

BASQUIN PARKER PROPERTY  
Portions Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM

FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN

by  
Douglas Ferrier, RPF #1672

March 27, 2006

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Physical Setting:

Property is made up of four contiguous Placer County Assessor's parcels totaling 597.50 acres. They are

APN 071-270-003	157.5 acres
071-310-001	320 acres
071-320-001	80 acres
071-330-008	<u>40 acres</u>
Total	597.5 acres

Elevations range from approximately 1600' above sea level, to just over 2600'. Aspects are generally flat (ridge tops) to west facing, although east, north and south aspects are also present, as property is bisected by three generally north to south flowing watercourses. The vast majority of the property falls within the drainages of three tributaries of Bunch Creek, which flows through a western corner of the property. Bunch Creek is itself a tributary of the North Fork American River, flowing into it about 2.3 miles southeast of the property. Within the property, Smuthers Ravine, Quail Trap Ravine, and an unnamed tributary flow southerly towards Bunch Creek. Except for Smuthers Ravine and Bunch Creek, all other watercourses on the property only flow water seasonally, and dry up during at least a portion of the summer and fall months.

In general, the area receives about 40 inches of precipitation a year, almost entirely as rain. Snow is very rarely seen at these elevations. Precipitation occurs almost exclusively from October/November to April/May, although other months of the year may receive small amounts of rain. The average number of frost free days in a season is between 150 and 250 days. Wintertime temperatures rarely go below 20° F and summertime temperatures can easily exceed 100° F for a number of days.

Geologically, the area has been mapped by the State as having soils derived from Upper Jurassic marine sedimentary rocks, such as slates and shales. An earthquake fault is mapped trending northwesterly/southeasterly down the ridgeline of Gillis Hill, the main ridge between the North Fork American River and Bunch Creek/Smuthers Creek drainages. Gillis Hill crosses the subject property in its southeastern corner (see property maps in Appendix at end of this report).

In 1980, the Federal Soil Conservation Service published the Soils of Western Placer County. The maps found in this publication show the property as having predominately Mariposa-Rock Outcrop Complex, Maymen-Rock Outcrop Complex and Mariposa-Josephine Complex soils. All of these soils are generally shallow to moderate in depth, moderate to well drained, slow to moderate permeability and only fair effective rooting depths (20-35"). Hazard of erosion is high to very high. The soils found on the property can typically support mixed forests of hardwoods and conifers, mainly California Black oak and Interior Live oak hardwoods, and Ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and Foothill pine for conifers. Only at the very highest elevations of the property is found a few Sugar pines. Intermixed with the forests may be open annual grasslands (mainly on ridge lines) and scrub oak and brushfields (mainly at lower elevations, but

found on some steeper sites). Overall site quality is poor, with conifers only estimated to reach 95' in 100 years of growth.

All parcels are currently zoned Timberland Production (TPZ) by Placer County, with a 160 acre minimum parcel size. To the north, the property is bordered by a similar size ownership also zoned TPZ, but with slightly better soils and growing conditions. To the east and south are large government owned parcels located on steep slopes with shallow soils. On the west side of the property, the southern portion is bordered by a 78 acre parcel straddling the steep inner slopes of the Bunch Creek drainage, while in the northern portion of the adjacent western boundary, the area has been subdivided into 3.5 acre parcels.

### **Past History of Property**

Little is known of the early history of the property area. At one time, the property was combined in common ownership with the Edwards Property, immediately north of the subject property. From the mid 1940s until the mid 1970s, when the larger ownership was split into two ownerships with separate family ownerships, the area was managed as a tree farm, with associated tree improvement practices and small harvests likely to have occurred. Prior to the mid 1940s, it appears that livestock grazing occurred on the property. 1938 aerial photographs of the area (at the Placer County Archives in Auburn) show ranch buildings in the large meadow just north of the subject property, and the gently sloped to flat bottom lands and the flatter ridge line of Gillis Hill being relative open with grass dominating underneath the scattered trees.

The USGS topographic map of the area shows several mining tunnels in the unnamed drainage in the center of the subject property. This mining activity probably dates back to the early 1900s or during the depression era. The area was not known for being a part of the pre-1900 gold mining era in California. Impacts of any mining appears to be small, as there are only very limited tailing piles seen around tunnels. Because of its proximity to the town of Colfax and the Central Pacific/Southern Pacific Railroad, it is possible that parts of the property were used to harvest cordwood to be burned in the steam locomotives of the railroad between 1865 and 1900.

