

Appendix 14

EIS Team

Guidance to SAG

Contents

Introduction	14-2
Categories	14-2
Restoration Management Activities	14-7
Probabilities of Implementation	14-8
Rate of Application	14-8
Assumptions	14-8
Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Alternatives	14-11
Tables 1–6 (Prescriptions)	14-12
Funding Allocation to High Restoration Priority Subbasins in Alternatives S2 and S3	14-24
Tables 7–8 (Funding Allocations)	14-26

Introduction

Appendix 14 is the guidance that the EIS Team provided to the Science Advisory Group (SAG) in spring 1999 to assist them in modeling the effects of Alternatives S1, S2, and S3. It is based on the management intent and direction for BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands, described in Chapter 3 of this Supplemental Draft EIS. The EIS Team refers to the guidance in this appendix as “storylines”. Storylines were developed for each of 26 categories, or areas (described below) and for each of six potential vegetation groups (PVGs): dry forest, moist forest, cold forest, dry grass, dry shrub, cool shrub. The storylines consist of a probability of being implemented in the short-term, and a rate of application on-the-ground, for six restoration management activities: timber and silviculture, rangeland management, noxious weed control, reduction of road effects, prescribed fire, and aquatic/hydrologic restoration.

The categories, management activities, probabilities of implementation, and rates of application are listed below. General assumptions and specific assumptions for each of the six potential vegetation groups are listed next, followed by a description of the management prescriptions recommended to simulate the alternatives. Storyline tables (Tables 1 through 6) are provided next, one for each potential vegetation group.

Appendix 14 concludes with a discussion of funding allocations to high restoration priority subbasins in Alternatives S2 and S3, with Tables 7 and 8.

Categories

‘Categories’ refers to land areas as used in this document. There are 26 different categories identified, each of which has a distinct management intent or emphasis that is the result of implementation of management direction. These categories sometimes overlap; for example, an aquatic A2 subwatershed might lie within a terrestrial T watershed. Therefore, it is possible that the basic unit of land classification, which is a 247-acre (1 square kilometer) pixel, can be assigned to 2 or more different categories and have 2 or more different management intents or emphases. Such a situation would become problematic on the ground, so one management intent must prevail. Therefore, for purposes of this exercise, each 247-acre pixel in the project area was assigned to only one of the 26 categories (land areas) so that each pixel would have a distinct category label. This was done to

accommodate SAG landscape modeling in which management prescriptions were tied to distinct types of management emphasis, where only one management prescription can be applied to each pixel.

A hierarchy was used to apply a category—and therefore a management prescription—to each pixel. The hierarchy was developed by the EIS Team and reflects a gradient that goes from most restrictive management to least restrictive management. For example, the highest category (most restrictive) in the hierarchy is MAC 1 areas, which represent congressionally designated areas such as wilderness and wilderness study areas. A pixel that could be placed into more than one category was assigned for the purposes of this exercise to the category that was highest in the hierarchy.

The categories are listed in this appendix in hierarchical order, with a brief discussion of restoration activities the EIS Team intended for each during the development of the restoration strategy (especially *Objective R-04*). It is intended that the types and mix of restoration activities (timber and silvicultural treatments, rangeland management, noxious weed control, reduction of adverse road effects, prescribed fire, and aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes) would vary depending on the management emphasis or priority for the area being restored. The emphasis or priority depends on management intent and management direction, which would vary depending on the area, such as A2 subwatersheds or economic restoration priority subbasins. This appendix refers to management of lands administered by the Forest Service or the BLM only.

To aid in visualization and location of the following categories within the project area, numerous maps were created. The aquatic A1 and A2 subwatersheds for Alternative S2 are shown on Map 3-11 and for Alternative S3 on Map 3-12 (in Chapter 3). Map 3-10 shows the T watersheds for both Alternatives S2 and S3 (there is no difference in T watersheds between the two alternatives). The 40 high restoration priority Subbasins for Alternative S2 are shown on Map 3-8 and the 51 high restoration priority subbasins for Alternative S3 are shown on Map 3-9. The broad-scale restoration priorities for Landscape, Aquatic, Water Quality, Old-forest/Rangeland Habitat, Economic, and Tribal are shown on Maps 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, and 3-7, respectively.

1. **MAC (Management Area Category) 1** — [wilderness, wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, etc.]. Restoration activities would be primarily passive in these areas. An exception is noxious weed control, which would occur at an increased level in the dry grass and dry shrub

- PVGs compared with other PVGs to secure the grasslands, shrublands, and shrub-grasslands from noxious weed invasion and spread. These vegetation types are relatively more susceptible to noxious weeds compared with other vegetation types. Management ignited prescribed fire would be used where “wildland fire use for resource benefit” (previously referred to as prescribed natural fire) is not effective. Expected activity levels are assumed to be low but, to the extent possible, the intent is to treat entire watersheds or subwatersheds when prescribed fire is necessary.
2. **A1 subwatersheds** — These areas are assumed to be at or near attainment of aquatics objectives. However, when restoration activities are implemented, the emphases of fostering maintenance and/or restoration of aquatic and riparian health would be achieved through: (1) altering livestock grazing management strategies, (2) controlling noxious weeds, and (3) reducing adverse road effects. In addition, there may be some need for prescribed fire. Other restoration activities would be primarily passive.
 3. **T watersheds** — These areas contain terrestrial source habitats that are assumed to be the most sustainable through time compared to source habitats outside T watersheds. The emphasis of restoration activities would be to benefit terrestrial species that have had broad-scale declines in geographic extent of their source habitats. Restoration activities would include: (1) altering livestock grazing management strategies, (2) controlling noxious weeds, (3) reducing adverse road effects, (4) conducting prescribed fire, and (5) silviculture. Livestock grazing management strategies may need to be altered to: (1) reduce the likelihood of noxious weed introduction into uninfested areas, (2) reduce noxious weed spread within infested areas, and (3) provide for adequate herbaceous fuel amounts to permit periodic prescribed fire on rangelands to achieve vegetation species composition and structure that is more characteristic of late seral conditions. Other restoration activities would be primarily passive management. The intent is for these restoration activities to be directed to the cover type–structural stages listed in Tables 3-4 through 3-9 (in Chapter 3).
 4. **Urban–rural–wildland interface (URWI)** — The emphasis of restoration activities in these areas is to minimize the buildup of fuels in woody and herbaceous (such as cheatgrass and medusahead) vegetation to minimize effects of wildfire on people and their structures. Restoration activities would include: (1) timber and silvicultural treatments, (2) prescribed fire, (3) noxious weed control, particularly in the dry grass and dry shrub PVGs where exotic herbaceous fuels frequently are present, and (4) altering livestock grazing management strategies.
 5. **A2 subwatersheds outside high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — These areas have a greater need for restoration to conserve and secure aquatic and riparian habitat compared to A1 subwatersheds. Restoration management emphasizes reduction of sediment delivery and enhancement of aquatic and riparian habitat. Restoration activities would include: (1) reducing adverse road effects (such as decreasing sediment delivery) on aquatic and riparian areas, (2) instream and/or riparian restoration activities that restore aquatic and riparian species habitat, (3) prescribed fire, (4) silvicultural treatments to reduce effects from severe disturbances (such as uncharacteristic wildfires), (5) altering livestock grazing management strategies, and (6) controlling noxious weeds. Other restoration activities would be primarily passive.
 6. **Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs) outside high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The discussion for A2 subwatersheds outside high restoration priority subbasins would apply to these areas as well; however, the rate of active restoration would be comparatively slower because of the greater emphasis on restoring A2 subwatersheds.
 7. **Unroaded areas that are larger than 5,000 acres outside high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The emphasis of restoration management in these areas would be to reduce risks of and adverse effects from large, severe disturbance events. Prescribed fire would occur at higher rates in these areas compared to the MAC 1 areas (Category 1).
 8. **Old forest outside high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The emphasis of restoration management in these areas would be to reduce old-forest habitat fragmentation (that is, enhance old-forest connectivity) to maintain, secure, and restore old-forest source habitats. Restoration activities would include: (1) timber harvest and silvicultural treatments, (2) prescribed fire, and

