

PURPOSE OF THE FOREST PLAN

The Boise National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (hereafter referred to as “the Forest Plan” or “the Plan”) guides natural resource management activities on lands administered by the Boise National Forest. It describes management goals and objectives, resource protection methods, desired resource conditions, and the availability and suitability of lands for resource management. The purpose of the Plan is to provide management direction to ensure sustainable ecosystems and resilient watersheds that are capable of providing a sustainable flow of beneficial goods and services to the public. The Plan is the implementing guide for fulfilling the Forest Service mission of “Caring for the land and serving people.”

The Forest Plan embodies the provisions of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA), as amended by the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and its implementing regulations. The management prescriptions in the Plan are designed to realize goals for achieving desired conditions; however, future projects planned to implement those prescriptions will be largely dependent on annual budgets.

Forest Plan Revision

The original Forest Plan for the Boise National Forest was released in 1990. The NFMA regulations require that forest plans are updated or revised every 10-15 years. To meet this requirement, the Boise National Forest teamed up with the Payette and Sawtooth National Forests in the Southwest Idaho Ecogroup (hereafter referred to as the “Ecogroup”) to revise their Forest Plans together. The three-Forest or Ecogroup approach to Forest Plan revision:

- Applied an ecosystem management framework to management direction across the Forest. Through this framework, the Responsible Official, in consultation with the Forest Plan Revision Interdisciplinary Team, identified and prioritized areas at risk, and developed direction to maintain or restore sustainable and resilient ecosystems.
- Aimed for compatibility. Complete consistency across the three Forests is neither practical nor necessarily desirable. The Responsible Official, in consultation with the Interdisciplinary Revision Team, tried to achieve compatible outcomes relative to key Forest Plan direction. Consistency was emphasized for important issues or effects that transcend administrative boundaries.
- Collaborated with landowners across administrative boundaries to provide for compatible management direction. Collaboration included tribal, federal, state, county, and private entities that own or manage land within the Ecogroup zone of influence.
- Maintained an adaptive strategy using available information. As new information became available, the Responsible Official had the Revision Team incorporate it into the process as appropriate. This adaptive management strategy will continue after revision.

This revised Forest Plan defines the programmatic management strategy for the Boise National Forest for the next 10 to 15 years. However, the revised Forest Plan does not in itself implement any specific actions or projects. Rather the revised plan, through its land allocation prescriptions and management direction, sets the stage for:

- The actions needed to be taken, or not, to move toward desired conditions and goals;
- The management strategies (i.e., active or passive restoration, or conservation) that should be used to help frame when, where, and why action or inaction is needed to help move toward achievement of desired conditions during this planning period;
- The type of activities that are allowed or not allowed to best address management strategies and related Management Prescription emphasis and direction (i.e., MPCs);
- The intensity, duration, and limitations on management actions needed to manage risks and threats to resources and the social and economic environment, while maintaining or moving toward achievement of desired conditions.

The revised Forest Plans replace the 1990 Plan, which was amended by Pacfish and Infish¹ and associated Biological Opinions (BOs) for chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout (US Dept of Commerce NMFS 1995, US Dept of Commerce NMFS 1998, USDI FWS 1998).²

Ecosystem Management

In 1992, the Forest Service adopted ecosystem management as an operating philosophy (Overbay 1992). Ecosystem-based management has been described as “scientifically based land and resource management that integrates ecological capabilities with social values and economic relations to produce, restore, or sustain ecosystem integrity and desired conditions, uses, products, values, and services over the long term” (ICBEMP 1997a). An ecosystem management approach shifts emphasis from a traditional, single resource or species focus to a focus on ecosystems and landscapes. Ecosystem management also strongly considers the interactions between humans and ecosystems.

¹ NMFS states in their 1998 Section 7 Consultation on the Effects of the Continued Implementation of LRMPs on ESA listed Salmon and Steelhead in the Upper Columbia and Snake River Basins that “...a major weakness in Pacfish has been, and still is, the lack of a comprehensive aquatic conservation strategy [ACS] for list anadromous fish. Pacfish was intended to maintain or improve the environmental baseline while a long-term strategy is being developed. ... Indefinite extension of Pacfish, delays the recovery of salmon and steelhead, and increase the risk that key population segments will be irretrievably lost. Pacfish maintains a fragmented network of habitats and degraded habitat conditions, where they presently exist, because it lacks a comprehensive restoration and management strategy for watersheds with anadromous fish.”

² To address shortcomings of Pacfish, NMFS required implementation of the nine Action Agency BA recommendations and the five implementing mechanisms specified in their 1998 BO. The BO concludes that this additional interim direction will offer additional short-term conservation measures for listed species until a long-term ACS can be developed “...if all provisions, including accelerated restoration, are fully implemented”. (1998 Section 7 Consultation on the Effects of the Continued Implementation of LRMPs on ESA listed Salmon and Steelhead in the Upper Columbia and Snake River Basins.)

Some of the important concepts used in ecosystem management are described in the *Preliminary Analysis of the Management Situation Summary* (USDA Forest Service 1997) for the Southwest Idaho Ecogroup, and in the Introduction to Chapter 3 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA Forest Service 2003) that accompanies this Plan.

