

**Comparison of PFC Recommendations to USFS Proposed Action**

The following table identifies a comparison of key concepts in the Payette Forest Coalitions (PFC) Recommendations for the Middle Fork Weiser River (MFWR) Restoration Project to the US Forest Service MFWR Landscape Restoration Project Proposed Action.

The table has been broken into three columns. The first column is a brief summary/interpretation of the PFCs recommendations, the second column identifies what the US Forest Service Proposed Action currently contains, and the third column lists noteworthy differences (if they occur) to ensure an understanding.

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences																										
<p>1. Retain or enhance the amount of large tree size class stands containing predominantly early seral species (ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and western larch) with low canopy closure in PVGs 1, 2, &amp; 5. PVG 6 encompasses a range of species composition.</p> <p>PFC estimated 1000 acres to be treated <b>BUT</b> expected the USFS to change this estimate with added data.</p> <p><i>Table 4: Priority One Objectives: Retain/Enhance Large Tree, Low Canopy Density Stands by PVG. Departure from desired condition (acres)</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="142 976 548 1195"> <thead> <tr> <th>PVG</th> <th>Departure from Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>365</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>487</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Total treatment is approximately 1800 acres</p>	PVG	Departure from Desired	1		2	365	5	487	6	1,000	<p><u>Commercial Thin-Free Thin (CT-FT) – up to <b>2,000</b> acres is designed to enhance large tree size classes.</u></p> <p>These treatments would generally be completed in forested areas dominated by mature, vigorous ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and / or western larch (<i>i.e.</i> - PVG 2, 5, and portions of PVG 6 dominated by early seral species) with canopy cover greater than 35 percent.</p> <p>Based on stand exams the USFS has determined that there are approximately 2,000 acres that have a seral species component.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="869 938 1310 1268"> <thead> <tr> <th>PVG</th> <th>Sum of Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>206</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>1574</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>193</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>2084</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PVG	Sum of Acres	2	53	4	11	5	206	6	1574	7	193	11	48	<b>Total</b>	<b>2084</b>	<p><b><i>PFC Recommendations are in PVG 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. Proposed Action includes PVG 7 and 11 and PVG 6 treatment would be 600 acres more than the PFC estimate.</i></b></p>
PVG	Departure from Desired																											
1																												
2	365																											
5	487																											
6	1,000																											
PVG	Sum of Acres																											
2	53																											
4	11																											
5	206																											
6	1574																											
7	193																											
11	48																											
<b>Total</b>	<b>2084</b>																											
<p>2. Accelerate the progression of the medium tree size class stands and plantations to the large tree size class in PVGs 1, 2, &amp; 5. Appropriate species composition for this priority is the stands containing early seral species.</p>	<p><u>Commercial Thin / Mature Plantations (CT-MP) – up to <b>1000</b> acres.</u> This treatment would be applied to stands that were previously artificially regenerated (plantations). These stands are typically greater than 30 years in age and were</p>	<p>Portions of the Proposed Action are consistent with the PFC recommendations while others differ.</p>																										

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
<p>In the case of PVGs 6, 7 and 10, no treatments are recommended in this priority category because the large tree size class is abundant. There is no need to accelerate the stand dynamics to attain the large size class.</p> <p>4. Accelerate the progression of small and medium tree class plantations to the medium and large tree classes in all PVGs. Appropriate species composition for this objective is stands containing early seral species.</p> <p>PFC recommends 62, 1,363, and 760 acres for PVGs 1, 2, and 5, respectively.</p>	<p>planted predominately with ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, and/or western larch.</p> <p>Most of these plantations are in PVG 2, 5 and 6.</p> <p>Within the medium size class in PVG 6 there are approximately 1,000 acres in that are being treated in FT-PC-MSw-SH and 300 acres treated in CT-FT. Additionally, there 110, 32, 40, 33 and 29 acres in PVG 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, respectively. These areas are being proposed for treatment.</p> <p><u>Non-Commercial Thinning (NCT)</u> – up to <b>3,000</b> acres. Non-commercial thinning would be completed in plantations that currently have density-related stress occurring.</p>	<p><u>Consistent Portions</u>                      The USFS acres are consistent with PFC in PVGs 2 and 5</p> <p><u>Differing Portions</u>                      The PFC recommended no treatments to in PVG 6, 7, and 10 because there was an overabundance of the large tree size class within these PVGs. However, the densities within the MP and medium tree size class are moderate to high. To increase their resiliency, thinning will be necessary in the higher PVGs. Additionally, since there is a deficit in the smaller age classes within PVG 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 some level of regeneration harvest is needed to create areas of smaller size classes (see the FT-PC-MSw-SH treatments).</p> <p><u>Consistent Portions</u>                      The USFS acres are consistent with PFC in PVGs 1, 2 and 5</p> <p><u>Differing Portions</u>                      The USFS and PFC are</p>

