

Category B Application Form

Notice of Intent to Comply with the
*Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Nonpoint Source Discharges Related to
Certain Federal Land Management Activities on
National Forest System Lands in the North Coast Region*
Order No. R1-2010-0029

USFS CONTACT INFORMATION

Greg Laurie
1711 S. Main St.
Yreka, CA 96097
(530) 841-4534
FAX: (530) 841-4571
Email: glaurie@fs.fed.us

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: Westside Fire Recovery Project
Project Size:
Primary Watershed Name (5th-field HUC watersheds):
Beaver Creek; Humbug Creek-Klamath River; Horse Creek-Klamath River;
Seiad Creek-Klamath River; Lower Scott River; Thompson Creek-Klamath
River; Elk Creek; and North Fork Salmon River.
Stream Name(s): Tributaries to the Klamath, Scott, and Salmon Rivers
Project Type: Fire salvage, fuels reduction, reforestation
Project Description: The project is designed to address the needs for 1) worker and public
safety and access; 2) safe conditions for firefighters performing fire
suppression for community protection; 3) an economically viable project;
and 4) restored and fire-resilient forested ecosystems.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I understand and intend to comply with all criteria and conditions of Order No. R1-2010-0029 and all applicable water quality control regulations.

PATRICA A. GRANTHAM, Forest Supervisor

Date

**Application for Coverage Under Category B of the
Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R1-2010-0029
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board**

Westside Fire Recovery Project

DRAFT July 14, 2015

A. Project Description:

- (1) Salvage harvest of fire-damaged green trees greater than 14 inches in diameter with a 70 percent or higher probability of mortality in the next three to five years. These treatments will be accomplished by a combination of ground-based, skyline, and helicopter logging systems and includes construction or reconstruction of landings.
- (2) Roadside hazard trees will be removed within 250 feet on side of selected roads using ground-based, skyline, and helicopter logging systems. Fire-damaged green trees with a 60 percent or higher probability of mortality within the next three to five years were included. Marking guidelines for fire injured trees are enclosed as an attachment. A few fire-killed trees that are upslope and further than 250 feet from a road may still present a hazard to the road and thus need to be removed but the majority of hazard trees will be within the 250-foot buffer. Trees greater than 16 inches in diameter that are downslope from the road and within the 250-foot buffer will be removed and sold as merchantable material. In Riparian Reserves, all trees within 25 feet will be retained unless it poses a threat to the road. Within one site tree, trees between 14 and 26 inches in diameter would be removed to reduce fuel loads; trees larger than 26 inches would be felled and retained on-site. On the downhill side of the road within Riparian Reserves, any tree greater than 26 inches that could reach the stream will be retained. No live shading vegetation will be cut. Equipment would be restricted to the running surface of roads.
- (3) Fuel Treatments:
 1. Wildland Urban Interface and Roadside Fuels Treatment:
 - Conifers and hardwoods taller than 2 feet and less than 8” d.b.h. shall be thinned
 - Dead trees / snags from 8 to 14 inches in diameter shall be felled.
 - Overall leave tree spacing average of 20 to 25 feet. In areas with “modified understory treatment” the overall leave tree spacing will average 15 feet. Leave trees should consist of a mosaic pattern incorporating clumps of at least ¼ acre in size and interspersed throughout the treatment area covering 10 to 20 percent. Preference for retention should be hardwoods.
 - Prune up to 7 feet from the ground level on uphill side of tree, for conifers and hardwoods. Branches that start above that height but hang below 7 feet above ground level must be cut at that point.
 - Brush taller than 2 feet shall be cut and stacked into compact hand piles

- Slash with a diameter over 6 inches must be limbed and bucked into less than 8 foot lengths and left on the ground (not piled). Limbed material and snag tops below 6 inches in diameter shall be included in hand piles.
- No cutting/bucking of previously existing coarse woody debris over 6 inches dbh.
- No live shading vegetation would be cut in Riparian Reserves.

Fuels Management Zones: Maintain existing strategic ridge fire lines from previous large fires. Treatments will include removing all dead vegetation and live understory vegetation along with live conifer trees less than 12 inches in diameter at breast height. Pruning retained conifers up to seven feet high within these zones will increase canopy base height and reduce the potential for crown fire initiation. Activity-generated fuels will be disposed of by a variety of methods to meet desired conditions. No live shading vegetation would be cut within Riparian Reserves. Fuel breaks within Riparian Reserves will be constructed by hand.

