

NOTICE OF CEQA EXEMPTION

To: Lassen County Clerk
220 South Lassen Street
Susanville, CA 96130

From: Honey Lake Valley RCD
1516 Main Street
Susanville, CA 96130
530-260-0067

Date: January 23, 2025

Project Title:

Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District Madeline Water System Improvement Project

Project Location:

Madeline, Lassen County, California (CA)

Project Description:

The Madeline Water System Improvements project is located in Madeline, California, a Census Designated Place (CDP) off of highway U.S. 395 approximately 72 miles north of Susanville. The proposed improvements to the local water system include the installation of +/- 38 LF of a 3/4" water service lateral adjacent to Blue Lake Road and a proposed 3,000-gallon fire water storage cistern adjacent to Lassen Street.

Exempt Status (Guidelines Section and Class): Categorical Exemption:

15303, which exempts new construction or conversion of small structures.

Reasons Why Project is Exempt:

This review for water system improvement construction activities concludes that project implementation as designed would have less than significant impact in each resource area. Class 3 exemption (CCR Section 15303) covers the construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures, installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures, and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the structure. The Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District (RCD) has determined that the objective of the project and the implementation activities as designed for this project are all new construction or conversion of a limited number of small structures and therefore fit within the CCR Section 15303 exemption. Additional environmental analysis was conducted by Environmental Specialists regarding proposed project effects on rare, threatened and endangered plants; threatened, endangered and special status wildlife species; and cultural resources. The Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District (HLVRCD) has reviewed these reports and determined that the project's implementation will result in multiple benefits. There will be no significant adverse impacts on endangered, rare, or threatened species or their habitats. There are no hazardous materials at or around the project site. The project will avoid all archeological resource sites. The project will not result in

NOTICE OF CEQA EXEMPTION

cumulatively significant impacts. The Project will have no significant adverse effect on the environment.

Public Agencies that will be involved with the project:

Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District
Lassen Land and Trails Trust

Lead Agency Contact Person:

Kelsey Siemer, District Manager
Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District
530-260-0067


Signature:  Date: 01/23/2025
Jesse Claypool, Chairman
Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District

ATTEST:

I, Kelsey Siemer, Clerk to the Board of Directors, Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District, do hereby certify that the Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District approved this Notice of Exemption on the 23rd day of January, 2025 by the following vote:

Ayes: 5
Noes: 0

Abstentions: 0
Absent: 0


Kelsey Siemer, Clerk to the Board of Directors
Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District

Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District (HLVRCD)
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REPORT FOR AN EXEMPT PROJECT

Author: Kelsey Siemer

Title: District Manager

Address: 1516 Main Street, Susanville, CA 96130

Phone: (530) 260-0067

Email: kmarks@honeylakevalleyrcd.us

Project Name: Madeline Water System Improvements

Project Number: CA DWR #4600013813 and #4600015403

Program Type: State of California Department of Water Resources Integrated Regional Water Management Grant, Proposition 1, Round 1 and Round 2

County: Lassen

Acres: 128 sq. ft. proposed fire water storage cistern and +/- 38 LF of proposed water service lateral

Legal Location: (Cistern) 41° 3' 5.47" N, -120° 28' 34.10" W and (water service lateral) 41° 3' 6.36" N, -120° 28' 27.10" W in Madeline, Lassen County, California (CA)

Other Public Agency Review or Permit Required:

Would the project result in:	YES	NO
Alterations to a watercourse (DFW – Lake and Stream Alteration Agreement)	☐	☒
Conversion of timberland (Susanville Indian Rancheria Conversion Permit or Exemption)	☐	☒
Demolition (Local Air District – Demolition Permit)	☐	☒
Soil disturbance over 1 acre (RWQCB – SWPPP)	☐	☒

Other:

Discuss any above-listed topic item checked Yes and consultation with agencies:

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

NOTE: The following report form is intended for use by the Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District (HLVRCD) staff to document a limited environmental impact analysis supporting the filing of a Notice of Exemption (NOE) document for the water system improvements in Madeline. Based on this analysis, the project appears to meet the exemption since the project creates no possible significant effects as discussed in CEQA Guidelines for Categorical Exemption Class 3 in Section 15303, new construction or conversion of small structures. This report will be filed with the CEQA administrative record for this project to document the environmental impact analysis conducted by the District.