In the mid-1970s, the larger ownership was split into two separate ownerships, with the Edwards family taking ownership of the northern portion and the Barnes family taking ownership of the southern portion of the original property. The Barnes family, absentee owners, would own the property until 2004, when the current landowners bought the property.

In 1994, the Barnes family obtained an approved Timber Harvest Plan from the State of California (2-94-29-PLA(3)). In it, they proposed to commercially harvest conifer trees on 235 acres within Sections 13, 14 & 24 of T14N R9E, MDM & BM. They proposed to use clearcutting, shelterwood-removal step, rehabilitation, and alternative prescription silvicultural methods to harvest the timber. The main limiting condition of the harvest was having enough existing conifer reproduction to support removal of the existing larger overstory conifer canopy, or the ground having the ability to support removal of all vegetation and being able to sustain a planting of new conifer seedlings. Within three years of obtaining the approved plan, the property was logged.

In 2001, in August, the most significant event to impact the subject property occurred, in the form of the Ponderosa Wildfire.

### **Impacts of the Ponderosa Wildfire**

Starting near the Ponderosa Bridge on the Yankee Jim's road across the North Fork American River, the fire would burn northwestern up Gillis Hill and across the majority of the subject property. Using 2005

aerial photographs of the property, approximately 379 acres of the property were totally burned, with only very scattered trees remaining alive, but generally heavily damaged. Another 21 acres was only partially burned, with a majority of the pre-fire tree vegetation remaining alive, but with some damage to their boles and foliage. The remaining 198 acres of the property was unburned (33%). A map showing the various burn areas can be found in the appendix of this report.

As a result of the fire, the Barnes family obtained an Emergency Notice from the California Department of Forestry to salvage harvest any remaining commercial size trees that were either killed or substantially damaged by the fire. So for many of areas of the property that were just starting to heal over from the commercial timber operations carried out in the mid 1990s, the fire removed what remained of the seed trees and canopy cover in these harvested areas, as well as burning up what reproduction had either been planted or naturally occurred since harvest. No attempts were made to reforest the subject property by the Barnes family after the fire. Nature was left to take its course.

### Today's Vegetation

The unburned portion of the subject property is concentrated in the northwestern portion of the ownership. It can be characterized as a young Douglas-fir/Oak forest on north facing slopes, an Oak woodland on ridgetops and south facing slopes, and scrub oak brushland on low elevation canyon slopes. Only the Douglas-fir/Oak forested areas meet the current definitions of stocking found in the State Forest Practices Act. Along Bunch Creek and Smuthers Ravine, a riparian forest of willow and alder trees border the watercourses in a narrow belt.

In the burned area, although no efforts were made to reforest the property, nature has reoccupied almost the entire burn area with new vegetation, dominated by resprouting of hardwoods (mainly oak) and brush (mainly ceanothus, manzanita, etc.) shrubs, as well as grasses and forbs. New vegetation in some places is now almost ten feet tall. With the density of new vegetation, combined with falling over of decaying boles of standing dead trees, walking through some areas of the property can be extremely difficult. Add in localized steep slopes and you have potentially significant safety issues. As currently vegetated, little if any of the burn area meets the minimum tree stocking levels of the State Forest Practice Act, and will not for many years, unless active reforestation occurs.

## FOREST MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

### Unburned Areas

Only two of today's existing parcels (071-270-003 and 071-330-008), totaling 197.5 gross acres have significant acreage not damaged by the Ponderosa fire. However, even this gross acreage cannot be considered fully stocked with existing conifers, or even predominantly by conifers.

Parcel 003 has 53 acres of land dominated by conifer timber, but with some hardwoods present. The other 105 acres of the parcel are dominated by hardwoods, with only an occasional conifer. For parcel 008, it is 13 acres of conifer dominated land, and 16 of hardwood dominated acres.

