

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
7.10 Land Use Affected Environment.....	7.10-1
7.10.1 Information Sources .....	7.10-1
7.10.2 Overview of Land Use in the Middle Fork American River Watershed.....	7.10-1
7.10.3 Land Management Plans.....	7.10-3
7.10.3.1 Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan .....	7.10-3
7.10.3.2 Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan .....	7.10-4
7.10.3.3 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendments.....	7.10-5
7.10.3.4 Placer County General Plan.....	7.10-5
7.10.3.5 Auburn State Recreation Area Interim Resource Management Plan .....	7.10-6
7.10.4 Land Use within the FERC Project Boundary.....	7.10-6
7.10.4.1 Shoreline Buffer Zones.....	7.10-6
7.10.4.2 Shoreline Management Plan .....	7.10-6
7.10.5 Other Land Uses within the Watershed.....	7.10-7
7.10.5.1 Recreation.....	7.10-7
7.10.5.2 Timber Management .....	7.10-7
7.10.5.3 Grazing.....	7.10-8
7.10.5.4 Mining.....	7.10-8
7.10.5.5 Natural Resource Protection .....	7.10-8
7.10.6 Fire History .....	7.10-9
7.10.6.1 Fuels Management.....	7.10-10

**List of Maps**

- Map 7.10-1. Land Jurisdictions in the Middle Fork American River Watershed.
- Map 7.10-2. Range Allotments in the Middle Fork American River Watershed.
- Map 7.10-3. Fire History in the Middle Fork American River Watershed.

## **7.10 LAND USE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

This section describes land use in the vicinity of the Middle Fork American River Project (MFP or Project). Note that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) regulations require the applicant to provide information regarding both recreation and land use. This section focuses on describing the land uses and pertinent land management plans and policies that govern land uses within and outside the FERC Project boundary. Recreation is discussed separately in Section 7.9 – Recreation Resources Affected Environment. In addition, documentation of consultation with agencies having land management or planning/zoning authority in the Project area is provided in Section 14.0 – Consultation Documentation.

### **7.10.1 Information Sources**

The information presented in this section was developed using the following information sources:

- Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (ENF-LRMP) (USDA-FS 1988).
- Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (TNF-LRMP) (USDA-FS 1990).
- Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA), Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS), and Record of Decision (ROD) (USDA FS 2004a). These documents augment the previously published 2001 SNFPA, FSEIS, and ROD.
- Placer County General Plan (Placer County 1994).
- Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA) Interim Resource Management Plan (USBR 1992). This plan amends the 1978 General Plan for the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project.
- LAND 1 – Transportation System Technical Study Report (TSR) – 2008 (LAND 1 – TSR) (PCWA 2011a; Supporting Document [SD] B).
- LAND 2 – Fire Prevention and Response TSR – 2008 (LAND 2 – TSR) (PCWA 2011b; SD B).
- LAND 4 – FERC Boundary and Authorization TSR (LAND 4 – TSR) (PCWA 2011c; SD B).

### **7.10.2 Overview of Land Use in the Middle Fork American River Watershed**

The MFP facilities are situated in the foothills and mountainous uplands of the western slope of the central Sierra Nevada, within the Tahoe and Eldorado National Forests. The MFP facilities are located on the Middle Fork American River, the Rubicon River,

Duncan Creek, and the North and South Forks of Long Canyon Creek within an area referred to in this section as the Middle Fork American River Watershed (Watershed). The Watershed boundary is shown on Map 7.10-1.

The Watershed is characterized by steep canyons and rugged terrain with dense forests and woodlands. The rivers and streams associated with the MFP flow from elevations ranging from a high of approximately 5,200 feet above mean sea level (msl) at French Meadows Reservoir and Duncan Creek Diversion to approximately 1,100 feet msl at Ralston Afterbay. The surrounding ridges reach elevations as high as 7,000 feet msl.

The Watershed is heavily forested, rural in nature, and sparsely populated. There are no residential or commercial developments in the immediate vicinity of the MFP. The nearest population center is Foresthill (population 1,791), located approximately 4 miles west-northwest of Ralston Afterbay. Several paved roads provide the primary access to the MFP vicinity. These include: Mosquito Ridge Road, Ralston Ridge Road, Blacksmith Flat Road, and Soda Springs Riverton Road. Access to more remote locations in the Watershed is possible using ancillary roads and trails on either the United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Service (USDA-FS or Forest Service) lands or lands reserved for the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project (Auburn Project Lands), located downstream of Ralston Afterbay.

