

## Appendix B: Public Scoping Comments Disposition and Open House Record

The Forest Service received 749 unique comments by means of 98 unique letters, and 1,556 form letters. Four issues were determined to be relevant to alternative development or modification.

### Methodology

---

The Forest Service provided the proposal for public review and comment for scoping from October 15 to November 15, 2014. Comments received before scoping were reviewed and considered during the development of the proposal and are not included in this disposition. Comments received after the end of the scoping period are being considered in the decision but not towards issue or alternative development.

Comments received during the scoping period were considered towards issue and alternative development. Comment documents were tracked upon receipt to assure all relevant comments were captured. All letters and attachments were logged in and scanned into an electronic file and made available in the project's public reading room for public review. Individual comments from within each comment document were identified and highlighted. Due to the amount of comments received, comments were categorized by subject area and like comments were grouped together into concern statements, as provided in table B-1 below.

Issues are defined as points of discussion, dispute, or debate about the environmental effects of proposed actions. Relevant issues were defined as being concerns about the directed or indirect effects of the implementing the proposed action. Relevant issues were resolved through alternative development. See chapter 1 for the issue statements and chapter 2 for alternatives resulting from concern statements that met the definition of an issue.

Other issues were not considered relevant for any of the following reasons:

- The issue was outside the scope of the purpose and need and is not related to the decision to be made.
- The issue was a procedural concern, which is already decided by law, regulation, policy, or direction (Forest Plan).
- The issue was a procedural concern, which is addressed through analysis.
- The issue is handled through project design.
- The issue is not supported by scientific or factual evidence.
- A general comment or question that did not meet the definition of an issue.

Some public comments included references and attachments of various articles and publications. References were filtered from further consideration if they were:

- cited but not provided by the commenter, including non-functioning hyperlinks;
- cited and provided but were not related to the comments from the commenter; or
- cited and provided but not a scientific study (e.g. opinion pieces).

References of scientific literature that were cited, provided, and tied to comments were reviewed by the appropriate interdisciplinary team member in order to determine whether or not the comment and reference were relevant to the actions being proposed and their potential effects. Literature was incorporated into analysis as appropriate. The attachments and the full review of references cited are available in the project record.

## **Results**

---

In response to public scoping comment, the Forest Service developed four relevant issues, four new action alternatives analyzed in detail, and ten alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study. See chapters 1 and 2 for details. Other issues were raised by the public that are being addressed by alternative 1 (no action), alternative 2 (the refined proposed action), and/or are being handled through responses to public comment (table B-1).

Table B-1: Concern statements and responses

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
1	There is a concern that salvage logging should be avoided in low to moderate fire severity areas and in areas where fires were ignited from below.	Criteria and rationale for determining the locations for proposed salvage harvest is clarified in chapter 2 under the description of the refined proposed action. Salvage harvest is not proposed in low fire severity areas, and is largely proposed in high severity area. Also see project design features, especially for wildlife, in chapter 2.
2	There is a concern that we will allow for the logging of trees that shouldn't be removed, especially green trees and large trees, and that this will result in the loss of a natural seed source and desertification in the long term.	None of the alternatives in this project propose green-tree removal. Green trees are defined as those with a 70% or better chance of surviving as discussed in chapter 2 of the DEIS. Some of the trees to be removed in all action alternatives include some green needles or leaves; however, the trees have a 70% or greater chance of dying and becoming part of the fuel accumulation on the ground in the short term. Criteria and rationale for determining the locations for proposed salvage harvest is clarified in chapter 2 under the description of the refined proposed action. Effects of logging on natural seed sources, and large and green trees are disclosed in chapter 3 of the EIS under the vegetation section.
3	There is a concern that salvage logging in burned areas will inhibit natural growth and recovery of plants and will negatively impact fragile post-fire soils.	Effects of logging on natural growth and recovery of plants, and post-fire soils, is disclosed in chapter 3 under the vegetation and soils sections.
5	There is a concern that salvage logging or planting within Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA) fails to preserve Roadless qualities within the IRA.	No salvage logging is proposed in any IRA under any alternative. Effects of planting on Roadless characteristics within IRAs are disclosed in chapter 3 under the IRA section.
6	There are concerns that salvage logging, especially by helicopter, will result in too much activity fuel, higher risk of fire, and the removal of biological legacies.	The effects of salvage logging on fuel loading and fire risks are disclosed in chapter 3 of the EIS under the fuels section.
7	There are concerns that salvage logging on both private and federal lands, especially in the Beaver Fire area, would create unacceptable cumulative impacts.	Cumulative effects of salvage logging on private and federal lands are disclosed throughout chapter 3.
8	There is a concern that not enough road access will be provided to facilitate salvage efforts.	Road access for project implementation is discussed in chapter 2 under the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action. Areas determined appropriate for salvage harvest are also discussed in chapter 2.
9	There is a concern that salvage logging and site preparation for planting should occur only on "matrix" lands and areas along existing roads.	Alternative 5, described in chapter 2, was developed in response to this relevant issue (chapter 1).

