-mails or verbal comments. No relevant issues were identified during scoping. Comments regarding the Bailey Plantation Health Improvement proposed actions primarily related to the amount and treatment of roads in the project area. As a result, the Forest Service carefully evaluated which roads were not essential and considered closing and/or decommissioning additional miles of roads. A list of non-relevant issues and reasons regarding their categorization as non-relevant may be found in the project record.

A legal notice, announcing the 30-day Opportunity to Comment on the EA appeared in the Union Democrat on March 4, 2011. The 30-day comment period ended on April 4, 2011. No comments were received during the comment period.

Is there a summary of issues raised in public comments?

Yes, A list of non-relevant issues and reasons regarding their categorization as non-relevant may be found in the project record.

4. Are mitigation measures (including design features) discussed, listed, and adopted as conditions? If so, where in the documentation do they exist? Do they include conditions as part of the project approval such as Best Management Practices (e.g., to prevent soil erosion, to protect water quality, to protect stream buffers, or to protect sensitive sites); wildlife, sensitive habitat, or cultural resources protocols, or other “standard” measures

used by federal agencies (e.g., regarding limited herbicide use, fire prevention or road maintenance/construction etc.)?

Yes, Page 5-10 list design features related to project activities.

5. How does the document address indirect impacts? This question will relate to the growth inducing impact discussion requirement by CEQA.

The EA does not address growth inducing impacts.

6. Does the document address cumulative impacts?

Yes – Page 17-37

7. Does the document address greenhouse gas emissions or climate change?

No, the EA did not address greenhouse gas emissions or climate change. However, a supplemental report was prepared that analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of greenhouse gasses and recreation use (by Alternative) for the Bailey Plantation Health Improvement project.

C. General guidance on CEQA impact analysis may be found in the [Initial Study checklist](#) (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). See also "[Mitigated Negative Declarations](#)," CEQA Technical Advice Series, prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

Notes: _____

