

LCP VOLUME I APPENDIX 9

Data Sources and Collection

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix 9 – Data Sources and Collection

This appendix includes an overview of the extensive data collection effort that informed the planning process for the Land Conservation Plan (LCP), including detail on specific GIS layers used in the existing conditions analysis.

Licensing and Other Regulatory Records

Since the Watershed Lands are predominately associated with PG&E's hydroelectric projects that are licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), much of the data used in the LCP planning process was obtained from documents prepared as part of FERC relicensing processes. FERC documents proved to be an excellent source of information on biological, cultural, and recreation resources in particular, since these items are required to be examined in detail during a FERC relicensing (or licensing) process for hydroelectric facilities.

Documents from FERC projects that have been licensed within the last few years generally provide the most comprehensive information. Projects that have not been relicensed for many years have the least amount of information available. Appendix 8 lists each FERC-licensed project relevant to Watershed Lands, the current license status of the project, and a brief summary of documents used in the development of the LCP.

Lands outside of the FERC boundary (the boundary that encapsulates lands and facilities that FERC determines necessary for hydroelectric project operation) are generally not studied to the same extent, if at all, as lands within the FERC boundary. As a result, little information is available on those lands.

With the exception of a few small (less than 5 megawatt) projects in Butte, Lassen, and Plumas Counties, all of PG&E's hydroelectric projects operate under FERC licenses. There are 26 FERC licenses in total; all but one contains watershed lands. Of the 25 project licenses that contain watershed lands, some were recently issued, while others are quite old dating as far back as the mid-1950s and early 1960s. In addition, a number of PG&E's hydroelectric projects are in varying stages of the relicensing process. Several of the projects have recently begun the relicensing process, and two more will begin the relicensing process in the next few years. Several other projects have recently submitted license applications and are awaiting FERC's environmental analysis, other Federal and State permitting, and the eventual issuance of new License Orders. Six projects have recently completed the relicensing process and received new licenses, while several more are not expected to begin relicensing until 10 to 20 years from now.

Information Generated from License Orders and Required Plans

Most FERC-related information analyzed during the LCP planning process was obtained from the FERC eLibrary, an electronic warehouse of all submitted and issued documents related to FERC-licensed projects. The eLibrary generally contains documents from about 1989 to the present. PG&E produced copies of requested documents not available online. Only documents that were believed to contain valuable, relevant information were requested from PG&E, and therefore not every FERC license-related document was obtained.

License applications, License Orders, biological studies, Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, and documents regarding Section 7 consultation with the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) such as Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions were reviewed. Documents produced by the USDS Forest Service (USFS) including 4(e) conditions, monitoring reports, comment letters, or other relevant documents posted to the FERC eLibrary website were also utilized.

Cultural monitoring reports are prepared in compliance with associated management and monitoring plans regarding cultural resources (e.g., Cultural Resources Management Plan). These management plans require frequent monitoring of cultural sites to ensure that resources are preserved and to protect against adverse impacts. Monitoring reports include actions to enhance cultural resources when additional measures are needed to ensure their long-term preservation. When available, cultural monitoring reports were reviewed during development of the LCP.

FERC mandates that hydropower licensees create and implement a recreation plan for each project, which addresses the preferred activities and needs of visitors to areas within the project license. Licensees such as PG&E typically conduct and compile a comprehensive Recreation Use and Needs Study for the project area. Each of these sources of recreation resource data was carefully reviewed during development of the LCP.

PG&E Records and GIS Data

Much of the data used in the planning process was provided by PG&E. In addition to the FERC documents described above, PG&E provided lease documents, the 1999 Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), timber management and timber harvest plans, and GIS layers. Additional information was obtained through personal communications with PG&E staff.

Leases

Tabular information on over 238 leases on Watershed Lands was provided by PG&E, including the lessee name or names, a brief description of the lease and the type of lease, the associated hydropower project or facility name, the lease period and fee, State Board of Equalization (SBE) parcel number(s), and whether or not the lease is located within a FERC Project boundary. Scanned copies of lease documents were provided by PG&E in electronic form.

