

**Summary of Alternatives for Sugar Pine Adaptive Management Project as of 12/11/08:**

- **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.

**Notes from Core IDT Meeting:** All action alternatives would include SNF Interim Guidelines for Pacific Fisher as design features. This includes: Old Forest Linkages 300' buffer associated with Perennial Streams with given treatment Rx's; Groupings of conifers with increased BA retention (20-30" dbh); Oaks buffer-No fuels treatment under oaks that are >20" dbh for 35' from bole or dripline whichever is greater.

- **Alternative 2-Proposed Action.** Under Alternative 2, the development of Strategically Placed Landscape Area Treatments (SPLAT's) would occur. Additional areas would be treated to provide a defensible fuel profile near key transportation corridors and within 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; prepare and plant failed conifer plantations.

**Notes from Core IDT Meeting:** This alternative would require a LRMP amendment (for this project only) to Standard and Guideline #85 (Fisher Den Site Buffer) to allow for treatments to include both fuels and forest health with no buffer created for currently known den sites. The LOP would be established, if den sites were found during implementation. This would be similar to what is currently being done if a New Nest Tree is found during implementation. (700 acre buffer is drawn and the LOP is established for that 700 acres).

**RATIONALE:** It is anticipated that the Fisher may use the same area, but not the same den site again. They move kits, possibly several times over the course of time. Without the SNAMP, it is anticipated that we will never know where den sites are in the future and will not have the budget to gather data to the extent that is being done now. 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.

- **Alternative 3-Lower Canopy Treatment with Limited Mid-level Canopy Treatment.** Under Alternative 3, the main focus would continue to be on the development of Strategically Placed Landscape Area Treatments (SPLAT's) and creating defensible fuel profiles near key transportation corridors and within the defense zone of the wildland urban intermix, similar to Alternative 2. But in this alternative, known fisher den sites would be buffered and a Limited Operating Period (LOP) implemented following Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Standard and Guidelines. Treatments within the den site buffer would include the treatment of ladder and surface fuels (within the lower and limited mid-canopy levels) needed to achieve fuels objectives within the wildland urban intermix zones. If a new den site(s) were located during implementation, a 700 acre buffer would be established and a Limited Operating Period within that buffer would be established (similar to that of New Nest Tree guidelines). Treatments outside of the den site buffer 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&Gs 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 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 (SPLAT's) 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 ladder and surface fuels (within the lower and limited mid-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 CBI modeling that shows that there is an 85% probability of fisher den sites being located somewhere within the project boundary, 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 (4M, 4D, 5M and 5D) of the project area. The entire project area would be considered a fisher den site with the Limited Operating Period imposed 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 within the area (no means or budget to verify). With this Alternative, an analysis of the effects of not treating fully for stand density can be addressed for the entire project area. It addresses issues brought forward into the DEIS about perceived extent of treatments in fisher habitat.