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
10	There is a concern that the salvage of trees, outside of what is required for public safety and the protection of infrastructure, especially at high elevations, is not necessary and is detrimental to the natural recovery process and the forest will recover more slowly than if left un-salvaged.	There are three relevant issues related to the disagreement about the effects of salvage harvest on resources (see chapter 1). The Forest Service developed three alternatives to the proposed action in response to this overarching concern. The no action also responds to this concern. Effects of the salvage of trees on the likelihood and speed of recovery of the forest will be disclosed in chapter 3.
11	There is a concern that Westside Fire Recovery Project efforts are not designed in a way that will incorporate cultural burning practices, promote the preservation of culturally significant plants and encourage the restoration of a natural fire regime to the project area.	Consultation with the Karuk tribe is ongoing and the proposed action has been refined since scoping to incorporate the concept of cultural burning as a project design feature (chapter 2 of the EIS). Effects of alternatives on the preservation of culturally significant plants and restoration of a natural fire regime will be disclosed in chapter 3 in the botany, heritage, and fuels sections.
12	There is a concern that there are not enough fuel treatments, including fuel breaks proposed in this project, especially around the wildland urban interface and private land but also along roadsides, along strategic ridgelines and around infrastructure.	In response to public scoping comments, fuels treatments have been added to the refined proposed action (alternative 2) and a new alternative (alternative 5) has been developed to address additional fuels treatments around private property in the Beaver Fire area. All alternatives in the EIS specify the number, size and location of the fuels treatments being proposed, including strategically placed fuel breaks and other hazardous fuels reduction treatments to address the need for safe conditions and access for fire suppression for firefighters and communities and enclaves within the wildland urban interface. See chapter two and appendix A (maps) for a description of fuels treatments by alternative. See chapter 3 under fuels for a discussion of the effects of the proposed treatments.
13	There is a concern that the forest is not facilitating the restoration of historic fire adapted communities or trying to restore a natural fire regime.	The purpose and need has been clarified in response to scoping concerns (chapter 1). The Forest Service recognizes the need for restored and fire-resilient forested ecosystems for this project. See chapter 2 for the proposed actions, including salvage harvest and hazardous fuels treatments that address this need. Effects of alternatives on the restoration of fire-adapted communities and a natural fire regime are disclosed in chapter 3 under the fuels section.
14	There is a concern that fire killed fuels and activity fuels pose a fire risk, especially for green trees, if not treated.	Effects of alternatives on fire risk is disclosed in chapter 3, primarily under fuels but also see other resources, including vegetation and wildlife.
15	There is a concern that the forest is in need of a new and improved safety/fire management plan.	The development of a new and improved safety/fire management plan is beyond the scope of this project. However, the effects of alternatives on safety and future fire suppression efforts are disclosed in the EIS.
16	There is a concern that the Forest will not salvage enough trees to take full advantage of the economic opportunity available.	The proposed action was refined to include more salvage units, which was based upon field-verified information and information provided by the public during scoping comments. The effects of salvage harvest and roadside hazard treatments on economic opportunities are disclosed in chapter 3 the EIS under the social-economic section.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
17	There is a concern that Limited Operating Periods will limit economic opportunity.	The limiting operating periods included as project design features in chapter 2. The Forest Service recognizes that limiting operating periods may affect economics, but they are required in order to meet other legal requirements, including Forest Plan direction.
18	There is a concern that the forest will not allow public access to the fire area for free firewood.	In response to public comments, alternative 2 of the proposed action addresses this concern (chapter 2). Following roadside hazard treatments, non-merchantable trees will be cut and left when it is not along a strategic road for fuel treatments. Per agency policy already in place, the public may obtain a fuelwood permit to remove felled trees for firewood in accordance with permit requirements. The agency anticipates that the local public will remove firewood along roadways, especially near communities.
19	There is a concern that not enough hazard trees will be removed from roadsides.	Hazard trees along all county, state, and Forest roads (maintenance levels 1-5) will have all identified hazard trees identified and felled, including burned and unburned. Hazard trees will also be removed, where it meets Forest Plan direction and other legal requirements. Hazard trees will be felled and left in certain places such as riparian reserves. For a detailed description of what is proposed, the description of the proposed action and project design features in chapter 2.