Proponent's Environmental Assessment

PG&E provided the 12-volume PEA that summarized PG&E's determination of market values for the proposed auction and ownership transfer of hydropower facilities and related assets. The PEA was prepared by PG&E and filed with the CPUC on October 29, 1999, however, PG&E did not move forward with the sale of these assets. The PEA describes the environmental setting and analyzes potential environmental effects for each "watershed region."

Personal Communications

Personal communication with PG&E staff also provided valuable information. During site visits, PG&E provided site-specific and historical information not readily available in documents. PG&E employees responsible for FERC license compliance provided useful about the Watershed Lands. Throughout the planning process, PG&E responded to questions about site-specific and FERC-related information and documents.

Current PG&E Timber Management and Timber Harvesting Plans

The Stewardship Council consulted with PG&E regarding PG&E's forestry management practices. PG&E provided data such as timber harvest forecasts and plans, overviews of timber sales, harvest rationale for selected areas, maps, information on the number of timbered acres, and type of management for all timber management units (TMUs) located on Watershed Lands.

PG&E provided maps of the TMUs to better understand the environmental context of forest stands, as well as their internal classifications of the timberlands, which include some 52,000 acres. In many cases, these maps provided information on the larger forest matrix, including adjacent land management issues.

GIS Data

A large collection of GIS data was provided by PG&E (see Appendix Table 9-1). Data included both confidential and public data layers. Public data layers received from PG&E included information on census areas and demographics, soils, vernal pools, cities, streams, rivers, waterbodies, geology, public lands, and township and range locations. Other layers included city boundaries, elevation contours, parks, fault lines, and recreation facilities. Additional layers depicting the PG&E service area, SBE parcels, and topographic quadrants were received. Data related to TMUs were also received, including information on landslides, slope types, springs, and TMU acreage. Data on archaeological sites were buffered appropriately to protect the location of cultural resources. PG&E also provided assorted parcel data for 19 counties.

Agency GIS Data

Federal and State agencies and non-profit organizations provided various GIS layers related to the Watershed Lands, with a focus on habitat data (see Appendix Table 9-2). These data were analyzed and viewed to determine the adjacent and greater environmental setting of the planning area. A limited amount of data was also received on recreation, forest, and agricultural resources. No other comprehensive public GIS information was available for the other BPVs.

California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) queries were conducted on all watersheds and planning units for the known (recorded) occurrences of special status species. The CNDDDB datasets include information submitted by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) as well as relevant information from documented sightings of special status species. Special status species are those protected under the categories of threatened, endangered, candidate, or other species of concern by such groups as the USFS and Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and plants listed as rare by the California Native Plant Society. As the database is dependent on data submissions from biologists, and not all documented sightings of special status species are included, the database is not exhaustive. Nonetheless, the CNDDDB provided information on habitat distribution for special status species and historic location accounts of extirpated species.

The Conservation Biology Institute (CBI) dataset was considered during the planning process. CBI created this dataset for The Trust for Public Land (TPL) to assist them with making decisions about strategic land acquisitions. Thus, while the dataset is robust for TPL's purposes, it does not include data for all PG&E lands and also excludes some extremely sensitive data. Data from the USFS, BLM, and the California Wilderness Association supplemented the CBI dataset, bolstering the available geographic information.

CalVEG GIS data were also reviewed. This dataset, maintained by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), is a compilation of a variety of remote sensing vegetation mapping sources. While this dataset is extremely limited due to accuracy issues, it was used to help determine high value habitat locations on PG&E lands.

Existing grazing areas were geographically analyzed by viewing GIS information from BLM and the USFS. Each agency produced grazing allotment maps, which were used to determine adjacency with PG&E lands.

Other Public Documents

Many additional public documents were used to obtain information regarding Watershed Lands. County general plans, agency resource management plans, as well as other resource plans and reports were used in the planning process.

County Plans

Because the Watershed Lands are located across many counties, numerous county plans were reviewed to gain information on existing conditions on the Watershed Lands, and related goals and policies, listed in Appendix Table 9-3.

General plans for most counties containing PG&E Watershed Lands were obtained and reviewed. In particular, information regarding land use planning and open space was utilized throughout the planning process. Such information detailed existing open spaces within the county, planned open space areas, as well as planning related to development and open space protection.