2. Prescribed Burn: Use existing control lines established in recent large fires within the project area. Line construction activities will occur around the perimeter of the fire and will include using dozers to re-scrape control lines to mineral soil; where control lines are inaccessible for equipment, handline construction to mineral soil will occur. Removal of understory vegetation along control lines will include cutting brush and conifer trees less than 12 inches in diameter to facilitate holding operations during prescribed fire implementation.
 3. Site-Preparation: This treatment will work in coordination with the site-preparation, planting, and release treatment proposed below and will reduce existing fuels while increasing the likelihood that newly planted vegetation will successfully regenerate. This treatment includes maintenance which will include thinning of understory vegetation and piling of surface fuels to maintain desired fuel conditions. No mechanical site preparation will occur in Riparian Reserves.
- (4) Site preparation, planting, and release in salvage harvest units, plantations, and natural stands.
1. Site preparation will include yarding, mastication, windrowing, and piling of dead material generally up to 16 inches in diameter. In some areas trees larger than 16 inches will be treated in order to reduce hazards to workers, the public, and reduce fuel loading to achieve flame lengths of less than four feet over the next 20 years. No mechanical site preparation will occur in Riparian Reserves. Hand treatments will include the cutting and piling of dead fuels up to ten inches in diameter;
 2. Reforestation (planting) will be by hand methods, using either bare root or container stock. Hand planting will increase the likelihood for survival and provide for the desired spatial variability within treatment units and across the project area. Tree species used for planting will include Douglas-fir, sugar pine, ponderosa pine, incense cedar, white fir, and red fir. A mosaic distribution will be achieved over time due to the spatial variability achieved by the planters' micro-site selection. An average of 130 to 300 trees per acre will be planted to achieve acceptable levels of stocking, depending on the site conditions; and
 3. Release includes manually removing all vegetation within a minimum of a five-foot radius from a planted or naturally regenerated conifer seedling.

(5) Temporary road construction

1. Construct new temporary roads. Roads will be hydrologically stabilized after use. Culverts and fill will be removed from stream channels and natural drainage patterns restored.
2. Reconstruct existing roadbeds used as temporary roads. Same as for #1.
3. Reopen previously decommissioned roads: Same as for #1. Roads will be re-decommissioned at the end of the project.
4. Reopen level 1 roads. Roads will be closed after use and drainage structures will either be maintained or removed to protect water quality.

(6) Legacy site treatments are designed to control preexisting sediment sources on roads, and at non-road sites on landslides, old landings, and unauthorized roads. The work may entail any or all of the following treatments:

- Remove fill from streambank or unstable areas.
- Construct dips at stream crossings to eliminate diversion potential
- Outslope road surface and eliminate in-board ditch or outside berms
- Seed and mulch disturbed areas to control short-term surface erosion
- Stabilize landslides. May include construction of retaining walls
- Upgrade culverts to pass 100-year peak flows
- Reduce road fill volumes at stream crossings to withstand 100-year peak flows and debris flows
- Apply rock aggregate to the road surface

B. Activity Dates:

Start: July, 2015 End: December, 2025

C. Contact Information:

Greg Laurie
Klamath National Forest
Forest Hydrologist
1711 S. Main St.
Yreka CA, 96097
(530) 841-4534

D. Description of Compliance With Waiver Conditions

Condition #1 - This project was reviewed by an interdisciplinary team which included a Hydrologist, Fisheries Biologist, Road Engineer, and Geologist. The team identified and reviewed sensitive watershed areas in the field such as active landslides, active surface erosion, stream channels, and Riparian Reserves. All proposed activities within Riparian Reserves were reviewed in the field including:

- Field review of proposed salvage units, hazard tree removal areas and fuels treatment units.
- Field review of proposed new log landings.
- Field review of the most actively unstable areas in or near proposed treatment units. The objective of this review was to look for correlations between slope failure and geology, geomorphology, and disturbance.

- Reviews of selected stream reaches to validate and supplement existing information on channels. These surveys were limited in geographic extent, intended only to provide a current snapshot of channel conditions since the quantitative surveys were conducted.