20	There are concerns that salvage logging or planting in a Late Successional Reserve (LSR) will cause us to fail to meet the goals to protect and enhance conditions of LSRs, old growth ecosystems and habitat for late-successional associated species.	The proposed action, within LSRs, is designed to protect and promote LSR habitat. In response to public comments and relevant issues 1 and 3 (chapter 1), alternatives 3 and 5 were developed that have reduced treatments in LSRs compared to the proposed action. Alternative 3 addresses concerns related to the effects of salvage harvest on late successional and northern spotted owl habitat. Alternative 5 eliminates salvage harvest and planting from LSRs. Effects of the varying amounts of salvage harvest and planting by alternatives on LSR is disclosed in chapter under the wildlife section.
21	There is a concern that salvage logging will harm wildlife and wildlife habitat, especially for snag-associated species.	Effects of alternatives on wildlife and habitat, including the snag associated species, are disclosed in chapter 3 under the wildlife section.
22	There is a concern that the guidelines used for determination of trees to be salvaged are not restrictive enough and will result in the loss of biological legacies crucial to wildlife.	The Forest Service has been consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the development of the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action. The proposed action was designed to protect and promote LSR habitat and to meet the recovery plan for the northern spotted owl. By meeting these requirements, the project design provides for legacy components and other wildlife habitat needs. See the project design features in chapter 2 for specific wildlife design criteria to retain legacy components. In response to scoping comments, the Forest Service recognized this as a relevant issue (chapter 1) and subsequently developed alternative 3 (chapter 2). Also see the wildlife section in chapter 3 for a discussion of the effects of salvage harvest on wildlife by alternative.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
23	There is a concern that treatment in riparian areas will cause negative impacts to the watershed and specific activities to avoid this are recommended.	As scoped, no salvage harvest is proposed within riparian reserves. However, other treatments, including site preparation and planting are proposed within riparian reserves, as developed by the interdisciplinary team for the benefit of riparian reserves. Roadside hazard treatments are proposed within riparian reserves to address safety and access needs; however, project design features are incorporated into the proposed action and its alternatives, including leaving felled hazard trees within riparian reserves for large woody debris recruitment. See chapter 2 for a detailed description of project design features to mitigate effects of proposed treatments on riparian reserves. As a result of scoping, the Forest Service recognized relevant issues no. 2 and 3 related to this comment. In response to the relevant issues from scoping, the Forest Service developed alternatives 3, 4, and 5. In response to scoping comments, the Forest Service also refined the proposed action by modifying and adding project design features to the project. See chapter 2 for a description of the proposed action, its alternatives, and associated project design features. Effects of treatments in riparian areas in the refined proposed action are disclosed in the DEIS. Project design features have been incorporated into the action alternatives to mitigate the project's effects on watershed resources.
24	There is a concern that the construction of new temporary or permanent roads as a part of this project will create unnecessary negative impacts on watersheds, and road maintenance and improvement actions will not be part of this project.	The Forest Service incorporated concern into relevant issue no. 2 (see chapter 1) and developed alternative 4, which responds to this issue. See chapter 2 for a description of alternative 4. Project design features have been developed and modified since scoping to mitigate negative effects on watershed as a result of temporary road access (chapter 2). Proposed road access needed for implementation, including road maintenance, is described in chapter 2 under each action alternative. Additionally, legacy site treatments, including road improvement actions, are described under the proposed action and apply to all action alternatives (chapter 2). Effects of road access related action on watershed conditions are described in the hydrology section of chapter 3.
25	There are concerns that salvage logging or fuels treatment activities may result in erosion, landslides, and sediment delivery to riparian areas or may result in the destruction of flora that provides watershed protection.	In response to concerns about salvage harvest and watershed impacts (relevant issue no. 2 in chapter 1), the Forest Service developed alternative 4. Project design features have been developed and modified since scoping to mitigate negative effects on watershed and botany resources as a result of salvage harvest or fuels treatments (chapter 2). Effects of salvage harvest and fuels treatments on flora and on erosion, landslide, and sediment delivery to riparian areas are described in chapter 3 under the botany, vegetation, soils, geology, and hydrology sections.
26	There is a concern that we are not including more vegetation cover in our stocking estimates.	Action alternatives (2 through 5) propose replanting with a mix of conifer species suitable to the area to increase vegetative diversity, and encourage the natural regeneration of hardwoods where they exist, as specified in Chapter 2. Types of vegetation to be included in stocking estimates vary by the objectives of each unit and include hardwoods where they exist, as described under planting in the proposed action description in chapter 2.