The Project facilities and land within the FERC Project boundary are located primarily within the ENF and TNF. Private parcels are present throughout the Watershed and intersect the FERC Project boundary at various locations.

The peaking reach (defined in Section 7.9.2) bisects Auburn Project Lands, which consist of federal lands and private lands reserved for the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project (totaling 41,000 acres) that was Congressionally-authorized in 1965. Construction of the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project, initiated by the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) in 1967, was halted in the 1980s. In 2008, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) revoked the USBR's water rights permits for the Auburn Dam; however, the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project remains a Congressionally-authorized project.

The Auburn Project Lands include USBR fee title lands (26,000 acres), and other lands (15,000 acres) owned by Bureau of Land Management (BLM), USDA-FS, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and private land owners (USBR 1992). Land use planning and resource management on all federal lands within Auburn Project Lands has been granted to the USBR in accordance with interagency agreements (Section 7.1 – Description of the River Basin, Attachment A).

In 1977, the USBR entered into an interim agreement with California State Parks to assume responsibility for management of public use on Auburn Project Lands. California State Parks continues management of public use on these lands at the discretion of USBR. Funding to manage public use and provide recreational opportunities and service within the Auburn Project Lands is provided in part from USBR, State of California, and user fees.

In 1978, the USBR developed a General Plan for the Auburn Project Lands, which designated that the area be managed as a reservoir-based recreation area, following construction of the Auburn Dam and reservoir. In 1979, the State of California incorporated Auburn Project Lands into the State Park system as the ASRA (USBR 1992). Lands reserved for the Auburn Dam and Reservoir Project (Auburn Project Lands), as managed by California State Parks, are referred to in this License Application as ASRA. Refer to Section 7.1 – Description of River Basin, Map 7.1-4 for the location of Auburn Project Lands.

Map 7.10-1 shows the MFP facilities and FERC Project boundary with respect to the various land jurisdictions in the Watershed. Land use within the FERC Project boundary is focused on hydropower generation and recreation. Land use outside the FERC Project boundary is managed mainly for recreation, timber harvest, grazing, natural resource protection, and to a lesser extent mining.

Note that the MFP includes a system of tunnels. However, the tunnels are not discussed in this section because they are located underground and do not involve land management activities.

### **7.10.3 Land Management Plans**

Land use and management is governed by federal, state, and local plans and regulations, depending on ownership status. Lands that lie within the jurisdiction of the USDA-FS are subject to the policies, goals, objectives, and prescriptions contained in the National Forest LRMP and the SNFPA (USDA-FS 2001; USDA-FS 2004a). West of French Meadows Reservoir, the Middle Fork American River forms the boundary between the TNF and the ENF. The boundary bisects the area between French Meadows and Hell Hole reservoirs. Upstream of Hell Hole Reservoir, the Rubicon River forms the boundary of the TNF and the ENF. Private land holdings in the vicinity of the MFP are generally subject to the provisions contained in the Placer County General Plan. Pertinent management plans are briefly described in the following.

#### **7.10.3.1 Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan**

The TNF-LRMP provides direction for long-term land management in the TNF. The TNF-LRMP goals are to: (1) ensure wise use and protection of TNF resources; (2) fulfill legislative requirements; and (3) address local, regional, and national issues.

Land within the TNF is divided into 109 Management Areas (MA). The Project facilities and FERC Project boundary lie in four of these, including the “French,” “Sunflower,” “End of the World,” and “Little Oak” Management Areas. Resource management in these areas emphasizes the following:

- Water-oriented recreation;
- Dispersed recreation along the Middle Fork American River;
- Safety for the forest visitor;

- Public sector facilities appropriate to the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classification to accommodate average weekend demand levels;
- Maintenance or improvement of visual quality; and
- Development of a management plan for the Western States National Recreation Trail during TNF-LRMP implementation.

The TNF-LRMP recognizes the potential for hydroelectric power in the TNF and contains standards and guidelines that allow for hydropower generation while protecting natural resources and meeting area-specific management objectives.

Note that management direction regarding certain resources, for example timber and wildlife, have been revised as part of the SNFPA (USDA-FS 2004a) as described below.

### 7.10.3.2 Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan

The ENF-LRMP provides direction for long-term land management of the ENF. The ENF-LRMP prescribes compatible sets of forest practices for land and natural resources. Land managed by the ENF is classified into six major “Emphasis Zones” where similar combinations of resource opportunities and land use potential exist simultaneously (USDA-FS 1988). The six Emphasis Zones are further categorized into 30 MAs that stress predominant management themes, practices and prescriptions. The Project facilities and FERC Project boundary lie in four Emphasis Zones and five MAs as described below. As with the TNF-LRMP, management direction for certain MAs (e.g., High Site Timber, Spotted Owl) was revised as part of the SNFPA.