As a result of the field reviews, the interdisciplinary team developed project design features (PDFs) to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) from the U.S Forest Service BMP handbook (USFS, 2011). The PDFs and BMPs are designed to control non-point source pollution related to project activities and protect beneficial uses of water. All BMPs are included in the attached list that will be completed during project implementation to ensure that any deviations from the project BMPs or PDFs are corrected.

a. & b. Activities in riparian reserves:

Table 1. Fuels treatments in riparian reserves for alternative 3 modified.

	Beaver Fire	Happy Camp Complex	Whites Fire	Total Acres
Fuels Management Zone	78	20	64	162
Roadside	56	372	113	541
Understory Prescribed Fire	72	275	1,967	2,314
Wildland Urban Interface	117	342	118	577
Total Acres	323	1,009	2,262	3,594

Table 2. Salvage, roadside hazard tree removal, and planting in riparian reserves for alternative 3 modified.

	Beaver Fire	Happy Camp Complex	Whites Fire	Total Acres
Salvage Harvest	0	0	0	0
Roadside Hazard Individual Tree	196	1,200	518	1,914
Roadside Hazard Cluster	109	177	56	342
Planting and Site Prep	221	600	31	852
Total Acres	510	1,993	605	3,108

Table 3. Temporary roads and reopened level 1 roads in riparian reserves for alternative 3 modified.

	Beaver Fire	Happy Camp Complex	Whites Fire	Total Miles
Maintenance level 1 roads reopened	2.0	2.7	0.1	4.8
Reopen Decommissioned Roads	0	1.2	0	1.2
Existing Temporary Road Reopened	0	0.2	0	0.2
New Temporary Road	0	0.1	0	0.1
Total Miles	2.0	4.2	0.1	6.3

Table 4. Road stream crossings for alternative 3 modified.

	Beaver Fire	Happy Camp Complex	Whites Fire	Total
Maintenance level 1 roads reopened	15	19	1	35
Reopen Decommissioned Roads	0	4	0	4
Existing Temporary Road Reopened	0	0	0	0
New Temporary Road	0	0	0	0
Total	15	23	1	39

Table 5. Landings in riparian reserves for alternative 3 modified. Skyline landings will use roads wherever possible. New skyline landings off the road system and ground based landings will average one acre in size but will not exceed 1.5 acres. Helicopter landings will be up to 2 acres in size.

	Beaver Fire		Happy Camp Complex		Whites Fire		Total
	New	Existing	New	Existing	New	Existing	
Ground Based	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Helicopter	0	0	5	0	0	3	8
Skyline	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	0	0	6	0	0	3	9

Table 6. Activities on unstable lands in “geologic” riparian reserves for alternative 3 modified. Unstable lands include steep, weathered granitic lands, active landslides and toe zones of dormant landslides. *Total acres include some treatments that overlap. (Data from the Amendment to the Geology Report).

	Beaver Fire	Happy Camp Complex	Whites Fire	Total Acres
Salvage Harvest (Skyline and Helicopter only)	0	1,973	0.1	1,973.1
Roadside Hazard Tree	60	1077	10	1,147
Fuels Treatments	60	741	20	821
Planting and Site Prep	8	380	10	398
Temporary Roads (miles)	0	0.35	0	0.35 mi
Total Acres	75*	3,128*	23*	3,226*

Condition #2 - A completed Category B Waiver application is included in this package

Condition #3 - The contractor(s) awarded contracts to implement this project shall receive on-the-ground BMPs, fisheries project design standards, other environmental documents, a copy of the Waiver (Order No. R1-2010-0029), and a provision stating that the contractor’s work is subject to terms and conditions of the Waiver.

Condition #4 - A cumulative watershed effects (CWE) analysis was conducted for all watersheds in the project area. The analysis includes the proposed project plus all past, present and reasonable foreseeable future impacts from roads, timber harvest, fuels management, and wildfire across all land ownerships. The Klamath National Forest uses three models to assess cumulative effects including Equivalent Roded Area (ERA), GEO, and USLE. ERA is an

indicator of cumulative watershed disturbance calculated using coefficients to weight management activities and wildfires relative to the effects of a road in terms of altering sediment budgets and runoff per acre of disturbance (USFS, 1990). The GEO model was developed for the Kamath Province and estimates the volume of sediment delivered to the stream channel network by mass wasting from a 10 year storm event (de la Fuente and Haessig 1994). The USLE model estimates chronic sediment delivery from surface erosion from a 2-year 6-hour storm using the universal soil loss equation calibrated with data from local erosion plots. All three models estimate a threshold of concern based on the sensitivity of a watershed to disturbance. The threshold of concern is an upper disturbance limit where the additive or synergistic effects of land use cause a watershed to become susceptible to adverse cumulative impacts. The thresholds are not interpreted as a single point, but the risk of adverse effects to beneficial uses increases from low to high as the level of disturbance increases towards or past the threshold (USFS, 1990). A full description of the methods used in the models is located in the Hydrology Report and its amendment (USFS, 2015a).