Why this is important is because only conifers are considered having significant economic value. Given the specific site characteristics and species involved on the subject property, a one-hundred year old Ponderosa pine, growing at it's maximum rate for the entire 100 year period, would expect to be about 22" DBH (diameter at breast height) and 95 feet tall. At full stocking, approximately 75 of these size trees would occupy an acre of ground. Each tree would have 450 board feet in it, to an 8" top diameter, inside bark, for a total of 33,750 board feet per acre, gross volume. For a Black oak growing on the property for 100 years

at it's maximum rate, it's size would be about 15" in DBH and possibly 60' tall. A tree this size has about 33.8 cubic feet of wood in it, to a 4" top, inside bark. If a field cord of wood has 95 cubic feet in it, then each tree has about one-third of a cord of wood in it, and if there are about 60 oak trees per acre in a fully stocked stand on this kind of land, then there is 20 cords of wood per acre. In today's commodity market, pine stumpage values are around \$350 per thousand board feet, so our one acre is worth \$11,812.50, while our one acre of hardwoods, with a stumpage value in today's market of \$30 per cord, has a value of \$600 per acre. This theoretical exercise is only to give the reader a comparison of the relative value of different kinds of wood in today's market, and why the discussion of forest management is weighted towards the growing of conifer timber.

Currently unburned conifer dominated acreage on the subject property is not fully stocked with conifers. Locally significant numbers of hardwood trees can be found mixed in with the conifers. For wildlife, aesthetics, water quality, and ground disturbance purposes, this isn't necessarily bad. However, for planning purposes, one must then use a lower conifer stocking percent to calculate volume. Instead of 100% stocking with 75 trees per acre, one might use 65% or 70% stocking, with 48-52 trees per acre and volumes of 22,000 board feet per acre. Of interest is that on the adjacent Edwards property, whose commercial timber management and harvesting is governed by a Non-Industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP) approved by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the goal for full management is about 65% of full stocking, with a 20,000 board foot per acre conifer goal.

#### Burned Areas

Because there is essentially no conifer volume left in these areas, only a very scattered population of damaged individual trees, the primary goal for management is to return the acreage to be dominated by live trees, preferably conifers. If the Ponderosa Fire had just happened this past year, the procedure would be fairly straight forward: plant bare root Ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir seedlings grown and bought from an area nursery, control competing sprouting and germinating vegetation until conifer growth is well above surrounding vegetation, and then wait 75 years until the trees are large enough to support a commercial operation (about 16" DBH or larger). No heavy equipment would have had to operate on steep ground (over 50% slopes) and if appropriate and advised by a licensed Pest Control Advisor, specific herbicides could possibly be either hand sprayed or aerial sprayed on land. An alternative might also have been grazing livestock to keep competing vegetation down. Costs for the project might have been seedling planting at \$0.50 per tree, 150 trees per acre to be planted, or \$75.00 per acre, and planting to occur on probably 350 acres, or \$26,250 total cost for planting. Seedling would cost \$150 per thousand or \$22.50 per acre, for a total of \$7,875. Total cost so far of \$34,125. One follow-up herbicide treatment might be \$200 per acre, for a cost of \$70,000. Project cost is now \$104,125. Add to that 25% overhead and administrative costs, and you have a potential cost of about \$130,000. However, this was never done.

Today, the project is vastly more complicated and expensive. Because significant revegetation has occurred, it must be removed or re-engineered so that significant amounts of bare ground are exposed to allow planting of bare root conifer seedlings. Traditionally, heavy equipment such as large tractors have plowed up existing vegetation into windrows on elevation contours, and then burned. Debris left in piles from burning help reduce the potential for soil erosion, and cleared land is then planted. Tractor costs can run \$300 to \$400 per acre, and if done on 300 acres, would total \$105,000. This acreage must then have at least one follow up treatment to inhibit competing resprouting of non-conifer vegetation. However, large tractors generally should only be considered on slopes less than 50%, and in areas away from watercourses. Some acreage on the subject property is over 50% in slope (only 24% of the subject property is estimated to be 30% or less in slope, and 63% being between 30% and 50%. That leaves 13% over 50% in slope). In the burn area, it is estimated that there is about 60 acres of over 50% sloped ground. To revegetate this, some other method, such as prescribed burning would have to be used to remove the competing vegetation. Issues of liability, air and water quality and maintaining control of burns are significant issues. Fire specialists

would have to be brought in and an analysis of whether there is enough fuel on site to have a complete enough burn to reduce existing vegetation to levels open enough to allow planting would all have to be done. Logical fire units might also include some slopes less than 50%. Costs would include a Fire Plan, Air Quality Control Board fees, cost of standby equipment, and personnel to do the burning. Total cost of CDF initiated control burns runs can be around \$5,000 to \$10,000 for 50 acres. Private industry costs may be significantly higher, due to potential liability insurance costs.

