United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Stanislaus
National Forest

February 2013

Fraser Flat Bridge Replacement (40552)

Environmental Assessment

Stanislaus National Forest
Mi-Wok Ranger District
Tuolumne County, CA

Table of Contents

Fraser Flat Bridge Replacement (40552)
Environmental Assessment

Stanislaus National Forest
Mi-Wok Ranger District
Tuolumne County, California

Introduction

The Forest Service prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant Federal and State laws and regulations. This EA discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that would result from the proposed action. Additional documentation, including more detailed analyses of project-area resources, is located in the project record at the Mi-Wok Ranger District Office in Mi Wuk Village, California.

The project is located on the Mi-Wok Ranger District of the Stanislaus National Forest where 04N01 (Fraser Flat Road) crosses the South Fork Stanislaus River. The analysis area lies entirely within Tuolumne County (Section 25 T4N R17E; MDBM).

Forest Plan Direction

The Forest Service completed the Stanislaus National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) on October 28, 1991. The Stanislaus National Forest "Forest Plan Direction" (USDA 2010)[1] presents the current Forest Plan management direction, based on the original Forest Plan as amended.

The Forest Plan Direction that applies to this project includes forestwide standards and guidelines (p. 33-64); management area direction for Wildlife (p. 123-127); and, land allocation direction for California Spotted Owl and Northern Goshawk Protected Activity Centers (p. 183-186); Old Forest Emphasis Areas (p. 190); and, Riparian Conservation Areas (p. 191-195).

All proposed actions are designed to be consistent with the applicable Forest Plan Direction (see Project Design Elements).

Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of this project is to provide a safe and efficient transportation system for public and administrative use, which includes passenger vehicles, permitted commercial use, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensees. The existing Fraser Flat Bridge is a single lane bridge that crosses the South Fork of the Stanislaus River along Fraser Flat Road (04N01). Fraser Flat Road functions as an arterial road, serving about 15,000 acres within the Forest. The road and bridge are classified as Maintenance Level (ML) 5; ML 5 is assigned to roads where management direction requires the road to provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Arterial roads provide service to large land areas, and usually connect with public highways or other Forest arterial roads to form an integrated network of primary travel routes. The location and standards of these roads are usually determined by a demand for maximum mobility and travel efficiency. The Fraser Flat Bridge provides access to various recreation sites (developed and dispersed), three FERC-licensed hydro-electric projects, areas of private land, and to/from State Highway 108 and other county roads. The bridge also provides for the transportation of commercial forest products.

The Fraser Flat Bridge provides primary access to various locations and for multiple activities and can no longer safely accommodate both vehicles and pedestrians, or meet present-day vehicle

[1] USDA 2010. Forest Plan Direction. Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest, Sonora, CA. April 2010.

requirements. The following details about the condition of the bridge were identified by a Registered Professional Engineer in a Routine Road Bridge Inspection Report (Salsig 2012)[2]. The bridge is a safety concern because it is both functionally deficient and weight-restricted. It is heavily used by pedestrians (campers, fishing enthusiasts, hikers and sightseers), but cannot safely accommodate the combination of pedestrian and vehicle traffic at the same time due to single-lane size restrictions. The bridge also poses a safety hazard for vehicles crossing the bridge because it is located on a blind spot of a double lane, paved road (04N01). The approach rail of the bridge is in poor condition and not attached to the bridge rail, rendering it ineffective. The approach rail has also been struck numerous times by vehicles, indicating a need for improvement. The Fraser Flat Bridge is a road bridge (14 feet wide x 53 feet long), composed of five rows of steel trusses with a cast-in-place concrete deck. The trusses were assembled from World War II vintage Bailey Bridge panels, with each truss five panels long. Bailey Bridge trusses are known to suffer fatigue cracks found in the welds and panels, and are subject to critical fracture (Greenaway 1968)[3].

Based on these existing conditions, the Fraser Flat Bridge needs to be replaced. This action responds to the goals and objectives, management practices, and standards and guidelines outlined in the Forest Plan and helps move the project area towards the desired conditions described in the Forest Plan.

Proposed Action

The Forest Service proposes to replace the Fraser Flat Bridge. The next section (Alternatives) contains further details under Alternative 1 (Proposed Action).