There are 28 7th-field HUC watersheds in the project area that are currently above the threshold of concern (TOC) for at least one of the models (Table 6). Of these the proposed project will increase equivalent roaded area or modelled sediment supply in 13 watersheds. As a ratio of the threshold the increases range from 0.01 to 0.08. The modelled change in equivalent roaded acres and sediment volumes for each watershed are included as an attachment. Landslide risks are not increased for any 7th field watershed by the addition of the proposed project (see Geology Report pg. 6). The proposed project includes the following measures to reduce the potential for adverse cumulative effects to beneficial uses:

1. Restoration of 353 legacy sites. Legacy site treatments will prevent the project from exceeding the threshold of concern for ERA in Whites Gulch and reduce the USLE sediment supply towards the threshold (Table 6). Legacy site treatments in the Lower East Fork of Elk Creek will reduce the current USLE sediment to below the threshold of concern.
2. The Burned Area Emergency Response repaired 175 legacy sites on roads, with work completed in most of the watersheds that are over the threshold of concern. The reductions in ERA and sediment volume are shown in Tables A1 to A3 in the enclosed attachment.
3. The salvage harvest, site preparation, and reforestation will decrease the time needed to reestablish conifer forest on unstable lands in geologic riparian reserves. The reduction in landslide risk will reduce the probability of sediment delivery to streams from landslides from unstable lands which will put watersheds on a trajectory to maintain and restore the sediment regime. This meets Forest Plan Standard 2-1 (page 4-18) and helps to meet the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objective focused on sediment regimes. Salvage harvest on unstable lands will be limited to skyline and helicopter treatments. Equipment will be excluded from all riparian reserves except for roadside hazard tree units where the equipment will be restricted to the road surface. See the enclosed Geology Report and amendment for a detailed risk assessment of activities on unstable lands.
4. The proposed project contains many design features and BMPs to reduce the potential for adverse effects to water quality. See the enclosed project design features for complete list.

Table 6. Watersheds over the threshold of concern for the ERA, USLE, or GEO cumulative effects models. Risk ratios >1.0 exceed the model threshold. Parentheses show the increase in risk ratio due to alternative 3 modified plus legacy site treatments. Legacy treatments in Whites Gulch were covered under the North Fork Salmon Roads CE and are therefore not considered as part of alternative 3 modified. Legacy site treatments in Elk are considered part of Alternative 3 mod.

