



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

July 2015



Amendment to the Heritage Report

Westside Fire Recovery Project

Happy Camp Oak Knoll and Salmon/Scott River Ranger Districts,
Klamath National Forest
Siskiyou County, California

For Information Contact: Jeanne Goetz, Forest Archaeologist
1711 S. Main Street, Yreka, CA 96097
530-841-4488, jgoetz@fs.fed.us

Non-Discrimination Policy

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers, employees, and applicants for employment on the bases of race, color, national origin, age, disability, sex, gender identity, religion, reprisal, and where applicable, political beliefs, marital status, familial or parental status, sexual orientation, or all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program, or protected genetic information in employment or in any program or activity conducted or funded by the Department. (Not all prohibited bases will apply to all programs and/or employment activities.)

To File an Employment Complaint

If you wish to file an employment complaint, you must contact your agency's EEO Counselor (PDF) within 45 days of the date of the alleged discriminatory act, event, or in the case of a personnel action. Additional information can be found online at www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_file.html.

To File a Program Complaint

If you wish to file a Civil Rights program complaint of discrimination, complete the [USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form](#) (PDF), found online at www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html, or at any USDA office, or call (866) 632-9992 to request the form. You may also write a letter containing all of the information requested in the form. Send your completed complaint form or letter to us by mail at U.S. Department of Agriculture, Director, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, by fax (202) 690-7442 or email at program.intake@usda.gov.

Persons with Disabilities

Individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing or have speech disabilities and you wish to file either an EEO or program complaint please contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339 or (800) 845-6136 (in Spanish).

Persons with disabilities who wish to file a program complaint, please see information above on how to contact us by mail directly or by email. If you require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) please contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | Summary of Modifications between Draft and Final EIS..... | 1 |
| II. | Environmental Consequences of Modified Alternative 2..... | 1 |
| | Methods..... | 1 |
| | Environmental Consequences..... | 2 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 2 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 2 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 2 |
| | Compliant with Law, Policy and the Forest Plan | 2 |
| III. | Summary of Environmental Consequences by Fire Area..... | 2 |
| | Affected Environment..... | 3 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 3 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 3 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 3 |
| | Environmental Consequences..... | 4 |
| | Alternative 2..... | 4 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 4 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 4 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 4 |
| | Alternative 3..... | 5 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 5 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 5 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 5 |
| | Alternative 4..... | 5 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 5 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 5 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 6 |
| | Alternative 5..... | 6 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 6 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 6 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 6 |
| | Modified Alternative 2..... | 6 |
| | Project Area A: Beaver Fire..... | 6 |
| | Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex..... | 7 |
| | Project Area C: Whites Fire..... | 7 |
| | Summary of Effects | 7 |
| | Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan | 10 |

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for All Fire Areas – Alt. 1..... 8

Table 2: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for All Fire Areas (except Cultural Resources within Karuk Ancestral Territory, Happy Camp Complex) – Alt. 2, 3, 4, 5, Mod Alt. 2, and Mod Alt. 3..... 9

Table 3: Summary of Cultural Resource Effects within Karuk Ancestral Territory, Happy Camp Complex 9

Table 4: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for Happy Camp Complex and Whites Fire Areas (the Beaver Fire Area is not part of this alternative) – Karuk Alternative..... 9

I. Summary of Modifications between Draft and Final EIS

Alterations to unit boundaries occurred based on public scoping and the consultation process. As a result, there is a decrease in the total number of known historic properties and cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The number of recorded sites within the APE is eighty-five, of which seventy-eight are historic, four are precontact and three are multicomponent.

For clarification, the Environmental Consequences section states “management and/or Standard Resource Protection Measures (SRPMs) are prescribed at the individual property or resource level and are documented in the Archaeological Survey Report for this project (R2014-05-05-2188-0). This should read, “and will be documented in Archaeological Survey Reports for this project, once surveys have been completed. Under the forthcoming Westside Fire Recovery Programmatic Agreement, surveys not completed prior to decision are required to be completed prior to implementation. This allows the NEPA process to move forward while still meeting the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. Any management actions and/or SRPMs needed to protect heritage resources from project activities will be developed and applied prior to implementation.

GIS modeling completed on the consultation baseline resulted in the need to clarify the percent of the APE previously surveyed and the percent of the APE that requires new survey. The Forest survey strategy requires survey of all areas less than 30% slope as well as survey of specific types of landforms and a random sample of areas greater than 30% slope. Approximately 38% of these required areas have been previously surveyed to current standards; the remaining areas that meet the survey criteria will be surveyed prior to project implementation.

In consultation with the Karuk Tribe, surveys of the Happy Camp Complex within Karuk ancestral territory will include areas up to 45% slope when those areas are contiguous with areas to be surveyed under the existing forest survey strategy. The efficacy of this strategy will be measured periodically (as measured by the number of new discoveries relative to the number of acres covered when compared to the existing forest strategy), and periodically re-evaluated.