State and Federal Agency Data

The Watershed Lands are adjacent to public land with various agency ownership patterns and management methods; thus, many agency plans were reviewed to fully understand adjacent management strategies, goals, management practices, and guidelines. National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) lands provided information on the setting as well as adjacent land management prescriptions. Relevant USFS plans that were reviewed are listed in Appendix Table 9-4. BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) provided information on the BLM's land management prescriptions for adjacent lands in the lower elevations in the Sierra foothills and in the Fall River Valley of Shasta County. Relevant BLM plans that were reviewed are listed in Appendix Table 9-5.

Plans produced by DFG, USFWS, Regional Water Quality Control Boards, CDF, and other governmental agencies and watershed groups were also reviewed to provide input into the Watershed Lands. Relevant plans that were reviewed are listed in Appendix Table 9-6.

Other agency sources were reviewed to better understand the resources, habitat value, and watershed-related species of the lands, such as USFWS documents (e.g., recovery plans and conservation agreements). Information from DFG was also reviewed, including species accounts and lists for special animals, special vascular plants, bryophytes, and lichens.

Web Searches

The internet was utilized extensively to supplement existing information and sources. Information related to all of the BPVs was obtained. This web information was confirmed using other literature sources when possible.

Data Variability

The availability of data relevant to the Watershed Lands varied considerably across geography. This variation was related to the accessibility of background material and how recently it had been updated, particularly for FERC-related data. Plans and documents were in varied states of detail and relevance to the LCP planning process, ranging from just recently updated, to outdated, to currently under revision.

With the exception of field visits and personal communication with community members, the planning process did not include collecting original data or conducting comprehensive field assessments of the land. This type of effort will likely be undertaken as needed during the development and implementation of Volume III.

Stakeholder Input

The Stewardship Council made significant outreach efforts to engage government agencies, non-profit and community groups, Native American entities, the public, and other stakeholders during the planning process for the LCP. Chapter 5 provides detailed information on the outreach program.

Government Agencies

Government agencies informed the planning process through verbal comments provided at community and targeted meetings as well as through written comments submitted to the Stewardship Council. The Stewardship Council staff conducted meetings with many government agencies to discuss the Stipulation, Settlement Agreement, and characteristics of the Watershed Land in relation to natural resources, recreation, cultural and historic resources, agriculture, forestry resources, management issues, and potential disposition. Meetings were held with the BLM, USFS, DFG, CDF, as well as numerous county Boards of Supervisors. These agencies provided existing conditions information and highlighted outstanding management issues related to access, development, PG&E facilities, and unauthorized uses. The agencies also provided possible suggestions for BPV enhancement and management actions that would be compatible with their own management.

Non-profit and Community Groups

Non-profit and community groups were invited to attend Stewardship Council Board of Directors meetings, Stewardship Council field trips, and regional public meetings. Numerous watershed and recreation groups, resource conservation districts, land trusts, and other non-profit organizations participated in these public meetings. In addition, Stewardship Council staff made presentations to and met separately with many non-profit organizations to present the land planning process and to seek input. Organizations provided valuable information on Watershed Lands and informed the planning process through verbal comments provided at public meetings as well as through written comments submitted to the Stewardship Council.

Native American Entities

Targeted meetings were held with numerous Native American entities to discuss the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, and the land planning process. During these meetings, input was received from representatives in an effort to integrate their concerns while developing enhancement measures. Native American entities were also invited to attend Stewardship Council Board meetings, field trips, and regional public meetings. Numerous representatives participated in these public meetings and provided verbal and written comments to Stewardship Council staff. Some Native American entities have provided information regarding cultural resources on Watershed Lands through verbal as well as written comments that are held in confidence by the Stewardship Council at the group's request. Native American entity outreach is further discussed in Chapter 5.

Public Comments

Public comments were received through various means, including public meetings, Board of Directors meetings, written and electronic comment submissions, as well as Stewardship Council field trips. All forms of comments were reviewed and used to verify and supplement existing conditions information. Chapter 5 describes the process undertaken to coordinate with interested members of the public, including community meetings, media outreach, and partnerships.

Board Member Constituencies

Each Board member may report to, and back from, their appointing constituent, and ensure that consensus decisions rendered by the Board take into account the views of that constituent, provided that each director acts at all times in accordance with his or her fiduciary duty of loyalty to the Stewardship Council. All Board members have provided written comments and/or oral comments during Planning Committee meetings to ensure that the Stewardship Council takes into account a broad and diverse set of interests during the LCP process.

