

Appendix A

Electric and Magnetic Fields

APPENDIX A

Electric and Magnetic Fields

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) have not concluded that exposure to magnetic fields from utility electric facilities is a health hazard. Many reports have concluded that the potential for health effects associated with electric and magnetic field (EMF) exposure is too speculative to allow the evaluation of impacts or the preparation of mitigation measures. EMF is a term used to describe electric and magnetic fields that are created by electric voltage (electric field) and electric current (magnetic field). Power frequency EMF is a natural consequence of electrical circuits, and can be either directly measured using the appropriate measuring instruments or calculated using appropriate information. Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) are present wherever electricity flows: around appliances and power lines, in offices, schools, and homes. Electric fields are invisible lines of force, created by voltage, and are shielded by most materials. Units of measure are volts per meter (V/m). Magnetic fields are invisible lines of force, created by electric current and are not shielded by most materials, such as lead, soil and concrete. Units of measure are Gauss (G) or milliGauss (mG, 1/1000 of a Gauss). Electric and magnetic field strengths diminish with distance. These fields are low energy, extremely low frequency fields, and should not be confused with high energy or ionizing radiation such as X-rays and gamma rays.

Possible Health Effects

The possible effects of EMF on human health have come under scientific scrutiny. Concern about EMF originally focused on electric fields; however, much of the recent research has focused on magnetic fields. Uncertainty exists as to what characteristics of magnetic field exposure need to be considered to assess human exposure effects. Among the characteristics considered are field intensity, transients, harmonics, and changes in intensity over time. These characteristics may vary from power lines to appliances to home wiring, and this may create different types of exposures. The exposure most often considered is intensity or magnitude of the field.

There is a consensus among the medical and scientific communities that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that EMF causes adverse health effects. Neither the medical nor scientific communities have been able to provide any foundation upon which regulatory bodies could establish a standard or level of exposure that is known to be either safe or harmful. Laboratory experiments have shown that magnetic fields can cause biologic changes in living cells, but scientists are not sure whether any risk to human health can be associated with them. Some studies have suggested an association between surrogate measures of magnetic fields and certain cancers while others have not.

California Public Utilities Commission Summary

Background

On January 15, 1991, the CPUC initiated an investigation to consider its role in mitigating the health effects, if any, of electric and magnetic fields from utility facilities and power lines. A working group of interested parties, called the California EMF Consensus Group, was created by the CPUC to advise it on this issue. It consisted of 17 stakeholders representing citizens groups, consumer groups, environmental groups, State agencies, unions, and utilities. The Consensus Group was charged to 1) consider a balanced set of facts and concerns; 2) define near-term research objectives; and 3) develop interim policies and procedures to guide the electric utilities in educating their customers, reducing EMF, and responding to potential health concerns. The Consensus Group's fact-finding process was open to the public, and its report incorporated concerns expressed by the public. Its recommendations were filed with the Commission in March of 1992. In August of 2004, the CPUC opened an Order Instituting Rulemaking to update the Commission's policies and procedures related to electric and magnetic fields emanating from regulated utility facilities. The final decision was issued in D.06-01-042.

Findings

Based on the work of the Consensus Group, written testimony, and evidentiary hearings, the CPUC issued its decision (D.06-01-042) to address public concern about possible EMF health effects from electric utility facilities. The conclusions and findings included the following:

- The body of scientific evidence continues to evolve. However, it is recognized that public concern and scientific uncertainty remain regarding the potential health effects of EMF exposure.
- It is not appropriate to adopt any specific numerical standard in association with EMF until we have a firm scientific basis for adopting any particular value.

Interim Policies

The CPUC's decision specifically requires seven measures. One of these measures that is applicable to the Proposed Project is as follows:

- No-cost and low-cost steps to reduce EMF. In response to a situation of scientific uncertainty and public concern, the CPUC felt it appropriate for utilities to take no-cost and low-cost measures where feasible to reduce exposure from new or upgraded utility facilities. It directs that no-cost mitigation measures be undertaken, and that low-cost options be implemented through the project certification process. Four percent of total project budgeted cost is the benchmark in developing EMF mitigation guidelines, and mitigation measures should achieve some noticeable reductions.

The CPUC will continue to monitor these issues. If new information develops in the future, the CPUC may amend its decision to reflect new scientific evidence.

