

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 |