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences																				
	<p>USFS proposal is to treat the following PVGs</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="869 261 1493 699"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="869 261 1024 337">PVGs</th> <th data-bbox="1024 261 1493 337">Sum of Potential Non-Commercial Thinning Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 337 1024 378">1</td> <td data-bbox="1024 337 1493 378">48</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 378 1024 418">2</td> <td data-bbox="1024 378 1493 418">1,392</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 418 1024 459">5</td> <td data-bbox="1024 418 1493 459">364</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 459 1024 500">6</td> <td data-bbox="1024 459 1493 500">947</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 500 1024 540">7</td> <td data-bbox="1024 500 1493 540">113</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 540 1024 581">8</td> <td data-bbox="1024 540 1493 581">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 581 1024 621">9</td> <td data-bbox="1024 581 1493 621">9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 621 1024 662">10</td> <td data-bbox="1024 621 1493 662">102</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="869 662 1024 699"><b>Total Acres</b></td> <td data-bbox="1024 662 1493 699"><b>2,974</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PVGs	Sum of Potential Non-Commercial Thinning Acres	1	48	2	1,392	5	364	6	947	7	113	8	0	9	9	10	102	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>2,974</b>	<p>relatively similar in PVG 1 and 2.</p> <p>The USFS proposal is slightly lower in PVG 5 primarily due to new data from field inventories.</p> <p>The difference comes at the higher PVG s where there is an overabundance of Large size class. The intent of treating the larger size classes with FT-PC-MSw-SH treatments is to promote various levels of regeneration through harvest; these treatments would be done in concert with NCT of small size class trees. The process would be movement of stands through the development stages. Additionally, high tree densities reduce tree resilience, vigor and increase the chance of insect/disease outbreaks.</p>
PVGs	Sum of Potential Non-Commercial Thinning Acres																					
1	48																					
2	1,392																					
5	364																					
6	947																					
7	113																					
8	0																					
9	9																					
10	102																					
<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>2,974</b>																					
<p>3. Re-establish early seral species in stands where they have been or are at risk of being extirpated in PVG 6 where western larch and ponderosa pine is occasionally present in microsites.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>6. Reduce patch size in PVGs 7 and 10 where large contiguous blocks of high density forests exist to</p>	<p><u>Free Thin, Patch Cut, Modified Shelterwood, Selection Harvest (Group or Individual Tree) (FT-PC-MSw-SH) – up to 8,000 acres.</u> This treatment would be implemented primarily in relatively cool, moist grand fir, subalpine fir and lodgepole forest types (i.e. - PVGs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) that have evidence (i.e., - relic early seral trees, stumps, snags, etc.) of previously having had an aspen, ponderosa pine,</p>	<p>High percentages of PVG 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 have presence of early seral species that can be promoted. In addition these PVGs have higher levels of large tree size class and less</p>																				

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
<p>improve resiliency to disturbance and enhance fire management and protection capabilities.</p> <p>Information on existing patch size and target patch size and arrangement in PVGs 7 and 10 was not available when developing these recommendations, therefore no targets are provided.</p>	<p>western larch and/or Douglas-fir component. In some cases PVG 1, 2, and 5 may be treated with FT-PC-MSw-SH. This treatment would occur in stands that still have a component of early seral species (<i>i.e.</i>, – 25 to 75 percent of the desired amounts) but not enough to free thin throughout and still leave the desired species composition</p> <p>A shaded fuelbreak would be created using existing roads and terrain features on approximately 370 acres to provide areas to control large or emerging fires in a safe manner for firefighters and to provide protection to the values to the east of the project (Tamarack Ski Area and structures in this area).</p>	<p>of GFSS, sapling, small, and moderate size classes than desired. Varied treatments like the PFC recommends will be needed to move these stands into a desired condition.</p> <p><b>Establish varying patch sizes consistent with spatial patterns created by historic fire regimes. Retaining portions of stands that historically would not have been dominated by early seral species as skips. Skips are defined as portions of units not treated mechanically (Franklin et al 2013). These skips would not generally exceed 30 percent of a stand; (pg 12 of the PA).</b></p> <p><b>There is more than one objective with the treatments – specifically by creating openings to reduce the spatial heterogeneity within the higher PVGs we will create avenues for GFSS (which is deficient in these PVGs) to re-establish which will create resiliency within the forest.</b></p> <p><b>Currently, PVG 6 – 11 are</b></p>

