

MINUTE ITEM

3/5/81
Bjornsen

C13. FUELBREAK AGREEMENT, STATE SCHOOL LAND IN SECTION 16,
T1N, R10W, SBM, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Calendar Item C13 attached was pulled from the agenda prior
to the meeting.

Attachment: Calendar Item C13.

CALENDAR ITEM

2013

2/81
W 22413
Bjornsen

FUELBREAK AGREEMENT, STATE SCHOOL LAND IN
SECTION 16, T1N, R10W, SBM, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

The United States Forest Service (USFS) has proposed a project in which they will construct a fuelbreak along Van Tassel Ridge, vicinity of Azusa in Los Angeles County. Fuelbreaks are a unique land use and their location is dependent on topographic features often requiring the cooperation of several land owners, all of whom enjoy benefits from the reduced fire hazard. In order to provide a document for Commission authorization of fuelbreak construction and maintenance, the staff has developed a fuelbreak Agreement form which also meets the needs of the USFS so that federal funds may be expended on non-federal land. The agreement does not convey any interest in real property, but provides for what amounts to a cooperative agreement whereby the State provides and furnishes a portion of its land and the USFS performs the construction and maintenance of the fuelbreak. The benefits accrue to all land owners in the area, including the State, in the reduction of risk and severity of wildfires.

In this case, a fuelbreak 300 feet wide and 6,785[±] feet long, containing 46.73[±] acres, is proposed for construction on State school land in Section 16, T1N, R10W, SBM. The proposed agreement provides that following construction, the USFS will maintain the fuelbreak for a period of 20 years from January 1, 1980. The agreement may be terminated on 60 days written notice by either party. The USFS shall indemnify and hold the State harmless to the extent allowable by the federal Tort Claims Act.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. An Environmental Analysis Report was prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, pursuant to CEQA and the State EIR Guidelines.

A 61

S 25

CALENDAR PAGE	056
MINUTE PAGE	234

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 13 (CONTD)

2. This project is situated on State land identified as possessing significant environmental values pursuant to P.R.C. 6370.1, and is classified in a use category, Class B, which authorizes Limited Use.

Staff has coordinated this project with those agencies and organizations which nominated the site as containing significant environmental values. They have found this project to be compatible with their nomination.

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

The proposed fuelbreak will cross a 250-foot easement granted to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California by the Division of State Lands (predecessor of the Commission) on September 18, 1934. The said easement extends southwesterly across the N $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 16. Since the State reserved the right to grant easements and rights-of-way for the construction of streets, roads and highways only over and across the said easement, the USFS was requested to and has secured written permission to construct the fuelbreak over the District's underground aqueduct easement. A copy of the letter of permission is on file in the office of the State Lands Commission.

EXHIBITS:

- A. Land Description.
- B. Location Map.
- C. Negative Declaration No. 280.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. DETERMINE THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT BY THE COMMISSION AFTER CONSULTATION WITH RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES.
2. CERTIFY THAT NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 280 HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA, THE STATE EIR GUIDELINES AND THE COMMISSION'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS, AND THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN TOGETHER WITH COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE REVIEW PROCESS.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C 13 (CONTD)

3. DETERMINE THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
4. FIND THAT GRANTING OF THE AGREEMENT WILL HAVE NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT UPON ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS IDENTIFIED PURSUANT TO SECTION 6370.1, OF THE P.R.C.
5. AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTION OF A FUELBREAK AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE TO PROVIDE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF A FUELBREAK ON THE LAND DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.

CALENDAR PAGE	058
MINUTE PAGE	236

EXHIBIT "A"

LAND DESCRIPTION

W 22413

A strip of California State school land situated in Section 16, T1N, R10W, SBM, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, said strip being 300 feet wide, 150 feet on each side of the following described center line:

BEGINNING at a point on the north line of said Section 16, said point lying 125.0 feet easterly of the section corner common to Sections 8, 9, 16 and 17 and thence the following 13 courses:

1. S 50°E 395.0 feet
2. S 10°E 295.0 feet
3. S 10°W 250.0 feet
4. S 35°E 400.0 feet
5. S 10°W 650.0 feet
6. South 350.0 feet
7. S 25°W 150.0 feet
8. S 25°E 300.0 feet
9. S 20°W 175.0 feet
10. S 40°E 500.0 feet
11. S 55°E 750.0 feet
12. S 10°E 650.0 feet
13. S 60°E 1000.0 feet;

thence southerly to a point on the south line of said Section 16, which point lies 3,125 feet east of the section corner common to Sections 16, 17, 20 and 21.

SUBJECT TO an agreement as indicated per letter of November 24, 1980 between the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest, a copy of which can be found in State Lands Commission file W 22413.