Effects analysis remains the same for historic properties as analyzed in the DEIS. However, consultation with the Karuk Tribe has changed the analysis of effects to cultural resources for planting project activities. See Environmental Consequences, Alternative 2, Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex. Additionally, the effects of the Karuk Alternative were analyzed and are summarized below. See Modification of Environmental Consequences by Fire Area since the Draft EIS, Environmental Consequences, Karuk Alternative.

II. Environmental Consequences of Modified Alternatives

Modified Alternative 2

Methods

The methods used for this analysis can be found in detail in the Heritage Resource report with the clarifications in Section I of this report incorporated.

Environmental Consequences

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Compliant with Law, Policy and the Forest Plan

This alternative adheres to applicable heritage resource laws, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan.

Modified Alternative 3

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects of Modified Alternative 3 are the same as for Alternative 2.

Compliant with Law, Policy and the Forest Plan

This alternative adheres to applicable heritage resource laws, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan.

III. Modification of Environmental Consequences by Fire Area since the Draft EIS

Affected Environment

The overall affected environment remains as described in the Cultural Resources section in Chapter 3 of the DEIS, though the number of historic properties in the APE decreased as the result of modified units.

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

There are eight recorded historic properties within the Beaver Fire APE; seven are historic and one contains components of both historic and precontact periods. There are approximately 2,600 acres that will be surveyed prior to project implementation. The Beaver Fire project area is entirely within the ancestral territory of Shastean people. At the time of publication, no Traditional Cultural Properties or Sacred Sites had been identified within this APE.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

There are forty-three recorded historic properties within the Happy Camp Complex APE; thirty-seven are historic, four precontact and two contain components of both historic and prehistoric periods. There are at least 4,300 acres that will be surveyed prior to project implementation. Approximately two thirds of the Happy Camp Complex project area is within the ancestral territory of the Karuk Tribe and approximately one third is within the ancestral territory of Shastean groups. At the time of publication, no Traditional Cultural Properties or Sacred Sites had been identified within this APE.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

There are thirty-four recorded historic properties within the Whites Fire APE; all of which date to the historic period. There are approximately 790 acres that will be surveyed prior to project implementation. Nearly three-quarters of the Whites Fire project area is within the ancestral territory of Shastean people and approximately one quarter is within Karuk ancestral territory. At the time of publication, no Traditional Cultural Properties or Sacred Sites had been identified within this APE.

Environmental Consequences

Alternative 2

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The effects of this alternative on heritage resources have not changed since the DEIS.

Cumulative Effects

The effects of this alternative on heritage resources have not changed since the DEIS.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The effects of salvage/roadside hazard or fuels reduction treatments in this alternative on historic properties have not changed since the DEIS. However, planting may have an adverse effect on Karuk cultural resources within Karuk ancestral territory, if plantations are placed in areas where there is no historical basis for them, and if fire is not allowed within the plantations. It is the Karuk belief that fire suppression and past general patterns and practices of establishing conifer plantations has increased the probability of large, uncharacteristic fires and has resulted in a homogenized forest structure. This forest structure is not reflective of pre-contact forests that were more diverse and perpetuated subsistence food resources, medicines, and materials critical to maintaining the integrity of Karuk Culture. The direct and indirect effects of planting are minor in the short term, but both are major in the long term and all are adverse.

Cumulative Effects

The effects of salvage/roadside hazard or fuels reduction treatments in this alternative on historic properties have not changed since the DEIS. The effects on Karuk cultural resources within Karuk aboriginal territory have changed to reflect input from the Karuk on the establishment of conifer plantations. Even if the plantations considered under this project are limited, the cumulative effect of these plantations in combination with recent planting and planting considered under projects in the foreseeable future, the cumulative effects will be adverse and major.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The effects of this alternative on heritage resources have not changed since the DEIS. However, planting may have an adverse effect on Karuk cultural resources within Karuk ancestral territory within the White's Fire footprint, if plantations are placed in areas where there is no historical basis for them, and if fire is not allowed within the plantations. It is the Karuk belief that fire suppression and past general patterns and practices of establishing conifer plantations has increased the probability of large, uncharacteristic fires and has resulted in a homogenized forest structure. This forest structure is not reflective of pre-contact forests that were more diverse and perpetuated subsistence food resources, medicines, and materials critical to maintaining the

integrity of Karuk Culture. The direct and indirect effects of planting are minor in the short term, but both are major in the long term and all are adverse.

Cumulative Effects

The effects of salvage/roadside hazard or fuels reduction treatments in this alternative on historic properties have not changed since the DEIS. The effects on Karuk cultural resources within Karuk aboriginal territory have changed to reflect input from the Karuk on the establishment of conifer plantations. Even if the plantations considered under this project are limited, the cumulative effect of these plantations in combination with recent planting and planting considered under projects in the foreseeable future, the cumulative effects will be adverse and major.