(3) reducing adverse road effects. Other restoration activities would be primarily passive.

9. **A2 subwatersheds *within* high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — These areas have a greater need for restoration to conserve and secure aquatic and riparian habitat compared to A1 subwatersheds. Restoration activities in A2 subwatersheds within high restoration priority subbasins would be similar to A2 subwatersheds outside high restoration priority subbasins; however, there would be a greater emphasis on timber and silviculture and prescribed fire to secure aquatic and riparian habitats from threats of extensive wildfire. In addition, a more rapid rate of restoration would occur in A2 subwatersheds within high restoration priority subbasins than in those outside the high priority subbasins because of greater management emphasis in the high priority subbasins.
10. **RCAs *within* high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The discussion for A2 subwatersheds within high restoration priority subbasins would apply to these areas as well. The types of restoration activities in these areas would be similar to, but would proceed at a faster rate than, activities in RCAs outside high restoration priority subbasins because of greater management emphasis in the high priority subbasins. The intent is to avoid short-term risks to aquatic and riparian resources; therefore, some restoration would be passive.
11. **Unroaded areas that are larger than 5,000 acres *within* high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The emphasis of restoration management in these areas would be to achieve vegetation species composition and structure that is more consistent with the climate, landform, and biological and physical characteristics of the landscape. There would be slightly greater emphases on prescribed fire, timber and silvicultural treatments, and altering livestock grazing management strategies (to provide adequate amounts of herbaceous fuels to permit the increased emphasis on prescribed fire) in these areas compared with unroaded areas outside high restoration priority subbasins. The type, amount, and rate of noxious weed control would be similar to that in MAC 1 areas (Category 1). Other restoration activities would be primarily passive.

12. **Old Forest *within* high restoration priority subbasins (HRPs)** — The emphasis of restoration management to reduce old-forest habitat fragmentation and enhance old-forest connectivity in these areas would be greater than for old forest outside high restoration priority subbasins. Restoration management activities would include timber and silvicultural treatments, prescribed fire, and reducing adverse road effects.

Categories 13 through 25 below refer to the high restoration priority subbasins shown on Maps 3-8 and 3-9. Labels given to each category (for example, Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic/Tribal Priority) reflect the major needs for restoration for those subbasin(s) as determined by the EIS Team. (See Appendix 15 for more detail on the development of high restoration priority subbasins.)

The discussion below on Subbasin Review and Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS) applies to the entire land area within high restoration priority subbasins. However, the discussions of restoration activities and restoration emphases beneath each category apply only to those areas within the high restoration priority subbasins that were not previously accounted for in categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, or 12.

In Alternative S2, Subbasin Review would be completed for each of the 40 high restoration priority subbasins within two years after the ICBEMP Record of Decision (ROD) is signed. Subbasin Review will aid in providing the context and the priority for finer scale analysis such as Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS) within these subbasins (Ecosystem Review at the Subbasin Scale, ICBEMP, August 1999 draft). The intent is that EAWS would aid in planning and designing restoration activities, including the types, locations, and sequence of restoration activities. The two-year requirement for conducting Subbasin Reviews would not apply in Alternative S3 (although all Subbasin Reviews in the project area must be completed within five years after the ROD is signed). Subbasin Reviews would still assist in providing the context and priority for finer scale analysis such as EAWS under Alternative S3, and the intent of EAWS would be the same under Alternative S3 as it is under Alternative S2.

13. **Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic/Tribal Priority** — The Upper Grande Ronde subbasin is the only subbasin in this category for Alterna-