Watershed Name 7 th -field HUC	Fire Area	ERA current risk ratio and increase due to Alt 3 mod + Whites GI legacy	USLE current risk ratio and increase due to Alt 3 mod + Whites GI legacy	GEO current risk ratio and increase due to Alt 3 mod + Whites GI legacy
Dutch Creek	Beaver	1.33 (0.07)	1.72 (0.00)	0.94 (0.00)
Buckhorn Gulch-Beaver Creek	Beaver	1.04 (0.05)	1.40 (0.00)	1.19 (0.00)
Doggett Creek	Beaver	1.99 (0.03)	1.58 (0.00)	1.12 (0.00)
Kohl Creek	Beaver	1.51 (0.03)	1.58 (0.00)	1.20 (0.00)
Big Ferry-Swanson	Happy Camp	1.15 (0.02)	0.74 (0.00)	0.62 (0.00)
Music Creek	Whites	1.03 (0.01)	0.97 (0.00)	1.17 (0.00)
Walker Creek	Happy Camp	1.00 (0.08)	1.18 (0.02)	1.92 (0.04)
O'Neil Creek	Happy Camp	0.77 (0.11)	1.80 (0.01)	1.53 (0.01)
Whites Gulch	Whites	0.68 (0.29)	1.30 (-0.18)	0.66 (-0.04)
Lower North Russian Creek	Whites	0.74 (0.21)	1.15 (0.01)	0.84 (0.01)
Fryingpan Creek-Klamath River	Happy Camp	0.57 (0.06)	1.12 (0.01)	0.76 (0.00)
Lower East Fork Elk Creek	Happy Camp	0.43 (-0.02)	1.05 (-0.09)	0.49 (-0.05)
Caroline Creek-Klamath River	Happy Camp	0.48 (0.07)	0.71 (0.04)	1.64 (0.02)
Middle Creek	Happy Camp	0.57 (0.08)	0.98 (0.02)	1.09 (0.06)
Lower Grider Creek	Happy Camp	0.69 (0.09)	0.91 (0.02)	1.09 (0.04)
Deep Creek-Scott River	Happy Camp	0.46 (0.01)	0.57 (0.00)	1.39 (0.00)
Schutts Gulch-Klamath River	Happy Camp	0.59 (0.01)	0.79 (0.00)	1.16 (0.00)
Bear Creek	Happy Camp	0.66 (0.00)	0.28 (0.00)	1.01 (0.00)
Middle Elk Creek	Happy Camp	1.40 (0.00)	0.12 (0.00)	2.85 (0.00)
Granite Creek	Happy Camp	0.59 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.52 (0.00)
Bishop Creek-Elk Creek	Happy Camp	0.57 (0.02)	0.10 (0.00)	1.76 (0.00)
Horse Creek	Happy Camp	0.64 (0.02)	1.08 (0.00)	0.81 (0.02)
Rancheria Creek	Happy Camp	0.88 (0.04)	1.23 (0.00)	0.68 (0.00)
Lower West Fork Beaver Creek	Beaver	1.31 (0.00)	1.65 (0.00)	1.05 (0.00)
Lumgrey Creek	Beaver	0.45 (0.01)	1.38 (0.00)	1.04 (0.00)
Soda Creek-Beaver Creek	Beaver	1.06 (0.00)	1.60 (0.00)	1.47 (0.00)
Jaynes Canyon	Beaver	1.16 (0.00)	1.68 (0.00)	0.85 (0.00)
Dona Creek-Klamath River	Beaver	0.82 (0.00)	1.17 (0.00)	1.19 (0.00)

Condition #5 – The Watershed Condition Framework (WCF) is the Forest Service process for planning restoration on all National Forest system lands. A strategy for how legacy site treatments in the project area can fit into the national WCF restoration policy is presented in sections E and F below.

Condition #6 – Implementation monitoring checklists will assure the project is conducted in accordance with the project description in the FEIS. See condition #7.

Condition #7 –The BMP Implementation checklist will be used to ensure 100% implementation of BMPs and project design features. The effectiveness of BMPs will be monitored by following the Best Management Evaluation Program protocol. In-channel monitoring will occur by following the 2010 Klamath National Forest Sediment and Shade Monitoring Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan (USDA, 2010).

Condition #8 – The BMP Implementation checklist specifies that “areas where soil has been disturbed by project activities within designated riparian zones must be stabilized prior to the beginning of the winter period, prior to sunset if the National Weather Service forecast is a “chance” (30% or more) of rain within the next 24 hours, or at the conclusion of operations, whichever is sooner”.

Condition #9 – Not Applicable

Condition #10 – The proposed project includes treatments in Riparian Reserves that will increase ground cover in areas that burned at moderate and high severity. In hazard tree units within one tree height distance from streams, trees larger than 26 inches would be retained on the ground. In fuels treatments slash with a diameter over 6 inches must be limbed and bucked into less than 8 foot lengths and left on the ground (not piled). Thus, treatments will increase soil cover and sediment retention capacity, as well as improve soil productivity, reducing erosion and sedimentation from areas that burned at high severity. Trees would be planted in high priority areas that burned at moderate and high severity. The roots of forest vegetation, especially trees, help stabilize slopes by providing additional strength to the soil.

Conditions #11 through #13 – Not Applicable

Condition #14 – Project design features that implement BMPs for activities in riparian reserves are included as an enclosure. Project design features were designed to ensure compliance with the riparian reserve program and aquatic conservation strategy.

Condition #15 – Not Applicable

Condition #16 - There will be no roads added to the National Forest Transportation System as a result of this project. Temporary roads will be closed after use and configured for long-term drainage and stability.

