



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

July 2015



# Amendment to the Rangeland Resource Report

## Westside Fire Recovery Project

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

For Information Contact: Stephanie McMorris  
11263 N Hwy 3, Fort Jones, CA 96032  
530-468-1226

**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](http://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](http://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](mailto: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 Alternatives .....	3
	Modified Alternative 2.....	3
	Methods.....	3
	Environmental Consequences.....	3
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	3
	Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	3
	Project Area C: Whites Fire.....	4
	Modified Alternative 3.....	4
	Methods.....	4
	Environmental Consequences.....	4
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	4
	Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	4
	Project Area C: Whites Fire.....	5
III.	Modification of Environmental Consequences by Fire Area since the Draft EIS .....	5
	Affected Environment.....	5
	Environmental Consequences.....	5
	Alternative 1.....	5
	Alternative 2.....	5
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	5
	Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	6
	Project Area C: Whites Fire.....	6
	Alternative 3.....	6
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	6
	Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	6
	Project Area C: Whites Fire.....	7
	Alternative 4.....	7
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	7
	Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	7
	Project Area C: Whites Fire.....	7
	Alternative 5.....	7
	Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	7

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex .....	8
Project Area C: Whites Fire .....	8
Modified Alternative 2.....	8
Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	8
Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	8
Project Area C: Whites Fire .....	9
Modified Alternative 3.....	9
Project Area A: Beaver Fire.....	9
Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex.....	9
Project Area C: Whites Fire .....	9
Summary of Effects .....	10
Compliance with law, regulation, policy, and the Forest Plan .....	10

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Proposed treatments within the Dry Lake, East Beaver, and Horse Creek Allotments (Beaver Fire Area) .....	1
Table 2: Proposed treatments within the Lake Mountain, Marble Valley, and Middle Tompkins Allotments (Happy Camp Complex) .....	1
Table 3: Proposed treatments within the Etna Creek and South Russian Allotments (Whites Fire Area) ...	1
Table 4: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Alternative 2.....	2
Table 5: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Modified Alternative 2 ...	2
Table 6: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Modified Alternative 3 ...	3
Table 7: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Beaver Fire Area .....	10
Table 8: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Happy Camp Fire Area .....	10
Table 9: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Whites Fire Area .....	10

## I. Summary of Modifications between Draft and Final EIS

The tables in this addendum were updated from the Rangeland report to include the, modifications to analysis as a result of GIS data changes and to add the effects of Modified alternative 2 and 3. Changes in the effects are described below by fire area and alternative. Table 1, 2 and 3 show the proposed treatments within allotments by fire area.

**Table 1: Proposed treatments within the Dry Lake, East Beaver, and Horse Creek Allotments (Beaver Fire Area).**

Project Area A: Beaver Fire alternatives	Acres of Fuels Treatments	Acres of Salvage Harvest	Acres of Roadside Harvest	Acres of Vegetation Management (plant/prep)
Alternative 2	2047	842	2922	1769
Alternative 3	2047	0	2922	1769
Alternative 4	2047	741	2649	1769
Alternative 5	3260	811	2922	1758
Modified 2	2135	333	2922	1769
Modified 3	3263	0	2149	1648

**Table 2: Proposed treatments within the Lake Mountain, Marble Valley, and Middle Tompkins Allotments (Happy Camp Complex)**

Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex alternatives	Acres of Fuels Treatments	Acres of Salvage Harvest	Acres of Roadside Harvest	Acres of Vegetation Management (plant/prep)
Alternative 2	1497	2661	3830	1327
Alternative 3	1497	2435	3830	1327
Alternative 4	1497	2659	3593	1327
Alternative 5	1497	1236	3830	391
Modified 2	1497	2404	3830	1327
Modified 3	1595	1577	2803	1172

**Table 3: Proposed treatments within the Etna Creek and South Russian Allotments (Whites Fire Area)**

Project Area C: Whites Fire alternatives	Acres of Fuels Treatments	Acres of Salvage Harvest	Acres of Roadside Harvest	Acres of Vegetation Management (plant/prep)
Alternative 2	210	20	72	0
Alternative 3	210	20	72	0
Alternative 4	210	20	70	0
Alternative 5	210	0	72	0
Modified 2	210	20	72	0
Modified 3	210	0	60	0

Many of the proposed activities overlap spatially so the footprint on the landscape will be less than the acres proposed under each individual treatment: this is displayed as the number of “dissolved” acres. Table 4 displays an updated table for the percentage of allotment acres being treated under alternative 2, as this alternative proposes the greatest number of acres under

treatment. Percentage of allotment acres for the modified alternative 2 and modified alternative 3 has also been included as a comparison.