- tives S2 and S3. Management activities in this subbasin would focus on restoration of (1) old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes; and on providing economic benefits to tribal communities and other isolated and economically specialized communities. This subbasin has the greatest number and diversity of restoration needs/priorities in the project area; therefore it would probably require a coordinated emphasis on all types of restoration activities (timber harvest and silvicultural treatments, altered livestock grazing management strategies, noxious weed control, reducing adverse road effects, prescribed fire, and aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes).
14. **Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic Priority** — The Lower John Day, Middle Fork John Day, Upper John Day, and Goose Lake subbasins, all in Oregon, are the four subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would focus on restoration of (1) old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes; and on providing economic benefits to isolated, economically specialized communities. A coordinated emphasis on all types of restoration activities (timber harvest and silvicultural treatments, altered livestock grazing management strategies, noxious weed control, reducing adverse road effects, prescribed fire, and aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes) probably would be required in these subbasins.
15. **Biophysical/Economic/Tribal Priority** — The Upper Coeur d'Alene subbasin is the only subbasin in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would focus on restoration of (1) old forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes; and on providing economic benefits to tribal communities and other isolated, economically specialized communities. There would be greater emphasis on using timber harvest and silvicultural treatments, and noxious weed control, for restoration; and slightly less emphasis on reducing adverse road effects and on altering livestock grazing management strategies, compared with subbasins in categories 13 and 14 (Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic/Tribal and Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic).
16. **Biophysical/Aquatic/Tribal Priority** — The Middle Columbia-Hood subbasin is the only subbasin in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of (1) terrestrial old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes; and would be directed towards providing economic benefits to tribal communities. A slightly greater emphasis would be placed on restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes compared with subbasins in category 13 (Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic/Tribal).
17. **Biophysical/Economic Priority** — The Middle Fork Payette, Little Wood, Upper Snake-Rock, and Beaver-Camas subbasins, all located within Idaho, are the four subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of (1) terrestrial old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes; and would be directed towards providing economic benefits to isolated and economically specialized communities. See the description for category 15 (Biophysical/Economic/Tribal) for additional information on the emphases for restoration activities.
18. **Biophysical/Aquatic Priority** — The North Fork John Day subbasin is the only subbasin in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of (1) terrestrial old forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes. There would be a slightly greater emphasis on reducing adverse road effects and on restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes compared with subbasins in category 13 (Biophysical/Economic/Aquatic/Tribal).
19. **Biophysical/Tribal Priority** — The Upper Malheur subbasin is the only subbasin in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of (1) terrestrial old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes, which would promote tribal cultural and traditional uses and would be directed towards providing economic benefits to tribal communities. The emphases would be (1)

silvicultural treatments in the dry and moist forest; (2) altering livestock grazing strategies in the dry grass and dry shrub potential vegetation groups (PVGs); (3) noxious weed control in the dry forest, dry grass, and dry shrub PVGs; (4) reducing adverse road effects in the dry forest, moist forest, and dry shrub PVGs; and (5) prescribed fire in the dry, cold, and moist forest PVGs and the dry and cool shrub PVGs. Prescribed fire and restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes would be above base levels. Other activity levels should be at or above base levels.

20. **Economic/Tribal Priority** — The Lower Clark Fork and the Middle Snake-Succor are the two subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to provide economic benefits to tribal communities and other isolated and economically specialized communities. The emphases would be (1) silvicultural treatments in the dry and moist forest PVGs; (2) noxious weed control in the dry forest, dry grass, and dry shrub PVGs; and (3) prescribed fire in the dry and cool shrub PVGs and the dry, moist, and cold forest PVGs. Prescribed fire and noxious weed control would be at higher than base levels.

21. **Aquatic/Tribal Priority** — The Lower Deschutes, Clearwater, and Salt subbasins are the three subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of aquatic and riparian habitats as well as provide economic benefits to tribal communities. The emphases would be (1) silvicultural treatments in the dry and moist forest PVGs; (2) noxious weed control in the dry grass and dry shrub PVGs; (3) reducing adverse road effects in the dry forest, moist forest, dry shrub, and cool shrub PVGs; (4) altering livestock grazing strategies in the dry grass and dry shrub PVGs; (5) prescribed fire in dry and cool shrub PVGs and the dry, moist, and cold forest PVGs; and (6) restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes in all PVGs. The expectation is that restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes and reducing adverse road effects would be greater than base level and other restoration activities would be equal to or higher than base level.

22. **Biophysical Priority** — The Upper Crooked, Trout, Lower Snake-Tucannon, and Medicine Lodge subbasins are the four subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of (1) terrestrial old-forest and/or rangeland source habitats, (2) aquatic and riparian habitats, and (3) water quality and hydrological processes, in an integrated fashion. The emphases would be on silvicultural treatments, altering livestock grazing management strategies, noxious weed control, reducing adverse road effects, prescribed fire, and restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes, which indicates that there is no single emphasis but rather higher rates of restoration activities.

23. **Economic Priority** — The Lake Abert, Pend Oreille, and Upper Kootenai subbasins are the three subbasins in this category for Alternative S2. In addition to those subbasins, the Yaak, Moyie, Idaho Falls, Big Lost, Boise-Mores, and Lower Malheur subbasins constitute the nine subbasins in this category for Alternative S3. Management activities would be expected to provide economic benefits to isolated and economically specialized communities. There would be greater emphasis on silvicultural treatments, prescribed fire, and noxious weed control. Other restoration activities would be near base levels.

24. **Aquatic Priority** — The Swan, Upper North Fork Clearwater, Lochsa, Lower Selway, Lower Salmon, Little Salmon, South Fork Salmon, Upper Salmon, Pahsimeroi, South Fork Boise, Palisades, Walla Walla, and Upper Yakima subbasins are the 13 subbasins in this category for Alternatives S2 and S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of aquatic and riparian resources. The emphases would be on restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes and reducing adverse road effects. Opportunities for other types of restoration are low and related activities would be near base levels.

25. **Tribal Priority** — The Sanpoil and Priest subbasins are the two subbasins in this category for Alternative S2. In addition to those subbasins, the Lower Kootenai, North Fork

Flathead, Upper Spokane, Sprague, and Blackfoot subbasins constitute the seven subbasins in this category for Alternative S3. Management activities would be expected to stimulate restoration of the biophysical resources that will promote tribal cultural and traditional uses, as well as provide economic benefits to tribal communities. In general, all restoration activity levels would be above base level. The emphases would be (1) silvicultural treatments in the dry and moist forest PVGs; (2) noxious weed control in the dry forest, cool shrub, dry shrub, and dry grass PVGs; (3) reducing adverse road effects in the dry, cold, and moist forest PVGs; (4) altering livestock grazing management strategies in the cool shrub, dry shrub, and dry grass PVGs; and (5) prescribed fire in all PVGs.

26. **Base level** — All other areas not covered in categories #1–25 above.

Restoration Management Activities

In this EIS, reference to restoration management activities in general refers to one or more of the following in the list below. The probabilities of implementation and the rate of application (see definitions below) of these restoration management activities are shown for each of six potential vegetation groups (PVGs) in storyline tables at the end of this document.

Timber harvest and silvicultural treatments — Includes mechanical forest activities such as harvest, commercial and precommercial thinning, and planting. These activities may produce commercially marketable wood products.

Rangeland management — The EIS team interpreted this as primarily “altered livestock grazing management strategies.” As the rate of application grades from High to None in the storyline tables, the EIS Team interpreted it as grading from a high level of altered livestock grazing management strategies to no change in currently administered livestock grazing management strategies. Thus, rangeland health improvements are more likely to be detected as the rate

of application grades from None to High rangeland management; the more management, the more improvement. The premise is that when livestock grazing management strategies are altered, they are altered because there is a need to reduce negative ecological effects attributable to excessive livestock grazing pressure.