The ENF-LRMP also identifies numerous management practices that are applied to the MAs. Management Practice 98 provides directives specific to energy-related licenses and permits.

- **Zone I – Designated:** Lands set aside by legal or official designation. The Rubicon River from Hell Hole Dam to Ralston Afterbay lies within a Wild and Scenic River MA. The ENF-LRMP identifies that this is a preliminary administrative recommendation that this reach of the Rubicon River receive interim protection of its Wild, Scenic, or Recreational values until Congress makes a formal designation by law or disposes of the proposal. According to the Standards and Guidelines described under Management Practice 98, the Wild and Scenic River MA excludes transportation-utility corridors.
- **Zone II – High Country:** Lands that are largely undeveloped, and in some cases, unroaded. High Country lands occur in large tracts that are generally above 6,000 feet in elevation and are characterized by natural crest-like Sierran landscapes. Hell Hole Reservoir is located in this Emphasis Zone in a MA classified “Semiprimitive Motorized”. Management of these areas stresses dispersed recreation, livestock forage, wildlife habitat, and snowpack retention. Management Practice 98 recommends that design, construction, and

maintenance of projects are subdued in this landscape. The Standards and Guidelines call for minimal road construction, restricted use of access roads to Project facilities, and instream flows that satisfy aesthetic and recreation needs where streams border this MA.

- **Zone IV – Wildlife:** Lands managed to maintain viable populations of spotted owls and goshawks. The North and South Forks Long Canyon Creek diversions are located in this Wildlife Emphasis Zone within a MA classified as “Spotted Owl”. Management direction for these areas was revised and is described in the 2004 SNFPA.
- **Zone V – General Forest:** Lands that are most favorable for growth and harvest of commercial conifer species. This Emphasis Zone is the most intensely managed and most prevalent in the Watershed. The General Forest Emphasis Zone is further categorized into nine MAs. Most of the ENF land in the Watershed is classified as MA “High Site Timber,” which contains the most productive timberland base in the Forest. The management direction for this MA was revised and is superseded by the 2004 SNFPA; however, the SNFPA did not revise management direction for those MAs that address visual quality. The MA “Visual Foreground Retention” occurs near Ralston Afterbay, and along the Middle Fork American River and North and South Forks Long Canyon Creek. General direction described in Management Practice 98 does not allow major power projects that are incompatible with Foreground Retention Visual Quality Objectives.

### 7.10.3.3 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendments

The 2001 and 2004 SNFPAs augment the TNF-LRMP and ENF LRMPs. Appendix A of the 2004 SNFPA FSEIS – ROD, identifies the management direction for all National Forests within the Sierra Nevada bioregion, including the TNF and ENF. The ROD sets forth the management goals and strategies for five problem areas including: (1) old forest ecosystems and associated species; (2) aquatic, riparian and meadow ecosystems and associated species; (3) fire and fuels management; (4) lower westside hardwood ecosystems; and (5) noxious weed management. The ROD describes in detail the management standards and guidelines relevant to these five resource topics.

### 7.10.3.4 Placer County General Plan

Activities on private land within Placer County are subject to the provisions contained in the Placer County General Plan (1994). The Placer County General Plan provides goals, policies, and implementation programs in the following areas: land use, housing, transportation and circulation, public facilities and services, recreational and cultural resources, natural resources, agricultural and forestry resources, health and safety, and noise.

The Placer County General Plan identifies five land uses in the Watershed including Agriculture, Resource Protection, Rural Residential, Timberland, and Urban uses.

Although all five of these designations occur in the Watershed, all of the MFP facilities are located on lands designated as “Timberland.” This designation is applied to mountainous areas where the primary land uses relate to the growing and harvesting of timber and other forest products (together with limited, low-intensity public and commercial recreational uses). Necessary public utility facilities are an allowed use on lands designated as Timberland.

#### **7.10.3.5 Auburn State Recreation Area Interim Resource Management Plan**

The ASRA is situated downstream of the Ralston Afterbay and includes approximately 42,000 acres along 40 miles of the North Fork and Middle Fork American rivers (B. Deitchman, pers. comm.). It extends generally from the Oxbow Powerhouse to Folsom Reservoir. Three broad planning goals are identified in the ASRA Interim Resource Management Plan (1992): (1) provide for health and safety of the public; (2) minimize and correct environmental damage caused by recreational use and development; and (3) allow and encourage active volunteerism for projects or programs where feasible.