The Ecosystem Management Framework

For Forest Plan revision, the Boise National Forest has adopted an ecosystem management conceptual framework. This framework borrows from and builds on: (1) the current Forest Plan (USDA Forest Service 1990), (2) the Forest Service Region 4 *Desk Guide - Bridge to Revision* (USDA Forest Service 1993), and (3) *A Framework for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin* (ICBEMP 1996a). The intent of the framework is to integrate ecosystem elements with human needs to strengthen the essential link between economic prosperity, social continuity, and ecosystem processes and functions. Use of the ecosystem management framework will help provide for ecosystem resistance and resilience over time and space.

Ecosystem management recognizes that people are part of ecosystems and that collaborative stewardship may be able to address the complexity and controversy inherent in public land management. Furthermore, the ecosystem management framework will use adaptive management to improve our knowledge about environmental effects or the results of management actions, and incorporate this knowledge into future decisions and actions.

Ecosystem Management Components

The four basic components of ecosystem management are physical, biological, social, and economic, as well as all the diversity and connections contained therein. These components can be further broken down into elements. Examples of these elements include:

- Physical Diversity – the elements that comprise the basic building blocks of ecosystems, including geology, landforms, climate, air, water, soil, and hydrologic and soil processes.
- Biological Diversity – the elements that comprise life forms that live within ecosystems, including bacteria, fungi, plants, and animals.
- Social Diversity – the elements that describe how humans interact with ecosystems and how that interaction influences societies and cultures. These elements include human demographics, social organizations, attitudes, beliefs, values, and lifestyles.
- Economic Diversity – the elements that describe how humans generate goods and services from ecosystems and how those products influence economics. These elements include zone of influence, employment status, and economic opportunity and dependency.

These components represent the range of resources considered under the EM framework in this document, and most resources represent some combination of these components. For example, the timber resource manages tree vegetation (a biological element) to provide goods and jobs (economic elements) to support local community values and lifestyles (social elements). The

forested vegetation, in turn, depends on productive soils, oxygen, and water (physical elements) to grow. Indeed, most social and economic resources related to Forest management are heavily dependent on the biophysical resources for long-term sustainability. Put another way, sustainable goods and services are the product of resilient and properly functioning ecosystems. Thus, ecosystem management focuses on maintaining or restoring the biophysical components of ecosystems in order to sustain economic opportunities and support social and cultural values.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE FOREST PLAN TO OTHER DOCUMENTS

RPA and The Intermountain Regional Desk Guide

The Boise Forest Plan was developed and revised within the framework of national and regional Forest Service direction. The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA) and its implementing Program set direction and output levels for National Forest System lands. Goods and services are distributed based upon detailed, site-specific information concerning the capability and suitability of National Forest System lands being assigned various management activities and prescriptions at the Forest level. The Plan provides information for the RPA assessment and program updates.

Much of the Forest Plan revision was based on direction found in the *Intermountain Regional Desk Guide – Bridge to Revision* (USDA Forest Service 1993). Thus, Regional planning is a two-way street that conveys direction from the National to the Forest level, and transmits information from the Forest to the National level. While this planning Desk Guide ensures that a consistent approach to National Forest planning is followed throughout the Region, it also allows the individual Forests considerable latitude in formulation of their Plans.

Forest Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

During the Forest Plan revision effort, management alternatives were developed, analyzed, and compared, from which the Regional Forester selected an alternative for implementation. This Forest Plan represents the selected alternative, Alternative 7. The planning process and analysis procedures used in developing the selected alternative and Plan are described or referenced in the FEIS and supporting project record.

Relationship to Subsequent Multi-scale Analyses, Project or Site-scale Assessment and Planning

Management activities on National Forest System lands within the administrative boundary of the Boise National Forest will be planned and implemented in a manner that furthers the achievement of the goals and objectives described in this Forest Plan. Forest Plan direction serves as an umbrella for environmental analysis and project planning and implementation. Subsequent mid-, fine-scale analyses and project planning and implementation will be tiered to this Plan and its companion FEIS, as provided for in 40 CFR 1502.20.

Administrative Versus Proclaimed National Forest Boundaries

The Boise National Forest has both a “proclaimed” and an “administrative” boundary. There are an estimated 2,612,000 acres of National Forest System (NFS) lands within the proclaimed boundary of the Boise National Forest. Proclaimed Forest names and boundaries are designated by Congress and can only be changed by an act of Congress.

Administrative authority of National Forest System lands within the proclaimed boundaries of National Forests is shifted among respective Forest Supervisors for administrative efficiencies. The area administered by a particular Forest Supervisor is referred to as the “administrative” boundary. There are an estimated 2,267,000 acres of NFS lands within the administrative boundary of the Boise National Forest.

As shown on Figure I-1, the Boise National Forest administers NFS lands within the proclaimed boundaries of the Payette and Sawtooth National Forests. Likewise, the Payette, Sawtooth and Salmon Challis National Forests administer lands within the proclaimed boundary of the Boise National Forest.


This Forest Plan includes direction for the management of NFS lands within the administrative boundary for the Boise National Forest. This plan does not include direction for NFS lands within the Boise National Forest proclaimed boundary that are not within the administrative boundary. There are two areas within the Boise National Forest administrative boundary that are within the proclaimed boundaries of the Payette National Forest and the Sawtooth National Forest.