1. Project title: Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District (HLVRCD) Madeline Water System Improvements

2. Lead agency name and address:

Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District

1516 Main Street, Susanville, CA 96130

3. Contact person and phone number: Kelsey Siemer, District Manager

4. Project location: Madeline, California

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Lassen Land and Trails Trust

601 Richmond Rd.

Susanville, CA 96130

Amy Holmen

(530) 257-3252

6. General plan designation: Agricultural

7. Zoning: Census Designated Place

8. Description of project:

The Madeline Water System Improvements project is located in Madeline, California a Census Designated Place (CDP) off of highway U.S. 395 approximately 72 miles north of Susanville. The proposed improvements to the local water system include the installation of +/- 38 LF of a ¾" water service lateral adjacent to Blue Lake Road and a proposed 3,000-gallon fire water storage cistern adjacent to Lassen Street.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Madeline was a railroad stop for the Nevada-California-Oregon railway and the railway is now owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad (Purdy, 2024). The small community of Madeline consists of a population of approximately 21 people (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020).

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

The Project will be developed with the project stakeholders: HLVRCD as the grant administrator and lead agency and the town of Madeline is the owner of the project. A

Plumbing Permit will be submitted to Lassen County.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

This project does not involve any affiliation traditionally or culturally with the California Native American Tribes.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture / Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Conclusion

☒ After assessing potential environmental impacts and evaluating the description for the various classes of categorical exemptions to CEQA, the Honey Lake Valley RCD has determined that the project fits within one or more of the exemption classes and no exceptions exist at the project site which would preclude the use of this exemption. The Honey Lake Valley RCD considered the possibility of (a) sensitive location, (b) cumulative impact, (c) significant impact due to unusual circumstances, (d) impacts to scenic highways, (e) activities within a hazardous waste site, and (f) significant adverse change to the significance of a historical resource. A notice of exemption will be filed with the Lassen County Clerk and the State Clearinghouse.

☐ After assessing potential environmental impacts and evaluating the description for the various classes of categorical exemptions to CEQA, the Honey Lake Valley RCD has determined that the project does not fit within the description for the various exemption classes or has found that exceptions exist at the project site that precludes the use of a categorical exemption for this project. Additional environmental review will be conducted and the appropriate CEQA document used may be a negative declaration or a mitigated negative declaration.

Signed:



Jesse Claypool, Chairman, Board of Directors
Honey Lake Valley Resource Conservation District

1/23/2025
Date

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XVI. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

CEQA Environmental Checklist Form Explanations

Project: Madeline Water System Improvements

III. Air Quality, Part C:

Level of Significance: Less than significant impact

General construction activities may involve a temporary increase in air pollutant concentrations from dust. The contractor is anticipated to have a water truck or other means of onsite to control dust.

IV. Biological, Part A:

Level of Significance: Less than significant impact

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) IPaC was queried to determine if any ESA species were found within the project area. It is to be noted that the water service lateral and the fire cistern are in two separate locations and the IPaC only allows for one polygon to be identified as the project area, therefore a general polygon overlapping both areas were included in the IPaC report.

The species included in the IPaC were the monarch butterfly, *Danaus Plexippus*, which is a proposed threatened species and slender orcutt grass, *Orcuttia tenuis*, which is a threatened species. Due to the size of the project area, less than 1 acre, and the fact that these improvements are occurring in already disturbed area to an existing water system it is therefore unlikely that there will be any impact to the species listed in the IPaC.

XIX. Utilities, Part A-E:

Level of Significance: No Impact

This project does not involve any disturbance to any natural water features and only involves an addition of a water service lateral and a fire cistern to an existing water system of which will not cause significant environmental impacts.

