

Summary of Alternatives for Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project as of 2/4/09.

■ **Alternative 1-No Action.** Under the No Action alternative, current management plans would continue to guide activities in the project area. This includes all ongoing activities with existing decisions or permits that would not be changed if this alternative were selected including: underburning, plantation maintenance, cattle grazing, recreation and recreation residences.

Note from Core IDT Meeting: All action alternatives would include all guidelines in “SNF Interim Guidelines for Pacific Fisher” as design features. This includes: Old Forest Linkages (300’ buffer associated with perennial streams with given treatment prescriptions); Groupings of conifers with increased basal area retention (20-30” dbh); Oak buffer-No fuels treatment under oaks that are >20” dbh for 35’ from bole or dripline whichever is greater (specified number per acre to follow this guideline).

■ **Alternative 2-Proposed Action.** Under Alternative 2, the development of Strategically Placed Landscape Area Treatments (SPLATs) would occur. Additional areas would be treated to provide a defensible fuel profile near key transportation corridors and with the defense zone of the wildland urban intermix. Treatments would include silvicultural and fuels reduction including thinning from below in conifer stands, either pre-commercially or commercially to reduce lower and mid-level canopy densities; mastication of brush and shrub patches; prescribed burning, both understory and piles; manual and /or prescribed burning of noxious weed infestations; and prepare and plant failed conifer plantations.

Notes from Core IDT Meeting: This alternative would require a LRMP amendment (for this project only) specifically SNFPA ROD 2004 Standard & Guideline #85 (Fisher Den Site Buffer) to allow for treatments for both fuels and forest health objectives within a known den site buffer, rather than limit treatments to surface and ladder fuels within WUI (fuels only objective). The 700 acre buffer would be created around the known den sites (those that are currently known) and a Limited Operating Period established (March 1-June 1) for that buffer. If new den sites were located during implementation, a 700 acre buffer would be established and an LOP established for that buffer, similar to New Nest trees (Spotted Owl/Goshawk) being located during implementation with no change to treatments.

RATIONALE: In the past, surveys are conducted during the planning phase of projects for Pacific Fisher as well as other species. These previous surveys have located fisher in the project areas; no den sites have been located. During the planning and survey phase of this project, with the incorporation of SNAMP and the extensive data collection techniques being implemented, den sites were located for 1 Female. Without SNAMP, it is anticipated that we will be unable to locate den sites in the future (based on the past) and will not have the budget to gather data to the extent (or intensity) that is being done here. The purpose of SNAMP is to study the effects of our “typical” implementation of the 2004 ROD. If the S&G #85 was used in its entirety, 700 acres of the project area would treat for fuels objectives only (for known den sites prior to implementation). And with the knowledge that additional den sites may/will be found throughout the course of the SNAMP study, this has the potential for the entire project area to be treated in the same way with no measurement of the effects of our treatments for forest health. With the incorporation of the design features listed above, denning habitat structures would remain even with implementation of treatments for both fuels and forest health.

■ **Alternative 3-Lower and Limited Mid-Level Canopy Treatments within Known Den Site Buffer.** Under Alternative 3, there would be continued focus on the development of Strategically Placed Landscape Area Treatments (SPLATs) creating a defensible fuel profile near key transportation corridors and with the defense zone of the wildland urban intermix, similar to Alternative 2. Known Pacific Fisher den sites would be buffered and a Limited Operating Period (LOP) implemented following SNFPA ROD (S&G #85). Treatments within this buffer would include the treatment of ladder and surface fuels (within the lower and limited mid-canopy levels)

needed to achieve fire and fuels objectives with the WUI. If a new den site(s) were located during implementation, a 700 acre buffer would be established and a LOP placed on the buffer (similar to new nest tree guidelines), but treatments would not change. Treatments outside of the buffer established for the known den site locations would remain the same as in Alternative 2.

RATIONALE: Because SNAMP is to be used to study the effects of the implementation of the 2004 ROD, then ALL currently written S&G's need to be implemented as written to measure their effects and/or effectiveness. This alternative would not require a LRMP amendment for this project.

■ **Alternative 4 Lower and Limited Mid-Level Canopy Treatments Addressing Fuels Objectives Only:** Under Alternative 4, the main focus would continue to be on the development of Strategically Placed Landscape Area Treatments (SPLATs) and creating defensible fuel profiles near key transportation corridors and within the defense zone of the wildland urban intermix. Treatments in these areas would include only those needed to reduce the surface and ladder fuels (within the lower and limited mid-level canopy levels) needed to achieve fire and fuels objectives. There would be no additional treatments (i.e. additional thinning in the mid-level canopy) to fully address stand density/forest health objectives.

Notes from Core IDT Meeting: This Alternative is based on the CBI modeling that shows that there is an 85% probability of fisher being located somewhere within the project boundary (confirmed), that there will be additional den sites within the project, the knowledge from current SNAMP data of fisher movement/den site locations and field/aerial photo verification/site specific correction of CWHR vegetation mapping of habitat (4D and 5D) of the project area. The entire project area would be considered a fisher den site with the Limited Operating Period established as such.

RATIONALE: We know that there are fishers and fisher habitat within the project area. If SNAMP were not gathering data on fisher we would know, with varying degree of certainty, that fisher are in the project area (possibly, but not where), know that there is habitat within the project area (CWHR veg. mapping with site specific field/aerial photo verification/corrections) and know that there is potential for fisher to den with the area (no means or budget to verify). With this Alternative, an analysis of the effects of not treating fully for stand density/forest health can be addressed for the entire project area. It addresses issues brought forward into the DEIS about perceived extent of treatments in fisher as well as other species habitat.