#### **7.10.4 Land Use within the FERC Project Boundary**

The MFP FERC Project boundary encompasses approximately 4,554 acres of land. With the exception of a few private parcels, most of the land within the FERC Project boundary is under the jurisdiction of either the ENF or the TNF. No state- or county-owned lands are present within the FERC Project boundary. Land use within the FERC Project boundary includes hydropower generation and recreation.

The primary Project facilities are shown on Map 7.10-1 and are described in detail in Section 3.0 – No-Action Alternative. The Project recreation facilities are described in Section 7.9 – Recreation Resources.

##### **7.10.4.1 Shoreline Buffer Zones**

The FERC Project boundaries represent buffer zones around the reservoirs and smaller impoundments. These buffer zones serve two purposes—to ensure public access to the Project lands and waters and to help protect the recreation and aesthetic values of the Project reservoirs and their shorelines. All of the land within the FERC Project boundary is either owned by Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) or is public land managed by the USDA-FS. PCWA does not restrict access to any of the Project reservoirs or shorelines, except where perimeter fences surround certain Project facilities (e.g., powerhouses and switchyards) for security purposes. Public access to the reservoir shorelines is not restricted by the USDA-FS. Access to some portions of the reservoirs and to the smaller impoundments is limited due to the steep terrain.

##### **7.10.4.2 Shoreline Management Plan**

There are no permitted piers, boat docks, landings, bulkheads, or other shoreline facilities associated with any of the MFP reservoirs or diversion pools. Therefore, PCWA does not maintain a shoreline management plan.

### **7.10.5 Other Land Uses within the Watershed**

Land use adjacent to the FERC Project boundary and within the Watershed primarily consists of recreation, timber management, livestock grazing/range land, mining, and natural resource protection. In general, these uses began in the early 1800s and continue today. Current land uses in the Watershed are briefly described below. Historic lands uses are discussed for perspective, where appropriate.

#### **7.10.5.1 Recreation**

A wide variety of land and water-based recreational opportunities are available in the Watershed. Popular recreation activities include camping, hiking, equestrian use, sightseeing, swimming, picnicking, hunting, flat water boating, whitewater boating, fishing, mining (e.g., dredging and gold panning), cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, and off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. These activities are supported by a variety of developed recreation facilities located in the Watershed including public campgrounds, day-use and picnic areas, boat ramps, scenic vistas, hiking and equestrian trails, OHV staging areas and trails, river access for whitewater boating, and snowmobile and cross-county snow trails. The recreation opportunities and Project and non-Project facilities in the vicinity of the MFP are described in Section 7.9 – Recreation Resources Affected Environment.

#### **7.10.5.2 Timber Management**

- Prior to the construction of Foresthill Road and Mosquito Ridge Road in 1949, timber harvesting was minimal in the upper portions of the Watershed, and access was limited to mining trails. Extensive timber harvesting occurred from 1949 through the mid-1980s.
- Logging trends based on LRMPs of the national forests in the Sierra Nevada indicate a decline in the amount of remnant stands of old growth forests. Clear-cut, seed-tree, and shelterwood cutting techniques all have the same effect: production of even-aged forest stands.
- Timber sale offerings (timber available for sale) on lands managed by the ENF and TNF have been decreasing since the late 1980s. Likewise, the average annual sales of sawtimber sold from the ENF and TNF have decreased by nearly 77% over the 15-year period between 1988 and 2002 (USDA-FS 1998, 2002).

In the ENF, four main types of timber harvest prescriptions are practiced. These include thinning treatments designed in accordance with regulations for California spotted owls (CASPO), clear cutting, fuelbreak thinning, and forest thinning. From 1992 to 2002, clearcutting has occurred within the Rubicon and Long Canyon sub-watersheds. CASPO thinning has also occurred within the upper Middle Fork American River and North Fork Long Canyon watersheds. Fuel break thinning and forest thinning treatments have been applied in the lower Middle Fork American River and Rubicon River watersheds, respectively.