27	There is a concern that planting, especially conifer-centric planting, within low or moderate severity burn sites will increase the likelihood of catastrophic wildfire and is unnecessary for forest recovery because a natural seed source is still available.	The criteria used to determine areas proposed for planting and how areas is clarified under the refined proposed action in chapter 2. The effects of such planting on the likelihood of catastrophic wildfire are addressed in chapter 3 under the fuels section. Concerns about planting were also captured under relevant issue 3 (chapter 1); the Forest Service developed alternative 5 with less proposed planting in response to this issue.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
28	There is a concern that plantings and fuels treatments are not strategically designed for future fire management or for planted seedling success.	The criteria used to determine areas proposed for planting and how areas is clarified under the refined proposed action in chapter 2. The effects of such planting on planting success and fire management are addressed in chapter 3 under the vegetation and fuels section.
29	There is a concern that logging trucks “Jake brakes” will create a noise disturbance to certain homeowners along their route.	A project design feature was added to the refined proposed action and its alternatives in response to this concern near Walker Bridge (see chapter 2). Implementation direction will address noise disturbance to homeowners from “Jake brakes”.
30	There is a concern that the forest is planting conifers where they were not historically established or with wide-enough spacing, especially in LSRs.	The criteria used to determine areas proposed for planting and how areas is clarified under the refined proposed action in chapter 2. No planting is proposed where conifers were not historically found. Effects of planting on LSR habitat is disclosed in chapter 3 under the wildlife section.
31	There is a concern that salvage logging along a Scenic River will have negative impacts on its functionality and viewshed.	Forest Plan MA12-18 directs that “A wide range of silvicultural treatments may be used to meet Scenic River objectives.” Forest Plan direction for Scenic Rivers and its viewsheds is being met with the proposed action and its alternatives. Effects of salvage logging along Scenic Rivers on functionality and viewsheds are disclosed in chapter 3 under the scenery section.
32	There is a concern that the scope of the Westside Fire Recovery Project is too large.	The responsible official determines the scope of the project. The scope of the project was based upon the disturbance footprint of the 2014 fires. The project boundaries were extended slightly beyond the fire perimeter in order to incorporate fuels reduction treatments within 1/4 mile of private property structures and strategic fuel breaks for the local communities. The scope of the project also includes the effects of the proposed action and its alternatives, which is disclosed in the chapter 3.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
33	There is a concern that restoring recreational features is not a part of this recovery project.	Beyond addressing hazard trees, as appropriate, the restoration of recreational features is outside the scope of the project. Fuels treatments are proposed adjacent to some recreational features in order to address needs from a hazardous fuels perspective. Both Grider Creek and Idlewild Campgrounds will reopen on May 16, 2015 upon termination of Forest Order #14-05-761; this will allow for an increase in use at these sites. Recreational features affected by the fires were reviewed and addressed during BAER activities, including the bridge replacements (Grider 2 and 3) for the Pacific Crest Trail. Special funding will be sought for recreation facilities damaged from the fires and trail signs will be replaced. As downed trees fall across the Forest trails, they will be cut to open up the trail during normal trail maintenance activities. Individual hazard trees will be removed at developed recreation sites as needed. Such treatments are considered maintenance of existing facilities and, when proposed, would likely be categorically excluded from documentation in NEPA pursuant 36 CFR 220.6(d)(3) or (4).
34	There is a concern that the specifications/project design features approved for the project will not end up on the stand prescription cards.	Following decision, applicable project specifications and project design features of the decision will be implemented. Appropriate means, including stand prescription cards, will be used.
35	There is a concern that an Emergency Situation Determination or Alternative Arrangements will not allow adequate time for analysis or provide for sufficient public involvement opportunities.	The Forest is applying for an emergency situation determination that may be approved by the Chief of the Forest Service. If approved, the emergency situation determination would result the FEIS and ROD being released at the same time, eliminating the requirement of an objection period, pursuant to 36 CFR 218.21. The Forest Service is also seeking alternative arrangements through the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.11. If the alternative arrangements being sought are approved, the DEIS comment period would be reduced from 45 days to 30 days, the 90-day wait period between the release of the DEIS and FEIS would be eliminated, and FEIS and ROD would be released at the same time.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