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
		<p><i>deficient in lower size classes therefore there is little resiliency in the ecosystem. Example the spruce beetle targets larger diameter trees with those removed we have little replacement across the landscape. We need to stress that creating a multi-age system is a resilient and diverse system that responds better to disturbance. To do this, the FS needs to provide avenues for regeneration such as patch cuts and modified shelterwoods. Currently PVG 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 have high canopy closure in the large tree size classes – desired conditions in the Forest Plan Appendix show no high canopy closure within this size class.</i></p>
<p>5. Reduce surface fuel loading, reinvigorate native forbs, grasses and shrubs and promote aspen regeneration in all PVGs where appropriate to restore ecological function and underrepresented habitat.</p>	<p><u>Aspen Conifer Removal Treatment – up to 1,500 acres.</u> This treatment would be implemented in relatively cool, moist grand fir, subalpine fir and lodgepole forest types (i.e. - PVGs 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11) that have evidence (i.e., - relic early seral trees, stumps, snags, etc.) of previously having a dominant aspen overstory. The treatment would occur in stands that still have a dominant component of aspen present.</p> <p><u>Restoration treatments in stands with Low Densities – up to 1000 acres.</u> These stands typically have stocking rates not</p>	

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
	<p>conducive to commercial logging; however, in many cases they are considered overstocked for their relative site quality.</p> <p>Removal within these stands would focus on late seral species and trees affected by either insect or disease to reduce ladder fuels. Focus would be retention and daylighting the legacy western larch, ponderosa pine, and legacy-like Douglas-fir.</p> <p><u>Commercial and Non Commercial Thinning within Meadows (wet and dry) – up to 6,000 acres.</u> Both thinning (commercial and non-commercial treatments) and prescribed fire treatments are proposed in wet and dry meadows.</p>	
<p><i>Other factors to consider when determining which areas would provide the most opportunity to achieve all of the MFWR goals, including creating large blocks of habitat in PVGs 1, 2 and 5, include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to increase connectivity between blocks of high quality habitat.</li> <li>• Opportunities to clump leave trees within both commercial and precommercial thinning.</li> <li>• Opportunities to increase the amount of aspen.</li> <li>• Existing access to stands for mechanical treatment.</li> <li>• Where road decommissioning may reduce opportunities for future treatment, particularly in existing plantations.</li> <li>• Consider biomass removal in plantations over 35 years of age if a lop and scatter treatment would create an unacceptable fuel load</li> <li>• The consensus recommendation regarding Inventoried Roadless Area the following: no mechanized harvest in this Management Prescription Category</li> </ul>	<p>WHWO habitat is so widely distributed that any increase in source habitat would be a move toward creating large blocks. It may take decades to restore source habitat to the point of having large blocks. The WHWO section of the MFWR Landscape Assessment illustrates this point well.</p> <p>Clumping is planned in implementation, <b>see Draft Marking Guides, Proposed Action Appendix B</b></p> <p>See aspen treatments</p> <p>No new road construction is proposed</p> <p>The Travel Analysis Process identified roads needed for future management</p> <p>See Mature Plantation treatments in the Proposed Action</p> <p>There would be no vegetation treatment in the IRAs except for prescribed burning</p>	
<p>Where upland forest types consistent with the vegetation restoration objectives recommended in this document are</p>	<p>The Forest Plan Option 2 is proposed in this project. Option 2 requires less site-specific analysis but it more appropriately</p>	<p>Option 2 would provide a consistent starting point, if</p>

