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Instructions: the class will divide into three groups of roughly equal size; each group shall evaluate one of the three case studies assigned. Each group shall also critique the findings made by the other two groups. Instructors may assist these groups by being called-upon to answer questions, but students shall evaluate these case studies without significant input from instructors. Each group shall designate a group-leader to lead the investigation, coordinate group discussions, and present the group's findings to the entire class. The circumstances described in these cases represent a collection of actual situations witnessed by the Department over the past several years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:35 – 2:40</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Instructions for Site Management Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 - 3:00</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Students Read All Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:05</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Students Break into 3 Groups &amp; Select Group-Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05-3:40</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>Group Study of Assigned Case, Develop Answers to Questions in Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40-3:50</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50-4:05</td>
<td>Students / Foster</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Group A (Case Study 1) – Presentation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05-4:20</td>
<td>Students / Foster</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Group B (Case Study 2) – Presentation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20-4:35</td>
<td>Students / Foster</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Group C (Case Study 3) – Presentation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35-4:45</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Q &amp; A, Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study #1 Grading Incident at Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park

California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) personnel were alerted in January 1994 that a significant amount of grading work had recently occurred within Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. This small park unit lies adjacent to the community of Chatsworth at the far western end of the San Fernando Valley (see Map #1). The dozer work was conducted by Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) staff on December 22, 1993 working under a contract with Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE maintains a transmission line that passes across the park. The grading was reportedly performed to provide access to two transmission
towers, under an easement, although curiously, an extensive network of roads was built going several different directions (see Map #2). The newly-graded roads were from 20 to 45 feet wide. In 1993, this park unit was undeveloped. Neither LACFD nor SCE made any effort to inform the landowner (State Parks) that grading would be performed here to improve vehicular access to the towers that was reportedly necessary to clean certain elements on them. Highly significant prehistoric and historic-period archaeological sites are present within the entire area affected by the grading. Two large prehistoric village sites, CA-LAN-448 and CA-LAN-449, occur here and these were recorded prior to the grading incident. Both sites contain extensive midden deposits over one meter in depth. These deposits were crossed several times by the recent grading activity which exposed abundant chipped-stone artifacts and fragmentary human bone remains from cremations disturbed by the grading. Bedrock mortars also occur at both village sites at prominent rock outcrops. The historic-period sites, which overlap the prehistoric deposits, contain structural remains, a variety of artifacts and bones, and remnants of the 19th Century Santa Susana Stage Route, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The historic features at the sites are distinctive and readily visible. These include rows of historic olive trees, rock walls, remains of a work camp, sandstone quarries, tailings, trash deposits, and stone corrals. State Park archaeologists prepared damage assessments which initiated a lawsuit between DPR, SCE and LACFD. After years of litigation as well as considerable staff time and contract expenses incurred by all three entities, DPR agreed to settle the case monetarily. Payment was made by SCE to DPR. DPR and SCE also negotiated a new protocol for maintenance of utility easements throughout the State Park system.

1. Discuss the relevancy of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to this case. Which of the three entities, if any, had CEQA requirements, and specifically what were those requirements?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. How could this unfortunate incident have been prevented, and what are some of the lessons that we can learn from it?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Case Study #2

You are a CAL FIRE Forest Practice Inspector working in CAL FIRE's Lassen-Modoc Unit. You are one of three CAL FIRE Inspectors working in that Unit and currently have 14 open THPs that you review for the Department. One of these plans is named the Big Tree THP. It is a 160-acre THP located near Westwood, not far from Mountain Meadows Reservoir, on private property bordered on the west by the Lassen National Forest. The landowner's name is George McGillicuity. The RPF that wrote the plan is Henry Smith. Henry has twice taken CAL FIRE’s archaeological training, including the full course and a one-day refresher two years ago. RPF Smith conducted the archaeological survey for the Big Tree THP, CAL FIRE approved the plan a year ago, and the logging has been completed. CAL FIRE recently received an RM-71 notice and you have scheduled a completion inspection for Wednesday of the following week. RPF Smith said he would meet you on-site at 0900 and the plan area would be ready for completion inspection. Today you receive a phone call from the Lake Almanor Ranger District Archaeologist reporting his observation that recent logging on private property adjacent to the Lassen National Forest damaged a known prehistoric village site. The Forest Service Archaeologist sent you via fax a map and site record. The map shows the site in an open area along the edge of a meadow, near a spring, and you immediately recognize the location bearing this archaeological site is within the Big Trees THP. You notify CAL FIRE Archaeologist Rich Jenkins in Redding. He agreed to assist in the investigation and will accompany you on inspection scheduled for Wednesday. You contact the RPF to inform him of the report from the USFS and that CAL FIRE will be looking at the southwest comer of the property—the location of the reported site. The CAA for the plan was written by RPF Smith. He conducted a survey of the entire 160 acres but did not identify any prehistoric site. He did find a small, circa 1930's can dump in the northern part of the property and completed a site record for that find. That site was protected by avoidance and its significance was not determined. You, Mr. Jenkins, and RPF Smith meet on the property and immediately go to the southwest comer. This area has been extensively logged. A log landing was constructed here, and several scattered large pine trees have been harvested. You begin to see scattered artifacts across the disturbed area, including approximately 50 flakes derived from basalt and obsidian. The archaeologist finds two manos in the log landing and three patches of midden soil. You hop the fence and realize that the site extends on USFS lands; in fact, the majority of the site area is on public land and remains undisturbed. The site record is accurate. This appears to be a prehistoric village site with midden and lots of artifacts. It was recorded by the USFS five years ago but does not have a trinomial. The site area is located on the edge of timberland, on the northern margin of a large, grassy meadow with a perennial stream. The LTO was not told about the site or any restrictions to logging this area. The CAL FIRE archaeologist determines the site to be significant and the damage to it from logging was also significant, particularly the construction and use of the log landing. You talk to the RPF and find out that the record search conducted by the Northeast Information Center did not disclose the existence of this or any other site on the property. The RPF said he sent a letter to the Forest Archaeologist in Susanville notifying him of the proposed
THP and requesting information on any known sites. No response was received. He sent letters to the NAHC and four local contacts listed on CAL FIRE's Native American Contact List, but no reply was received. He said he did survey this area but just missed the site. He said there was an existing road through this area and did notice the soil was darker here than elsewhere, but attributed that to recent fires. The CAL FIRE Archaeologist did not attend the PHI because no archaeological issues were brought up during the first review. The observations described are documented in a pair of maps (Map #3, Map #4) that were prepared by RPF Henry Smith following the inspection.