The bottom line is that now that almost six years have gone by since the Ponderosa Fire, the costs of returning the burned acreage into a working forest have gone up significantly, due to the regrowth of vegetation on site. Not only do you have the \$130,00 base reforestation costs, but you also have current vegetation treatment costs of possibly \$115,000.

### Cost Share Programs

Both the State of California through the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and the Federal Government, through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, have various cost share programs that may be able to be used to address some of the costs of reforesting the property. The Federal program, EQIP, generally pays up to 50% of the cost of certain land management practices, while the State's CFIP program pays up to 75% of some pre-determined costs for certain practices. The State also has a VMP (Vegetation Management Program) that includes prescribed burning on private lands, long with cost sharing of up to 50% of treatment costs. All programs should be investigated thoroughly prior to initiating any on the ground reforestation projects on the subject property.

## FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN

### Unburned Conifer Dominated Timberland

Because this portion of the property was most recently logged in the mid 1990s, it will be at least 20-30 years until there will be significant amounts of merchantable timber that can sustain a low volume harvest. Where possible, subject property areas adjacent to development should be considered for thinning existing vegetation into shaded fuel breaks of at least 150' wide, along property boundaries. This would be a non-commercial operation, as trees to be removed are generally too small to have commercial value. Vegetation could be masticated with resulting chipped material left in place, for erosion control. Tree canopy would be opened up so that aerial fire fighting equipment could effectively reach both the crown of trees and the ground, should a forest fire become established and burn towards the property. **Target areas:** The western and northern boundary of the property in Section 14, T14N R9E, MDM. Costs would be somewhere around \$1,000 per acre, with about 9 acres of land needing treatment, for a cost of \$9-10,000.

Modified fuel breaks, or shaded fuel breaks are also effective tools along ridge lines. It was such a shaded fuel break on the adjacent Edwards Property on Gillis Hill that allowed fire fighting personnel to get in safely and stop the Ponderosa Fire before it reached the outskirts of Colfax. These areas have reduced vegetation densities so that there is some open ground between trees or brush. **Target Areas:** Side ridges within the unburned portions of the property. There is about 24 acres of this type of ground in Sections 13 & 14, and if a 200' wide swath of ground was masticated at a cost of \$800/acre (less vegetation density today than along boundary line described above), a total project cost would be \$19,200.

### Unburned Hardwood Dominated Timberland

Only after reforesting burn areas and manipulating vegetation for shaded fuel breaks on ridge tops, should consideration be given to trying to partial restock hardwood areas with a conifer component. Select only

those areas supporting California Black oak growing towards merchantable size. By hand, can remove in small openings up to two acres in size, all vegetation by cutting, piling and burning. Then plant in openings either Ponderosa pine seedlings in open sun light areas, or Douglas-fir in partial shade. Keep areas small as do not want to dry out the site. Treat at least once with first five years for competing vegetation. Possible methods include hand clearing, herbicides, or grazing animals. By using Black oak as an indicator species, you are picking areas that have enough soil to support conifer growth. Plant at a 12' x 12' spacing, then thin out to a 15' x 15' spacing after 5 years. Depending on growth, will eventually need to thin out to a 20' x 20' spacing

### Riparian Forest

To prevent impacts to water quality in area watercourses, no projects should be done within these forests except to replace undersize road culverts and maintenance of roads. Because of density of culverts on main watercourses on property, should removed concentrations of potential culvert clogging large debris by hand on a periodic basis, before and during winter months. This usually requires removal in a zone 50' to 100' above culverts of large debris only, such as extensive limbs and concentrated deadfall.

### Burned Areas

Given the pattern of burn over the property, and the physical characteristics of the subject property, the entire burn area should be broken into smaller treatment areas. Areas over 50% in slope should generally be written off as inoperable, due to steepness of slope, thin soils, aspect, and existing revegetation already starting to occur. This means that there will be no treatments of the property east of Gillis Hill, as well as localized areas within the unnamed tributary flowing southerly through the middle of the property and into Bunch Creek. The remaining burn acreage could be broken down into roughly 80 acre units, with each unit staying on either the west or east side of the major drainages that run through the property in a north/south direction. This is done so that if prescribed fire is to be used to pre-treat the existing vegetation before replanting of trees, each set fire will plan to stay on one side of the watercourse, thus not burning across watercourses and exposing watercourse banks to increased erosion. More than one treatment area could be burned at a time, should the developed Fire Plan be in agreement. Burns could be done during winter months and tree planting to occur in the next February or March after the burn. Purchase of seedlings would need to be done in the fall, preceding the burn, and be ready for planting when appropriate after the burn. Douglas-fir can be planting in protected bottom lands and on north facing slopes, while Ponderosa pine would be appropriate for all other areas. Initial planting spacing should be no closer than 12' x 12', given the low elevation and thin soils. Followup treatment of competing vegetation should occur with 1-3 years of planting. A second treatment would need to be evaluated for after 6-8 years.