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
<p>adjacent to riparian vegetation or stream channels, use Option 3 as described on page 34 of Appendix B to delineate RCA boundaries. Option 3 uses an on-site analysis process to define RCA width based on the distance that best encompasses the extent of riparian functions and ecological processes.</p> <p>2. Give additional priority to using Option 3 RCA delineation techniques within large restoration blocks.</p> <p>3. Only implement treatments within designated RCAs where doing so will maintain or improve water quality or aquatic habitat.</p>	<p>tied to the landscape than a default distance might be and requires less intensive analysis than Option 3.</p> <p><b><i>This is a design feature of the Project as required by Forest Plan SWST10 (USDA 2003).</i></b></p>	<p>soil and water requirements can be met, treatment within RCAs would be included on a site specific basis.</p>
<p><b><i>In certain instances, RCA vegetation may also be at risk to high severity, stand-replacing wildfire due to the uncharacteristic density and fuel continuity as the result of years of fire exclusion. The PFC encourages the Forest Service to look for opportunities to reduce this risk using targeted treatments within the RCA and use an adaptive management approach toward understanding how best to reduce wildfire risk without significantly reducing the value these forests provide in maintaining water quality and fish habitat.</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>See Riparian Treatment Area, Proposed Action This is approximately ½ mile of stream corridor, or about 15 acres...Within this defined location, RCA treatments would occur up to the stream channel; treatments would include understory/overstory thinning and prescribed burning. Treatments would remove less than 40 percent canopy cover and would be developed in consultation with the district fish biologist and/or hydrologist to ensure streambank stability, large woody debris recruitment, stream shade, and ground cover are addressed and riparian functions are maintained or improved as required by Forest Plan SWST10 (USDA 2003).</i></b></p>	
<p><b>LARGE TREE RETENTION</b></p> <p>1. Include Douglas-fir trees under the large tree retention guidelines in the Marking Guide.</p> <p>2. Provide more comprehensive training for marking crews, particularly when using crews made up of seasonal Forest Service employees or contract markers (purchaser mark or 3rd party markers). Consider including conservation organizations and Society of American Foresters in designing and conducting this training.</p> <p>3. The Forest Service should provide additional supervision and more intensive monitoring of contractor marking to ensure that Large Tree Retention guidelines are achieved.</p>	<p><b><i>Purpose and need pg. 2:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>1b) Maintaining and promoting large tree forest structure, early seral species composition (for example aspen, western larch, ponderosa pine, and Douglas-fir) and forest resiliency;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>2) Maintaining and promoting legacy ponderosa pine and western larch and legacy-like Douglas fir;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Objectives pg. 4:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Objective 1: Move vegetation toward the desired conditions defined in the Forest Plan, with an emphasis on promoting large tree forest structure, early seral species</i></b></p>	

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
<p>4. Consider using 3rd party contractors to mark the legacy trees which are to be retained when Forest Service employees are not available to do this marking.</p>	<p><b>composition and forest resiliency.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Action pg. 9:</b>  <b>Legacy tree guidelines proposed for utilization in this project are included in Appendix A of the Proposed Action. Old tree and large tree retention would be accomplished through the use of marking guides, see Draft Marking Guides, Appendix B.</b></p>	
<p>SPATIAL CONSIDERATIONS                      Key species habitat presence, including lynx, goshawk, and pileated woodpecker, merit priority at a finer scale than the general treatment priorities discussed above.                      In addition, there is a need to design a spatial prioritization scheme that will produce post treatment a distribution of conditions reflecting the conservation principles referenced in the draft WCS.</p>	<p>Canada lynx (T), white-headed woodpecker (S, MIS), goshawk (S), flammulated owl (S), great gray owl (S), and pileated woodpecker (MIS) require specific management considerations, either from recovery plans, regional forester direction, forest plan direction, and/or agency management guidelines. Each of these wildlife species has different spatial requirements for mitigation of management activities.</p>	
<p>The conservation principles referenced in the draft WCS offer the following direction on spatial configuration of treatments relevant at the project scale: (See PFC Recommendations, pg. 14)</p>	<p>The landscape level restoration addresses the conservation principles as described in the Draft Payette National Forest Wildlife Conservation Strategy Report (Egnew, 2011).</p>	
<p>The desired condition for vegetation may conflict with elk habitat management goals within the watershed. Reducing tree density, for example, may open conditions to the extent that elk security areas could be compromised. Mitigation measures that compensate should be addressed, e.g. reducing open road density, implementing seasonal road closures and enhancing winter and summer range. The PFC recommends that the proposed action incorporate a review of elk calving areas, winter range and summer range with the objective to enhance habitat components that will support elk populations.</p>	<p>The Forest currently provides appropriate amounts and distribution of seasonal habitat for management of the elk population by IDFG. The IDFG population goals for the West Zone hunting units have been exceeded during the past decade. At this point, elk population management is truly a function of how IDFG manages elk hunting. The Forest contributes to this effort by attempting to provide elk security areas that are at least 0.5 miles away from open roads, at least 250 acres in size, and with an adequate amount of hiding cover to reduce the vulnerability of bull elk to hunting mortality.</p> <p>Because elk are grazers, they prefer open, grassy, lower elevation areas as winter range. The MFWR Project area provides this winter range component on most south-facing slopes and in the foothills along the west edge of the Project</p>	