Decision Framework

The Forest Supervisor is the Responsible Official for this project. Given the purpose and need, the Responsible Official reviews the proposed action in order to decide whether or not to replace the bridge as described.

Public Involvement

In October 2012, the Forest Service listed the Fraser Flat Bridge Replacement project online in the Stanislaus National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). The project first appeared in the published quarterly SOPA in January 2013. The Forest distributes the SOPA to about 160 parties and it is available on the internet [http://www.fs.fed.us/sopa/forest-level.php?110516].

On November 16, 2012 the Forest sent 19 scoping packages to individuals, permittees, organizations, agencies, and Tribes interested in this project. The package included a letter requesting comments on the Proposed Action by December 3, 2012. Two interested parties submitted letters, e-mails or verbal comments. Scoping comments and responses to comments are documented and filed in the project record (available upon request).

Issues

Using the comments received during the scoping period, the interdisciplinary team developed issues. The Forest Service separated the issues into two groups: relevant and non-relevant issues. Relevant issues were defined as those directly or indirectly caused by implementing the proposed action. Non-relevant issues were identified as those: 1) outside the scope of the proposed action; 2) already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision; 3) irrelevant to the decision to be made; or, 4) conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence. No relevant issues were raised during scoping that could be used to develop alternatives to the proposed action. A list of non-relevant issues and reasons regarding their categorization as non-relevant may be found in the project record.

[2] Salsig, William W. 2012. Routine Road Bridge Inspection Report. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. April 4, 2012.
[3] Greenaway, L.R. 1968. Fatigue Risk in Bailey Bridges. Ministry of Transport, Bridges Engineering Division, London, England. April 1968.

Alternatives

This section describes the one alternative considered for the Fraser Flat Bridge Replacement project: Alternative 1 (Proposed Action). NEPA regulations (36 CFR 1502(c)) do not require consideration of a no action alternative in an EA (FSH 1909.15_14.2). The EA may document consideration of a no action alternative through the effects analysis by contrasting the impacts of the proposed action and any alternatives(s) with the current condition and expected future condition if the proposed action were not implemented (36 CFR 220.7(b)(2)(ii)).

Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

Under this alternative, the Forest Service would replace the Fraser Flat Bridge. This replacement includes removing the current bridge and constructing a new bridge that meets current design standards and the desired uses (see Purpose and Need for Action). The new construction would create a two-lane bridge that would extend upstream from the original footprint, creating a larger footprint. Erosion control and stabilization would be performed on disturbed slopes to prevent resource damage. A small number of trees, mostly seedling size, would be removed along with one larger incense cedar leaning toward the existing bridge. Additional activity includes the paving of up to 200 feet of the approaches on both sides of the bridge as well as any finish grading or earthwork needed to accommodate vehicles on the approach curves. Specific engineering design plans for the new bridge will be developed upon the completion of this analysis. Construction, which includes removal and reconstruction, is expected to occur over a 60-90 day period beginning as early as September 2014.

Project Design Elements

The following project design elements apply to this alternative.

Cultural

The following cultural resources of interest are located within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and would be protected using the following method:

1. Two segments of the Sugar Pine Railway: Project work shall stay within the agreed upon, previously disturbed terminus of the segment and intersection with 4N01 to prevent any new or further impact to the railroad grade segment.
2. The existing Fraser Flat Bridge was found ineligible to the National Register of Historic Places and no mitigation is required.

Should any other cultural resources be discovered during implementation, all project activities shall cease and the District Archaeologist shall be notified.

Hydrology

Best Management Practices

Water quality management is a forest responsibility per agreement between the California Water Quality Control Board and the Pacific Southwest Region of the Forest Service (USDA 2011)[4].