36	There is a concern that, without an Emergency Situation Determination or Alternative Arrangements, the forest will miss the opportunity to maximize profits from salvage.	In response to this public scoping concern and in order to meet the project's purpose and need, the Forest is seeking is seeking emergency situation determination (36 CFR 218.21), and the Forest Service is seeking alternative arrangements with the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1506.11).
37	Comments received that indicate general support for the project as proposed.	Comments will be considered by the responsible official when making a decision.
38	Comments received that provide general information, including literature references.	Available, relevant scientific literature was considered in the EIS per the methodology in this appendix. See table B-2 for results of the literature review.
39	Comments received that are beyond the scope of the project.	Some comments made were beyond the scope of this project but will be considered by the Forest in other projects or plans, as appropriate.
40	Comments received that showed concern about trust or credibility issues.	Although these comments are not directly related to the proposed action, efforts will be made to establish trust and credibility through public engagement efforts and implementation of the project and other projects.
41	Comments received that suggest a new complex alternative or a combination of things.	Suggested alternatives were either considered as a whole or parts and were incorporated into as appropriate. See the action alternatives and the alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study in chapter 2.
42	Comments received that requested consultation, coordination, and continued involvement.	Continued consultation and coordination will be fostered through the development and implementation of the proposed project.
43	Comments received that identify laws, regulations and policies pertinent to the project.	The project will comply with law, regulation, policy and the Forest Plan.
44	Comments received that suggest something already addressed in a PDF or alternative or something that will be addressed in analysis.	This is a procedural concern. See chapter 2 for a description of the proposed action, including project design features. See chapter 3 for analysis of effects of proposed activities on relevant resources.
45	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on air quality.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on air quality are disclosed in chapter 3 under air quality. Smoke Management Plans intended to incorporate best available control techniques for prescribed burning will be developed and implemented per the State Implementation Plan. See also the response to concern 46.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
46	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on climate change and the effects of climate change on project activities.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on climate change factors (e.g. greenhouse gases) are disclosed in chapter 3 and are based on the best available information that is relevant to the project.
47	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on cultural resources.	Consultation with tribes is ongoing. Effects of the refined proposed action and its alternatives on cultural resources are disclosed in chapter 3 under heritage resources. See chapter 2 for project design features to minimize negative effects to resources and encourage cultural practices such as cultural burning.
48	Concern with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on economics.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on economics is disclosed in the social and economic section of chapter 3. See also response to concern statements 16 and 17.
49	Concern with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on forest Health.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on forest health is disclosed in the vegetation section of chapter. See also response to concerns 2, 3, 10, 13 and 20.
50	Concern with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on fire and fuels.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on fire and fuels will be disclosed in the fuels section of chapter 3. See also response to concerns 6, 11, 13 and 14.
51	Concern with the effects of the proposed action on recreation and scenery.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on recreation and scenery in chapter 3. See also response to concerns 31 and 33.
52	Concern with the effects of the proposed action on Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and flooding and sediment in streams, especially in relation to safety and community protection.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, safety and community protection related to flooding, landslide risk, and sediment will be disclosed in hydrology, geology and soils sections of chapter 3. Also see the aquatic conservation strategy report in project record.
53	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on soils, geology and watershed protection.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on soils, geology (landslides, unstable lands) and watershed protection are disclosed in chapter 3. Project design features have been incorporated into all action alternatives to mitigate effects of the project on watershed resources. See also response to concerns 3 and 25.
54	Concern with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on vegetation, especially timber resources.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on vegetation are disclosed in chapter 3.
55	Concern with the effects of the proposal as scoped on invasive vegetative species (noxious weeds).	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on invasive plant species will be disclosed in chapter 3.