- The area within the proclaimed boundary of the Payette National Forest is east of Council, Idaho and south of McCall, Idaho. This area falls within Management Area 18 of this revised Boise Forest Plan. [Map Label 1a]
- The area within the proclaimed boundary of the Sawtooth National Forest is northeast of Mountain Home, Idaho and west of Fairfield, Idaho. This area falls within Management Areas 1 and 2 of this revised Boise Forest Plan. [Map Label 1b]

There are three areas within the proclaimed boundaries of the Boise National Forest that are administered by adjacent National Forests. Analysis and management direction for these areas can be found within the Forest Plan prepared by each of those Forests. These areas are:

- The Stibnite area in the upper East Fork South Fork Salmon River drainage, east of Yellow Pine is administered by the Payette National Forest. Direction for the area is in the Payette National Forest Plan. [Map Label 2]
- The Indian Creek, Pistol Creek, and Elkhorn Creek drainages in the Middle Fork of the Salmon River canyon are administered by the Salmon-Challis National Forest. Direction for the area is in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness Management Plan. [Map Label 3]

Figure I-1: Boise National Forest Proclaimed and Administrative Boundaries



- The Part of the Sawtooth Wilderness, including part of the South Fork Payette River drainage, near Grandjean, is administered by the Sawtooth National Forest. Direction for the area is in the Sawtooth Wilderness Plan. [Map Label 5]

There is one area with the proclaimed boundary of the Boise National Forest where the Salmon-Challis and Boise National Forests share administration. This area falls within the Frank Church – River of No Return Wilderness. Direction for this area is located in the Frank Church – River of No Return Wilderness Management Plan. This area is identified as Management Area 22 in the revised Boise Forest Plan. The Boise National Forest administers permits related to term grazing permits and special uses, such as outfitter and guides. The Salmon Challis administers all other management activities on NFS lands in this area. [Map Label 4]

Plans for Special Areas

There are two existing plans that were mandated by separate Congressional actions that cover lands within the proclaimed and administrative boundaries of the Forest. These plans, listed below, are referenced so that the reader will know which documents provide direction for those unique portions of the Forest.

- Frank Church—River of No Return Wilderness Management Plan (USDA Forest Service 1986)
- Management Plan for the Middle Fork of the Salmon Wild and Scenic River (USDA Forest Service 1985)

Existing Forest Plan, Permits, Contracts, and Other Uses

This revised Forest Plan replaces the existing Plan. All permits, contracts, and instruments for use or occupancy of the Forest must conform to the revised Plan's direction. However, because some existing permits and leases are already committed, they will remain in effect until they can be adjusted to accommodate direction in the revised Forest Plan. The Record of Decision for the revised Forest Plan provides the Responsible Official's direction concerning transition of the permits, contracts, and other uses to reflect direction of the revised Plan.

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE FOREST PLAN

The Forest Plan, as administered by the Forest Supervisor, provides direction for managing the Boise National Forest. The Plan contains the goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines needed to achieve the desired conditions for Forest resources. The Forest Plan is organized into the chapters and appendices described below. Subsections for the chapters and appendices are listed in the Table of Contents.

Chapter I – Introduction

Discusses the general purpose of the Forest Plan, the relationship of the Plan to other documents, and the Plan organization. Includes an integrated description of the Forest, as well as a breakdown of past and revised management prescriptions for the Forest.

Chapter II – Analysis of the Management Situation Summary

Describes the Need For Change in management direction for selected resources, the current condition of those resources, and how the Plan addresses the need to improve those conditions.

Chapter III – Management Direction

Presents management direction for the Forest as a whole, and for specific Management Areas. The first section provides Forest-wide desired conditions, goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines. The second section describes the resources of each Management Area, and provides more area-specific direction for the management of those resources.

Chapter IV – Implementation of the Forest Plan

Includes direction for implementing the Forest Plan, presents a plan for monitoring and evaluating the effects of management practices, and describes how the Plan will be amended or revised in the future.

Appendices

- Appendix A – Vegetation (Desired conditions, mapping, classification)
- Appendix B – Soil, Water, Riparian, and Aquatic Resources (Matrix, RCAs, LSP areas, ACS)
- Appendix C – Botanical Resources (TEPCS plants, trends, rare communities, cultural plants)
- Appendix D – Wild and Scenic Rivers (Results of revised eligibility study)
- Appendix E – Wildlife and Fish (TEPCS/MIS, habitat changes, lynx, elk vulnerability)
- Appendix F – Recreation (ROS definitions and implementation relationships)
- Appendix G – Land Capability Groups (Susceptibility to erosion)
- Appendix H – Legal and Admin. Framework for Forest Planning and Resource Management
- Appendix J – Utility Corridors

Glossary and Acronyms

Includes definitions of key terms, and commonly used acronyms.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE FOREST

The Boise National Forest is located in west central Idaho (see Figure I-2), north and east of the capitol city of Boise. Parts of the Forest are located in Ada, Boise, Elmore, Gem, and Valley Counties. The Forest borders the Sawtooth and Salmon-Challis National Forests on the east, and the Payette National Forest on the north. The Supervisor's Office is located in Boise. The Forest is comprised of five ranger districts—Mountain Home, Idaho City, Lowman, Emmett, and Cascade—with district offices located in each of those towns. The Forest is an administrative unit of the Intermountain Region (Region 4) of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Regional Forester's office is located in Ogden, Utah.