Non-point source pollution on National Forests is managed through the Regional Water Quality Management Plan (USDA 2011) and the National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on National Forest System Lands (USDA 2012)[5], which relies on implementation of

[4] USDA 2011. FSH 2509.22, Soil and Water Conservation Handbook, Chapter 10 Water Quality Management Handbook, Best Management Practices. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. December 2011.
[5] USDA 2012. National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on National Forest System Lands, Volume 1-National Core BMP Technical Guide. FS-990a. Washington, DC. April 2012.

prescribed best management practices (BMPs). Riparian resources within Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs) will be protected through compliance with the Riparian Conservation Objectives in the Stanislaus National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

Beneficial uses of water are protected by BMPs which prevent or minimize the threat of discharge of pollutants of concern. Temporary and permanent BMPs would be implemented as part of the proposed project to minimize effects on natural resources, including ground and surface waters. Temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented to control erosion at the project site both during and after construction of the project and to prevent sediment from entering ground or surface waters. BMPs relating to project implementation are listed below (applicable National Core BMPs are cited in parenthesis); site-specific requirements and comments are located in the Hydrology Report which can be found in the project record. BMPs relating to planning processes are inferred as a result of the preparation of this document.

Project planners and administrators (e.g., layout, Sale Administrator, Contracting Officer's Representative) are responsible for consulting with a hydrologist and/or soil scientist prior to or during project implementation for adjusting or interpreting application of watershed design elements.

The following BMPs are provided to reduce the potential for impact from this activity.

1-13: Erosion Prevention and Control Measures During Operations

1-19: Streamcourse and Aquatic Protection (Plan-3 Aquatic Management Zone Planning, AqEco-2 Operations in Aquatic Ecosystems)

1-20: Erosion-Control Structure Maintenance

2-4: Road Maintenance and Operations (Road-4 Road Operations and Maintenance)

2-5: Water Source Development and Utilization (Fac-2 Facility Construction & Stormwater Control)

2-8: Stream Crossing (Road-7 Stream Crossings)

2-10: Parking and Staging Areas (Road-9 Parking and Staging Areas)

2-11: Equipment Refueling and Servicing/Includes Vehicle Cleaning - All Approved Locations (Road-10 Equipment Refueling and Servicing)

2-13: Erosion Control Plan (Veg-2 Erosion Prevention and Control)

7-6: Water Quality Monitoring

Regulatory Considerations

The following consultation for applicable permits should be included as part of project implementation:

1. Army Corps of Engineers – the Corps will be contacted regarding the need for Section 404 permits. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates dredge and fill activities in "waters of the U.S.". All activities that would result in dispersal of materials to waters of the U.S., such as activities that cause sedimentation or increased erosion, would require compliance with the terms of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 permit.
2. 401 Certification – contact the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Division of Environmental Protection for Section 401 Certification. Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires applicants proposing projects with a federal nexus to obtain certification for activities that could result in the discharge of pollutants into waters of the U.S. Certification is obtained from the state where the discharge originates. Therefore, all projects that have a federal

component and may affect the quality of the state's waters must also comply with CWA Section 401.

3. Environmental Protection Agency – A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is not needed because less than 1 acre of land will be disturbed during project activities.
4. A Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan is not needed because no petroleum products will be kept on site (other than what is in the machinery).

Invasive Plants

1. All equipment and tools must be free of soil, mud (wet or dried), seeds, vegetative matter or other debris that could contain seeds in order to prevent new infestations of noxious weeds in the project area. Dust or very light dirt that would not contain weed seed is not a concern.
2. For erosion control use wood-strand mulch (e.g., WoodStraw®), pine needles (from the project area), or other materials that are free of invasive plant propagules. Rice straw should not be used.
3. Ensure that any gravel or other earth materials come from a source and at the appropriate time of year that promotes rapid turnover so material is less likely to become infested with weed propagules. Utilize material from the middle of the identified source piles.
4. Any seeding must be from seed collected at the site or from genetically local sources. Use of non-native plant materials may be approved by zone botanist upon review of documentation explaining why non-natives are preferred.
5. Check with the zone botanist on how to minimize weeds and invasives if any other material beyond those mentioned above is proposed for this project.

Recreation

1. NFRS 4N01 should remain open to public vehicular traffic the Thursday before Memorial Day through the first Tuesday after Labor Day (May 22, 2014 – September 2, 2014).
2. Information signs should be posted at 4N01 and State Highway 108 as well as at the 4N01/4N42 intersection (Spring Gap) advising the public of 4N01 closure due to bridge replacement; information, including a map, that shows alternate route access to recreational sites north of the project area (e.g., 4N13, 4N14) for high clearance vehicles should be included on the signs.
3. Information signs should be posted on the east end (Old Strawberry Road) of the Sugar Pine Railroad Grade trail advising trail users of trail closure on the Fraser Flat end due to bridge replacement.