In the landscape modeling of vegetation and disturbances, as the rate of rangeland management grades from High to None, livestock grazing more likely causes successional change in vegetation. This successional change in vegetation is typically a reflection of negative ecological effects and a decline in rangeland health. The probabilities associated with ‘successional change grazing’ and ‘successional accelerating grazing’ would increase in the landscape modeling as rate of application for rangeland management grades from High to None. (See Keane et al. 1996 for explanation of ‘successional change grazing’ and ‘successional accelerating grazing’.)

Noxious weed control — As the rate of application grades from None to High in the storyline tables, the EIS Team interpreted it as a greater degree of noxious weed control. In the landscape modeling of vegetation and disturbances, as the rate for noxious weed control grades from None to High, probabilities associated with ‘herbicide application’ and ‘seeding native plants’ would increase; this also reflects a greater degree of noxious weed control. (See Keane et al. 1996 for explanation of ‘herbicide application’ and ‘seeding native plants’.)

Reduction in adverse road effects — Includes actions designed to reduce the adverse effects of roads on hydrologic processes and aquatic and terrestrial species. Activities include road maintenance, seasonal closure, and obliteration.

Prescribed fire (includes planned and unplanned ignitions) — Includes actions designed to restore/maintain rangeland and forest vegetation composition and structure. Activities include prescribed fire and “wildland fire use for resource benefit” (formerly known as prescribed natural fire).

Aquatic–Riparian Condition/Hydrologic processes — Includes actions designed to restore water quality and riparian areas. Activities include seedings and plantings, to re-establish ground cover or riparian vegetative structure, so that gully erosion can be reduced, soil compaction can be reduced, and degraded or channelized streams can be reconnected to their floodplains.

Probabilities of Implementation

These are the probabilities of the activity occurring or being implemented in the first decade after the Record of Decision is signed, based on management intent, management direction, and the management hierarchy.

None:	0
Very Low:	1–4 percent
Low:	5–33 percent
Moderate:	34–66 percent
High:	67–100 percent

Rate of Application

This is the probable rate of application of the restoration activity, based on the management intent, management direction, and restoration priorities. These rates of application are qualitative and are relative to each other. These qualitative rates of application translate most directly to quantitative probabilities of disturbance applied to individual pixels within the landscape modeling of vegetation and disturbances. (See page 6 of Keane et al. 1996 for more detail on simulation of disturbances.)

None
Low
Moderate
High

Assumptions

The EIS Team made the following assumptions in the spring of 1999 in developing the storylines. These assumptions also were developed to help the SAG understand how the EIS team interpreted management intent, management direction, and the management hierarchy, so that SAG could model the effects of the alternatives.

General Assumptions

Rates of application for silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire will be slowed where there is a complexity of resource issues. For example, in subbasins

where there are numerous restoration priorities, there will be more need for Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS). The rates of application for silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire would be increased under Alternative S3 compared to Alternatives S2 and S1.

The rate of application for prescribed fire is slowed slightly in areas where there is greater emphasis on timber harvest for economic reasons; for example, in subbasins that have an Economic restoration priority.

An Economic and/or Tribal restoration priority trend the rate of application upward for noxious weed control.

An Aquatic restoration priority reduces the probability of implementation and the rate of application of silvicultural treatments, prescribed fire, and noxious weed control, while increasing the same for range management, reduction of adverse road effects, and aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes.

A Tribal restoration priority trends the rate of application upward for silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire.

A1 subwatersheds and T watersheds trend the probability of implementation upward for noxious weed control because there is high priority in the management direction to maintain and secure these aquatic strongholds and terrestrial source habitats from noxious weed invasion and spread. However, the rates of application will be low because A1 subwatersheds and T watersheds should be relatively noxious weed-free.

The A2 subwatersheds *inside* high restoration priority subbasins typically were rated higher for probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control, silvicultural treatments, and prescribed fire, compared with A2 subwatersheds *outside* high restoration priority subbasins. The same distinction between inside and outside high restoration priority subbasins will hold for RCAs, unroaded areas, and old forest.

Base level areas typically will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application for silvicultural treatments, range management, prescribed fire, and noxious weed control compared with areas within high restoration priority subbasins.

There was intent to trend probability of implementation and rate of application downward for noxious weed control in unroaded areas because of lack of access.

Restoration of aquatic-riparian condition/hydrologic processes in the urban-rural-wildland interface areas (URWI) will be of similar probability of implementation and rate of application as in base level areas.

Range management, noxious weed control, silvicultural treatments, and prescribed fire in the urban-rural-wildland interface areas will have a higher probability of implementation and rate of application than in base level areas.

Reducing adverse road effects in the urban-rural-wildland interface areas will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application than in base level areas.

Dry Forest PVG Assumptions

A Tribal restoration priority increases the probability of implementation and rate of application slightly for prescribed fire and silvicultural treatments.

The dry forest PVG will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control compared to the dry grass PVG, but will be higher compared to the moist forest PVG.

The dry forest PVG will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application for rangeland management compared to the dry grass PVG, but will be slightly higher compared to the moist forest PVG.

The Dry forest PVG is likely to see the highest probability of implementation and rate of application of prescribed fire because its resource conditions are the most departed, or most different from the historical range of variability.

Probabilities of implementation and rates of application for silvicultural treatments are likely to be highest in the dry and Moist forest PVGs because the dry forest is most departed and the highest management priority. Moist forest is the most productive forest PVG and will require more silvicultural treatments compared to fire; that is, the proportion of silvicultural treatments to prescribed fire will be higher in moist forest and lower in dry forest.

For the 40 High restoration priority subbasins in Alternative S2, probabilities of implementation are generally high for silvicultural treatments, prescribed fire, and noxious weed control. Therefore there is a high likelihood that these activities will be conducted within the first 10 years after the ROD is signed and it

is the rate that will vary comparatively more. The exception to this is in the subbasins with high Aquatic priority, where the focus is more on the aquatic portion of the subbasin and there is less need for high probabilities of implementation and high rates of application for the above-mentioned restoration activities.

Moist Forest PVG Assumptions

The Moist forest PVG is likely to have lower probability of implementation and rate of application of prescribed fire than the dry forest PVG because fire regimes are most departed in dry forest (that is, most different from the historical range of variability).

Silvicultural treatments are likely to have similar probabilities of implementation and rates of application in moist and dry forest PVGs because dry forest is most departed and moist forest is most productive, leading to an expected "leveling effect".