Middle Fork Weiser River Proposed Action Comparison to PFC Recommendations from August 20, 2014  
Payette National Forest - December 10, 2014

<b>PFC Recommendations</b>	<b>USFS Proposed Action</b>	<b>Differences</b>
	area. Summer range is provided in the mosaic of habitats that occur on the Forest lands in the Project area. Calving areas, consisting mostly of dense shrubfields on hillsides, also occur throughout the Project area. These sites are usually protected through mitigation measures incorporated into the timber sale contracts and agency burn plans.	

**Watershed Restoration Treatments**

The watershed restoration treatment proposal is designed to reduce road-related impacts such as accelerated sediment and alteration of natural flow regimes, improve floodplain function and restore upland and riparian vegetation.

The proposed action includes road decommissioning, road crossing improvements and restoration, dispersed camping and user-defined OHV route management, road relocation, trail access improvements, and implementation of road maintenance, improvements, and closures.

The following tables present the existing road conditions, elements of the proposed action, and comparisons.

<b>Existing Condition</b>	<b>Miles</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Miles</b>
Forest System Roads	156.5	Forest System Roads	140.4
Unauthorized Routes	64.9	Unauthorized Routes	2.8
Miles of Open Motorized Access (Including Seasonal)	100.0	Miles of Open Motorized Access (Including Seasonal)	98.5

<b>Treatment Type</b>	<b>Miles/Number Proposed</b>
AOP Replacements	2
New Long Term Closure (Change from closed Level 2 to Level 1)	16.6
Decommission of Forest System Road	16.1 Miles
Decommission of Unauthorized Routes	62.1 Miles
Forest System Road Relocation	2.4 Miles
Manage dispersed camping	NA

<b>Subwatershed</b>	<b>Existing Condition Total Road Density (FS Lands/All Ownerships)</b>	<b>Total Road Density under Proposal (FS Lands/All Ownerships)</b>
Granite Creek-Weiser River	4.2/4.5	2.6/3.0
Jungle Creek-Weiser River	3.1/5.9	2.1/5.3
Mica Creek-Weiser River	2.6/4.9	1.6/4.1
Little Fall Creek- Weiser River	3.9/5.0	1.8/3.5