Site Visits

Numerous site visits were conducted to view the Watershed Lands. PG&E Land Managers often attended site visits to provide access to non-public areas as well as local knowledge about the existing conditions and management of the parcels. Easily accessible parcels were viewed in detail while those lacking road access were often viewed from a distance. Photographs and written notes were taken while on site visits. Maps were also used to assist in identifying Watershed Lands and existing conditions.

Stewardship Council Field Trips

Stewardship Council field trips were opportunities for Board members to tour and learn about Watershed Lands. PG&E land managers, PG&E foresters, lessees, and other people with local knowledge were present on Stewardship Council field visits to further inform Board members about the current management and condition of the lands. Information learned on Stewardship Council field trips was then used by Board members to inform their constituencies, increase general knowledge of the Watershed Lands, and to provide input during the planning process.

Appendix Table 9-1 GIS Data Layers Provided by PG&E

Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
Confidential Data Layers		
Location/General Locale		
Area of influence	aoi	City name, city seat
City boundaries	gis_citybnd	Name, population
Major parks & recreation areas	gis_parks	Name
City boundaries	gis_places	City name
Population density	gis_popdens	Population density
100' contours	gis_contour	Elevation
State Board of Equalization (SBE)parcels	PGE_wshed_SBE	SBE number, type, description, watershed, etc.
2 mile buffer of parcels	pge_wshed_sbe_2mibuff	None
Topo quadrangle index	PUB_quad24k.shp	Quadrangle id, quadrangle name, etc.
Timber Management Features		
Slides	gis_tmu_slides	ID
Slope type	gis_tmu_sloptype	Slope class, TMU name
Springs	gis_tmu_springs	ID
TMU units	gis_tmu_units	Unit name, acres
Archeological sites	TMU_archsites_poly	Notes, comments, reference number
Archeological sites	TMU_archsites_pt	Notes, comments, reference number
Archeological sites	TMU_archsites_ln	Notes, comments, reference number
PG&E Facilities & Sites		
PG&E Facilities	gis_allfacil	Facility name, type (substation, powerhouse, PP, meter station, junction, switch), address, voltage, owner
Access points	gis_hyd_accpts	Type, comments
Electric Distribution Lines	edsa_distline_sdo	kV, type
Electric Transformers	edsa_transformers_sdo	Feeder number, address
Electric Structures	gad_structures_sdo	Tower number, type
Electric Transmission Lines	gad_tline_sdo	kV, Line name, OH/UG
Gas Pipeline	gas_pipespec_sdo	Route, width
Conveyance	gis_hyd_conveyance_sdo	Canal conveyance type (flume, penstock, tunnel, gunite box, pipe, siphon) material, ownership, GPS date
Crossings	gis_hyd_crossing	Canal crossing type, substructure, diameter, GPS date
Miscellaneous Canal Points	gis_hyd_miscpts	Cross gates, alarm stations, canal drains, sidewater devices

Appendix Table 9-1 GIS Data Layers Provided by PG&E

Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
Hydro Access Roads	Hydro_accessrds	Type, name, watershed
Bridges	hydro_bridges_sdo	Owner
Diversions	hydro_diversions_sdo	Place of use, Class of Water
ETI Gauge	hydro_etigage_sdo	Station name, gauge type
Helipad	hydro_heliport	Location
Microwave Site	hydro_microwavesite_sdo	Number of devices
Dams	hydro_pgedams_sdo	Dam name, type, status
Snow Gauges	hydro_snogage_sdo	Basin, interval, operating agency
Stream Gauges	hydro_streamgage_sdo	Description
Snow Gauges	PGE_sno_gauge	Basin, interval, operating agency
Stream Gauges	PGE_stream_gauge	Description
Hydro Telecom Lines	hydro_telecomln_sdo	Underbuilt
Fault lines	PGE_faults	Type, age
FERC boundary (clipped)	PGE_fercbnd_poly	None
Recreational Facility	PGE_recfacil	Name, facility type
PG&E service area	pge_service	None
PG&E service area mask	pge_service_mask	None
Water Rights POD	PGE_waterrightsPOD	Watershed, FERC project, number, etc.