Terrestrial Wildlife

1. Prior to bridge removal, the district wildlife biologist will conduct a survey of the bridge to determine if any bats are roosting in the structure. Any roosting bats will be excluded prior to demolition activities (i.e., plastic will be placed over roost openings so bats can exit the structure, but cannot re-enter).
2. If any threatened, endangered, candidate or Forest Service sensitive species are discovered during or prior to implementation of this project, the district wildlife biologist will be notified immediately and adequate mitigation measures will be taken.

Environmental Consequences

This section summarizes the physical, biological, social and economic environments of the affected project area and the potential changes to those environments due to implementation of the alternative.

The following resource specialist reports prepared for this project are incorporated by reference in this EA: Terrestrial Wildlife Biological Assessment and Biological Evaluation (BA/BE); Aquatic Wildlife Biological Evaluation (BE); Management Indicator Species and Migratory Landbird Conservation Report; Sensitive Plant BE; Invasive Plant Risk Assessment; Hydrology Report; Recreation Report; and, Cultural Resource Management Report. These reports are available for review as part of the project record.

Effects Relative to Issues

The Forest Service did not identify any relevant issues raised during scoping (see Public Involvement and Issues).

Effects Relative to Significance Factors

This section describes the context and intensity factors which provide a basis for determining if an action would have significant effects to the human environment (40 CFR 1508.27). It provides brief, yet sufficient evidence and analysis for the responsible official to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement or a Finding of No Significant Impact.

Context

This is a site-specific project that by itself does not have international, national, regional or statewide importance. Project activities will occur where 04N01 (Fraser Flat Road) crosses the South Fork Stanislaus River. The project area is part of the Forest transportation system that provides access to multiple uses identified in the Purpose and Need for Action of this EA.

Intensity

The following ten elements of impact intensity address the potential significance of project effects.

1. **Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse**.

The direct and indirect effects of the alternatives are addressed here. Cumulative effects are addressed below under intensity factor 7.

Aquatic Wildlife

The forest aquatic biologist reviewed the Proposed Action and determined that there are no aquatic wildlife concerns.

Cultural

The existing Fraser Flat Bridge was found ineligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the district archaeologist has determined that there are no concerns for cultural resources within the APE, with implementation of the Proposed Action including all design elements (Alternatives).

Hydrology

The project area is within the 7th Level Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) watershed: Lower South Fork Stanislaus River – Fraser Flat.

Temporary Effects During Construction

Construction adjacent to the South Fork Stanislaus River has the potential to increase soil mobility and increase turbidity in surface waters, adversely affecting water quality. Operations would directly disturb soils and surface drainage courses within the Streamside Management Zone (SMZ).

Potential stormwater discharges of construction-related contaminants could occur. Short-term negative effects include some sediment production during the time of removing or burying the existing wingwalls as well as during the time of widening the road on the approach curves. Asphalt application can contribute high concentrations of toxic hydrocarbons, other toxic organic compounds, oils and greases, and metals to stormwater runoff. As an indirect effect, the removal of minimal vegetation could create slope instability that subsequently could create some erosion and sedimentation inputs; however, disturbance is expected to be negligible and increases in water temperature are not expected. The installation of the new abutments and related retention walls on the drainage side slopes will be completed during the low-flow period, thus reducing the potential to affect the turbidity levels of the South Fork Stanislaus River.

Precautions will be implemented to ensure that material used for the bridge construction will not fall into the river, that refueling of vehicles or machines is completed at designated areas away from surface waters, and that general construction BMPs to prevent excess erosion and sedimentation from affecting surface waters are implemented and monitored.

An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) would be designed and implemented for the project. Standard erosion control and material capture measures, included with the ESCP for the project, would prevent materials from reaching the waterbody through all phases of the project, resulting in limited elevations of turbidity or other water quality parameters associated with construction activities above applicable water quality standards. The plan would comply with all applicable permits and policies relevant to the project, and would prevent the potential for degradation of water quality associated with construction activities.