### **7.10.5.3 Grazing**

Seasonal sheep and cattle grazing in the vicinity of French Meadows and Hell Hole reservoirs began prior to the 1850s, and continues today. Map 7.10-2 shows the grazing allotments present within the Watershed based on Geographic Information System (GIS) data published by the USDA-FS, Region 5 in October 2008. An allotment is a designated area of land available for livestock grazing. As indicated on Map 7.10-2, many of the Project facilities and bypass streams lie within the boundaries of or adjacent to a range allotment. With the exception of one small allotment on a private parcel located on the south side of the Middle Fork American River downstream of Canyon Creek, there are no BLM grazing allotments in the Watershed.

### **7.10.5.4 Mining**

Mining activities in the region began in 1848 with the discovery of gold by John Marshall on the South Fork American River near Coloma, California. The bars on the principal tributaries of the American River, including the North Fork and Middle Fork, were also explored during that year. On the Middle Fork American River, prospectors explored as far upstream as the Oxbow Powerhouse area in 1848. Beginning in the 1850s, miners traveled farther upstream, possibly to the French Meadows area. Mining also occurred along many of the streams tributary to the Middle Fork American River. The Middle Fork is believed to be the most productive placer mining main tributary of the American River, with many of these sites now under Folsom Reservoir. At some locations, the river course was altered to expose gold-bearing gravels within the river bed by moving the channel through the adjacent bluff, reportedly dredging more sediment between 1913 and 1916 than was removed from the Panama Canal. Hillsides and bars were denuded to supply lumber to build the flumes and other structures needed to support the mining activities. Entire towns for the miners were established on the bars.

Gold continues to be mined in some areas along the Middle Fork American River today. In addition to the locations of mines, dredging, and other activities, the Watershed is laced with dams, ditches, flumes, tunnels, and canals used to move water for hydraulic mining. Mining activities in the area are discussed further in Section 7.2 – Geology and Soils Affected Environment.

### **7.10.5.5 Natural Resource Protection**

State and federal resource agencies manage land use within the Watershed to protect and enhance the natural resources. Protection and enhancement is achieved through implementation of the policies, goals, objectives, and prescriptions contained in the various management plans described above. In addition, natural resource protection is achieved through the establishment of specially designated areas. Several specially designated areas are present in the Watershed. These specially designated areas are identified below and are described in more detail in Section 7.9 – Recreation Resources Affected Environment.

**Granite Chief Wilderness Area:** This Wilderness area is located in the uppermost portion of the Watershed, immediately east of the MFP. At its nearest point, the Wilderness boundary is approximately 0.25 mile east of Hell Hole Reservoir and approximately 4.5 miles east of French Meadows Reservoir.

**Desolation Wilderness Area:** This Wilderness area is located in the uppermost portion of the Watershed, southeast of the Granite Chief Wilderness. At its nearest point, the Desolation Wilderness boundary is approximately 8 miles southeast of Hell Hole Reservoir.

**Rubicon Wild Trout Stream:** The Rubicon River, from Hell Hole Reservoir to the Middle Fork American River confluence, is designated by the State of California as a Wild Trout Stream.

**Nationally or Regionally Important Trails:** Numerous trails traverse the Watershed, including three that are considered regionally or nationally important. These include the Pacific Crest Trail, which bisects the Granite Chief Wilderness, the Western States/Tevis Cup Trail near the Middle Fork American River, and the Rubicon OHV Trail, which traverses the southeast corner of the Watershed.

**National Wild and Scenic Rivers:** None of the streams or rivers within the MFP Watershed have been designated by Congress as Wild and Scenic under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968. However, portions of the Rubicon River, the Middle Fork American River, and the North Fork American River are considered eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act System as described Section 6.0 – Statutory and Regulatory Requirements.

**Auburn State Recreation Area:** The ASRA is situated downstream of the Ralston Afterbay and encompasses approximately 42,000 acres of land along 40 miles of the North Fork and Middle Fork American rivers. The ASRA is administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) under contract with the USBR, the land owner. The area offers a wide variety of recreation opportunities to an average of 979,279 visitors a year.

**State Game Refuge:** A California State Game Refuge is present in the Watershed. The refuge boundaries extend, roughly, from the west end of French Meadows Reservoir to the northwest portion of the Granite Chief Wilderness. The designation is intended primarily to protect habitat used by the Blue Canyon mule deer herd.

### 7.10.6 Fire History

Large, catastrophic fires have occurred in the Watershed. The major fires that occurred in the Watershed between the years 1908 and 2006 are shown on Map 7.10-3, by decade. The information presented on Map 7.10-3 is based on GIS data published in April 2007 by the UDA-FS, Region 5.