### Economic Timber Management

From an economic management standpoint, it is unrealistic to think that any for profit timber management company would invest funds in the growing of commercial forests on the subject property, given the thin soils, lack of existing growing stock, and the significant costs of reforestation after the Ponderosa Fire. Because of the fire, there will be no income to offset expenses for many years (at least 75 in the burned areas). The inability to achieve 100% conifer stocking, given soil and growing condition restraints, further reduces the likelihood that someone would be willing to invest scarce dollars into such an operation. Significant harvests off the unburned portions are at least 20-30 years away, and will be of low volume/value. If regulatory costs keep escalating like they have in the past 10 years, it will be even harder to meet any kind of positive economic goal. Even with the use of cost sharing programs picking up 50-60% of actual costs of reforestation, significant amounts of money would have to be spent now to generate some economic value sometime in the distant future. There is also the continued risk of another future wildfire in the area

## ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN

In the Appendix of this report is a series of maps, one of which shows the major roads on the subject property, as well as a number of roads that have been left unused and allowed to become overgrown with adjacent area vegetation. Most existing roads are native soil surface, which includes some rock in them. They are generally passible, even in damp conditions, due to the amount of native rock in them. None of these roads however were observed to have any waterbars or rolling dips in them. Because of this, minor sheet erosion and some gulling was observed, particularly on inclined roads, and where roads were used during wet weather. It is important to preserve the surface material in roads, and to prevent soil movement off roads and potentially towards watercourses. At a minimum, rolling dips need to be installed on all roads where roads have inclines over 3%. Rolling dips, as opposed to waterbars, allows motor vehicle traffic over them, even in damp conditions, while at the same time preventing precipitation drainage from running down roads significant distances before draining off to the sides. Waterbars are abrupt mounds of dirt directly across roads, while rolling dips are gradual declines into a shallow dip and back out in a gradual incline. Water flows into the dip, and out of the open throat of the dip, into existing vegetation and slash, where it can then seep into the ground.

Where roads are immediately adjacent to watercourses, such as along the north line of Section 24, base rock or crushed asphalt should be brought in and spread out over road surface, to lower potential road surface flows of water.

During summer months, erosion control features can be removed, although if installed correctly, rolling dips should withstand any season of the year use. However, if they are removed, they should be put back no later than October 15<sup>th</sup> of any year.

## ROAD CROSSINGS OF WATERCOURSES

It is evident from field inspection that both the culverts under the road crossings at Bunch Creek and Smuthers Ravine are undersized, and overflow when trying to handle large storm systems. Both crossings have had water flow over the top of the roads this past winter. Both crossings need to be replaced, with either culverts sized for 100 year storms, or possibly be bridges. All the landowners who use the road crossings should get together and discuss what is economically feasible replacing the crossing, so that potential adverse impacts to watercourses does not occur from future flood events.

Other road crossings of intermediate watercourses also have undersized culverts on them, most being no larger than 12" in diameter. The only time one should use culverts this small are for temporary culverts to be removed prior to any winter period. Most of these culverts should be at least 18" in not larger.

## VEGETATION AND FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As stated previously, a system of modified fuels located on tops of ridges, called a shaded fuel break system, would go a long way towards reducing potential wildland fire damage to the property. It would allow firefighting personnel to safely get into the area to fight a potential fire, and it would allow aerial fire fighting resources, such as helicopters and airplanes, to drop fire retardant or water on a fire that would not only get on the surface of the vegetation, but would be able to drop down through the vegetation and onto any fuels burning on the ground. Vegetation immediately adjacent to roads needs to be kept pruned back and thinned, so the equipment can safely move in and out, as well as being used as a potential fire line. Major roads need to be kept passable at all times.