The moist forest PVG is likely to see a higher probability of implementation and rate of application for silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire than cold forest because moist forest is more departed and has a higher priority for restoration.

The moist forest PVG will have more emphasis on commercial thinning (harvest) and dry forest will have more emphasis on precommercial thinning because the moist forest is more productive, producing larger trees, faster.

The moist forest PVG will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control than dry forest and higher than cold forest. These differences are attributable to differential susceptibilities of these PVGs to invasion by noxious weeds.

The moist forest PVG will have a lower probability of implementation and rate of application for rangeland management than dry forest and higher than cold forest.

Cold Forest PVG Assumptions

In the cold forest PVG, silvicultural treatments are not expected in MAC1 areas, A1 subwatersheds, or T

watersheds because most of these areas are within designated wilderness areas.

In the cold forest PVG, there is a much lower emphasis on silvicultural treatments and a slightly lower emphasis on prescribed fire, compared to Moist forest because cold forest is less departed (less different from the historical range of variability).

Dry Grass PVG Assumptions

No timber harvest will occur in the dry grass PVG. Management direction does permit some harvest of timber (ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir, for example) in dry grass, particularly where trees have encroached into dry grass because of fire suppression, excessive livestock grazing pressure, and other activities. However, it did not seem possible to translate this into specific pixels where management prescriptions could be applied.

There will be generally low incidence of prescribed fire in dry grass because fire increases the risk of invasion and establishment of noxious weeds and other exotic undesirable plants (such as cheatgrass). Dry grass is the PVG most susceptible to invasion by noxious weeds and other exotic undesirable plants.

There will generally be a higher incidence of prescribed fire inside high restoration priority subbasins.

No old forest is assumed to be present within the dry grass PVG.

The probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control are higher in the dry grass PVG than in the dry shrub PVG.

Dry Shrub PVG Assumptions

The probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control are higher in the dry shrub PVG than in the cool shrub PVG. In general,

dry shrub sustains a greater susceptibility to noxious weed invasion and spread compared to cool shrub.

The probability of implementation and rate of application for prescribed burning are greater in the dry shrub PVG compared to dry grass.

No timber harvest will occur in the dry shrub PVG. Management direction does permit some harvest of timber (western juniper, for example) in dry shrub, particularly where woodlands have encroached into dry shrub because of fire suppression, excessive livestock grazing pressure, and other activities. However, it did not seem possible to translate this into specific pixels where management prescriptions could be applied.

Cool Shrub PVG Assumptions

The cool shrub PVG generally has the highest probability of implementation and rate of application for prescribed fire among rangeland PVGs because cool shrub is a relatively productive PVG where shrub and/or herbaceous fuel loads accumulate more rapidly and where historical fire frequency was relatively more frequent.

The cool shrub PVG has the lowest probability of implementation and rate of application for noxious weed control because cool shrub (compared to dry grass and dry shrub) is least susceptible to noxious weed invasion and spread.

No timber harvest will occur in the cool shrub PVG. Management direction does permit some harvest of timber (Douglas-fir, for example) in cool shrub, particularly where forest has encroached into cool shrub because of fire suppression, excessive livestock grazing pressure, and other activities. However, it did not seem possible to translate this into specific pixels where management prescriptions could be applied.

Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Alternatives

The following management prescription sets were used to model the Supplemental Draft EIS alternatives. These recommended prescriptions are referenced in Tables 1–6, later in this section.

H1 Prescription set to model 100-year and 400-year simulations of HRV.

Ecological Restoration Prescriptions

A1 Prescription set with moderate levels of ecological restoration. Generally designed for areas that have moderate departure from HRV, in areas with road access.

A2 Prescription set with moderate levels of ecological restoration. Generally designed for areas that have moderate departure from HRV, in areas with road access.

A3 Prescription set with moderate levels of ecological restoration. Generally designed for areas that have high departure from HRV, in areas with road access.

N1 Prescription set with low levels of ecological restoration. Generally designed for maintenance of areas that have low departure from HRV.

N4 Prescription set with low levels of ecological restoration, typically for use in visually sensitive areas or where the objective has mixed traditional and ecological restoration objectives. Generally designed for areas that have low departure from HRV.

Traditional Reserve Management Prescriptions (Wilderness and Semi-primitive Roadless Areas)

C1 Prescription set for traditional wilderness, park, and semi-primitive area management with minimal ecological mitigation.

N6 Prescription set for traditional wilderness and semi-primitive area management with minimal ecological mitigation.

P1 Prescription set for traditional reserve management with low probability of successful wildfire suppression.

Traditional Commodity Management Prescriptions

C2 Prescription set for traditional commodity and resource value production at high levels with some ecological mitigation.

C3 Prescription set for traditional commodity and resource value production at high levels with no ecological mitigation.

N3 Prescription set for traditional commodity and resource value production at moderate levels and some ecological mitigation with higher livestock grazing than N8, and low probability of successful wildfire suppression.

N5 Prescription set for moderate level traditional commodity and resource value production with low emphasis on exotic weed control on rangeland.

N8 Prescription set for traditional commodity and resource value production at moderate levels and some ecological mitigation.

P3 Prescription set for traditional commodity and resource value production at very high levels with no ecological mitigation.

Traditional Management in Visually or Environmentally Sensitive Areas Prescriptions

N2 Prescription set for moderate level traditional commodity and resource value production in visually sensitive areas with somewhat higher livestock grazing than N7 and minimal ecological mitigation.

N7 Prescription set for moderate level traditional commodity and resource value production in visually sensitive areas with minimal ecological mitigation.

P2 Prescription set for minimal levels of management in visually sensitive areas with no ecological mitigation and low probability of successful wildfire suppression.

Table 1. Dry Forest PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N1, C1, N6, A1, P1
2	A1	prob: VL rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	N4, A1, C1, N6
3	T	prob: VL rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N4, A1, C1, N6
4	URWI	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M/H rate: M/L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: L/M	A2, A3
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N4, C1, N6, A1
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	N4, P1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N1, A1, C1, N6, P1
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N2, N7
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	N4, C1, N6, A2, N2, N7
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: L/M	N4, C1, N6, A1
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N7, A1
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, A2

Table 1. Dry Forest PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/ Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A2
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A2
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M/L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2
17	Bio/Econ	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3
18	Bio/Aq	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M/L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2
19	Bio/Tr	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: H	A3
20	Econ/Tr	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	A3
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M/L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2
22	Biophys	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: H	A2
23	Economic	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	A3
24	Aquatic	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	N4,A2
25	Tribal	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: M	A3
26	Base level	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M/L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	higher rate of Rx fire & thinning and slightly more aq/hydro rest. than S1.