Physical and Biological Setting

The Forest administers an estimated 2.27 million acres of federal lands. A general description of the biophysical setting for the Forest appears below.

Climate

Climate patterns are typically moist and cold in the winter and early spring, and warm to hot and dry during the summer and early fall. The winter climate is influenced by mountain ranges that block most arctic air from entering the area. The deep Snake River and Salmon River valleys, however, can funnel dry arctic air into the basin where it often stagnates. In the late spring and summer, moisture from the Gulf of Mexico may move north and combine with warm seasonal temperatures and steep topography to increase high-intensity, short-duration thunderstorms. Late spring events generally have more precipitation, with 24-hour accumulations often greater than one inch. Dry lightning is more common during summer and fall.

Winter temperatures average between 29 and 9 degrees Fahrenheit. Snowfall ranges from about 55 to 70 inches, with greater amounts at higher elevations. Despite cold winter temperatures, occasionally warmer air off the Pacific Ocean brings rainfall mainly at elevations below 5,000 feet. This situation increases the risk for rain-on-snow events that can trigger floods and landslides. Increased exposure to maritime air masses creates moister vegetation regimes as one moves progressively north within the Forest. Maximum summer daytime temperatures can reach over 100 degrees at lower elevations, with higher elevations in the 80s to 90s. Growing seasons vary greatly, from less than 30 days in the alpine areas to over 150 days in the lower valleys.

Topography and Geology

Elevations vary greatly across the Forest, from 2,800 feet in the North Fork Payette River Canyon to nearly 10,000 feet atop Steel Mountain. This wide range of elevations encompasses a great diversity of geologic characteristics. At least five major landforms have resulted from past geomorphic processes:

- 1) High-elevation distinctive mountains and valley formed from alpine glaciation,
- 2) More subtle high-elevation topography formed by freezing and thawing processes,
- 3) Lands with sharply defined drainage patterns formed by stream-cutting action,
- 4) Depositional lands formed from eroded materials from higher lands, and
- 5) Lands formed by volcanic flows.

Geologically, the Forest is dominated by granitic rock, with inclusions of basalts to the west, and volcanic rock to the south. Major mountain systems include the Boise, Salmon River, and West Mountain Ranges. Much of the area lies within the Idaho batholith, the largest contiguous batholith in the United States. The batholith features steep slopes of coarse-textured soils that readily take in and transmit water. Unless these soils are disturbed, surface runoff is rare except during high-intensity storms or rain-on-snow events.

Water

Watersheds on the Forest provide a continuous supply of water to the Snake and Salmon River Basins. The annual water yield from the Forest has been recently estimated at just over 4,100,000 acre-feet. This water resource has many beneficial uses, including aquatic habitat,

recreation, irrigation, hydropower, and domestic water supply. The Forest has an estimated 9,600 miles of perennial and intermittent streams, and 15,400 acres of lakes and reservoirs, and contains important portions of the Salmon, Payette, and Boise River systems.

Vegetation

The wide range of landforms, elevation, and climate across the Forest has produced a wide variety of vegetative conditions. An estimated 76 percent of the Forest's lands are considered forested, or capable of supporting trees on at least 50 percent of the area. Common tree species include ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, aspen, lodgepole pine, subalpine fir, Engelmann spruce, and whitebark pine. Grand fir and western larch only grow in the northern portion of the Forest where conditions are somewhat moister. About 23 percent of the Forest is considered non-forested, or dominated by grass, forb, shrub, or brush species. Much of the non-forested vegetation is found at lower elevations or more southern latitudes, on dry southern aspects, or in high-elevation alpine settings. The Forest also contains potential habitat for Ute ladies'-tresses, listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

For the purposes of effects analysis and management considerations, the Forest has been broken out into forested, woodland, shrubland, grassland, and riparian vegetation groups. These groups are listed and described in Appendix A.

Terrestrial and Aquatic Species

The Forest provides habitat for close to 300 terrestrial species of mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. Elk and deer are the most common large animals, although moose, black bear, and cougar are also present. Habitat also exists for other wide-ranging carnivores such as wolverine and fisher. Bird species include sage grouse, great gray owl, northern goshawk, and many migratory land birds. The Forest also provides habitat for the bald eagle, listed under the ESA but proposed for de-listing, and an experimental/non-essential population of gray wolf. Habitat for the Canada lynx, listed as a threatened species, also occurs on the Forest.

An estimated 28 species of fish are found in Forest streams and lakes, including 11 species that have been introduced or moved to areas where they are not native. Native species include chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and bull trout, which are currently listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Other native species of special concern include redband rainbow trout and westslope cutthroat trout.

Social and Economic Setting

A general description of the social and economic setting for the Forest appears below. Social and economic analyses are conducted by the Forest Service to determine what effects the agency has on local communities and the people using natural resources. The human dimension component is an important part of ecosystem management. Impacts on communities were considered in resource decisions made in the Forest Plan revision process. Social and economic impacts were determined for each alternative analyzed.

Just as the Forest Service can directly or indirectly *affect* social and economic conditions, the agency is also *affected by* changes in attitudes, values, and public desires at both local and national scales. Conflicting opinions over the uses of public lands have increased the complexity of national forest management, and the number and types of laws governing natural resources. In many cases these changes have narrowed the decision space available to local managers.