END OF DESCRIPTION

PREPARED DECEMBER 9, 1980 BY TECHNICAL SERVICES UNIT, ROY MINNICK, SUPERVISOR

CALENDAR PAGE	059
MINUTE PAGE	237




EXHIBIT "B"
W 22413



STATE LANDS COMMISSION

KENNETH CORY, Controller
 MIKE CURB, Lieutenant Governor
 M. ANN GRAVES, Director of Finance

EXHIBIT "C"



EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
 1807 - 13th Street
 Sacramento, California 95814

WILLIAM F. NORTROP
 Executive Officer

EIR ND: 280

File Ref.: W 22413

SCH No.:

Draft NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 Final

Project Title: U.S.D.A. - Forest Service

Project Location: Section 16, T.1N, R.10W, SBM, near Azusa,
Los Angeles County.Project Description: Construction of a 300 foot wide, 6,785 foot
long fuelbreak along Van Tassel Ridge, containing
46.73 acres.

This NEGATIVE DECLARATION is prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 21000 et. seq. of the Public Resources Code), the State EIR Guidelines (Section 15000 et. seq., Title 14, of the California Administrative Code), and the State Lands Commission regulations (Section 2901 et. seq., Title 2, of the California Administrative Code).

Based upon the attached Initial Study, it has been found that:

- the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- the attached mitigation measures will avoid potentially significant effects.

Contact Person: Ted T. Fukushima
 State Lands Commission
 1807-13th Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

(916)322-7813

CALENDAR PAGE	061
MINUTE PAGE	239

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Form 2.20 (7-70)

File Ref.: W 22013

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Applicant: U.S.D.A. - Forest Service
Angeles National Forest
150 S. Los Robles Ave., #300
Pasadena, CA 91101

B. Checklist Date: 12 / 17 / 80

C. Contact Person: Dan Cohen
 Telephone: (916) 322-7805

D. Purpose: To facilitate control of wildfire and reduce size of
fires.

E. Location: Section 16, T.1N, R.10W, SBM, near Azusa,
Los Angeles County.

F. Description: Construction of a 300 foot wide, 6,785 foot long fuelbreak
along Van Tassel Ridge primarily by blade. Containing 46.73 acres.

G. Persons Contacted: NOTE: This checklist constitutes a brief compilation
of a 1973 Environmental Analysis Report and
a 1978 E.A.R. Supplement by the U.S. Forest
Service which address this project.

Subsequent to completion of the E.A.R. and
Supplement, the entire State-owned parcel
identified above suffered the full adverse
effect of the recent Southern California wildfires.
Thus, construction of the fuelbreak, as noted
below, will have virtually no adverse environmental
impact.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (Explain all "yes" and "maybe" answers)

A. Earth. Will the proposal result in:

- | | Yes | Maybe | No |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or overcovering of the soil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Change in topography or ground surface relief features? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet, or lake? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Yes Maybe No

B. Air. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?
- 2. The creation of objectionable odors?
- 3. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

C. Water. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Changes in the currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?
- 2. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?
- 3. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?
- 4. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?
- 5. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?
- 6. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?
- 7. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?
- 8. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?
- 9. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?
- 10. Significant changes in the temperature, flow or chemical content of surface thermal springs?

D. Plant Life. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?
- 2. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?
- 3. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?
- 4. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?

E. Animal Life. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, or insects)?
- 2. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
- 3. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
- 4. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

F. Noise. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Increase in existing noise levels?
- 2. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

G. Light and Glare. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The production of new light or glare?

H. Land Use. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. A substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

I. Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?
- 2. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable resources?

CALENDAR PAGE	063
MINUTE PAGE	241

Yes Maybe No

J. Risk of Upset. Does the proposal result in:

- 1. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?
- 2. Possible interference with emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

K. Population. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The alteration distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of the area?

L. Housing. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Affecting existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

M. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?
- 2. Affecting existing parking facilities, or create a demand for new parking?
- 3. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?
- 4. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?
- 5. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?
- 6. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

N. Public Services. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

- 1. Fire protection?
- 2. Police protection?
- 3. Schools?
- 4. Parks and other recreational facilities?
- 5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
- 6. Other governmental services?

O. Energy. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?
- 2. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources?

P. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- 1. Power or natural gas?
- 2. Communication systems?
- 3. Water?
- 4. Sewer or septic tanks?
- 5. Storm water drainage?
- 6. Solid waste and disposal?

Q. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
- 2. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

R. Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

S. Recreation. Will the proposal result in:

- 1. An impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

T. Cultural Resources.

Yes Maybe No

- 1. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?
- 2. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?
- 3. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?
- 4. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

U. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

- 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, 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?
- 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?
- 3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?
- 4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

II. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (See Comments Attached)

- A.3. Feature modification involves construction of a 300 foot wide, 5,785 foot long fuelbreak.
- M.1. Fuelbreak will provide access for recreational, emergency, and fire patrol vehicles.
- 4. Fuelbreak will provide access for fire fighting vehicles, equipment, and manpower.
- N.1. Fire protection services will be enhanced and wildfire control will be facilitated.
- R.1. In general, the visiting public has accepted the fact that forest fuelbreaks are a necessary fire protection measure; this may aid in mitigating the fuelbreaks' aesthetic impact.
- T.1-4. To be determined by the State Office of Historic Preservation (Regional Office, UCLA). The E.A.R. indicates that there are no recorded historical or cultural sites in the project area.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Date: 12 / 17 / 80

Dan Cohen

Dan Cohen, Environmental Specialist
 For the State Lands Commission
 CALENDAR PAGE 243
 MINUTE PAGE