Public Data Layers

Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
General Locale		
Navigation rivers	Hyd_nav	Link name, river name, etc.
Streams and rivers	hydl	Description, names, code, etc.
Waterbodies	hydp	Codes
Streams and rivers	PUB_hydl	Description, names, code, etc.
Waterbodies	PUB_hydp	Codes
GNIS places, clipped to PG&E	PUB_GNIS	Item name, type, county, etc.
Public lands, 2003	PUB_pct103_1	Property name, administrative area, manager, etc.
Public lands, 2004	pct104_1	Property name, administrative area, manager, etc.
Census tracts	tracts2k	Description, population, miscellaneous demographic info
Urban centers	urbs2k	Name
Topo quad index	q24kca	Quadrangle id, Quadrangle name, etc.

Appendix Table 9-1 GIS Data Layers Provided by PG&E

Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
Demographic Data		
Township & ranges	PUB_plstrfill	Township and range, meridian
Population density	PUB_popdens	Density
Block groups	blkgrps2k	Miscellaneous census, demographic data
Blocks	blocks2k	Miscellaneous census, demographic data
1990 urban footprint	gis_urbca1990	City name
2000 urban footprint	gis_urbca2000	City name
1990 urban footprint (clipped to PG&E)	PUB_urbca1990	City name
2000 urban footprint (clipped to PG&E)	PUB_urbca2000	City name
GNIS place point info	gnis02	Item name, type, county, etc.
Geologic Data		
Soils data	ca_soils_utm	Description, group, name, etc.
Geological fault zones	faults	
Soils data	PUB_statsgosoil	Description, soil group, etc.
Generalized soil map	PUB_usgsgeo	Ptype
Generalized geology map	usgs_geomap	Ptype
Habitat and Species		
Vernal pools	gapdata_vpools	Quadrangle name, county, type, etc.
Vernal pools	PUB_vpools	Quadrangle name, county
Recreation Facilities		
Recreational Facility	Hydro_recfacil	Name, facility type
Parcel Data Layers from California Counties		
Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
Assorted parcels in Yuba County	apn_yuba	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Tuolumne County	apn_tuolumne	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Tulare County	apn_tulare	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Tehama County	apn_tehama	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Siskiyou County	apn_siskiyou	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Plumas County	apn_plumas	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address

Appendix Table 9-1 GIS Data Layers Provided by PG&E

Description	Data Layer	Selected Attributes
Assorted parcels in Placer County	apn_placer	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Nevada County	apn_nevada	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Merced County	apn_merced	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Mendocino County	apn_mendocino	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Madera County	apn_madera	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Lake County	apn_lake	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Kern County	apn_kern	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Fresno County	apn_fresno	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in El Dorado County	apn_eldorado	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Calaveras County	apn_calaveras	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Butte County	apn_butte	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Amador County	apn_amador	Assessor Parcel Number, owner, address
Assorted parcels in Lassen County	digitized_lassen	Owner only

Source: PG&E 2004.

Appendix Table 9-2 GIS Data Layers Provided by Agencies and Non-Profit Organizations

Description	Source	Comments
Federal wilderness areas	BLM	
Detailed roads by county	USGS DLG	
Planning units	EDAW	
California Natural Diversity Database	CNDDB	
Existing point, line and polygon features	EDAW	
Alternative point, line and polygon features	EDAW	
Major rivers	CalTrans	
Detailed streams	NHD	

Appendix Table 9-2 GIS Data Layers Provided by Agencies and Non-Profit Organizations