In the Forest Plan revision process, counties and communities were a focal area of analysis for social and economic purposes, although international, national, regional, and state perspectives were also assessed. This approach differs from that taken in the original Forest Plan analysis, which examined effects on counties and communities, with particular emphasis on counties.

Counties and Communities

The socio-economic overview area for the Boise National Forest includes six counties and six communities within and adjacent to the Forest. The six counties are Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, and Valley. These counties were selected because they include National Forest System lands, and/or they have major social and/or economic ties to the Boise National Forest. The six communities are Cascade, Crouch-Garden Valley, Emmett, Idaho City-Centerville, McCall-Donnelly, and the greater Boise metropolitan area, commonly referred to as the “Treasure Valley,” which includes Boise, Nampa, Caldwell, Meridian, Kuna, Eagle and other incorporated communities in Ada and Canyon Counties.

Population Trends

Table I-1 shows population trends of counties within the socio-economic overview area. This table shows Boise County, which adjoins urban Ada County to the north and east, as the fastest growing of the six counties. Other rapidly growing areas in the same time period were Canyon, Ada, and Elmore Counties.

Table I-2 shows that nearly all of the six communities selected for in-depth analysis grew at least slightly during the 1980-2000 period. For some of these communities, growth was substantial, and much of it occurred during the 1990-2000 period.

The populations of the urban and urban-adjacent areas have generally been growing rapidly and are predicted to continue this growth pattern through the next planning period. Rural areas, on the other hand, have been fairly static, and populations are predicted to remain so or increase at a slower rate.

Table I-1. Historic¹ and Projected² Populations

County	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010	2020	1990-2000 Change	2000-2010 Projected Change
Ada	189,811	207,505	252,251	300,904	358,495	416,167	45%	19%
Boise	3,285	3,552	4,669	6,670	7,902	8,971	88%	18%
Canyon	87,815	90,639	109,123	131,441	155,288	178,676	45%	18%
Elmore	21,764	21,232	23,547	29,130	34,504	40,284	37%	18%
Gem	11,789	11,940	13,871	15,181	17,267	19,246	27%	14%
Valley	6,525	6,150	7,848	7,651	9,621	11,426	24%	26%
Idaho	977,617	996,553	1,149,284	1,293,953	1,506,581	1,717,847	23%	16%

¹"Historic" population figures (1985, 1990, 1995, 2000) are from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Regional Information System (Robison 1997, Robison and Gneiting 2002a).

²"Projected" population figures (2010, 2020) represent the median of projections compiled by Idaho Power and by ICBEMP (Robison 1997, Robison and Gneiting 2002a).

Table I-2. Community Populations: 1980-2000

Community	County	1980	1990	2000	90-00 Change
Treasure Valley ¹	Ada/Canyon	167,033	199,710	333,601	67%
Crouch	Boise	69	75	154	105%
Idaho City		300	322	458	42%
Emmett	Gem	4,605	4,601	5,490	18%
Cascade	Valley	945	877	997	14%
McCall-Donnelly		2,327	2,140	2,222	2%

¹For the purposes of this discussion, the "Treasure Valley" includes the incorporated communities in Ada County (Boise, Eagle, Garden City, Kuna, Meridian and Star) and Canyon County (Caldwell, Greenleaf, Melba, Middleton, Nampa, Notus, Parma, Wilder).

Economic Trends

The following are important economic trends within the Forest.

Payments to Counties

Counties that contain federal lands receive payments from the federal government as follows:

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 – The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) was signed into law on October 30, 2000. This law was enacted "to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public school, roads and other purposes" for fiscal year (FY) 2001 through 2006 (October 1 – September 30).

Before Public Law 106-393 was enacted, the Forest Service returned 25 percent of the revenues from the sale of forest products and permitted operations to counties which contain National Forest System land, through the "25 Percent Fund Law of 1908." The amount that a county received from each National Forest's 25 percent fund was proportional to the percent of the

Forest located in that county. State regulations stipulated that 70 percent of the funds were to be used for public roads, with 30 percent used to fund public schools.

Under Public Law 106-393, counties will have the option of continuing to receive payments under the 25 Percent Fund Act, or electing to receive their share of the average of the three highest 25 percent payments made to the State during the period of FY 1986 through FY 1989 (“the full payment amount”).

Table I-3 shows the 25 percent fund payments from the Boise National Forest to counties over the last several years, as compared to each county’s share of the full payment amount. The table indicates that the level of 25 percent fund decreased in the last several years, as linked to the decrease in National Forest timber sales on the Forest, and that for most counties, their share of the full payment amount would be substantially greater than that received in the past few years.

Table I-3. 25 Percent Fund Payments to Counties

County	Payment From:	FY 1985 \$	FY 1990 \$	FY 1995 \$	FY 2000 \$	FY 95-00 Change	County Share – Full Payment
Ada	Boise NF	1,575	2,228	3,199	1,785	-44%	5,900
Boise	Boise NF	326,165	461,663	773,627	415,685	-46%	1,354,700
Canyon	Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0%	0
Elmore	Boise NF	237,720	337,373	564,660	309,284	-45%	1,023,000
Gem	Boise NF	22,587	32,311	54,007	29,219	-46%	94,800
Valley	Boise NF	400,553	567,790	951,301	515,217	-46%	2,970,000
Totals		988,600	1,401,365	2,346,794	1,271,190		5,448,400

Data reflects only 25 percent payments from Boise National Forest; some counties may also receive 25 percent fund payments from other national forests. Fiscal Year (FY) extends from October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next calendar year.