References

- Purdy, T. (2024). *The Naming of Ravendale, California*. Retrieved from Exploring Lassen County's Past: <https://tipurdy.org/the-naming-of-ravendale-california/>
- U.S. Census Bureau . (2020). *Madeline CDP, California*. Retrieved from United States Census Bureau : https://data.census.gov/profile/Madeline_CDP,_California?g=160XX00US0645008
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) IPaC . (2024). *IPaC Resource List*. USFWS.


Attachments:

- I. Project Vicinity and Project Location Maps
- II. Project Plans
- III. USFWS IPaC report

Attachment I
Madeline Project Maps

Madeline Water System Improvements Project

VICINITY MAP



LOCATION MAP



Attachment II
Madeline Project Plans

CIVIL ENGINEER

MIKE WILHELM, P.E.
J—U—B ENGINEERS, INC.
9160 DOUBLE DIAMOND PKWY
RENO, NEVADA 89521
PHONE: (775) 852-1440
CELL: (775) 741-1437

LAND SURVEYOR

JERRY JUAREZ
J—U—B ENGINEERS, INC.
9160 DOUBLE DIAMOND PKWY
RENO, NV 89521
PHONE: (775) 345-3178

OWNER/OPERATOR

TOWN OF MADELINE
BRUCE SKEHAN
(530) 277-5486


GRANT ADMINISTRATOR

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RCD
170 RUSSELL AVE.
SUSANVILLE, CA 96130
ANDREA STUEMKY
(530) 260-0067

MADELINE WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

LASSEN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

VICINITY MAP



Sheet List Table	
Sheet Number	Sheet Title
G-001	TITLE SHEET
G-002	GENERAL NOTES
C-101	SITE PLAN
C-501	DETAILS

LOCATION MAP



J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.

J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.
9160 Double
Diamond Parkway
Reno, NV 89521
Phone: 775.852.1440
www.jub.com



10-28-21

REUSE OF DRAWINGS
JUB SHALL RETAIN ALL COMMON LAW, STATUTORY, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER RIGHTS IN THIS DRAWING. NO PART OF THIS DRAWING SHALL BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF JUB. ANY REUSE WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY JUB WILL BE AT CLIENT'S SOLE RISK AND WITHOUT LIABILITY OR LEGAL EXPOSURE TO JUB.

REVISION		NO.	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE

MADELINE WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
LASSEN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

TITLE SHEET

FILE : 49-21-079 MADEL G-001.TIT

JUB PROJ. # : ---

DRAWN BY : ---

DESIGN BY : ---

CHECKED BY : ---

AT FULL SIZE, IF NOT ONE
INCH SCALE ACCORDINGLY

LAST UPDATED: 10/28/2021

SHEET NUMBER:

G-001

ISSUED FOR
PERMIT

10-28-21

BASIS OF BEARING

THE BASIS OF BEARINGS FOR THIS SURVEY IS THE CALIFORNIA STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM (ZONE1), NAD 83(1992). ALL DISTANCES SHOWN ARE GRID VALUES. BASED ON GPS OBSERVATIONS ON NATIONAL GEODETIC SURVEY (NGS) DATA SHEET FOR DESIGNATION: B 94 RM 1 PID: MW0101.

BASIS OF ELEVATION

THE BASIS OF ELEVATIONS FOR THIS SURVEY IS NAVD88, BASED UPON NGS BM: MW0101-B 94 RM 1. ELEVATION = 5318.90. COMPLETED OCTOBER 2021. NAVD 88 HEIGHT WAS COMPUTED BY APPLYING THE VERTCON SHIFT VALUE TO THE ADJUSTED NGVD 29 HEIGHT.