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences																				
<p>We encourage the line officer to be open to adaptive management, including modification of TAP road categories, based on the results of GRAIP analysis.</p>	<p>The GRAIP report is expect in winter 2014/2015. This information will be used in determining the appropriate treatment for roads, ranging from decommissioning to reconstruction or resurfacing. The TAP road categories are based on an evaluation of risk vs. benefit, and while GRAIP data may inform the IDT on the current condition with respect to sediment and some degree of hydrologic risk, there are other considerations that must be made before a road category is changed in the TAP.</p>																					
<p><b>...the PFC recommends the restoration prioritization displayed in the Table 8 - Spatial Priorities for Road and Recreation Infrastructure</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="107 722 810 1425"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="107 722 285 837">Watershed</th> <th data-bbox="285 722 417 837">FS Owner.</th> <th data-bbox="417 722 644 837">Forest Plan Restoration Objective</th> <th data-bbox="644 722 810 837">WCF Condition Class</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 837 285 959">Granite Creek</td> <td data-bbox="285 837 417 959">93%</td> <td data-bbox="417 837 644 959">Move Toward Appropriate Function</td> <td data-bbox="644 837 810 959">Impaired</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 959 285 1122">Mica Creek</td> <td data-bbox="285 959 417 1122">73%</td> <td data-bbox="417 959 644 1122">Move Toward Appropriate Function</td> <td data-bbox="644 959 810 1122">Impaired</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1122 285 1263">Jungle Creek</td> <td data-bbox="285 1122 417 1263">65%</td> <td data-bbox="417 1122 644 1263">Move Toward Appropriate Function</td> <td data-bbox="644 1122 810 1263">At Risk</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="107 1263 285 1425">Little Fall Creek</td> <td data-bbox="285 1263 417 1425">34%</td> <td data-bbox="417 1263 644 1425">Move Toward Appropriate Function</td> <td data-bbox="644 1263 810 1425">At Risk</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Watershed	FS Owner.	Forest Plan Restoration Objective	WCF Condition Class	Granite Creek	93%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	Impaired	Mica Creek	73%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	Impaired	Jungle Creek	65%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	At Risk	Little Fall Creek	34%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	At Risk	<p><b>The Proposed Action subwatershed restoration priority is 1 Granite Creek, 2 Mica Creek, 3. Jungle Creek, and 4. Little Fall Creek. See the Watershed Improvement and Restoration Treatments section in the Proposed Action.</b></p> <p>The Forest Plan, through standards, guidelines, goals and objectives, and through the Plan's Appendix B, provides direction regarding the restoration of watersheds to desired conditions. The WCF describes the condition of subwatersheds using indicators similar to those used in Forest Plan Appendix B. The MFWRLRP Proposed Action includes management actions that will move each of the affected subwatersheds further towards desired conditions as defined by the Forest Plan and the WCF.</p>	
Watershed	FS Owner.	Forest Plan Restoration Objective	WCF Condition Class																			
Granite Creek	93%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	Impaired																			
Mica Creek	73%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	Impaired																			
Jungle Creek	65%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	At Risk																			
Little Fall Creek	34%	Move Toward Appropriate Function	At Risk																			

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
<p>The Coalition supports a combination of treatments that are the least expensive, least intensive, and least intrusive actions possible that will make the most progress in moving all four watersheds toward Functioning Appropriately per Appendix B of the Forest Plan.</p> <p>(Road) Treatment options include, in no particular order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road surfacing</li> <li>2. Re-routing of roads and trails</li> <li>3. Road/stream crossing upgrades to improve hydrologic function and aquatic organism passage</li> <li>4. Seasonal closures</li> <li>5. Year-round closures</li> <li>6. Long-term closures</li> <li>7. Effectively blocking motorized access to closed roads</li> <li>8. Decommissioning by returning road prisms to a more natural state</li> <li>9. Rehabilitation of trails and supporting recreational facilities</li> </ol>	<p>System road treatments proposed throughout the project area include maintenance and/or improvement of Forest Service System Roads where needed. Approximately 18.9 miles of road would be placed in Long Term Closure status and approximately 16.1 miles of system roads would be decommissioned.</p> <p>Approximately 62.1 miles of unauthorized roads would be decommissioned. All unauthorized routes not needed for future management would be evaluated for restoration treatments.</p> <p>Currently, 72.7 miles of road are open year round and 27.3 miles are open seasonally to motorized use within the Project area.</p> <p>Reconstruction that replaces pipes will provide fish passage where needed.</p> <p>Culverts that restrict proper hydrologic function and passage of fish and other aquatic organisms would be replaced. These are (in priority order):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FS System Road 50186 at the MF Weiser River (reconnects over 5.5 miles of streams)</li> <li>2. FS System Road 50186 at Big Creek (reconnects about 1 mile of stream)</li> </ol> <p>See Recreation section for #9</p>	
<p>The Coalition recommends implementation of a combination of measures to maintain access to personal use firewood, including year-round and seasonally opened roads and firewood gathering as part of timber sales within the project area. The Coalition supports the personal use firewood policy as described in Personal Use Fuelwood Brochure for the Payette and Boise National Forests (2014). The PFC further recommends that any changes to the personal use firewood policy within the project area involve public input.</p>	<p>No change in the Firewood Permit policy is proposed in this Project.</p> <p>No change in access except for the seasonally and year-round open road that would be decommissioned (1.5 miles).</p> <p>Firewood would be made available by creating firewood decks for public use.</p>	
<p>The Coalition recommends that the FS analyze closed system roads and roads slated for year- round closure to determine the feasibility of opening some of these roads from July 1 through August 30, either annually or on a rotating basis, for firewood retrieval while still meeting wildlife and watershed</p>	<p>Closed roads used for timber harvest would be evaluated for firewood retrieval, including firewood decks made available for public use.</p>	