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Table 2. Moist Forest PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N	prob:L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob:VL rate: L	N, C1, N6 A1, P1
2	A1	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	N4, A1, C1, N6
3	T	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N4, A1, C1, N6
4	URWI	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	A3 ,A2, N7
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob:L/M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N4, C1, N6, A1
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob:L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob:M rate: L	N4, P1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob:L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N1, A 1, C1, N6, P1
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: L rate: M	prob:L rate: L	prob:L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	N4,N2, N7
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: H rate: L/M	prob:L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob:H rate: H	N4, C1,N6, A2, N2, N7
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: M rate: L	prob:L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: L/M	N4,C1,N6,A1
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob:L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N7, A1
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: M rate: M	prob:L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, A2

Table 2. Moist Forest PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A2,N7
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A2,N7
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3,A2, N7
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	A2,N7
17	Bio/Econ	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3,A2, N7
18	Bio/Aq	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	A2,N7
19	Bio/Tr	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3,A2, N7
20	Econ/Tr	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	A3,A2, N7
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2,N7
22	Biophys	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2,N7
23	Economic	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	A3,A2, N7
24	Aquatic	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	N4,N7
25	Tribal	prob: H rate: H	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	A3,A2, N7
26	Base level	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	higher silv and lower Rx fire rate than dry forest, slightly more aq/hydro rest. than S1.

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Table 3. Cold Forest PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N1,C1, N6, P1
2	A1	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	N1, N4, C1, N6
3	T	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N1, N4, C1, N6
4	URWI	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob:L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	N7, A1, A2
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	N4, C1, N6,
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: VL rate:L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	N4, P1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N4,N1,C1, N6,P1
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N4,N1
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	N4, C1, N6, N7
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	N4,C1,N6,
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	N4, N1
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	N4

Table 3. Cold Forest PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: L	N4
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: L	N4
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L	N4, A1
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N4
17	Bio/Econ	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: L	N4, A1, N7
18	Bio/Aq	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: M	N4
19	Bio/Tr	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	N4, A1
20	Econ/Tr	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	N4, A1
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N4
22	Biophys	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N4
23	Economic	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	N4, A1
24	Aquatic	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	N4
25	Tribal	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	N4, A1
26	Base level	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	a lower activity rate for all activities compared to the moist forest Rx.

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Table 4. Dry Grass PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvics	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N6
2	A1	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L	N6
3	T	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	N6
4	URWI	prob: N rate: N	prob: M/H rate: L/M	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	A3, C3
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	N1, A1
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	N4, N1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A1
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	N/A
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	A1, N1
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N1
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A1
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	N/A

Table 4. Dry Grass PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	A3,N1
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3,C3
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3
17	Bio/Econ	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3,C3
18	Bio/Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	A3
19	Bio/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	A3
20	Econ/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	A3,C2
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3
22	Biophys	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3
23	Economic	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	A3,C2
24	Aquatic	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: H	A3,N1
25	Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	A3,C2
26	Base Level	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	a higher rate of weed control over S1, shifting to more N7

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Table 5. Dry Shrub PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvics	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	N6, A1
2	A1	prob: N rate: N:	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: L rate: L	A1
3	T	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	N6, A1
4	URWI	prob: N rate: N:	prob: M/H rate: L/M	prob: M rate: M	prob: M/L rate: M/L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	N4, A3
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	C1,C2
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	N4, N1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A1
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	N/A
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	N1
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A1
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	NA

Table 5. Dry Shrub PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3, N1
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3,C2
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A3, A2
17	Bio/Econ	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3,C2
18	Bio/Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: H	A3, A2
19	Bio/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	A2
20	Econ/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	C2, N7
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	A3, A2
22	Biophys	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: H	A2
23	Economic	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	C2, N7
24	Aquatic	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M/L rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: H	A3, N4
25	Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: M rate: M	A3,C2
26	Base Level	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M/L rate: M/L	prob: M rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	N2

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Table 6. Cool Shrub PVG Storyline

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
1	MAC 1	prob: N rate: N:	prob: L rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A3
2	A1	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: M/H	prob: L rate:L	A3
3	T	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: VL rate: L	A3
4	URWI	prob: N rate: N	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M/H rate: M	prob: M rate:L/M	A3
5	A2 outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	A3
6	RCAs outside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	N4, N1
7	Unroaded outside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: L rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: M/H	prob: VL rate: L	A3
8	Old Forest outside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate:L	NA
9	A2 inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M/H	prob: H rate: H	A2, A3
10	RCAs inside HRP	prob: VL rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A2, A3
11	Unroaded inside HRP	prob: N rate: N	prob: H rate: M	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: VL rate: L	prob: M rate: M/H	prob: VL rate: L	A2
12	Old forest inside HRP	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	prob: NA rate: NA	prob: VL rate: L	NA

Table 6. Cool Shrub PVG Storyline (continued)

Cat	Area	Timber& Silvic.	Range Mgmt	Noxious Weed Control	Reduce Road Effects	Prescribed Fire	Aq/Hydr Restoration	EIS Team Recom. Prescrip.*
<i>High Restoration Priority Subbasins</i>								
13	Bio/Econ/ Aq/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: L	A2
14	Bio/Econ/ Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L	A3
15	Bio/Econ/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L	A3,C3
16	Bio/Aq/ Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M/H	prob: H rate: M	A2
17	Bio/Econ	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: L	A3,C3
18	Bio/Aq	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3
19	Bio/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: H rate: M	A2
20	Econ/Tr	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	A3,C3
21	Aq/Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M/H rate: L/M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A2
22	Biophys	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	prob: H rate: M	A3
23	Economic	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: M rate: L	A3,C3
24	Aquatic	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	prob: L rate: L	prob: H rate: M	A3,N4
25	Tribal	prob: N rate: N	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: M	prob: M rate: L	prob: H rate: H	prob: M rate: L	A2,C3
26	Base Level	prob: N rate: N	prob: L rate: L	prob: L/M rate: L	prob: M rate: L	prob: M rate: L/M	prob: M rate: L/M	N4,N2

* For management prescription descriptions, see the Management Prescriptions to Simulate the Supplemental Draft EIS Alternatives section, immediately preceding Table 1.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MAC1 = Management Area Category 1 (e.g., congressionally designated wilderness and wilderness study areas)

A1 = Aquatic A1 subwatersheds

A2 = Aquatic A2 subwatersheds

T = Terrestrial watersheds

URWI = Urban–Rural–Wildland interface areas

HRP = High restoration priority subbasins

RCA = Riparian Conservation Area

H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; VL = Very low; N = None; NA = Not applicable.