Condition #17 – Assessment of new temporary roads was conducted in the FEIS.

Condition #18 – Upon completion of the project a Notice of Completion, completed BMP Implementation Checklist and other monitoring forms/reports will be sent to the Regional Water Board certifying that all the conditions and monitoring and reporting required by this waiver have been met.

E. Relation to Forest Service Restoration Planning Strategy

Forest Service policy for planning watershed restoration on National Forest system lands is established in the Watershed Condition Framework (WCF, USFS 2011). The WCF is a nationally consistent process for evaluating watershed conditions, prioritizing watersheds for restoration, and developing comprehensive restoration plans for the priority watersheds. The

WCF approach is to target implementation in watersheds that have been identified as priorities. The WCF does not preclude restoration activities outside of priority watersheds but Forest Service funding is focused on projects identified in priority watersheds.

KNF proposes to meet the Waiver’s legacy restoration requirement for the Westside Fire Recovery Project by designating the four watersheds in Table 7 as priority watersheds under the Watershed Condition Framework. Three of the four watersheds have previously signed NEPA decisions to treat legacy sites on roads. Under this proposal there would be at least one priority watershed in each of the three TMDLs in the project area. Legacy sites located outside of priority watersheds would not be treated as part of the project except where sites can be restored without unreasonable cost, or where funding opportunities become available that do not divert funds away from priority watersheds.

Table 7. Priority Watersheds for Restoration on the Klamath National Forest. Elk Creek and Whites Gulch are within the project area for the Westside Fire Recovery Project. Elk Creek combines three 6th-field watersheds including the East Fork, Upper, and Lower Elk Creek.

Watershed	TMDL	Status
Sugar Creek	Scott River	Inventories completed, Restoration plan complete
Seiad Creek	Klamath River	Inventories completed, Restoration plan complete
Elk Creek	Klamath River	Inventories completed Restoration plan in development
Whites Gulch	Salmon River	Road inventories completed Restoration plan not started

F. Proposed Treatments of Legacy Sites and Treatment Schedule

A total of 423 road-related legacy sites were inventoried within the project areas for the Westside Fire Recovery Project (Table 8). The KNF proposes to treat about 150 legacy sites in the Elk Creek watersheds and 203 sites in Whites Gulch, including some that are located outside the project boundary. The total of 353 sites treated is equivalent to 83% of the road-related legacy sites in the project area. These sites are in addition to the 175 legacy sites in the project area treated for BAER. More information on the legacy site inventory is enclosed as an attachment.

An estimated schedule for treating legacy sites in the Westside Fire Recovery Project is shown in Table 9. The actual schedule is subject to change after project designs are completed and actual contract costs determined. The schedule assumes funding levels comparable to historic levels of \$600,000 per year. The entire schedule could be accelerated if more funding becomes available. The emphasis for 2015 to 2018 is completing existing commitments to BAER, the Sugar Creek restoration plan, and the Seiad Creek restoration plan. Treatment of legacy sites for the Westside Salvage Project begins in 2019 after the work in the Seiad Creek is complete. Work will then alternate between Sugar Creek, Whites Gulch, and Elk Creek with work in Elk Creek scheduled to be completed in 2037.

Table 8. Road-related legacy sites in the Westside Fire Recovery Project area by 6th field watershed. Data from the KNF road sediment source inventory (USFS, 2012). Legacy sites in Whites Gulch and Elk Creek include some sites outside of the project boundary.

HUC	6 th Field HUC Watershed Name	TMDL	Legacy sites still needing repairs	Sites repaired by BAER	Sites to be Repaired in Elk and Whites Restoration Plans
180102060904	Dutch Creek-Beaver Creek	Klamath River	31	7	0
180102061004	Horse Creek	Klamath River	1	3	0
180102060902	Hungry Creek-Beaver Creek	Klamath River	5	0	0
180102061005	Kohl Creek-Klamath River	Klamath River	8	3	0
180102061002	Little Humbug Creek-Klamath River	Klamath River	8	0	0
180102061003	McKinney Creek-Klamath River	Klamath River	18	0	0
180102060903	West Fork Beaver Creek	Klamath River	3	0	0
180102061103	Bittenbender Creek-Klamath River	Klamath River	56	11	0
180102090203	China Creek-Klamath River	Klamath River	46	13	0
180102090302	East Fork Elk Creek	Klamath River	45	11	65
180102061101	Grider Creek	Klamath River	28	25	0
180102090303	Lower Elk Creek	Klamath River	9	4	85
180102080604	Tompkins Creek-Scott River	Scott River	70	16	0
180102080606	Scott Bar-Scott River	Scott River	4	6	0
180102100103	East Fork South Fork Salmon River	Salmon River	4	1	0
180102100204	North Russian Creek	Salmon River	3	0	0
180102100203	South Russian Creek	Salmon River	11	26	0
180102100207	Whites Gulch-N.F. Salmon River	Salmon River	69	49	203
180102100205	Yellow Dog Creek-N.F. Salmon River	Salmon River	4	0	0
Total			423	175	353