Permanent Effects

The new bridge and related features (i.e., added fill and realigned approach road) could cause changes in runoff patterns and/or increased runoff volume. Stormwater and drainage measures would be implemented according to standard specifications for Construction of Roads and Bridges on Federal Highway Projects and Forest Service engineering supplemental standards and specifications. Additionally, a Forest Service Engineer or Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) would approve the permanent and post-construction BMPs. Stormwater management measures would be designed and implemented that result in runoff peak flows and volumes being similar to or less than those under existing conditions. Thus, the long-term effect on water quality from construction of the new bridge would be negligible.

Invasive Plants

Equipment and ground disturbance could increase the risk of introducing weed propagules to the area. Additionally, the South Fork Stanislaus River could serve as a vector that would quickly spread noxious weed seed downstream. Implementation of Project Design Elements (Alternatives) would result in a low risk of noxious weed introduction and spread by the project activities.

Management Indicator Species

There would be no change to habitat for aquatic macroinvertebrates, black-backed woodpeckers (*Picoides arcticus*), yellow warblers (*Dendroica petechial*), Pacific tree frogs (*Pseudacris regilla*), mountain quail (*Oreortyx pictus)*, sooty grouse (*Dendragapus fuliginosus*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), fox sparrows (*Passerella iliaca*), California spotted owls (*Strix occidentalis occidentalis*), American martens (*Martes americana*), northern flying squirrels (*Glaucomys sabrinus*) or the hairy

woodpeckers (*Picoides villosus*) from project implementation; therefore, no further documentation is required.

Migratory Birds

No effects to migratory birds are expected because the Proposed Action is limited in scope and duration. There would be no alteration of habitat for migratory species, only minor noise disturbance to individuals in the project area; therefore, impacts to migratory avian species are expected to be temporary and negligible.

Recreation

The Proposed Action would improve public vehicular and pedestrian safety and access to recreational sites north of the South Fork Stanislaus River; this includes access to Fraser Flat Campground, Sandbar Flat Campground, and Crandall OHV Parking and Camping Area. Recreation users would also benefit from improvements in access to dispersed camping areas within the Crandall Peak and Spring Gap areas along the 4N01 corridor north of the South Fork Stanislaus River, the motorized trail system within the Crandall Peak area, hunting along 4N01 north of the river during the fall hunting season, and the Sugar Pine Railroad Grade non-motorized trail from Fraser Flat to Strawberry.

Sensitive Plants

The zone botanist determined that there are no direct or indirect effects to sensitive plant species anticipated for this project.

Terrestrial Wildlife

Species were considered in detail in the effects analysis if suitable habitat exists within the elevation and geographic range of the project area. Occurrence records were also considered.

Noise disturbance during bridge replacement could affect the following Region 5 Forest Service sensitive species and their habitat: northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), California spotted owl, Pacific fisher (*Martes pennanti*), American marten, pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), and western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*). Noise disturbance would be of short duration and limited scope. It could temporarily cause wildlife to avoid the project area. Project implementation is not expected to affect individual fitness of any of the aforementioned species. No forested habitat alteration would occur as a result of the Proposed Action. The new bridge construction may provide roost sites for bats, and is considered a benefit to pallid and Townsend's big-eared bats. In summary, short-term negative effects from disturbance are expected during project implementation and are considered negligible. Long-term beneficial effects include potential day and night roost sites for pallid bats and Townsend's big-eared bats.

Determinations

The Proposed Action may affect individuals, but is not likely to result in a trend toward Federal listing or loss of viability for the northern goshawk, California spotted owl, American marten, pallid, Townsend's big-eared, or western red bats in the project area.

The Proposed Action may affect individuals, but is not likely to contribute to the need for Federal listing or result in loss of viability for the Pacific fisher in the project area.

2. **The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety**.

   This Proposed Action will improve public health and safety by meeting present-day vehicle requirements and providing additional space for pedestrians.

3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas**.

   This Proposed Action does not contain nor would it adversely affect any parklands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas, or wetlands. Mitigation measures are identified in Project Design Elements (Alternatives) that relate to proximity of the Proposed Action to historic or cultural resources.