Rx = Prescribed/prescription

Funding Allocation to High Restoration Priority Subbasins in Alternatives S2 and S3

Introduction

The EIS team prioritized 40 subbasins as high restoration priority subbasins for Alternative S2 and 51 subbasins as high restoration priority subbasins for Alternative S3. This prioritization was developed from five “functional” resource priority maps: (1) aquatic, (2) old forest/rangeland habitat, (3) water quality (aka hydrologic processes & water quality), (4) economic, and (5) tribal, which were integrated to varying degrees through use of a landscape restoration priority map. The majority of the high restoration priority subbasins in alternatives S2 and S3 were rated either moderate or high for landscape restoration priority. These subbasins provide a moderate to high opportunity to increase restoration effectiveness and efficiency by achieving restoration of multiple resource needs simultaneously in an integrated fashion across landscapes (that is, landscape restoration). Other high restoration priority subbasins, particularly some of those labeled for tribal restoration and aquatic restoration, show low opportunity for restoration of multiple resource needs simultaneously.

It is assumed that current budget allocations will be used as necessary to meet local (administrative unit) restoration priorities. Any additional funding originating from ICBEMP will be allocated for restoration and divided among the subbasins which were designated as high restoration priority subbasins. However, because each high restoration priority subbasin does not have the same complexity of restoration issues and needs, a method that takes account of the complexity was developed to allocate the additional funding originating from ICBEMP among the high restoration priority subbasins.

Methodology: How Funding Allocation is Determined

General Methods

The method of funding allocation for the high restoration priority subbasins was based on three general premises:

1. Subbasins that are rated High for landscape restoration priority will receive larger allocations because restoration efforts here should provide more effective and efficient results. Subbasins that are rated Moderate for landscape restoration priority will receive an intermediate level of allocation. Subbasins rated Low for landscape restoration priority will receive the smallest allocations.
2. Within each of the three general levels of allocation (High, Moderate, and Low landscape restoration priority), subdivision within these levels is based on the number of high ratings for the functional restoration priorities. Subbasins that contain the most High ratings will receive larger allocations because of possibly more complicated restoration needs that dictate more complicated planning of restoration activities and mitigation of the effects across multiple resources. This could lead to higher costs of analysis.
3. Within these subdivision levels, a second level of subdivision is based on acreage of BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands. The more acres of BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands within a subbasin, the higher the allocation for restoration.

In summary, general funding allocation was influenced by three factors, with landscape restoration priority being the most influential, functional restoration priority being intermediate in influence, and acreage of BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands being least influential.

Specific Methods

1. The 40 high restoration priority subbasins for Alternative S2 and the 51 high restoration priority subbasins for Alternative S3 were sorted into three categories based on whether they were rated High, Moderate, or Low for landscape restoration priority (see columns 1 and 2 of Tables 7 and 8). For Alternative S2, this resulted in 18 subbasins rated High, 9 subbasins rated Moderate, and 13 subbasins rated Low; for Alternative S3, it resulted in 20 subbasins rated High, 13 subbasins rated Moderate, and 18 subbasins rated Low.
2. Within these three categories of High, Moderate, and Low from Step 1, subbasins were subdivided based on the number of High ratings they had for functional restoration priorities (that is, Aquatic, Old Forest/Rangeland Habitat, Water Quality, Economic, and Tribal). In this classification, a subbasin with a greater number of High ratings was placed in a higher subdivision than a subbasin with fewer High ratings (a few subbasins had no High ratings). This resulted in four subdivisions (subdivisions 1–4) for the High-rated subbasins, two subdivisions (subdivisions 5 and 6) for the Moderate-rated subbasins, and three subdivisions (subdivisions 7–9) for the Low-rated subbasins (see column 3 in Tables 7 and 8).
3. An equal percent of the initial allocation was assigned to each subbasin within a subdivision. Proceeding down from subdivision 1 to subdivision 9 (see column 4 in Tables 7 and 8), lower percents were assigned to subbasins. For Alternative S2, percents were summed for each subdivision, resulting in the total percent allocation for each subdivision. The same was done for Alternative S3. Percent allocated for Alternative S2 equaled 99.5; percent allocated for Alternative S3 equaled 101.25. The assignment of percentages was subjective, with only two criteria used: (1) the sum percent needed to be near 100; and (2) percents needed to grade downward from subdivision 1 to subdivision 9.
4. The second level of subdivision—a weighting by BLM- and Forest Service-administered ownership, applied to the first level of subdivision—began in Step 4 by listing the number of acres of BLM- and Forest Service-administered land per subbasin (see column 5 in Tables 7 and 8). BLM- and Forest Service-administered acres were summed per subdivision.
5. Within a subdivision, each subbasin's BLM- and Forest Service-administered acreage was divided by the sum BLM- and Forest Service-administered acreage for the subdivision; the resulting quotients were converted to percents, and these are presented in column 6 in Tables 1 and 2.
6. Within a subdivision, the subbasin percent in column 6 was multiplied by the total subdivision percent funding allocation (column 4, used in decimal form). The resultant outputs are in column 7 and represent the percent funding allocation for each high restoration priority subbasin.

Table 7. Characteristics of Each High Restoration Priority Subbasin in Alternative S2 Used to Determine Funding Allocation.