G. Environmental Documents

The following documents are enclosed in the Waiver application package:

1. Project design features for water.
2. Cumulative watershed effects model results for ERA, USLE, and GEO
3. Legacy Site Inventory
4. Project area maps for the Happy Camp, Beaver, and Whites Fire areas
5. Maps of legacy sites to be treated in Elk Creek and Whites Gulch
6. Marking guidelines for fire damaged trees
7. Geology Report with amendment (risk assessment for unstable lands)

References

U.S. Forest Service Handbook, 1990. Soil and water conservation handbook. R-5 FSH 2509.22, amendment no.2

USDA, Forest Service, 2010. Klamath National Forest sediment and temperature monitoring plan and quality assurance project plan.

USDA, Forest Service, 2011. Watershed Condition Framework. A Framework for Assessing and Tracking Changes to Watershed Condition. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, FS-977 http://www.fs.fed.us/publications/watershed/Watershed_Condition_Framework.pdf

USDA, Forest Service, 2012. Water quality management handbook. FSH 2209.22. U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.

USDA, Forest Service, 2012. National best management practices for water quality management on National Forest system lands. FS-990a. Vol. 1, National core BMP technical guide.

USDA, Forest Service, 2015a. Hydrology Report for Westside Fire Recovery Project, and amendment to Hydrology Report for Westside Fire Recovery Project.

USDA, Forest Service, 2015b. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Westside Fire Recovery Project

Table 9. Estimated schedule for treating legacy sites in the Westside Fire Recovery Project and existing Category B projects. The schedule assumes future funding at \$500,000 per year. No FS funding is scheduled for 2017 but grants may be available.

Year	TMDL	Category B Project	Project Phase	Description
2015	Scott River	Sugar Ck WCF	Phase 1 & 2	Rd. Stormproofing,
	Scott River	2014 BAER		Rd. Stormproofing
	Klamath River	2014 BAER		Rd. Stormproofing
	Salmon River	2014 BAER		Rd. Stormproofing
2016	Klamath River	Seiad Ck WCF	Seiad Ck Phase 3	Rd. Decommissioning, Stormproofing
2017	No funding			
2018	Klamath River	Seiad Ck WCF	Phase 4	Rd. Stormproofing
2019	Scott River	Singleton	Lower Scott Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2020	Scott River	Sugar Ck WCF	Sugar Ck Phase 3	Mine reclamation, Meadow Restoration, Rd. stormproofing.
2021	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	East Fork Elk Ck Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2022	Scott River	Sugar Ck WCF	Sugar Ck Phase 4	Rd. Stormproofing
2023	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites GI WCF	Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2024	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	East Fork Elk Ck Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2025	Scott River	Sugar Ck WCF	Sugar Ck Phase 5	Rd. Stormproofing
2026	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites WCF	Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2027	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Doolittle Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2028	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites GI WCF	Phase 3	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2029	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Doolittle Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2030	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites GI WCF	Phase 4	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2031	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Elk Ck. / Rd. 1605 Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2032	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites GI WCF	Phase 5	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2033	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Elk Ck. / Rd. 1605 Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2034	Salmon River	Westside Salvage, Whites GI WCF	Phase 6	Rd. Stormproofing + Decommissioning
2035	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Stanza Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2036	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Stanza Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2037	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Stanza-Bishop Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2038	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Stanza-Bishop Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2039	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Twin Phase 1	Rd. Stormproofing
2040	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Twin Phase 2	Rd. Stormproofing
2041	Klamath River	Westside Salvage, Elk Ck WCF	Elk Ck. Road decommissioning	Road decommissioning, Non-road Sites, and Drafting Sites