Alternative 3

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Alternative 4

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Alternative 5

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Modified Alternative 2

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Modified Alternative 3

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 2.

Karuk Alternative

Project Area A: Beaver Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct or indirect effects are the same as for Alternative 1.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as for Alternative 1.

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects of the Karuk Alternative are the same as for salvage harvest and roadside hazard tree removal as for Alternative 2. There are no direct or indirect effects from site prep and planting as these activities are not proposed. The scale of fuels reduction increases the potential adverse effects on historic properties, but increases the beneficial effects to Karuk cultural resources.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects of salvage harvest and roadside hazard are the same as described for the Alternative 2. There are no cumulative effects from site prep and planting. Cumulative effects from fuels reduction under this project, in combination with fuels reduction considered under projects in the foreseeable future, would have a beneficial effect on Karuk cultural resources on the landscape level. However, the number of “leave” areas resulting if historic properties are avoided under this project in combination with future projects, increases the risk of high intensity fire to more properties, and increases the risk of looting and vandalism to the same.

Project Area C: Whites Fire

Direct Effects and Indirect Effects

The direct and indirect effects are the same as the Karuk Alternative, Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.

Cumulative Effects

The cumulative effects are the same as the Karuk Alternative, Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.

Summary of Effects

Table 1: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for All Fire Areas – Alt. 1.

| Alternative 1 | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Indicator | Proposed Treatments | Direct Effects | | Indirect Effects | | Cumulative Effects |
| | | Short Term | Long Term | Short Term | Long Term | |
| Historic Properties | None | None | None | Negligible | Moderate to Major (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) |
| Cultural Resources | None | None | None | Moderate (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) |

Table 2: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for All Fire Areas (except Cultural Resources within Karuk Ancestral Territory, Happy Camp Complex) – Alt. 2, 3, 4, 5, Mod Alt. 2, and Mod Alt. 3.

| Alt. 2, 3, 4 5, Mod Alt. 2, and Mod Alt. 2 | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Indicator | Proposed Treatments | Direct Effects | | Indirect Effects | | Cumulative Effects |
| | | Short Term | Long Term | Short Term | Long Term | |
| Historic Properties | Salvage/Roadside Hazard Tree | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |
| Historic Properties | Fuels Reduction Rx Fire Mechanical | None | None. | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Minor (Adverse) | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Moderate to Major (Adverse) | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Moderate to Major (Adverse) |
| Historic Properties | Site Prep and Plant | None | None | None | None | None |
| Cultural Resources | Salvage/Roadside Hazard Tree | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |
| Cultural Resources | Fuels Reduction Rx Fire Mechanical | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |
| Cultural Resources | Site Prep and Plant | None | None | None | None | None |

Table 3: Summary of Cultural Resource Effects within Karuk Ancestral Territory, Happy Camp Complex

| Alt. 2, 3, 4 5, Mod Alt. 2, and Mod Alt. 2 | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Indicator | Proposed Treatments | Direct Effects | | Indirect Effects | | Cumulative Effects |
| | | Short Term | Long Term | Short Term | Long Term | |
| Cultural Resources | Salvage/Roadside Hazard Tree | Moderate (Adverse) | Moderate (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) | Moderate to Major (Adverse) |
| Cultural Resources | Fuels Reduction Rx Fire Mechanical | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |
| Cultural Resources | Site Prep and Plant | Minor(Adverse) | Major (Adverse) | Minor (Adverse) | Major (Adverse) | Major (Adverse) |

Table 4: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for Happy Camp Complex and Whites Fire Areas (the Beaver Fire Area is not part of this alternative) – Karuk Alternative.

| Karuk Alternative | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Indicator | Proposed Treatments | Direct Effects | | Indirect Effects | | Cumulative Effects |
| | | Short Term | Long Term | Short Term | Long Term | |
| Historic Properties | Salvage/Roadside Hazard Tree | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |
| Historic Properties | Fuels Reduction Rx Fire Mechanical | None | None | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Minor (Adverse) | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Major (Adverse) | Minor to Moderate (Benefit) Moderate to Major (Adverse) |
| Historic Properties | Site Prep and Plant | None | None | None | None | None |
| Cultural Resources | Salvage/Roadside Hazard Tree | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) |

| Karuk Alternative | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Indicator | Proposed Treatments | Direct Effects | | Indirect Effects | | Cumulative Effects |
| | | Short Term | Long Term | Short Term | Long Term | |
| Cultural Resources | Fuels Reduction Rx Fire Mechanical | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Major (Benefit) | Moderate to Major (Benefit) | Major (Benefit) | Major (Benefit) |
| Cultural Resources | Site Prep and Plant | None | None | None | None | None |

Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan

There is no change to compliance with law, regulation, policy and the Forest Plan from the Heritage Resource report.