**Table 4: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Alternative 2**

<b>Allotment Name (Fire area)</b>	<b>Forest Service Acres within allotment</b>	<b>Total dissolved acres</b>	<b>Percentage of allotment acres being treated</b>
Dry Lake (Beaver Fire)	37,457	4,285	11%
East Beaver (Beaver Fire)	41,607	1,157	3%
Horse Creek (Beaver Fire)	23,224	504	2%
<b>Total for Beaver Fire Allotments</b>	<b>102,288</b>	<b>5,946</b>	<b>6%</b>
Lake Mountain (Happy Camp Complex)	9,655	3,150	33%
Marble Valley (Happy Camp Complex)	8,136	103	1%
Middle Tompkins (Happy Camp Complex)	14,736	4,528	31%
<b>Total For Happy Camp Complex Allotments</b>	<b>32,527</b>	<b>7,781</b>	<b>24%</b>
Etna Creek (Whites Fire)	17,254	188	1%
South Russian (Whites Fire)	12,277	34	0.3%
<b>Total for Whites Fire Allotments</b>	<b>29,531</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>0.8%</b>

**Table 5: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Modified Alternative 2**

<b>Allotment Name (Fire area)</b>	<b>Forest Service Acres within allotment</b>	<b>Total dissolved acres</b>	<b>Percentage of allotment acres being treated</b>
Dry Lake (Beaver Fire)	37,457	3,993	11%
East Beaver (Beaver Fire)	41,607	1,157	3%
Horse Creek (Beaver Fire)	23,224	504	2%
<b>Total for Beaver Fire Allotments</b>	<b>102,288</b>	<b>5,654</b>	<b>6%</b>
Lake Mountain (Happy Camp Complex)	9,655	2,939	30%
Marble Valley (Happy Camp Complex)	8,136	103	1%
Middle Tompkins (Happy Camp Complex)	14,736	4,487	30%
<b>Total For Happy Camp Complex Allotments</b>	<b>32,527</b>	<b>7,529</b>	<b>23%</b>
Etna Creek (Whites Fire)	17,254	188	1%
South Russian (Whites Fire)	12,277	34	0.3%
<b>Total for Whites Fire Allotments</b>	<b>29,531</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>0.8%</b>

**Table 6: Approximate acres of proposed activity with allotment boundaries for Modified Alternative 3**

<b>Allotment Name (Fire area)</b>	<b>Forest Service Acres within allotment</b>	<b>Total dissolved acres</b>	<b>Percentage of allotment acres being treated</b>
Dry Lake (Beaver Fire)	37,457	4091	11%
East Beaver (Beaver Fire)	41,607	1198	3%
Horse Creek (Beaver Fire)	23,224	478	2%
<b>Total for Beaver Fire Allotments</b>	<b>102,288</b>	<b>5767</b>	<b>6%</b>
Lake Mountain (Happy Camp Complex)	9,655	2562	27%
Marble Valley (Happy Camp Complex)	8,136	0	0%
Middle Tompkins (Happy Camp Complex)	14,736	3366	23%
<b>Total For Happy Camp Complex Allotments</b>	<b>32,527</b>	<b>5928</b>	<b>18%</b>
Etna Creek (Whites Fire)	17,254	168	1%
South Russian (Whites Fire)	12,277	34	0.3%
<b>Total for Whites Fire Allotments</b>	<b>29,531</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>.07%</b>

## **II. Environmental Consequences of Modified Alternatives**

### **Modified Alternative 2**

#### ***Methods***

The methods used for this analysis can be found in detail in the Rangeland Resource Report.