4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial**.

   The Proposed Action is consistent with all laws, regulations and policy including the Forest Plan as amended. In addition, no issues were raised during scoping that indicated that the degree to which this project may affect the human environment is likely to be highly controversial.

5. **The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks**.

   Resource specialists do not expect that the project will involve uncertain, unique, or unknown risks. Additionally, they have reviewed the Proposed Action and determined that it is not likely to affect individual Forest Service sensitive species or lead to a trend toward federal listing.

6. **The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration**.

   The Proposed Action would not establish a precedent for any future actions with significant effects. This decision only applies to the project area and does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Any future action not analyzed in this EA would be analyzed separately and on its own merits at the time it is proposed in the future.

7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts**.

   Other present and foreseeable future actions in this area are grazing and recreation activities. These actions would occur with or without the Fraser Flat Bridge Replacement project. The Proposed Action would incrementally contribute to noise disturbance in the area, but because of the limited scope and duration of project activities, this contribution is negligible.

8. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources**.

   A Cultural Resource Management Report (05-16-1340) was prepared for this project. A review of the Forest's heritage resource files revealed that all of the area of potential effect was previously inventoried. The Fraser Flat Bridge was evaluated and found ineligible to the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining cultural resources of interest within the APE are to be protected using the measures identified in Project Design Elements (Alternatives).

   The Tuolumne band of the Me-Wuk Indians was informed of the Proposed Action during scoping. No cultural issues, concerns or comments were brought forth.

   There are no scientific research sites that may be affected by the proposed actions, nor is there any indication that this project would affect any scientific resource.

9. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973**.

   No Federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, exist within or adjacent to the project area. Forest Service Sensitive species may occur within or near the project area; however, the degree of potential effect of the proposed action would not result in extraordinary circumstances (Baumbach 2013)[6].

10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment**.

    The Proposed Action was developed in accordance with and does not threaten violation of any Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (i.e., National Forest Management Act, Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Federal Clean Water Act, Executive Order 11988 for Floodplain Management, or the Clean Air Act). As mentioned previously in this document, the Forest Service or contract purchaser would obtain required permits from the appropriate county, state, and federal regulatory agencies prior to implementation.

[6] Baumbach, Marcie 2013. Wildlife Biological Assessment and Evaluation. Forest Service, Mi-Wok Ranger District, Mi Wuk Village, CA. January 29, 2013.

Consultation and Coordination

The Forest Service contacted/consulted the following individuals, Federal, State, and local agencies, tribes and non-Forest Service persons during the development of this EA:

ID Team Members

Ann Denton – District Ranger, Responsible Official Representative

Alex Janicki – Soil Scientist

Chuck James – Recreation Specialist

Fernando Perez – Hydrologist

Josh Merrill-Exton – IDT Leader, Writer/Editor

Marcie Baumbach – Wildlife Biologist

Margaret Willits – Botanist; District Noxious Weed Coordinator

Pete Wisniewski – Archaeologist

Steve Holdeman – Aquatic Biologist

Additional Forest Service Employees

Charlie Brooks (Recreation Specialist), Chris Sorensen (District Planning Forester), John Maschi (Forest Planner), Julie Martin (Public Service Program Area Leader), Kathy Strain (Forest Archaeologist), Marty Gmelin (Resource Management Program Area Leader), Mike Bradshaw (Forest Engineer), Pat Boyer (District Culturist/Range Specialist), Ray Cablayan (Forest Road Design/Construction Engineer)

Federal, State, and Local Agencies

California Department of Fish and Game

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors

Tribes

Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians

Others

Mike Damaso (Merced Dirt Riders); Aaron Davis (Tri-County Offroad Club; Clavey River Watershed Council); Yvonne White (Tri-County OHV); Matt Waverly, Steve Wiard (Sierra Pacific Industries); Mike Albrecht (Sierra Resource Management); Dan Pope (Tri-Dam); Jason Smith, Sally Helm (Dodge Ridge); Justin Smith, Ross Jackson (Pacific Gas & Electric Company), John Buckley (Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center); William Ritts (cattle permittee)