Exemption Criteria

The CPUC agreed that "Utility management should have reasonable latitude to deviate and modify their guidelines as conditions warrant and as new EMF information is received. However,

if the EMF guidelines are to be truly used as guidelines, the utilities should incorporate criteria which justify exempting specific types of projects from the guidelines."

Sierra Pacific will use the following guidelines to determine those specific types of projects that will be exempt from no/low cost field reduction:

- Operation, repair, maintenance replacement or minor alteration of existing structures: facilities or equipment.
- Restoration or rehabilitation of deteriorated or damaged structures, facilities or equipment to meet current standards of public safety.
- Addition of safety devices.
- Replacement or reconstruction of existing structures and facilities on the same site and for the same purpose as the replaced structure or facility.
- Emergency restoration projects.
- Re-conductoring projects except when structures are reframed or reconfigured.
- Projects located on land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management or other governmental agency.
- Privately owned tree farms.
- Agricultural land within the Williamson Act.
- Areas not suited to residential/commercial development. Such areas might include steep slopes, areas subject to flooding or areas without access to public facilities.

The intent of the exemption criteria is to exclude two types of projects. The first type of projects are those that either replace or make minor additions or modifications to existing facilities. This will include pole replacements or relocations less than 2,000 feet in length. Those projects where more than 2,000 feet of line is relocated or reconstructed or where the circuit is reinsulated or reconfigured should be considered for low cost magnetic field management techniques.

The second type projects are those located in undeveloped areas.

EMF Reduction

Sierra Pacific will use the following Guidelines in the application of no and low cost steps to reduce magnetic field strengths:

- Sierra Pacific will take low cost steps to reduce fields from new and upgraded facilities in accordance with CPUC decision D.06-01-042 on EMF.
- No cost measures will be implemented when available and practical.
- Mitigation measures should not compromise the reliability, operation, safety or maintenance of the system.
- Total cost of mitigation measures should not exceed 4 percent of the total cost of the Project.
- Mitigation measures should have a noticeable reduction in the magnetic field level approximately 15 percent or more.

Sierra Pacific's no cost option is to cross phase the 12.5 kV and the 60 kV lines. Sierra Pacific's low cost mitigation option is to raise the pole heights from 50 feet to 55 feet, which will reduce the ground level magnetic fields by 29 percent directly below the line and by 18 percent at the edge of the power line right-of-way.

Appendix B

Air Emission Estimates



PROPOSED PROJECT DAILY EMISSIONS

ONSITE		HP		Hours/day	Emission factor (lbs/hour)			Daily Emissions lbs		
					NOx	PM	VOC	NOx	PM	VOC
Site Preparation										
Hydroax	250	acres	10	months	1.931	0.064	0.171	19.31	0.64	1.71
Fugitive Dust	0.5		0.0333333			0.77			25.67	
					Total:			19.31	26.31	1.71
Pole Installation										
Drill Rig/Generator	175	HP	10	Hours/day	1.6938	0.0795	0.1944	16.94	0.80	1.94
Line Truck	250		10		1.9993	0.0709	0.1933	19.99	0.71	1.93
Skycrane Helicopter (2 engines)	4800 (2)		4		30.99863	2.13	0.39284	123.99	8.52	1.57
					Total:			160.93	10.02	5.45
Conductor Installation										
Line Truck	250		10		1.9993	0.0709	0.1933	19.99	0.71	1.93
Tension Machine	120		10		1.0579	0.0896	0.1711	10.58	0.90	1.71
Wire Puller	175		10		1.231	0.0641	0.1464	12.31	0.64	1.46
Bell 206 Helicopter	420		10		1.749553	0.1	0.079525	17.50	1.00	0.80
					Total:			60.38	3.25	5.90
OFFSITE										
	Round	trips/day	miles/trip	grams to lbs	Emission factor (g/mile or start)			NOx	PM	VOC
Semi-Truck (running)	5	40	0.002205		16.299	0.539	0.836	7.19	0.24	0.37
Semi-Truck (starting)	5	40	0.002205		4.854	0.008	18.13	0.05	0.00	0.20
Semi-Truck (tire wear)	5	40	0.002205			0.031			0.01	
Semi-Truck (break wear)	5	40	0.002205			0.025			0.01	
					Total:			7.24	0.26	0.57
Pick-Up Truck (running)	26	20	0.002205		0.689	0.014	0.106	0.79	0.02	0.12
Pick-Up Truck (starting)	26	20	0.002205		0.371	0.001	0.306	0.02	0.00	0.02
Pick-Up Truck (tire wear)	26	20	0.002205			0.008			0.01	
Pick-Up Truck (break wear)	26	20	0.002205			0.013			0.01	
					Total:			0.81	0.04	0.14
					Offsite Total:			8.05	0.30	0.71