Plot Date: 12/10/2024 4:52 PM Plotted By: Elena Johnston
Date Created: 10/29/2021 JUB-CENTRAL CLIENTS/CAD/NET/ACERD/PROJECTS/49-21-079 RAVENDALE/MADELINE/DESIGN/CAD/SHEET MADELINE-49-21-079 MODEL C-100 INDEX.DWG



J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.

J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.
9160 Double Diamond Parkway
Reno, NV 89521
Phone: 775.852.1440
www.jub.com



10-28-21

REUSE OF DRAWINGS
JUB SHALL RETAIN ALL COMMON LAW, STATUTORY, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER RIGHTS IN THIS DESIGN AND ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN. NO PART OF THIS DESIGN OR INFORMATION SHALL BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF JUB. ANY REUSE WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY JUB WILL BE AT CLIENT'S SOLE RISK AND WITHOUT LIABILITY OR LEGAL EXPOSURE TO JUB.

NO.	REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE

MADELINE WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
LASSEN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SITE PLAN

FILE: 49-21-079 MODEL C-100 INDEX

JUB PROJ. #: ---

DRAWN BY: ---

DESIGN BY: ---

CHECKED BY: ---


AT FULL SIZE, IF NOT ONE INCH SCALE ACCORDINGLY

LAST UPDATED: 10/29/2021

SHEET NUMBER:

C-101


File Date: 12/02/2024 4:52 PM Plotted By: Elena Johnston
Date Created: 10/28/2021 JUB CENTRAL CLIENT SCATIONS LAKESIDE PROJECTS 49-21-079 RAVENHILL MADELINE DESIGN CAD SHEET MADELINE 49-21-079 MODEL C-501X DETAILS.DWG



- ### NOTES
- CONTRACTOR TO FURNISH AND INSTALL ALL ITEMS IN LEGEND.
 - NOT USED.
 - WATER SERVICE WILL BE INSPECTED AND APPROVED BY OWNER PRIOR TO BACKFILL.
 - NOT USED.
 - ANY SUBSTITUTE ITEMS MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE OWNER FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
 - UPC 608.3 REQUIRES WATER HEATER EXPANSION TANKS WHENEVER CHECK VALVES ARE USED IN SERVICES.
 - CUSTOMER IS RECOMMENDED TO INSTALL A PRV IF MAIN PRESSURE EXCEEDS 80 PSI.

- ### LEGEND
- SADDLE - SMITH BLAIR MODEL 317, 1" FIP THREAD
 - CORPORATION STOP - FORD FB1101-4-Q-NL, 1" MIP x 1" PEP W/SS INSERT STIFFENER
 - 1" POLYETHYLENE PIPE, IPS (PEP, IRON PIPE SIZE), 200 PSI

ALL PART NUMBER REFERENCES TO BE CONSIDERED "OR EQUAL"
VERIFY ALL PART NUMBERS WITH SUPPLIER TO CONFIRM COMPATIBILITY AND/OR NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FITTINGS.



- ### NOTES
- TO BE USED FOR UTILITY CROSSINGS OF EXISTING STREETS.
 - LAYOUT OF JOINT TRENCH SITUATIONS MUST BE APPROVED BY CITY.
 - ASPHALT CONCRETE (A.C.) SHALL CONFORM TO THE PROVISIONS IN SECTION 39 OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS. AGGREGATE FOR A.C. SHALL CONFORM TO THE ½" MAXIMUM, MEDIUM GRADING, PAVING SHALL BE PG 64-28. PRIME COAT SHALL BE MC-70 AND SPREAD AT THE RATE OF 0.25 GALLONS PER SQUARE YARD.
 - AGGREGATE BASE SHALL CONFORM TO THE PROVISIONS IN SECTION 26 OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
 - AGGREGATE SUB BASE SHALL CONFORM TO THE PROVISIONS IN SECTION 25 OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
 - ALL EARTH WORK SHALL CONFORM TO SECTION 19-5 OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
 - DESIGN THICKNESS BASED UPON A MINIMUM "R" VALUE OF EXISTING GRADING = 40. SOILS BELOW R=40 MAY REQUIRE SPECIAL DESIGN PRACTICES, EITHER ADDITIONAL SUBBASE COURSES OR FABRICS.
 - SS-1 TACK COAT SHALL BE APPLIED AGAINST EXISTING AC AND CONCRETE SURFACES IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 39-4.02.
 - AN EMULSIFIED ASPHALT FOG SEAL COAT SHALL BE APPLIED AFTER COMPLETION AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE AC IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 37 OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.

