

Winter Implementation Monitoring Checklist

South Shore Project Waste Discharge Requirements

This form and associated monitoring must be completed at the conclusion of winter period operations, or by May 1, whichever is sooner, and submitted to the Water Board by July 15

Please type or print clearly in ink

Winter implementation monitoring is only required if you conducted operations during the winter period, and consists of visual monitoring of areas where winter period operations have occurred. This inspection should verify all management measures designed to prevent sediment delivery and protect water quality are in place and secure at the conclusion of winter period operations.

1. Inspector's name and title:

Date of inspection:

Treatment Unit Number(s):

- | | | |
|-----------|-------------|---|
| 2. | Yes No | <p>Have all watercourse crossings and associated fills and approaches been constructed or reconstructed to prevent diversion of stream overflow and to minimize fill erosion and delivery to a waterbody if the drainage structure becomes plugged? If no, please explain in an addendum to this form how stream diversion or obstruction and/or sediment delivery to a watercourse will be prevented.</p> |
| 3. | Yes No | <p>Have all necessary critical dips been properly installed? If no, please explain in an addendum to this form why they have not been installed and/or when they will be installed.</p> |
| 4. | Yes No | <p>Not applicable to this activity Have all temporary over-snow skid trail watercourse crossings been removed without disturbing soils or damaging watercourse bed or banks? If no, please explain in an addendum to this form what actions have been taken to resolve watercourse bed or bank disturbance, or when temporary crossings will be removed.</p> |
| 5. | Yes No | <p>Not applicable to this activity Has all snow movement, plowing, packing, and/or cutting associated with timber harvest and vegetation management activities allowed for adequate road drainage and dissipation of snowmelt or runoff? If no, please explain in an addendum to this form why road drainage and runoff dissipation is inadequate, and when it will be resolved.</p> |
| 6. | Yes No | <p>Not applicable to this activity Have all culverts and drainage structures been cleared of debris, packed snow, and ice? If no, please explain in an addendum to this form why, and when this work will be implemented.</p> |

I, the Landowner, agent thereof, or Land Manager, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that all information contained in this monitoring report is true, accurately represents site conditions, and complete. I also certify that all timber harvest and vegetation management activities conducted have been in conformance with all the provisions of the South Shore Fuel Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Project Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges Resulting from Timber Harvest and Vegetation Management Activities in the Lahontan Region and all eligibility criteria requirements of this Monitoring and Reporting Program. If any deviation from the submittals to the Water Board, and/or the South Shore WDRs' eligibility criteria and conditions has been identified I have disclosed such deviations in this form along with corrective actions that will be taken to resolve the problem.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Invitation for feedback: Water Board staff respectfully request any constructive feedback regarding the monitoring program with regard to your timber harvest and vegetation management activities. Completing this section is not a requirement. Water Board staff may use your comments and suggestions to improve this program for future activities. Comments may include:

- perceived effectiveness of the program in protecting water quality
- recommendations on how to make the monitoring program more efficient, reliable, or effective
- impressions of recommendations made by Water Board staff regarding your activities (e.g., Do they appear to be effective? Is there a practice or a performance standard that would have been more cost-effective at protecting water quality?).