Payments in Lieu of Taxes – Counties also receive payments from the federal government based on the Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Act of 1976. The PILT is a federal revenue-sharing program designed to compensate local governments for the presence of tax-exempt federal lands within their jurisdiction. These payments are *not* linked to revenues generated by the sale of national forest products or permitted activities. The Act authorizes payments under one of two alternatives, based on the acres of qualifying federally managed acres (“entitlement acres”) within the county, subject to a payment ceiling based on county population. The amount paid to the county is the higher of two alternative calculations. However, PILT payments are appropriated each year by Congress, and actual payments may be less than those calculated.

Table I-4 shows recent PILT payments for counties within the overview area. Between 1995 and 2000, PILT payments have increased, although in earlier years, payments had shown substantial decreases. In some counties, these decreases were compounded by similar decreases in 25 percent fund payments.

Table I-4. Payments in Lieu of Taxes

County	Entitlement Acres in 1995	FY 1980 \$	FY 1995 \$	FY 2000 \$	FY 95—00 Change
Ada	199,368	228,181	155,748	155,073	< 1%
Boise	890,101	143,132	89,767	131,080	46%
Canyon	20,528 (BLM)	N/A	16,005	16,152	< 1%
Elmore	1,292,889	1,135,204	595,145	681,614	-15%
Gem	134,324	117,247	13,547	96,685	614%
Valley	2,045,758	392,813	206,315	215,892	5%
Totals	3,472,971	1,645,264	1,076,527	1,296,496	

Native American Indian Tribes

No Native American Indian reservations are located within the Forest or the Forest's socio-economic overview area. However, the ancestors of the modern day Nez Perce, Shoshone-Bannock, and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes were present in this area long before the establishment of the Boise National Forest. Many of the treaties and executive orders signed by the United States government in the mid-1800s reserved homelands for the Tribes. Additionally, the treaties with the Nez Perce and Shoshone-Bannock reserved certain rights outside of established reservations, including fishing, hunting, gathering, and grazing rights. In addition, the Yakima, Umatilla, and Warm Springs Tribes have reserved certain rights to anadromous fish produced from the Forest.

The following excerpts from the treaties with the Nez Perce and the Shoshone-Bannock, and the Executive Order with the Shoshone-Paiute, provide examples of the rights that the tribes have, and where they can exercise these rights on the Boise National Forest.

Nez Perce Treaty of 1855: Article IV in this treaty states:

“The exclusive right of taking fish in all the streams where running through or bordering said reservation is further secured to said Indians; as also the right of taking fish at all usual and accustomed places in common with citizen's of the territory; and of erecting temporary buildings for curing, together with privilege of hunting, gathering roots and berries, and pasturing their horses and cattle upon open and unclaimed lands.”

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fort Bridger Treaty of 1868: Article 4 of the Treaty with the Eastern Band Shoshone and Bannock states:

“...but they shall have the right to hunt on the unoccupied lands of the United States so long as game may be found thereon, and so long as peace subsists among the whites and Indians on the borders of the hunting districts.”

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes Executive Order of 1877:

This Order set aside the Duck Valley Reservation for several Western Shoshone bands who traditionally lived along the Owyhee River of southeastern Oregon, in southwestern Idaho, and along the Humboldt River of northeastern Nevada. Later they were joined by Paiute from the lower Weiser country of Idaho and independent Northern Paiutes from Fort McDermitt, Camp Harney, and Quinn River areas and from the Owyhee region of southwestern Idaho, and both settled on the reservation to take up farming and ranching. The aboriginal Northern Paiute territory includes portions of southwestern Idaho, eastern Oregon, and northwestern Nevada. Management of these historically occupied areas are still of interest to the Shoshone-Paiute tribes today.

The Nez Perce, Shoshone-Bannock, and Shoshone-Paiute interest in the Boise National Forest goes beyond that of spiritual and cultural, to the unique legal relationship that the United States government has with American Indian tribal governments. Federally recognized tribes are sovereign nations who work with the federal government and its agencies through the process of government-to-government consultation. The federal trust relationship with each tribe was recognized by, and has been addressed through, the Constitution of the United States, treaties, executive orders, statutes, and court decisions. In general, these mandates protect and enhance the ability of the tribes to exercise treaty rights and cultural practices off-reservation. The federal trust doctrine requires federal agencies to manage the lands under their stewardship with full consideration of tribal rights and interests, particularly reserved rights.

Historical and Cultural Setting

The Boise National Forest, and the ecosystems it encompasses, is as much a product of cultural history as of natural history. Contemporary land use patterns have important historical antecedents that provide the context for national forest management. Past uses of the ecosystem may encourage, condition, or preclude certain management practices.

The following historical sketch outlines significant periods in the development of the Forest's landscapes. The overview is by no means inclusive, but rather presented to convey general themes and patterns of the relationships between humans and their environments.