Description	Source	Comments
Late Successional Reserves	USFWS	7 mile buffer was added
California land ownership	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	
Compilation of significant natural areas	Sierra Nevada Ecosystem project	Obtained from CBI
Fire history from 1654 to 2002	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Farm land and monitoring and rating info	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI
Springs and seeps	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Grazing allotments on BLM land	BLM	Obtained from CBI
Off-road vehicle recreation areas	BLM	Obtained from CBI
Recreation management areas	BLM	Obtained from CBI
Timber sales and harvest information	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Grazing range allotments	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Private water district boundaries	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI
Pacific Crest Trail		Obtained from CBI
Wilderness Study Areas	BLM	Obtained from CBI
CWC proposed additional Wilderness Areas	CWC/ Citizens wild	Obtained from CBI
CWC proposed additional Wild and Scenic Rivers	CWC/ Citizens wild	Obtained from CBI
Special management areas	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Wilderness Areas	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Local and regional parks	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI
Northern spotted owl habitat	USFWS	Six Rivers, Mendocino, and Shasta-Trinity National Forests, Website data
California red-legged frog critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
Critical refuges	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Federally listed Chinook salmon units	Bonneville Power Administration	Obtained from CBI
Existing conservation plans and activities	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI
Natural community conservation plans & habitat conservation plan	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI

Appendix Table 9-2 GIS Data Layers Provided by Agencies and Non-Profit Organizations

Description	Source	Comments
Restoration plans	California Resources Agency Legacy Project	Obtained from CBI
Riparian conservation areas	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Wild, scenic and recreation rivers	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Little Kern golden trout critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
Modoc sucker critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
15 vernal pool species critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
California condor critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
Willow flycatcher habitat	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Protected Activity Centers for spotted owls	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
Least Bell's vireo critical habitat	USFWS	Obtained from CBI
Invasive exotic species point locations	Eldorado National Forest	Obtained from CBI
Deer emphasis areas	USFS	Obtained from CBI
Invasive exotic species point locations	Tahoe National Forest	Obtained from CBI
Forest carnivore tracking results 1996-2000	USFS	Obtained from CBI

Note: GIS data from other agencies were reviewed to help assess existing conditions. The Stewardship Council recognizes that these data were gathered for other purposes and are not presumed to be complete.

Table 9-3 County Plans

Plan	Date
Alpine County General Plan	2005
Amador County General Plan	1993
Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (Placer County)	1999
Butte County 2004 Regional Transportation Plan, Chapter 7	2004
Calaveras County General Plan	1996
El Dorado County - parcel zoning information & zoning code	2006
Fresno County General Plan	2000
Kern County General Plan	2004
Lake County General Plan	2005
Madera County General Plan	1995
Mariposa County General Plan Update (draft)	2005
Mendocino County General Plan	1981
Merced County Year 2000 General Plan	2000
Nevada County General Plan	2005

Table 9-3 County Plans

Plan	Date
Placer County General Plan	1994
Plumas County - parcel zoning information & zoning code	2006
Shasta County General Plan	2004
Tehama County General Plan Update and Goals	2005
Tehama County Voluntary Oak Woodland Management Plan	2005
Tuolumne County - parcel zoning information & zoning code	2006
Tuolumne County General Plan	1996

Table 9-4 Forest Service Plans and Other Documents

Document	Date
Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1988
Feather River Scenic Byway Implementation Strategy	1996
Lassen National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1992
McCloud River Coordinated Resource Management Plan [USFS & other signatories]	1991
Mendocino National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1995
Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1988
Off-Highway Vehicle Inventory Maps (all Forests)	2006
Sequoia, Lassen, and Plumas National Forest Maps	2001
Shasta-Trinity National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1995
Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Forest Wide LSR Assessment	1999
Sierra National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1991
Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment, Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	2004
Stanislaus National Forest - Forest Plan Direction	2005
Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan	1990

Table 9-5 BLM Plans

Plan	Date
Alturas Resource Management Plan	2006
Carrizo Plain Natural Area Plan	1996
Folsom Resource Area Sierra Management Framework Plan Amendment (MFP)	1988
Redding Resource Management Plan & Record of Decision (ROD)	1993

Table 9-6 Other Plans

Entity	Plan	Date
California Department of Fish and Game	Hat Creek Wild Trout Management Plan	1999
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	State of the Watershed Report - Pit River Sub-Watershed	2003
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Recovery Plan for Shasta Crayfish	1998
Western Shasta Resources Conservation District (RCD) & Cow Creek Watershed Management Group	Cow Creek Management Plan	2005
Butte & Plumas County Fire Safe Councils and CDF	Community Wildfire Protection Plan - CDF Butte Unit Service Area	2005
Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy	Deer Creek Watershed Management Plan	1998
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	Tulare Unit – Fire Management Plan 2005	2005