Concerns	Concern Text	Response Text
56	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on roadless characteristics of Inventoried Roadless Areas.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on the Roadless character of IRAs are disclosed in chapter 3. See also response to Concern 5.
57	Concerns with the effects of the proposed action as scoped on wildlife species and habitat.	Effects of the refined proposed action and alternatives on wildlife species and habitat are disclosed in chapter 3. See also response to Concerns 20, 21 and 22.
58	Comments received that indicate no support for the project as proposed.	Comments will be considered by the responsible official in making the decision.

## Public Open House Summary Input \_\_\_\_\_

The Forest Service sponsored public open houses prior to the release of the draft EIS:

**Table B-2: Open houses offered prior to the release of the draft EIS**

Date	Time	Location
Friday, January 30, 2015	1800-2000 hours	Klamath National Forest Headquarters, Yreka, CA
Saturday, January 31, 2015	1200-1400 hours	Fort Jones Community Center, Ft. Jones, CA
Tuesday, February 3, 2015,	1800-2000 hours	Klamath River Community Center, Klamath River, CA
Wednesday, February 4, 2015	1800-2000 hours	Karuk Senior Nutrition Center, Happy Camp, CA
Friday, February 6, 2015,	1530- 1730 hours	Salmon River Restoration Building, Sawyers Bar, CA
Friday, February 13, 2015,	1800-2000 hours	Seiad Valley Volunteer Fire Department, Seiad, CA

Input from the public was captured in flipchart notes and comments. These notes are verbatim except for minor corrections for abbreviations etc. Where no notes are provided, it is because no comments were made by the public on provided flip charts at the meeting in question. Also included is a follow-up comment the Forest Service received from interested parties about the public open houses.

### **January 31, 2015 (Fort Jones Community Center, Ft. Jones, CA):**

- “I want the most aggressive Harvest project available. None of the plans are aggressive enough!” Local resident, Horse Creek, CA
- “Salmon River wants ‘Ground-based’ especially in light of all previous rds (roads) built for such.”
- “I like ASAP salvage + ongoing tree planting + summer use of major roads.”
- “I want fuels treatment as regular daily FS work and salvage after fires to keep forests healthy to avoid lg. fires.”
- “Read Ernest Hayden’s stories of old firefighting in Trinity circa century change plus retired Oak Knoll F.S. or residents to see how handfuls of men could put out the most egregious (quicker than modern workers can back fire).”
- “In 40 years here: saw most “backfires” get out of control and burn more.”
- “Comments made that private roads are listed as F.S. roads = contention”

A local group of ranchers had gathered and shared their comments on logging, fire suppression and special interest group input into projects such as these as well as their own opinions of the position of the agency and their past practices. They became very passionate about their viewpoints and at times had volume and conviction behind their inflection and tone.

### **February 4, 2015 (Karuk Senior Nutrition Center, Happy Camp, CA):**

- “Our watersheds have way more than monetary value.”
- “Much of the project is Karuk Ancestral Territory.”
- “Nearly ½ of the project area is in LSR (must protect and enhance.)”
- “The rest of the majority would affect W&S Rivers, & other sensitive viewsheds (VQO); salvage logging scars the landscape for decades.”

- “200 miles of dozer line from 2014 fires. How many in the project area? Are they being considered?”
- “How many owls affected by the fire? How many in the project area? How are you treating NSO home range?”
- “How are you following the NSO recovery plan? Most of the project area is in critical habitat.”
- “How are you considering wildlife connectivity? The project area would affect two of four main corridors.”
- “What survey and manage species are being considered?”
- “How many endemic species plant and animal would be affected? Like the Siskiyou Mtn Salamander.”
- “There is a duty to restore and protect endangered, threatened, listed (Candidate) and sensitive species.”
- “Must consider the ecological & social costs!”
- “What you do on the landscape directly affects the people.”
- “Must follow CWA for impaired rivers COHO.”
- “What about the shred values with partners?”
- “Green trees should be retained.”
- “Moderate Severity areas will re-seed.”
- “How much \$ has been spent on planning?”
- “”Alt 4 – concern about lop and scatter fuels treatment in RR for <16” Trees & fuel levels that will create.”
- “ – agree that it is prudent to not plant if the fuels cannot be treated 1<sup>st</sup>.”
- “ – would like to see some broadcast burning where appropriate to provide the most effective fuels treatment after harvest on other fuel treatment.”
- “Restoration should include prescribed fire burn plans for the reintroduction of fire on the landscape.”
- “ – Forest transportation system should be reduced rates than increased.”
- “ – USFS should collaborate with stakeholders to ID areas of agreement & priorities for treatment.”
- “ - Address legacy sites.”
- “Honestly Consider NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE & concentrate on main roads only fuels a & hazards.”
- “ How are existing NEPA projects being considered?”