Maximum Day (pounds) 168.98 26.61 6.61

MITIGATED EMISSIONS

ONSITE	HP	Hours/day	Emission factor (lbs/hour)			Daily Emissions lbs			
Pole Installation			NOx	PM	VOC	NOx	PM	VOC	
Line Truck	250	4	1.9993	0.0709	0.1933	8.00	0.28	0.77	
Skycrane Helicopter (2 engines)	4800 (2)	4	30.99863	2.13	0.39284	123.99	8.52	1.57	
			Onsite Total:			131.99	8.80	2.34	
OFFSITE			Emission factor (g/mile or start)			Daily Emissions lbs			
Round	trips/day	miles/trip	grams to lbs	NOx	PM	VOC	NOx	PM	VOC
Pick-Up Truck (running)	26	20	0.002205	0.689	0.014	0.106	0.79	0.02	0.12
Pick-Up Truck (starting)	26	20	0.002205	0.371	0.001	0.306	0.02	0.00	0.02
Pick-Up Truck (tire wear)	26	20	0.002205	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.01	0.01	0.01
Pick-Up Truck (break wear)	26	20	0.002205	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.01	0.01	0.01
			Offsite Total:			0.81	0.04	0.14	0.14
Maximum Day (pounds)						132.80	8.84	2.48	

Sources: Onsite construction equipment emission factors are for year 2007, obtained from SCAQMD and Offsite emission factors were obtained from Emfac2007. Helicopter emission factors for VOC and NOx were obtained from FAA, 2005 and helicopter emission factors for PM10 were obtained from CPUC, 2006.

Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy (FAA). 2005. Emissions and Dispersion Modeling System Version 4.4, Released November 21, 2005.

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), 2006. Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Line Project Environmental Impact Report, July 2006.

HELICOPTER EMISSION FACTOR DERIVATION

SKYCRANE

	kg/s	g/kg	g/s	g/hour	4380 hp lb/hour	4800 hp lb/hour	Skycrane 2 - 4800 hp
CO	0.2053	1.67	0.342851	1234.2636	2.72108545	2.98201146	5.96402291
HC	0.2053	0.11	0.022583	81.2988	0.17923317	0.19641992	0.39283983
NOx	0.2053	8.68	1.782004	6415.2144	14.1431268	15.499317	30.9986341
Sox	0.2053	0.54	0.110862	399.1032	0.87987194	0.96424323	1.92848645

used T64-GE-416 Turboshaft 4,380 hp engine from the H-53 Super Stallion. Take off and climb out mode were used for fuel flow

HUGHES 500

	kg/s	g/kg	g/s	g/hour	lb/hour
CO	0.0334	7.81	0.260854	939.0744	2.07030467
HC	0.0334	0.3	0.01002	36.072	0.07952515
NOx	0.0334	6.6	0.22044	793.584	1.74955324
Sox	0.0334	0.54	0.018036	64.9296	0.14314526

used Allison 250-C20 420 hp engine from the Bell 206 Jet Ranger. Takeoff mode was used for fuel flow.

Appendix C

Federal Endangered and Threatened Species



**Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in
or may be Affected by Projects in the Counties and/or
U.S.G.S. 7 1/2 Minute Quads you requested**

Document Number: 070109122712

Database Last Updated: January 4

, 2006

Quad Lists

Listed Species

Fish

- *Oncorhynchus (=Salmo) clarki henshawi*
 - Lahontan cutthroat trout (T)

Birds

- *Haliaeetus leucocephalus*
 - bald eagle (T)

Candidate Species

Amphibians

- *Rana muscosa*
 - mountain yellow-legged frog (C)

Mammals

- *Martes pennanti*
 - fisher (C)

Quads Containing Listed, Proposed or Candidate Species:

MARTIS PEAK (554D)

County Lists

No county species lists requested.