## TENTATIVE MAP PROPOSAL

A proposal has been made to reconfigure the four parcels that make up the subject property into three parcels, two being 160 acres and one parcel being the remaining 273.5 acres. What impacts to potential forest management of the ownership might occur with this reconfiguration? None if the ownership retains all three parcels. However, if the reconfiguration occurs, parcel A (the 273.5 acre one) will have all of the unburned areas in it, and other two will be totally within the burned area. What needs to be done in each area will not change, but issues of deeded access to each parcel will need to be addressed, should any parcel be sold off.

It would actually make some logical sense to split the two 160 acre parcels into four 80 acre parcels. Three of them would then have logical burn units that could be the basis for removing the existing vegetation by prescribed fire and then replanting areas. Issues of potential impacts to watercourses and water quality would not be an issue, as each of the four parcels would have only one aspect adjacent to any watercourse, and therefore could be burned without potential to crossing a watercourse. Each of the four parcels would have a ridge line to break off any prescribed fire (the same ridgelines that are proposed to be permanent shaded fuel breaks). However, splitting into these smaller parcel sizes may not be possible, depending on Placer County zoning ordinances.

## APPENDIX

Map showing Current Placer County Assessor's Parcels comprising Property

Property Map showing Soil Conservation Service Soil Types

Property Map Showing Road Access

Property Map Showing Watercourse Drainages

Property Map Showing 2001 Ponderosa Fire Impacts

Property Map Showing Road/Watercourse Crossings

Property Map Showing Riparian Forest Areas

Property Map Showing 30% and Less Slopes


Property Map Showing Tentative Map Parcels

**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Collfax 7.5 USGS Topo. Quad Map Base (1949/73)

**PLACER COUNTY ASSESSOR'S PARCELS**

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferner, RPF #1672







**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
 Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
 Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
 Colfax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949:73)

**SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE SOIL TYPES (1980)**



Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, #1572



- 124: Boomer-Rock Outcrop Complex, 5-30% Slopes
- 143: Dubakella Very Stony Loam, 9-50% Slopes
- 164: Mariposa-Josephine Complex, 5-30% Slopes
- 167: Mariposa-Rock Outcrop Complex, 5-50% Slopes
- 168: Mariposa-Rock Outcrop Complex, 50-70% Slopes
- 170: Maymen-Rock Outcrop Complex, 50-75% Slopes




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Colfax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949/73)

**ROAD ACCESS:**  
County Road   
Private Dirt/Gravel Surface   
Overgrown/Unused 

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrier, RPF #1672



64




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Collax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949/73)

**WATERCOURSE DRAINAGES**  
Class I (Fish Possible) ———●———  
Class II (Amphibian Habitat) ———●●———  
Class III (Storm Drainage Only) ———●●●———

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, RPF #1672



62




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Coffax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949:73)

**2001 PONDEROSA FIRE IMPACTS:**  
Burned B  
Partially Burned P  
Unburned U

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, RPF #1677

63




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
 Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
 Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
 Colfax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949/73)

**ROAD/WATERCOURSE CROSSINGS**

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, RPF #1672

- A: 28" x 20' Metal Culvert under County Road
- B: 30" x 16' 3 Cement pipes
- C: Cement Bridge under County Road
- D: 18" x 16' 2 Metal Culverts under County Road
- E: 18" x 20' Metal Culvert
- F: 24" x 20' 2 Metal Culverts
- G: 18" x 20' Under abandoned road
- H: 12" x 20' Metal Culvert
- I: 12" x 20' Metal Culvert
- J: 12" x 40' Metal Culvert




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Colfax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949-73)

**RIPARIAN FOREST AREAS ADJACENT TO WATERCOURSES**

Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, RPF #1672

65




**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY** —————  
Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
Collax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949/73)

**PROPERTY SLOPE CLASSIFICATION:**  
0-30% Slopes —————  
30+% Slopes REMAINDER OF PROPERTY

John  
Forest Slopes Management, Douglas Ferner, RPF #1672



660



**BASQUIN/PARKER PROPERTY**  
 Portion Sections 13, 14 & 24, T14N R9E, MDM & BM  
 Scale 1" = 2,000'; 40' contours  
 Colfax 7.5' USGS Topo. Quad. Map Base (1949/73)

**TENTATIVE MAP PARCELS:**  
 Parcel 'A' 277.5 acres  
 Parcel 'B' 160.0 acres  
 Parcel 'C' 160.0 acres

Fores: Slopes Management, Douglas Ferrer, RPF #1672

67