1. What is the primary reason the archaeological site was damaged during the THP?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. List the reasons the site was not identified in the THP:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3. Discuss any observed performance errors of:

RPF Smith:____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

The LTO:_____________________________________________________________________

The USFS Archaeologist:________________________________________________________

Anyone Else?__________________________________________________________________

4. What are some of the issues related to Forest Practice Rule enforcement that CAL FIRE will be exploring.  Is there a violation here? What are some reasonable recommendations for the rehabilitation / mitigation to the damaged site?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Case Study #3

Linda Jones is a consulting RPF. She was hired by a private landowner to prepare a THP for the 40-acre parcel located near Willits in Mendocino County. The property has not been logged for over 25 years and it contains a considerable volume of merchantable timber. The landowner indicated a desire to maximize the timber harvest yield to generate needed revenues. RPF Jones conducted the archaeological survey required by California's Forest Practice Rules and found a single, multi-component archaeological site on the property. She was tipped-off by the landowner who told her his family has found "arrowheads" in the vicinity of the "old cabin," but she would have found the site anyway. The RPF's survey of the area revealed an archaeological site containing both prehistoric and historic components measuring 80 X 100 meters in total size. RPF Jones determined the site boundary based on the maximum limits of visible artifacts. Surface visibility was excellent and the RPF believes the site boundary determination to be accurate. The site is located in a forest opening on the west side of "Dribble Creek," a Class-2 watercourse bisected by an existing dirt road, the primary access and haul road through the property. The RPF found a sizeable midden area, a cluster of three possible housepits, and an extensive scatter of chipped and ground stone artifacts, including six chert Gunther-Barbed projectile points. There is also the "old cabin." This is a one-room wooden structure built from milled lumber with wire nails. It dates to possibly as early as the 1920's (based on historic bottle types), although it appears to have been rebuilt in the 1950's based on the condition of the roof and siding. It probably functioned as a hunter's cabin, not as a homestead. The landowner does not know much about it, other than he seen it on this property for over 50 years and heard stories about it from his dad. There may be an old photo of the cabin in with his dad's stuff in the garage. The site area contains fragments of historic bottles, cans, and other metal items could help establish the age and use of the cabin. The landowner indicated his desire to remove the cabin while logging equipment was in the area, although it appears to be in good condition. The RPF prepared a detailed record of the site including the two attached maps (Map #5, Map #6). The detailed Site Map (Map #6) was used to map and describe the details of proposed timber operations in and around the archaeological site. The landowner does not want to unnecessarily disturb the site, but has requested the RPF to consider ways to harvest merchantable trees in and around the site, and to remove the cabin, if possible. There is an existing log landing within the site, just north of the midden area, east of the housepits. This landing was used 25 years ago but still contains numerous artifacts including one of the projectile points. There are 10 large Douglas-fir trees in the forest opening. Seven of these are located within the site and three just outside the site boundary. The market for fir is currently high so these trees have considerable value. The northeastern part of the site contains a very sparse flake scatter and there does not appear to be subsurface deposit, midden, or features.
Review the two Maps and Answer the following questions:

1. Discuss the significance of the site, its values, and its potential impacts from logging and from the landowner.

2. Taking into account the landowners objectives, if you were the RPF, how would you propose the site be managed? What are the alternatives?

3. What issues will CAL FIRE be looking at during the Department's review of this plan during the PHI?

4. What are the issues related to the old cabin? What options should RPF Jones present to the landowner?