#### ***Environmental Consequences***

##### **Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

###### ***Direct Effects and Indirect Effects***

This alternative will reduce proposed harvesting treatments to 333 acres, less than half of what alternative 2 proposes. Acres of fuels treatments, plantation acres, and roadside hazard treatment areas will remain at similar levels which will slightly increase the amount of available forage, but not as much as alternatives 2, 4, and 5. Less salvage units may mean some rangelands are harder to access as they will not be easily traversed by cattle when trees have fallen and will be a hazard for permittees. Rangeland condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

###### ***Cumulative Effects***

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

##### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

###### ***Direct Effects and Indirect Effects***

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

**Project Area C: Whites Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects will be identical to those of alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

**Modified Alternative 3**

***Methods***

The methods used for this analysis can be found in detail in the Rangeland Resource Report.

***Environmental Consequences***

**Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

This alternative will reduce proposed harvesting treatments to 0 acres within range allotment boundaries and reduce the amount of open canopy that could potentially offer transitory range. Fuels treatments would be increased by over 1000 acres as compared to alternative 2. Rangeland will respond favorably to fuels treatments by allowing sparse herbaceous vegetation to grow within the understory but will produce less pounds per acre than opening the canopy through salvage harvesting. Plantation acres and roadside hazard treatment areas will remain at similar levels. No salvage units may mean some rangelands are harder to access as they will not be easily traversed by cattle when trees have fallen and will be a hazard for permittees. Rangeland condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

*Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

**Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Both roadside hazard treatments and salvage harvest are proposed to be reduced by 1000 acres, when compared to alternative 2. Fuels treatments and plant and site preparation units are similar to what was proposed for alternative 2. The reduction in salvage harvest and roadside hazard

treatments will not have the potential for transitory range that alternative 2 does and it will make permittee travel and cattle management more difficult and dangerous within the allotments. Rangeland condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

### **Project Area C: Whites Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects will be similar to those of alternative 2, with the exception that the 20 acre unit of salvage harvesting would not occur. This will be only a negligible change to the amount of forage available.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Cumulative effects will be similar to those identified in Alternative 2 of the Rangeland Resource report.

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

### ***Affected Environment***

There is no change to the affected environment other than the updated tables above. Refer to the Rangeland Resources report for a detailed description of the affected environment.

## **Environmental Consequences**

### ***Alternative 1*** (no action)

Under alternative 1, no treatments are proposed for the project area. As a result, there will be no additional increase of forage resulting from harvest or fuels operations. All other effects will be similar to those stated in the Rangeland Resource report.

### ***Alternative 2***

### **Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

There were several fuels and harvest units modified or dropped which slightly reduces the potential new transitory forage available for permitted cattle. Much of the treated area will be replanted so that reduces the available forage even more. Since treatments are limited to 6% or less of the allotment acres, only a small portion of the allotments will produce additional forage. All other effects will be similar to those stated in the Rangeland Resource report.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Very little has changed in the unit boundaries for the Happy Camp Complex allotments. Harvest and fuels treatments will open up forest areas and potentially increase forage within 24% or less of the allotment acres. Planting units will mostly be restricted to areas with steeper slopes or areas that would not likely support a herbaceous community. All other effects will be similar to those stated in the Rangeland Resource Report.

#### *Cumulative Effect*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Project Area C: Whites Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

30 acres of fuels treatments have been removed but the number of acres being treated in the allotment areas as a whole are negligible at less than 1%. In addition, most work will be done around pre-existing roads, where there are few rangeland resources. Treatments will only produce a minimal amount of open areas which may produce additional forage. Rangeland condition will be largely unaffected as there is little overlap between rangelands and units that will require heavy equipment. Mitigation measures for weeds and rangelands will continue to pertain to this alternative to further ensure rangeland condition is protected.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Alternative 3**

#### **Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

##### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Alternative three does not propose any salvage units which would slightly decrease the amount of available forage within the allotment areas. Other effects would be similar to those in alternative 2.

##### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

#### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

##### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

##### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

**Project Area C: Whites Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are identical to that of Alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

**Alternative 4**

**Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

**Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

**Project Area C: Whites Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

**Alternative 5**

**Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

*Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Alternative 5 proposes approximately 1000 more acres of fuels treatments than the other alternatives. This would open up forest understory and renew herbaceous and shrubby growth which would provide more forage for cattle and wildlife. Other effects would be similar to those stated in alternative 2.

*Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

As compared to alternative 2, there are more than a 1000 acres less proposed for both Salvage logging and plantations. These effects seem to have a cancellation effect on each other as the logging would leave standing timber in an area that would otherwise be a potential forage source however, the decrease in plantation units would leave openings in the forest that may be available as forage in the future. There would be fewer disturbances from heavy equipment which may reduce the potential spread of weeds into rangeland areas.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Project Area C: Whites Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are identical to that of Alternative 2.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

No change in cumulative effects: see the Rangeland Report for more detail.

### **Modified Alternative 2**

### **Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

This alternative will reduce proposed harvesting treatments to 333 acres, less than half of what alternative 2 proposes. Acres of fuels treatments, plantation acres, and roadside hazard treatment areas will remain at similar levels which will slightly increase the amount of available forage, but not as much as alternatives 2, 4, and 5. Less salvage units may mean some rangelands are harder to access as they will not be easily traversed by cattle when trees have fallen and will be a hazard for permittees. Rangeland Condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report.

### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are similar to that of Alternative 2.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report.

### **Project Area C: Whites Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects are identical to that of Alternative 2.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report.

### **Modified Alternative 3**

### **Project Area A: Beaver Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

This alternative will reduce proposed harvesting treatments to 0 acres within range allotment boundaries and reduce the amount of open canopy that could potentially offer transitory range. Fuels treatments would be increased by over 1000 acres as compared to alternative 2. Rangeland will respond favorably to fuels treatments by allowing sparse herbaceous vegetation to grow within the understory but will produce less pounds per acre than opening the canopy through salvage harvesting. Plantation acres and roadside hazard treatment areas will remain at similar levels. No salvage units may mean some rangelands are harder to access as they will not be easily traversed by cattle when trees have fallen and will be a hazard for permittees. Rangeland condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report for alternative 2.

### **Project Area B: Happy Camp Complex**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Both roadside hazard treatments and salvage harvest are proposed to be reduced by 1000 acres, when compared to alternative 2. Fuels treatments and plant and site preparation units are similar to what was proposed for alternative 2. The reduction in salvage harvest and roadside hazard treatments will not have the potential for transitory range that alternative 2 does and it will make permittee travel and cattle management more difficult and dangerous within the allotments. Rangeland condition will not be affected as mitigation measures are in place that will protect meadows and reduce the risk of weed spread.

#### *Cumulative Effects*

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report.

### **Project Area C: Whites Fire**

#### *Direct Effects and Indirect Effects*

Effects will be similar to those of alternative 2, with the exception that the 20 acre unit of salvage harvesting would not occur. This will be only a negligible change to the amount of forage available.

**Cumulative Effects**

Effects are similar to those identified in the Rangeland Resource report.

**Summary of Effects**

**Table 7: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Beaver Fire Area**

Indicator	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Mod Alt. 2	Mod Alt 3
Availability of Forage	No additional increase of forage	Increase	Small increase	Increase	Increase	Small increase	Small increase
Rangeland Condition	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

**Table 8: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Happy Camp Fire Area**

Indicator	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Mod Alt. 2	Mod Alt 3
Availability of Forage	No additional increase of forage	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	Small increase
Rangeland Condition	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	

**Table 9: Summary of Effects by analysis indicator for the Whites Fire Area**

Indicator	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Mod Alt. 2	Mod Alt 3
Availability of Forage	No additional increase of forage	Negligible increase					
Rangeland Condition	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

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

All project alternatives are in compliance with law, policy, and regulation related to rangeland resources, and is in compliance with the standards of the Forest Plan as displayed in the Forest Plan consistency checklist, available on the project website.