CHAPTER 5.0
Report Preparation

5.1 Introduction

CEQA Guidelines Section 15129 requires that an EIR identify the persons, firm, or agency preparing the DEIR, by contract or other authorization. The following chapter identifies those firms and individuals that prepared the Draft and Final EIR.

5.2 Report Authors

County of Plumas (Lead Agency)

Randy Wilson	County of Plumas Planning Director and Project Manager
Becky Herrin	Senior Planner
Becky Osborn	GIS Planner II

Consultants

Environmental Science Associates

Ray Weiss	Project Manager
Aaron Hecock, AICP	Hazardous Materials and Public Safety Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage Noise Public Services, Recreation Resources, and Utilities
Jennifer Moore	Agricultural and Timber Resources Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources Land Use and Aesthetics
Katherine Anderson	Cultural Resources
Lindsey Tisch	Biological Resources
Matt Morales	Air Quality Energy and Climate Change
Brad Allan	GIS
Tom Wyatt	Graphics
Logan Sakai/John Hart	Report Production

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (Traffic and Circulation Analysis)

Gordon Shaw, PE, AICP	Principal

R.O. Anderson (Land Use and Senior Technical Review)

Coleen Shade, AICP, LEED AP	Principal Planner

The true amount of fertilizer N put on fields is unknown, but these estimates are closer to real numbers than 140 lbs N/ac figure from the Sacramento County GHG Inventory that consultants used for Plumas and Sierra Counties. I worked with UCCE colleagues to come up with figures then consulted with a few local growers as well as two major fertilizer salesmen who have serviced the area for years. It is important that nitrogen use efficiency be looked at, not just rate. –Holly George, University of California Cooperative Extension, Plumas-Sierra Counties, April 2013.

Agriculture Sector Notes for Plumas and Sierra County 2005 Community-Wide GHG Inventory Reports

CROP	# AC in Plumas County *	# AC in Sierra County*	Estimated Average #/ac N fertilizer **	Notes
Alfalfa Hay	6,000	1,200	10	N amount from fertilizers is estimate of the annual application of P fertilizers (across all fields) with 11-52-0 being applied. Not applied every year to all fields, with many fields receiving zero for many years. (Range 0-25 #N/ac/yr)
Meadow Hay	3,000	1,600	10	Most (~90%) of this acreage isn't fertilized as it is low quality forage; estimate ~10% of acreage receives 100#N/ac (Range 0-100#N/ac/yr)
Grain Hay	1,000	700	70	Range 0-150#N/ac/yr
Irrigated Pasture	35,000	11,445	25	Some improved irrigated pastures (~10%) are fertilized; but much of the acreage is a grass/sedge/rush mixture with the majority of the acreage (~90%) not being fertilized. (Range 0-80#N/ac/yr)

*Source of figures is 2005 Crop & Livestock Report prepared by Plumas-Sierra County Department of Agriculture

** Source of Estimated fertilizer application, UCCE Intermountain Farm Advisors (Holly George-Plumas-Sierra Counties, Steve Orloff-Siskiyou County, Rob Wilson-Intermountain Research and Extension Center-Tulelake) and Dan Putnam, Statewide Alfalfa-Forage Specialist, UC Davis.

Footnotes

1. These estimates may be high due to the widespread lack of inputs on some of these more marginal grounds, common practice for economic reasons.
2. Rate is only one of the factors when it comes to either water quality impacts or atmospheric gas emissions. Timing (single vs multiple), method of application (surface, knifing in, etc.), and source of fertilizer, plus use of nitrification inhibitors are at least as important if not more important. This is an important message for the water regulators as well as the air boards.