**Additional Comments supplied by Kimberly Baker of Klamath Forest Alliance in a handout:**

- Real Recovery= Natural Recovery
- Collaborate with CA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Incorporate CA State Wildlife Action Plan and CA Climate Strategy -Habitat and Biodiversity
- Follow recommendations in the National Fish, Wildlife and Plant Climate Adaption Strategy
- Consider peak flows, especially because of agency/science climate predictions for extreme weather events e.g. Floods
- How much volume is being proposed for extraction?

- Don't turn our forests into waste lands- like Salmon Salvage, Panther and Caribou. Salmon Salvage is a mess, thick slash throughout most units, ground and soils are disturbed, any natural regeneration is being hindered and creeks are running brown. Panther is still an eyesore from the Pacific Crest Trail.
- Have you completed monitoring requirements for Caribou Salvage? River communities and our watersheds need restoration
- Please work with affected river communities on a reasonable alternative
- Why have one Alt. for owls and one for fish? Agency has a duty to restore multiple species, particularly Coho, Northern spotted owls and Pacific Fishers.
- Maintain fire with fire Consider replanting dozerlines.
- There is a need to update sediment source inventories and use these in analysis for DEIS.
- How have past fire increased sediment? How much?
- Consider regional demographic studies and annual reports for Northern Spotted Owl.
- Roads are running sediment into Whites Gulch, as well as Salmon Salvage area. Is the agency surveying for fungi?

**February 4, 2014 (Karuk Senior Nutrition Center, Happy Camp, CA)- Notes by Gregg Bousfield**

- Kimberly Baker asked Tom Mutz a question about Coho Salmon that he deferred to Gregg for an answer.
- “Regarding the effects to Coho,” Gregg communicated, “water quality was the topic of discussion, bringing up the fact that we meet the TMDL (Total maximum daily load) on the Klamath, Scott and Salmon Rivers. We use our water quality waiver to meet those criteria.”
- He explained how a big piece of the waiver is about treating legacy sites; inventory, prioritize and schedule those legacy sites to meet the waiver. He stated that due to the large scale of the project, an alternative agreement was made with the water board to only address legacy sites within USFS watershed condition framework focus watersheds where they overlap the project area.
- For instance, since Elk Creek is the next focus watershed for the Klamath River TMDL, the only NEPA coverage needed under WFR is Elk Creek. This appeared to be an issue for them. To meet the Scott and Salmon River TMDLs, the forest will schedule out legacy site treatments where they overlap the WFR project area using existing NEPA: the Lower Scott and North Fork Salmon Rivers road projects
- Susan and Kimberley’s responses were: Why Elk Creek? Grider Creek should be considered due to it being more impacted (in their opinion) by the fire than Elk Creek. The projects connected actions (temp roads, landings, etc.) will cause additional impacts on top of the wildfire impacts. The Forest appears to not be doing enough in the Grider Creek watershed to offset the projects impacts.
- The feedback from Gregg is that the Forest can’t shotgun our treatments across the landscape and that we need to follow the USFS watershed condition framework because that is where appropriated funds go. A legacy site inventory in Elk Creek had been completed and appropriated dollars for planning was on the program of work prior to the fire.

- They were still concerned that activities in the Grider creek area will cause more erosion and impact the watershed even more.
- Gregg stated that Alternative 4 addresses this by dropping temp roads and landings where they would have the most impact to water quality and that Lop and Scatter treatments in salvage units within Riparian Reserves would aid in minimizing these impacts.
- Additional concerns were voiced in respect to Alternatives 3 and 4 stating that they should be combined. Gregg explained that effects to NSO are bound by a larger analysis area. Hence Alternative 3 requires much more changes to show a measurable difference in effects. Whereas the watershed alternative focuses on site specific project design features that may not be as wide spread.
- Some general comments on road decommissioning, design features, workload capability and that implementation monitoring is needed to ensure that project design features are being carried out. Gregg added that sometimes you have to train the crews on how to layout and identify riparian reserves, adding that supervising these crews would be paramount.
- Implementation was a great concern, oversight being paramount as well as workforce.