Middle Fork Weiser River Proposed Action Comparison to PFC Recommendations from August 20, 2014  
 Payette National Forest - December 10, 2014

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
restoration objectives. The analysis should identify resource concerns that can be mitigated when deciding whether to open these roads seasonally.		
Livestock permittees need access within and between drainages to properly manage grazing allotments. Obliterations and long-term closures that include pipe removal can make roads impassable to livestock and horsemen. Treatment of unauthorized roads, as well as system roads, should be coordinated with permittees. If risk factors necessitate decommissioning or long-term closure, consider crossing improvements to maintain permittee access.	The Proposed Action has identified roads that will have permittee coordination in decommissioning or other treatment.	
Where it is possible to do so while still meeting the objectives of the PFC to improve watershed function and wildlife habitat, roads identified for decommissioning or long-term closure should be evaluated for conversion to motorized or non-motorized trails. Roads that were built over historic roads or trails as identified by review of historical maps and atlas records should be considered high priority for conversion to trails. Analysis of these conversions should include an assessment of potential benefits and impacts, including potential maintenance costs, of converting some roads to trails that accommodate OHVs <70 inches wide. The PFC recommends utilizing the GRAIP model as part of these analyses.	The Proposed Action includes a 3-4 mile OHV loop trail in the squaw flat area, see recreation section. Historic roads will be identified in SHPO consultation and Adams County will need to identify RS 2477 routes.	
<b>Developed Recreation/Dispersed Recreation</b>		
At Cabin Creek Campground, replace the old restroom at the back of the campground with a new vault toilet. Widen or realign the road through the campground for easier ingress/egress.	Cabin Creek Campground: install and relocate one single vault toilet to replace existing one, add new site markers, new fee tube, information kiosk, accessible tables, accessible pathway to toilets, widen the road to accommodate large RVs.	
Horse Cabin Flat, evaluate potential for hardening to reduce resource damage; add equestrian facilities and a vault toilet.	Construct improvements to Horse Cabin Flat dispersed site including installation of a vault toilet, hitch rails, designation of camping sites with site markers and boulders to define the sites, graveling the area.	
Harden the crossing of Jungle Creek at the dispersed camping area to minimize resource damage.	Narrow and harden the crossing located at the MFWR/Jungle Creek confluence. In addition, harden the dispersed camping	

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
	area to minimize resource damage. Focus motorized access to the existing bridge approximately 300 feet from this crossing.	
<b>Trails</b>		
Develop a trailhead and parking area for the #205 Crystal Tr. Coordinate with Potlatch, as the most advantageous location is on private ground. TR #198 at Cabin Creek TH, create parking/turnaround on the old log landing and add hitching facilities. Formalize easement for this trail with Potlatch, and repair the road where access is blocked by a slide on #50591.	Establish trailheads with parking for the #205 and #198 trails. Both trailheads would require securing easements from Potlatch, the private landowner.  Work with engineering to repair the road where the slump is located to continue to provide access to the #198 trailhead.	
Evaluate reroute of a segment of TR#198 away from the wet flat to reduce resource impacts and improve sustainability. Consider relocating the trail segment (198) within the IRA and changing designation of that short section from non-motorized to two-wheel motorized so that the existing motorized trail is continuous.  TR#201 to 213/198 on Council Mtn – a connector exists on the ground and should be evaluated for adding to the 2-wheel motorized trail system.  Tr. #198 should be 2-wheel motorized throughout.	Motorized use is currently present and allowed within the Council Mountain IRA. To accommodate continued two-wheel motorized access on the entire #198 trail, change the designation of a short section (two miles) of the trail from non-motorized to two-wheel motorized use. Reroute portions of the trail near the base of Council Mountain to reduce resource impacts and improve sustainability.  Work to reduce congestion of multiple trail junctions in this sensitive upper elevation trail network. Identify mainline trails and sign, rehabilitate and close routes not on the system.	
Maintain and sign the #518 trail to Indian Mountain. Repair/restore places where users have created shortcuts on switchbacks on motorized trails.  Existing designed two-wheel motorized trails should remain on the system and be maintained or improved to minimize resource damage.  PNF should develop a color map of motorized trails in the MFWR and adjacent areas that would be separate from the MVUM.  Evaluate opportunities to harden areas near trails for parking and unloading to minimize resource impacts.	Perform trail maintenance (including proper signing) on 24 miles of existing open designed trail within the project area (this includes the #518 trail to Indian Mountain).  Partner with local communities to help develop information on the trail system.	