JUB
J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.


J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.
9160 Double
Diamond Parkway
Reno, NV 89521
Phone: 775.852.1440
www.jub.com

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No. 66592
Exp. 06-30-22
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10-28-21

REUSE OF DRAWINGS
JUB SHALL RETAIN ALL COMMON LAW, STATUTORY, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER RIGHTS IN THIS DESIGN AND DRAWING. NO PART OF THIS DESIGN OR DRAWING SHALL BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF JUB. ANY REUSE WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY JUB WILL BE AT CLIENT'S SOLE RISK AND WITHOUT LIABILITY OR LEGAL EXPOSURE TO JUB.


NO.	REVISION	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE

MARK	EQUIPMENT LISTING AND SUPPLIER	CSI	CUSTOMER	MARK	EQUIPMENT LISTING AND SUPPLIER	CSI	CUSTOMER
A	C.S.I. SINGLE WALL FIBERGLASS TANK	X		G	36" DIAMETER MANHOLE AND COVER		X
B	C.S.I. FRP HOLD DOWN STRAP & TURNBUCKLE ASSEMBLY	X		H	4" NPT FTG w/ DUAL NST FILL OR RECIRCULATING POINTS	X	
C	C.S.I. PRECAST DEADMAN ANCHOR WITH EYEBOLTS	X		I	10" NPT FITTING WITH VENT/LEVEL INDICATOR ASSEMBLY	X	
D	22" FRP FLANGED MANWAY	X		J	6" DRY HYDRANT CONNECTION ASSEMBLY	X	
E	42" ATTACHED CONTAINMENT COLLAR	X		K	6" FULL NPT FTG w/ 6" FRP SUCTION TUBE	X	
F	42" TANK SUMP WITH 32" I.D. OPENING	X		L	DRY HYDRANT STRAINER ASSEMBLY	X	



3 FIRE WATER STORAGE CISTERN DETAIL
SCALE: NTS

SHELL CODES: 1-E6S09SD, 1-E6SECS



- ### NOTES:
- HOLD DOWN STRAP CLIP
 - HOLD DOWN STRAP LOCATION
 - TYPE "13" LIFT LUG - SD
 - TYPE "13" LIFT LUG - HD

MADELINE WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
LASSEN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

FILE: 49-21-079 MODEL C-501X DETAILS
JUB PROJ. #: ---
DRAWN BY: ---
DESIGN BY: ---
CHECKED BY: ---
AT FULL SIZE, IF NOT ONE
INCH, SCALE ACCORDINGLY
LAST UPDATED: 10/28/2021
SHEET NUMBER:
C-501

Attachment III
USFWS IPaC Report

IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as *trust resources*) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

Location

Lassen County, California



Local office

Klamath Falls Fish And Wildlife Office

☎ (541) 885-8481

📅 (541) 885-7837

1936 California Avenue
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

NOT FOR CONSULTATION

Endangered species

This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and project-specific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can **only** be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
3. Log in (if directed to do so).
4. Provide a name and description for your project.
5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

Listed species¹ and their critical habitats are managed by the [Ecological Services Program](#) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries²).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are **not** shown on this list. Please contact [NOAA Fisheries](#) for [species under their jurisdiction](#).

-
1. Species listed under the Endangered Species Act are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the [listing status page](#) for more information. IPaC only shows species that are regulated by USFWS (see FAQ).

2. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

Insects

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i> Wherever found There is proposed critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Proposed Threatened

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Slender Orcutt Grass <i>Orcuttia tenuis</i> Wherever found There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1063	Threatened

Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

There are no critical habitats at this location.

You are still required to determine if your project(s) may have effects on all above listed species.

Bald & Golden Eagles

Bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act¹ and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to bald or golden eagles, or their habitats³, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described in the links below. Specifically, please review the ["Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"](#).

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds
<https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds
<https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC
<https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action>

There are likely bald eagles present in your project area. For additional information on bald eagles, refer to [Bald Eagle Nesting and Sensitivity to Human Activity](#).

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
Golden Eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read ["Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"](#), specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (■)

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25/0.25 = 1$; at week 20 it is $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season (■)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.


To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

No Data (—)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.



What does IPaC use to generate the potential presence of bald and golden eagles in my specified location?

The potential for eagle presence is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply). To see a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs of bald and golden eagles in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to obtain a permit to avoid violating the [Eagle Act](#) should such impacts occur. Please contact your local Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office if you have questions.

Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act¹ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats³ should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described in the links below. Specifically, please review the ["Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"](#).

1. The [Migratory Birds Treaty Act](#) of 1918.
2. The [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds
<https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC
<https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action>

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the [USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ [below](#). This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the [E-bird data mapping tool](#) (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found [below](#).

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
American White Pelican <i>pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6886	Breeds Apr 1 to Aug 31
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
Black Tern <i>Chlidonias niger surinamensis</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3093	Breeds May 15 to Aug 20
Cassin's Finch <i>Haemorhous cassinii</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9462	Breeds May 15 to Jul 15
Evening Grosbeak <i>Coccothraustes vespertinus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.	Breeds May 15 to Aug 10
Forster's Tern <i>Sterna forsteri</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA	Breeds Mar 1 to Aug 15
Golden Eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680	Breeds Jan 1 to Aug 31

Lewis's Woodpecker *Melanerpes lewis*

Breeds Apr 20 to Sep 30

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9408>

Northern Harrier *Circus hudsonius*

Breeds Apr 1 to Sep 15

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8350>

Olive-sided Flycatcher *Contopus cooperi*

Breeds May 20 to Aug 31

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914>

Sage Thrasher *Oreoscoptes montanus*

Breeds Apr 15 to Aug 10

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9433>

Willet *Tringa semipalmata*

Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 5

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read ["Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles"](#), specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (■)

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25/0.25 = 1$; at week 20 it is $0.05/0.25 = 0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season (■)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.


To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.


No Data (—)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.





Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

[Nationwide Conservation Measures](#) describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. [Additional measures](#) or [permits](#) may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the list of migratory birds that potentially occur in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS [Birds of Conservation Concern \(BCC\)](#) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#) and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle ([Eagle Act](#) requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the [Rapid Avian Information Locator \(RAIL\) Tool](#).

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the [Avian Knowledge Network \(AKN\)](#). This data is derived from a growing collection of [survey, banding, and citizen science datasets](#).

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering or migrating in my area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may query your location using the [RAIL Tool](#) and look at the range maps provided for birds in your area at the bottom of the profiles provided for each bird in your results. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are [Birds of Conservation Concern](#) (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the [Eagle Act](#) requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal](#). The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the [NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf](#) project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the [Diving Bird Study](#) and the [nanotag studies](#) or contact [Caleb Spiegel](#) or [Pam Loring](#).

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to [obtain a permit](#) to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

Facilities

National Wildlife Refuge lands

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the [National Wildlife Refuge](#) system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

There are no refuge lands at this location.

Fish hatcheries

There are no fish hatcheries at this location.

Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI)

Impacts to [NWI wetlands](#) and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District](#).

This location did not intersect any wetlands mapped by NWI.

NOTE: This initial screening does **not** replace an on-site delineation to determine whether wetlands occur. Additional information on the NWI data is provided below.

Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

Data exclusions

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tubercid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

Data precautions

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate Federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.

NOT FOR CONSULTATION