Since European settlement, the fire return interval, pattern, and severity within Sierra Nevada forests have changed as a result of development and fire management

practices within the region (J. Jue, pers. comm. 2006). Prior to the 1800s, the fire return intervals were probably between 5 and 20 years. The fires would have burned moderately large areas, been well-distributed within the landscape, and burned with low to moderate intensity, interspersed with smaller patches of higher severity. The majority of the fires were likely surface fires, causing little tree mortality. By the 1900s, fires were typically high severity, with only small portions of the landscape experiencing fires of low to moderate severity, with return intervals between 35 and 100 years. In addition, decades of fire suppression have caused accumulations of understory vegetation enabling surface fires to easily become crown fires and burn upper canopy vegetation. This has resulted in a growing number of catastrophic fires that burn out of control.

The 2001 Red Star Fire is an example of a recent catastrophic fire in the Watershed. The Red Star Fire consumed 17,500 acres of forest within the ENF and TNF and on private land. The fire burned approximately 2,416 acres in the ENF, 10,473 acres in the TNF, and 4,590 acres of private land (USDA-FS 2006). The USDA-FS determined that it will take 100 years to reestablish large trees (>24" diameter at breast height [dbh]) and at least 250 years to develop old trees with decadence features that would be beneficial to wildlife (USDA-FS 2002).

#### **7.10.6.1 Fuels Management**

Fire management in the Watershed is the responsibility of the USDA-FS and local fire districts. Fire and fuels management has become a high priority for the USDA-FS in an effort to reduce threats to communities and wildlife from large, severe wildfires and to reintroduce fire into the USDA-FS fire-adapted ecosystem (USDA-FS 2004b). Specific broad-scale USDA-FS goals for fire and fuels management that are practiced within the Watershed include:

- Treating fuels in a manner that reduces wildland fire intensity and rate of spread, thus contributing to more effective fire suppression and a smaller number of acres burned; and
- Restoring fire-adapted ecosystems by implementing various treatments to forests to reduce unnaturally dense conditions in certain areas.

The USDA-FS uses two main strategies for landscape-level fuels management: (1) containing fires with linear fuelbreaks and Defensible Fuel Profile Zones (DFPZ); and (2) using a spatial arrangement of dispersed treatments (called strategically placed area treatment or strategically placed area treatment [SPLATS]) to interrupt the spread of fire. The linear fuelbreaks are intended to provide defensible areas and facilitate suppression action by indirect tactics including backfiring. By reducing the size of a fire, the practice reduces the potential of large severe burns. The SPLATS, which includes treatments such as prescribed burns, thinning and clearcutting, and planting, modify fire effects and behaviors by reducing fire loads and the spread and severity of fire where it encounters the treatment units.

**LITERATURE CITED**

Placer County. 1994. Placer County General Plan. Placer County, CA.

Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). 2011a. LAND 1 – Transportation System Technical Study Report. Available in PCWA's Application for New License – Supporting Document B.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011b. LAND 2 – Fire Prevention and Response Technical Study Report. Available in PCWA's Application for New License – Supporting Document B.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011c. LAND 4 – FERC Project Boundary and Authorization Technical Study Report. Available in PCWA's Application for New License – Supporting Document B.

United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Service (USDA-FS). 1988. Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

USDA-FS. 1990. Tahoe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

USDA-FS. 1998. 2002. Regions 4 and 5 Cut and Sold Reports.

USDA-FS. 2001. 2001 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendments: Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment 2001, Final EIS, and Record of Decision.

USDA-FS. 2002. Star Fire Restoration Record of Decision. Georgetown Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest. El Dorado County, California. Available: [www.fs.fed.us/r5/eldorado/projects/star/](http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/eldorado/projects/star/)

USDA-FS. 2004a. Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendments: Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment 2004, Final Supplemental EIS, and Record of Decision.

USDA-FS. 2004b. Forest Service Manual, Fire Management. Available online at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsm/5100>

USDA-FS. 2006. Red Star Restoration DEIS. Available online at: [http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/tahoe/documents/red\\_star\\_feis/chapter3a.htm/](http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/tahoe/documents/red_star_feis/chapter3a.htm/). Accessed May 2006.

United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). 1992. ASRA Interim Resource Management Plan.

**PERSONAL COMMUNICATION**

California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). 2006 (April). Meeting, telephone and e-mail correspondence with Bill Deitchman. Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA) – whitewater boating manager.

United States Department of Agriculture-Forest Service (USDA-FS). 2006. Telephone and e-mail correspondence with John Jue, Eldorado National Forest.

**MAPS**