The First Inhabitants

Native American Indians were the first known human inhabitants to live in and use the natural resources of what is now central Idaho. Spear points recovered from archaeological sites in the area document the presence of Paleo-Indian peoples in the area as early as 12,000 years ago.

The Boise National Forest is within the traditional subsistence range of the Shoshone, Northern Paiute, and Nez Perce Tribes. Historically, their life ways were seasonal and cyclical. They spent the winter in warmer climates along the lower elevations, and summer and early fall in the mountains, where it was cooler. At different elevations, they harvested different plants, fish and game. Within the Forest area, camas and salmon were critical food sources for the tribes.

For hundreds, if not thousands of years, Native Americans played an active role in Idaho's environments. Fire was the most powerful tool at their disposal. American Indians deliberately burned forests and meadows for a number of reasons, including forage regeneration and campsite and trail clearing. Fur traders and Oregon Trail emigrants traveling through southern Idaho frequently observed Indian set fires in the mountains north of the Snake River Plain. These fires were set in late summer and early fall as they left for winter camps in lower elevations.

Over time, ecosystems were conditioned to the effects of fires set by Native Americans. The practice was not widespread across the landscape, but instead focused on habitats that supported specific food plants. Deliberate burning enhanced camas and berry crops. Seasonal burning fertilized the soil, discouraged the invasion of undesirable species, and prevented forest encroachment into camas meadows. Hand tilling in camas meadows aerated the soil, creating conditions later receptive to Euro-American crops. Fires ignited to keep transportation corridors open spread into the surrounding forest, contributing to the open, park-like stands shown in early photographs of Idaho's forests.

In the 1870s, stockmen and then settlers converted camas meadows in the Payette River drainage and Camas Prairie into pasture and agricultural fields. Camas crop destruction was a leading cause of the Bannock War and Sheepeater Campaign of 1878-1879, in which settlers and government troops skirmished with Paiute and Shoshone trying to pursue traditional life ways on lands increasingly occupied by miners and homesteaders.

By 1900, most Nez Perce, Shoshone, and Paiute lived on reservations far removed from the mountains of central Idaho. They continue, however, to exercise off-reservation treaty rights such as fishing, hunting, and gathering on what was to become national forest. According to eyewitness accounts, Indians also continued to set fires when leaving the mountains. White settlers and Forest Service regulations for fire suppression eventually discouraged the practice.

New Arrivals and the Fur Trade

Euro-American exploration, settlement, and industry profoundly changed central Idaho's landscape. Capitalism and a free market economy introduced social, economic, and environmental changes inextricably associated with the region's abundance of natural resources.

Shortly after Lewis and Clark's Corps of Discovery explored the Pacific Northwest in 1805-1806 for the United States, Euro-Americans moved into the region. At the time, Idaho was part of Oregon Country, the ownership of which was disputed between Great Britain and the United States. Until the Oregon Treaty of 1846, when Britain relinquished its claim, the two countries jointly occupied Oregon Country.

The first Euro-Americans to arrive in central Idaho were fur trappers and traders working for British companies in Montreal. The fur trade opened Oregon Country to commerce. It was the first large-scale, corporate enterprise in the region, and the first to market Idaho's resources in a global economy. The demand for beaver pelts was enormous—the hat-making industry alone required an estimated one hundred thousand pelts to supply European markets. The British

quickly gained control of central Idaho. The Hudson's Bay Company sent its "Snake Brigades" to trap out the Snake River and its tributaries. In 1818, a party of fur trappers for the company named the Payette River in honor of their comrade, the French-Canadian, Francois Payette. He explored the Payette River and its tributary areas.

Though short-lived and on the decline by the 1840s, the fur trade had enormous environmental and social consequences. Hudson's Bay Company purposefully over trapped beaver, creating "fur deserts" to discourage American competition and settlement. Beaver occupy a special niche in forest environments, and their removal from certain watersheds initiated a host of complex, interconnected changes related to stream morphology, species composition, and disturbance events such as flooding and increased sediment loads.

The fur trade also changed relationships between Indians and Euro-Americans. Native American economies were drawn into new trading relations that transformed the way Indians perceived natural resources. Some tribes increased their hunting of ungulate species or began trapping beaver and other furbearers as commodities exchangeable for European trade goods. As a result, many became dependent on European trade goods, preferring them to traditional cultural goods.

Mining

In 1848, Congress made Oregon Country a United States territory. From 1848 until 1863, what is now Idaho was included at different times in Oregon and Washington territories. Mining was the impetus behind the establishment of Idaho Territory in 1863.

Emigrants and miners on their way to Oregon and California between 1840 and 1860 were unimpressed with the Snake River Plain. Southern Idaho was portrayed as a desert—hot, barren, and inhospitable to settlers and livestock. Although Goodale's Cutoff took thousands of travelers north into cooler, forested environments, the majority of Oregon Trail emigrants were unwilling to stop short of the Willamette Valley. Miners that were intent on California's gold fields largely ignored, for the moment, evidence of Idaho's mineral wealth.

In 1860, gold was discovered in northern Idaho, on a tributary of the Clearwater River. Miners, many of them depression-ridden settlers from Oregon, set out prospecting, and steadily moved south into central Idaho. In 1862, gold was discovered in Boise Basin. A year later, the basin's population of miners surpassed the population of Portland. Idaho's mining camps, like those elsewhere in the West, were remarkable for their ethnic diversity. Many of the miners were international immigrants from various European countries and Chinese provinces. By 1870, Chinese comprised thirty percent of Idaho's population. In Boise Basin alone, nearly half the population was Chinese.