Key:

- (E) Endangered - Listed as being in danger of extinction.
- (T) Threatened - Listed as likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.
- (P) Proposed - Officially proposed in the Federal Register for listing as endangered or threatened.
- (NMFS) Species under the Jurisdiction of the [National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service](#). Consult with them directly about these species.
- Critical Habitat - Area essential to the conservation of a species.
- (PX) Proposed Critical Habitat - The species is already listed. Critical habitat is being proposed for it.
- (C) Candidate - Candidate to become a proposed species.
- (V) Vacated by a court order. Not currently in effect. Being reviewed by the Service.
- (X) Critical Habitat designated for this species

Important Information About Your Species List

How We Make Species Lists

We store information about endangered and threatened species lists by U.S. Geological Survey 7½ minute quads. The United States is divided into these quads, which are about the size of San Francisco.

The animals on your species list are ones that occur within, or may be affected by projects within, the quads covered by the list.

- Fish and other aquatic species appear on your list if they are in the same watershed as your quad or if water use in your quad might affect them.
- Amphibians will be on the list for a quad or county if pesticides applied in that area may be carried to their habitat by air currents.
- Birds are shown regardless of whether they are resident or migratory. Relevant birds on the county list should be considered regardless of whether they appear on a quad list.

Plants

Any plants on your list are ones that have actually been observed in the area covered by the list. Plants may exist in an area without ever having been detected there. You can find out what's in the surrounding quads through the California Native Plant Society's online [Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants](#).

Surveying

Some of the species on your list may not be affected by your project. A trained biologist or botanist, familiar with the habitat requirements of the species on your list, should determine whether they or habitats suitable for them may be affected by your project. We recommend that your surveys include any proposed and candidate species on your list.

For plant surveys, we recommend using the [Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical](#)

[Inventories](#). The results of your surveys should be published in any environmental documents prepared for your project.

Your Responsibilities Under the Endangered Species Act

All animals identified as listed above are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations prohibit the take of a federally listed wildlife species. Take is defined by the Act as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect" any such animal.

Take may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or shelter (50 CFR §17.3).

Take incidental to an otherwise lawful activity may be authorized by one of two procedures:

- If a Federal agency is involved with the permitting, funding, or carrying out of a project that may result in take, then that agency must engage in a formal [consultation](#) with the Service.
- During formal consultation, the Federal agency, the applicant and the Service work together to avoid or minimize the impact on listed species and their habitat. Such consultation would result in a biological opinion by the Service addressing the anticipated effect of the project on listed and proposed species. The opinion may authorize a limited level of incidental take.
- If no Federal agency is involved with the project, and federally listed species may be taken as part of the project, then you, the applicant, should apply for an incidental take permit. The Service may issue such a permit if you submit a satisfactory conservation plan for the species that would be affected by your project.
- Should your survey determine that federally listed or proposed species occur in the area and are likely to be affected by the project, we recommend that you work with this office and the California Department of Fish and Game to develop a plan that minimizes the project's direct and indirect impacts to listed species and compensates for project-related loss of habitat. You should include the plan in any environmental documents you file.

Critical Habitat

When a species is listed as endangered or threatened, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation may be designated as [critical habitat](#). These areas may require special management considerations or protection. They provide needed space for growth and normal behavior; food, water, air, light, other nutritional or physiological requirements; cover or shelter; and sites for breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring, germination or seed dispersal.

Although critical habitat may be designated on private or State lands, activities on these lands are not restricted unless there is Federal involvement in the activities or direct harm to listed wildlife.

If any species has proposed or designated critical habitat within a quad, there will be a separate line for this on the species list. Boundary descriptions of the critical habitat may be found in the Federal Register. The information is also reprinted in the Code of Federal Regulations (50 CFR 17.95). See our [critical habitat](#)

[page](#) for maps.

Candidate Species

We recommend that you address impacts to candidate species. We put plants and animals on our candidate list when we have enough scientific information to eventually propose them for listing as threatened or endangered. By considering these species early in your planning process you may be able to avoid the problems that could develop if one of these candidates was listed before the end of your project.

Species of Concern

The Sacramento Fish & Wildlife Office no longer maintains a list of species of concern. However, various other agencies and organizations maintain lists of at-risk species. These lists provide essential information for land management planning and conservation efforts. [More info](#)

Wetlands

If your project will impact wetlands, riparian habitat, or other jurisdictional waters as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, you will need to obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Impacts to wetland habitats require site specific mitigation and monitoring. For questions regarding wetlands, please contact Mark Littlefield of this office at (916) 414-6580.

