

9.0 CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

This chapter meets FERC requirements by providing a discussion of the extent to which the alternatives are consistent with qualifying comprehensive plans as defined in 18 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2.19 as a result of proposed operational or facility modifications. FERC publishes a list of comprehensive land and resource management plans that must be evaluated for consistency. The list of plans for the State of California, identified as of March 2004, was reviewed to find plans relevant to this project. In addition, this chapter discusses the extent to which the alternatives are consistent with other appropriate comprehensive plans identified through the collaborative process. The existing levels of consistency with all such plans (as listed and summarized in Table 9.0-1) are the baseline condition that was used when evaluating the alternatives.

For the most part, the comprehensive plans reviewed for this analysis provide general policy guidance for resource management by various government agencies. In contrast, the alternatives are composed of specific action items within the FERC project boundary. For the most part, there is little nexus between these actions and the general issues addressed by these comprehensive plans. Unless clear conflicts between the policy directions addressed in the comprehensive plans and the actions associated with the alternatives could be identified, the comprehensive plans were determined to be *consistent*, as shown in Table 9.0-1. Potential conflicts between the comprehensive plans and the alternatives identified as being *inconsistent* were identified in only one case, which is explained below.

- **Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California.** The No-Action Alternative does not include measures for the protection, preservation, or management of cultural resources. This alternative would not meet the stated goals of the Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California, and would therefore be inconsistent with this plan.

Table 9.0-1. Consistency with comprehensive land and resource management plans.

Agency	Document Title, Date	No-Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Alternative 2	Rationale for Inconsistency
FEDERAL					
USFS	Plumas National Forest LRMP, 1988	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
USFS	Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment, 2004	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
BLM	Redding Resource Management Plan and ROD, 1993	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
USFWS	Final Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan, 2001	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
CALFED	California's Water Future: A Framework for Action, 2000	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
STATE					
DPR	California Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2002	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DPR	Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California, 1997	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DPR	Lake Oroville State Recreation Area Resource Management Plan and General Development Plan, 1973	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DPR	Lake Oroville State Recreation Area Resource Management Plan—Lime Saddle Area, 1988	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DPR	Office of Historic Preservation. Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California, 2000-2005, 2001	<i>inconsistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	See text
DWR	The California Water Plan Update, 1994	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DWR	Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan, 1995	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DFG	Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan, 1978	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
DFG	California Regulations on Hunting and Other Public Uses on State and Federal Areas, 2002	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
CDF	Fire Management Plan, 2002	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
CDF and SBF	The California Fire Plan, 1996	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
SWRCB	Central Valley RWQCB Water Quality Control Plan, 1998	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	

Table 9.0-1. Consistency with comprehensive land and resource management plans.

Agency	Document Title, Date	No-Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Alternative 2	Rationale for Inconsistency
LOCAL					
City of Oroville	General Plan, 1995	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
City of Oroville	Bicycle Transportation Plan, 1998	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
Butte County	General Plan, 1996	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
BCAG	Butte County Bicycle Plan, Butte County 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, 2001	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	
BCAG	Countywide Bikeway Master Plan, 1998	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	<i>consistent</i>	

Notes: BCAG = Butte County Association of Governments; BLM = U.S. Bureau of Land Management; CALFED = CALFED Bay-Delta Program; CDF = California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; DFG = California Department of Fish and Game; DPR = California Department of Parks and Recreation; DWR = California Department of Water Resources; LRMP = Land Resource Management Plan; ROD = Record of Decision; RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board; SBF = State Board of Forestry; SWRCB = State Water Resources Control Board; USBR = U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

This page intentionally left blank.