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
Partner with the Idaho State UTV club on donations of trail signs.		
<p>Re-evaluate the ATV trails proposed by Adams County. Roads identified for decommissioning or long-term closure should be evaluated for conversion to motorized or non-motorized trails.</p> <p>50166 – create a loop connector to 50485 Squaw Flat Loop.</p>	<p>Construct and formally designate for seasonal use, a new motorized OHV loop trail (trail open to vehicles 70 inches and less) using closed road 50166 and closed road 50485, to provide a motorized trail approximately 3-4 miles in length. This would require ½ mile of new trail construction to complete and close the loop. The under-laying roadbed would remain a closed road on the road system (Upgrade the road to a Level 2 road to enable culverts to be constructed where needed).</p>	
Add non-motorized TR#202 to the system and evaluate possibility of adding switchbacks to the steep pitch.	Sign and formally designate the former #202 trail as open for non-motorized use. Complete needed switchback construction to mediate the steep sections.	
<p>Meet with permittee(s) regarding how to avoid user conflicts between ATVs and livestock on the Bear Gap Trail #209. Work with Idaho Rangeland Commission for possible assistance with signage to educate users. Relocate the TH from private to FS property. Correct the mapping error so that FS maps coincide with actual trail location.</p> <p>TR#209 access roads that are seasonally open, consider changing Bear Gap #209 to seasonally open.</p>	<p>Relocate the trailhead for the #209 ATV trail onto Forest Service property. Complete heavy maintenance on the trail to bring it up to the proper trail standard for a Class 3 trail.</p> <p>Correct the map to coincide with actual trail location. Change the designation of the trail from open year round to seasonal, to coincide with other seasonal trail and road designations in the immediate area.</p>	
	Close and rehabilitate up to 2 miles of user created trail throughout the project area.	Added by the USFS to meet resource concerns (also a priority of the PFC)
50218 Jungle Creek: Evaluate for a connection to West Mountain Jeep Trail.		PFC recommendation not brought forward by the USFS. There is no trail in this area at this time. This is a steep area with heavy timber. Other trails offer a better opportunity. Field verification showed that this route is too steep and not suitable for

PFC Recommendations	USFS Proposed Action	Differences
52183000, an unauthorized route that TAP recommends for IDT evaluation could be converted to OHV trail to connect to West Mountain Jeep Trail.		a trail.  PFC recommendation not brought forward by the USFS Field verification showed that this route is too steep and not suitable for a trail. Needs to be closed and rehabilitated. Severe erosion problems.
<b>Snowmobile Routes</b>		
FS should protect groomed snowmobile routes and not gate or decommission roads that are being maintained for over-snow travel.	This would be included as a project design feature in the EIS document	

**PFC recreation related recommendations that require no change to current condition:**

- 51763 West Mountain Jeep Trail should remain open to 4WD throughout its length.
- 51899 TAP recommends decommissioning with permittee coordination. This may need further evaluation as to option to maintain this route. The USFS agrees, it should remain on the system and used as a connection to West Mountain Road to maintain this large motorized loop ride.

Listed below are recreation proposals from the PFC that are either outside the scope of the project, and/or located primarily on private land. These recommendations are not a part of the PA, but may be considered in connected actions and cumulative effects.

- Research the best route for a non-motorized trail from the vicinity of Cabin Ck CG to the scenic waterfall and work with Boy Scouts and/or other groups that are interested in building and maintaining this new trail. If necessary, work with private landowner to secure easement. The USFS encourages private groups to work with Potlatch on this proposal as it would be located primarily on private land.
- 50209 – Fall Creek connects to 50211 and 50214 on to Anderson Creek to provide good OHV opportunities. OHV use can and does occur on these roads at this time. These routes could be highlighted as available on the information trail brochure/map that could be produced during implementation of the project.
- Old Cascade Highway #50165 should be an open road. Currently a section of road from Five Points to Dewey Ck has a mile section that is seasonally closed. This road is not within the Project Area and will not be considered as a part of this project.
- 50591 – Cabin Ck to Middle Fork near White Licks offers an ATV loop opportunity. The USFS encourages private groups to work with Potlatch on this proposal. It is located almost 100% on private land.

Note: The Wyden Act focuses primarily on restoration for watershed benefits, not on providing for recreational opportunities.