Subbasin Number	Landscape Restoration Priority	Subdivision	Initial Allocation (percent)	BLM-FS* Acres	Percent of Total BLM-FS* For Subdivision	Percent of Total Budget
17070202	H	1	5	719226	26.49	6.62
17070201	H	1	5	677443	24.96	6.24
17010301	H	1	5	540624	19.92	4.98
17060104	H	1	5	483028	17.79	4.45
17070203	H	1	5	294272	10.84	2.71
<i>Total for Subdivision 1</i>			25	2714593		25.00
17010101	H	2	4	1185696	59.53	9.52
17070304	H	2	4	413351	20.75	3.32
17020004	H	2	4	208516	10.47	1.67
17050121	H	2	4	184314	9.25	1.48
<i>Total for Subdivision 2</i>			16	1991877		16.00
17010213	H	3	3	1003608	39.57	9.50
17010216	H	3	3	392090	15.46	3.71
17070105	H	3	3	373547	14.73	3.53
17040214	H	3	3	296971	11.71	2.81
18020001	H	3	3	186782	7.36	1.77
17060306	H	3	3	156642	6.18	1.48
17060107	H	3	3	77576	3.06	0.73
17070307	H	3	3	49165	1.94	0.47
<i>Total for Subdivision 3</i>			24	2536381		24.00
17010211	H	4	2.5	284610	100.00	2.50
<i>Total for Subdivision 4</i>			2.5			2.50
17050116	M	5	2	1037175	44.10	2.65
17050103	M	5	2	989774	42.09	2.53
17010215	M	5	2	324659	13.81	0.83
<i>Total for Subdivision 5</i>			6	2351608		6.00
17040212	M	6	1.75	742965	27.53	2.89
17120006	M	6	1.75	484275	17.94	1.88
17040221	M	6	1.75	421753	15.63	1.64
17040105	M	6	1.75	396756	14.70	1.54
17040215	M	6	1.75	349342	12.94	1.36
17070204	M	6	1.75	303621	11.25	1.18
<i>Total for Subdivision 6</i>			10.5	2698712		10.50
17060303	L	7	1.5	716763	74.63	2.24
17070306	L	7	1.5	243597	25.37	0.76
<i>Total for Subdivision 7</i>			3	960360		3.00
17060201	L	8	1.25	1466509	35.86	2.69
17060208	L	8	1.25	829129	20.27	1.52
17060307	L	8	1.25	755829	18.48	1.39
17060202	L	8	1.25	471624	11.53	0.86
17040104	L	8	1.25	465691	11.39	0.85
17070102	L	8	1.25	100800	2.46	0.18
<i>Total for Subdivision 8</i>			7.5	4089582		7.50
17050113	L	9	1	676670	29.55	1.48
17060302	L	9	1	656718	28.67	1.43
17030001	L	9	1	365649	15.97	0.80
17060209	L	9	1	350822	15.32	0.77
17060210	L	9	1	240383	10.50	0.52
<i>Total for Subdivision 9</i>			5	2290242		

BLM-FS = BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands in the project area

Table 8. Characteristics of Each High Restoration Priority Subbasin in Alternative S3 Used to Determine Funding Allocation.

Subbasin Number	Landscape Restoration Priority	Subdivision	Initial Allocation (percent)	BLM-FS* Acres	Percent of Total BLM-FS* For Subdivision	Percent of Total Budget
17070202	H	1	4.5	719226	26.49	5.96
17070201	H	1	4.5	677443	24.96	5.62
17010301	H	1	4.5	540624	19.92	4.48
17060104	H	1	4.5	483028	17.79	4.00
17070203	H	1	4.5	294272	10.84	2.44
<i>Total for Subdivision 1</i>			22.5	2714593		22.50
17010101	H	2	3.5	1185696	59.53	8.33
17070304	H	2	3.5	413351	20.75	2.91
17020004	H	2	3.5	208516	10.47	1.47
17050121	H	2	3.5	184314	9.25	1.30
<i>Total for Subdivision 2</i>			14	1991877		14.00
17010213	H	3	2.5	1003608	33.08	8.27
17010216	H	3	2.5	392090	12.92	3.23
17010103	H	3	2.5	384944	12.69	3.17
17070105	H	3	2.5	373547	12.31	3.08
17040214	H	3	2.5	296971	9.79	2.45
18020001	H	3	2.5	186782	6.16	1.54
17060306	H	3	2.5	156642	5.16	1.29
17010105	H	3	2.5	112659	3.71	0.93
17060107	H	3	2.5	77576	2.56	0.64
17070307	H	3	2.5	49165	1.62	0.41
<i>Total for Subdivision 3</i>			25	3033984		25.00
17010211	H	4	2	284610	100.00	2.00
<i>Total for Subdivision 4</i>			2			2.00
17050116	M	5	1.75	1037175	44.10	2.32
17050103	M	5	1.75	989774	42.09	2.21
17010215	M	5	1.75	324659	13.81	0.72
<i>Total for Subdivision 5</i>			5.25	2351608		5.25
17040218	M	6	1.5	876810	19.77	2.97
17040212	M	6	1.5	742965	16.75	2.51
17120006	M	6	1.5	484275	10.92	1.64
17050117	M	6	1.5	434855	9.80	1.47
17040221	M	6	1.5	421753	9.51	1.43
17040105	M	6	1.5	396756	8.94	1.34
17040215	M	6	1.5	349342	7.88	1.18
17070204	M	6	1.5	303621	6.85	1.03
17050112	M	6	1.5	248791	5.61	0.84
17040201	M	6	1.5	176422	3.98	0.60
<i>Total for Subdivision 6</i>			15	4435590		15.00
17060303	L	7	1.25	716763	55.84	2.09
17010104	L	7	1.25	323152	25.18	0.94
17070306	L	7	1.25	243597	18.98	0.71
<i>Total for Subdivision 7</i>			3.75	1283512		3.75

Table 8. Characteristics of Each High Restoration Priority Subbasin in Alternative S3 Used to Determine Funding Allocation. (continued)

Subbasin Number	Landscape Restoration Priority	Subdivision	Initial Allocation (percent)	BLM-FS* Acres	Percent of Total BLM-FS* For Subdivision	Percent of Total Budget
17060201	L	8	1	1466509	28.50	2.85
17060208	L	8	1	829129	16.11	1.61
17060307	L	8	1	755829	14.69	1.47
18010202	L	8	1	568759	11.05	1.11
17060202	L	8	1	471624	9.16	0.92
17040104	L	8	1	465691	9.05	0.91
17010206	L	8	1	292767	5.69	0.57
17040207	L	8	1	158598	3.08	0.31
17070102	L	8	1	100800	1.96	0.20
17010305	L	8	1	36320	0.71	0.07
<i>Total for Subdivision 8</i>			<i>10</i>	<i>5146026</i>		<i>10.00</i>
17050113	L	9	0.75	676670	29.55	1.11
17060302	L	9	0.75	656718	28.67	1.08
17030001	L	9	0.75	365649	15.97	0.60
17060209	L	9	0.75	350822	15.32	0.57
17060210	L	9	0.75	240383	10.50	0.39
<i>Total for Subdivision 9</i>			<i>3.75</i>	<i>2290242</i>		<i>3.75</i>

* BLM-FS = BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands in the project area.