#### **February 6, 2015 (Salmon River Restoration Building, Sawyers Bar, CA)**

- “There’s broad consensus on post fire work on 1.) roadside safety along main and important travel ways; 2.) Defensible space around private property; 3.) Strategic ridgetop fuel breaks.”
- “Salvage logging shouldn’t be used to Rush timber production at the expense of cultural & wildlife values.”
- “Focus on protecting private and access routes by implementing fuels treatments.”
- “Replanting burn plantations except in very specific areas is a waste of time & resources, could preclude future prescribed burns within the fire footprints.”
- “Roadside hazard(s) should focus on main roads, not seasonally closed or decommissioned roads; use the newly finished MVUM.”
- “It’s critical to get the fire back into the recent fire footprints, within 5 to 10 years of the original burn. The only way we will get our forest back into a healthy fire regime is to use prescribed burns while recent fire footprints for landscape level prescribed burns while the fuels are still manageable.
- If we put plantations in the footprint, it makes it a lot more difficult to plan and implement RX burns on this ground in the future.
- Our traditional plantation.
- “Focus on the fuel breaks we will have after the project is implemented. Think about the fire next time. Get out of cutblock mentality. Start around private and strategic road & Ridgetop fuel breaks. Not just hazard trees, but creating defensible fuel breaks and anchors to light RX burns and stop wildfires.”
- “If you helilog, clean up the slash”
- “These burn footprints need RX fire in the next 3 to 5 years. Site prep and planting precludes burning. *If you are going to plant, do it after you burn, and only in areas where conifers were growing prefire exclusion. Look at the (19)44 aerial photos & Wieslander maps.*”

- “Until landowners feel safe, they will not support large scale burning or support the use of wildfires to achieve resource objectives.”
- “Why are fish and wildlife alternatives separate? Combine them.”
- “Keep the soil on the hillside. Minimize ground disturbance,”
- “Treat all the severely burned area by removing those trees so there is no fuel loading. Suggest helilog areas that are roadless. (Hickey Gulch, Both side of the road.)
- “Maintain fuel breaks, + (plus) fire plan on landscape level and this will drive where projects will be in place in the future. Such as RX burning, thinning, and other ways to reduce fuels.”

**Representatives of the Klamath Forest Alliance of Orleans, CA and the Environmental Protection Information Center in Arcata, CA provided the following email comments concerning open houses.**

RE: Westside Public Meeting Evaluation

Dear Westside Planners,

Thank you for visiting our Klamath, Salmon and Scott River communities on the recent Westside Open House Meeting tour. Please consider this Westside Public Meeting evaluation on behalf of Klamath Forest Alliance and EPIC-Environmental Protection Information Center. We believe it was appropriate to have at least seven meetings, given that the Westside post-fire project as proposed would affect so many significant values and comprises a very large landscape.

Although there was short notice, less than two-weeks, of the meeting announcement, locations and times, I was able to attend in Happy Camp on February 4<sup>th</sup>. After arriving, I was dismayed that the Open House structure did not allow for formal introductions, a presentation or group question, answers or discussions. Introductions with the multiple Klamath National Forest staff and contractors and a brief presentation on the five agency alternatives would have been greatly appreciated. People who are less familiar with the staff, significant issues and the National Environmental Policy Act process would have a difficult time navigating and learning through this type of structure.

Since there were so many different Klamath National Forest staff and contractors at the meetings, how will the information and the concerns of the public going to be relayed to the planning team, especially if they were not captured on paper? How will the comments and concerns captured during the public meetings be incorporated or considered in project planning? Is the agency planning any follow up to the meetings? Where and how where Public Meetings Advertised?

Thank you for your attention.

Regards,

Kimberly Baker, Executive Director  
Klamath Forest Alliance  
PO Box 21  
Orleans, CA 95556

Natalynne Delapp, Executive Director  
EPIC-Environmental Protection  
Information Center  
145 G. St., Suite A  
Arcata, CA 9552