Updates

Our database is constantly updated as species are proposed, listed and delisted. If you address proposed and candidate species in your planning, this should not be a problem. However, we recommend that you get an updated list every 90 days. That would be April 09, 2007.

Appendix D

Certificate of Service and IS/MND Mailing List



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rachel Baudler, certify that I have on this date caused the following:

Notice of Publication of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, regarding Sierra Pacific's Application (No. A.06-04-017) to the California Public Utilities Commission to construct and operate an approximately one half of a mile of 60 kilovolt (kV) single-circuit power line near the community of Hirschdale pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D, to be served by United States Postal Service mail to the owners of property adjacent to the Proposed Project.

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 15, 2007 in San Francisco, California.


Rachel Baudler
Rachel Baudler

Sierra Pacific Power Company Hirschdale Power Line Project Distribution List

AGENCY	ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ZIP	CONTACT NAME/TITLE
CLIENT/APPLICANT					
California Public Utilities Commission, Energy Division, ARE 4-A	505 Van Ness Ave	San Francisco	CA	94102	John Boccio
Sierra Pacific Power Company	6100 Neil Road	Reno	NV	89520	Lee Simpkins
LOCAL AGENCIES					
Town of Truckee, Community Development Department	10183 Truckee Airport Road	Truckee	CA	96161	John McLaughlin, Community Development Director
Planning Division, Town of Truckee, Community Development Department	10183 Truckee Airport Road	Truckee	CA	96161	Duane Hall, Town Planner
Planning Department, Nevada County Community Development Agency	950 Maidu Avenue	Nevada City	CA	95959	Randy Wilson, Planning Director
Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, Truckee Field Office	P.O. Box 9766	Truckee	CA	96162	Ryan Murano, Air Pollution Control Specialist III
Nevada County LAFCo	950 Maidu Avenue	Nevada City	CA	95959	SR Jones, Executive Officer
Town of Truckee, Department of Transportation and Sanitation	950 Maidu Avenue	Nevada City	CA	95959	Michael Hill-Weld, Director Ron Reynolds, Electric Planner
Truckee Donner Public Utility District	P.O. Box 309	Truckee	CA	96162	
STATE AGENCIES					
California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans) District 3	P.O. Box 911	Marysville	CA	95901	Jody Jones, District Director
California / Occupational Safety and Health Administration (DOSH)	2424 Arden Way	Sacramento	CA	95825	
California Department of Health Services	1501 Capital Ave, Suite 6001	Sacramento	CA	95814	Sandra Shewry, Director
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	1001 I Street	Sacramento	CA	95814	Jim Marxen, Deputy Director, External Affairs
California Department of Fish and Game, Region 2	1701 Nimbus Road	Rancho Cordova	CA	95670	Sandy Morey, Regional Manager
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), Nevada-Yuba-Placer Unit	13760 Lincoln Way Media and Public Communications Office, 1516	Auburn	CA	95603	Brad Harris, Unit Chief
California Energy Commission	Ninth Street, MS-29	Sacramento	CA	95814	B.B. Blevins, Executive Director
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board	2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd	So. Lake Tahoe	CA	96150	Harold J. Singer, Executive Officer
California Resources Agency	1416 9th Street, Ste 1311	Sacramento	CA	95814	Mike Chrisman, Secretary Milford Wayne Donaldson, State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of Historic Preservation		Sacramento	CA	95814	Debbie Pilas-Treadway, Environmental Specialist 3
California Native American Heritage Commission	915 Capitol Mall, Room 364	Sacramento	CA	95814	Catherine Witherspoon, Executive Officer
California Air Resources Board	1001 I Street	Sacramento	CA	95812	
FEDERAL AGENCIES					
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District	1325 J Street	Sacramento	CA	95814	Matt Ravve, Regulatory Branch
U.S Environmental Protection Agency	75 Hawthorne Street	San Francisco	CA	94105	Sally Seymour, Director, Planning and Public Affairs
U.S Environmental Protection Agency	75 Hawthorne Street, Mail Code WTR-8	San Francisco	CA	94105	Michael Monroe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Sacramento Valley Branch	2800 Cottage Way, Room W- 2605	Sacramento	CA	95825	Field Supervisor, Region 1
Tahoe National Forest Office, Supervisor's Office	631 Coyote Street	Nevada City	CA	95959	Supervisor
Tahoe National Forest Office, Truckee Ranger District	9646 Donner Pass Road	Truckee	CA	96161	
Federal Aviation Administration, Western- Pacific Region	P.O. Box 92007	Los Angeles	CA	90009	William C. Withycombe, Regional Administrator
Sacramento Flight Standards District Office	6650 Belleau Wood Lane	Sacramento	CA	95822	Greg Michael, Manager
APPEARANCES					
Library/Miscellaneous					
Truckee Branch Library	10031 Levon Avenue	Truckee	CA	96161	Lauri Ferguson, Head Librarian
State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning & Research	1400 Tenth Street	Sacramento	CA	95814	
County Clerk-Recorder	Eric W. Rood Administrative Center, 950 Maidu Avenue	Nevada City	CA	95959	Kathleen Smith, County Clerk- Recorder

PacifiCorp Yreka-Weed Transmission Line Upgrade Project Distribution List – NOI only

APN#	Landowner	Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
48-240-01 (New APN), 48-240-02, 48-240-06 (New APN), 48-240-14	James and Joyce R Teel	PO Box 15618	Sacramento	CA	95852
48-100-01	Gordon Fleig & Donna Abare	5963 Buena Vista Ave	Oakland	CA	94618
48-100-03 = New APN 48-120-41, 48-120-21	Larry & Cheryl Andresen	PO Box 34047	Truckee	CA	96160
48-100-04 = New APN 48-120-42	R E & Martha McBride	8191 Belden Blvd	Cottage Grove	MN	55016
48-100-06	Jerry & Jimmy Blakeley	10771 Hirschdale Rd	Truckee	CA	96161
48-100-07	Bruce Waltrip	PO Box 80	Truckee	CA	96160
48-100-09 (New APN), 48-100-12, 48-120-18, 48-120-19	Ronald D. & Virginia S. Legg	1340 Princess Ave	Reno	NV	89502
48-100-10	Christina Mortensen	1095 Festa Way	Sparks	NV	89434
48-100-13	Laura Kirby c/o Kirby Investment	PO Box 2663	Truckee	CA	96160
48-100-14	Gregory & Marieke Sinchenko	12110 SE Hawkebo Dr	Boring	OR	97009
48-110-02,48-110-07	Gary Rivara	650 Cascade Drive	Fairfax	CA	94930
48-110-03	James McGuire	PO Box 6226	Tahoe City	CA	96145
48-110-06	Andriano Castro	309 Mira Vista Way	S. San Francisco	CA	94080
48-110-08, 48-110-11, 48-110-12	Anthony & Mary Rivara	PO Box 5522	Reno	NV	89513
48-110-10 = New APN 48-100-16	Terry Garcia	10800 Juniper Way	Truckee	CA	96161
48-110-13	Gregory M & Lisa L Lamb	10866 Floriston Rd	Truckee	CA	96161
48-120-06	Richard & Suzanne Figlietti	9434 Valle Vista St	Windsor	CA	95492
48-120-07	Roger Williams	9310 Rock Springs Rd	New Castle	CA	95658
48-120-08	Matthew Jacobs	PO Box 1054	Truckee	CA	96160
48-120-09, 48-120-10	Bert J Hepworth	11056 Shoshone Ave	Granada Hills	CA	91394
48-120-12	FH Whittemore	16110 Torry Pines Rd	Houston	TX	77062
48-120-15	Duane N & Diane M Brunson	PO Box 1966	Truckee	CA	96160
48-120-16	Richard H & Mary E Fehrt	8320 Midland Rd	Granite Bay	CA	95746
48-120-17	John N & Miriam H Minnis	PO Box 2170	Truckee	CA	96160
48-120-24, 48-120-28	Louis Parker	PO Box 5071	Reno	NV	86513
48-120-30	Sherry McElhinnie	1846 Bladwin Ln	Stockton	CA	95205
48-120-33	Robert C Barnecut	598 Trumbull Ave	Novato	CA	94947
48-120-35	John R & Lisa Finnemore	979 Rhode Island St	San Francisco	CA	94107
48-120-37, 48-120-38	Richard T & Mistie D Brown	PO Box 9422	Truckee	CA	96160
48-120-39	Randy T Bess	PO Box 8302	Truckee	CA	96162
48-120-40	Peter Rivara	PO Box 741	Truckee	CA	96160