Mining created new demands on central Idaho's natural resources. The industry required an enormous amount of timber to build and fuel mines. The effect that mining had on timberlands is clearly visible in historic photographs that show mining camps surrounded by cutover slopes. Mining, especially of placer deposits, also depended on vast amounts of controllable water. The industry built the first impoundments and diversions in the state. Mining reconfigured the physical and biological landscape—it moved vast amount amounts of earth, diverted the course of entire streams and rivers, and altered the composition, structure, and function of ecosystems.

Mining has continued to support Idaho's development throughout the twentieth century. The boom-bust cycle of mining prolonged the existence of mountain communities that otherwise might have become ghost towns. Agribusiness, however, has been Idaho's chief source of income since statehood. Today, mining's historical legacy contributes to the visitor's experience and provides educational and interpretive opportunities for the public.

Settlement

The demand of mining camps for agricultural products eventually encouraged settlement on the Snake River Plain and in forest valleys suitable for cultivation. Whereas settlement was initially a response to mining, goods and services from forest communities also supported regional urban development. In 1890, Idaho Territory became the nation's forty-third state.

Public land laws prior to the establishment of national forests promoted settlement in the West. The Homestead Act of 1862 and the Timber and Stone Act of 1878, were important in moving public land into private ownership. When national forests were later established, they often incorporated a mosaic of land ownerships with existing land use patterns.

Settlement imposed a new set of values on the use, allocation, and conservation of natural resources. Agriculture on the Snake River Plain could not survive without extensive irrigation development. Reclamation reached deep into central Idaho for the water necessary to support settlement and industry. The Minidoka Project, up and running by 1909, and the Boise Project, which included the construction of Arrowrock Dam in 1915, marked the beginning of extensive engineering projects within National Forests. In many cases, these water conservation measures ensured future water supplies, provided inexpensive electricity, and offered a variety of recreational opportunities. Dams, nevertheless, have also had environmental consequences, the most controversial of which are effects to anadromous fish.

Euro-American perceptions about fire, namely that it destroyed life and property, evolved into government policies and programs for fire suppression. Predators such as grizzly bears and wolves were also considered dangerous, and were eradicated from central Idaho. Conversely, Euro-Americans intentionally and unintentionally introduced or encouraged the spread of non-native plants and animals in the ecosystem.

Livestock Grazing

The livestock industry followed the 1860s mining boom into Idaho. Stockmen quickly divided into opposing camps. Prior to 1884, when the Oregon Short Line was built across southern Idaho, stockmen from other western states drove cattle across the territory on their way to stockyards in Cheyenne and Winnemucca. Mountain valleys north of the arid Snake River Plain became popular and highly coveted summer pastures. The range was unregulated, and serious overgrazing occurred, causing resentment among resident Idaho stockmen. Although the livestock industry had a reputation for opposing forest reserves, in Idaho, stockmen often petitioned for the establishment and enlargement of reserves to protect and regulate the range.

Prior to regulation, improved grazing practices, and progress in veterinary science, livestock had more impacts on the Forest. Overgrazing contributed to changes in the distribution and occurrence of native plant communities, erosion, and the amount of forage available to wildlife populations. Livestock can transmit disease, and this transmission played a role in the decline of certain species such as bighorn sheep.

The livestock industry made significant contributions to the development of Idaho's economy, and continues to support the state's rural communities. In the context of National Forest management, grazing was at one time widely believed to help the agency with fire suppression. Stockmen promoted the industry as a beneficial use of national forests, because cattle and sheep consumed much of the understory vegetation needed for the ignition and spread of fire.

Logging

In 1900, Idaho's economy received a much needed boost from a new industry—commercial logging. Prior to that time, sawmills and timber harvesting existed to meet the needs of mining and local settlement. Although independent contractors logged in the mountains of central Idaho, most of the small operators were eventually bought out by new companies with strong ties to Weyerhaeuser, a lumber giant from Illinois. Companies like Boise Payette Lumber purchased vast tracts of state and private lands, built large sophisticated mills, and established company towns within national forest boundaries.

Early loggers tended to prefer clear-cutting. Lumber companies commonly liquidated the timber, and then leased cutover land to stockmen who needed range. Cutover land was rarely rehabilitated. In 1924, Congress passed the Clarke-McNary Act to promote cooperation and incentives between federal, state, and private forestry for the improvement of private timberlands. Clarke-McNary programs focused on fire and tax relief, although there was a strong emphasis on convincing lumbermen to adopt better cutting practices. Over time, cutting practices did change in response to technological innovations, evolutions in silvicultural method and theory, federal laws and regulations, and prevailing public opinion about what constitutes responsible timber harvesting.

The timber industry was responsible for much of central Idaho's transportation network. When driving logs downriver through steep, rugged canyons proved unprofitable and highly dangerous, the timber industry persuaded Union Pacific to build subsidiary railroads into the Weiser and Payette River drainages to haul timber. The trains also carried passengers and freight, stimulating additional settlement. Although the Great Depression marked the end of the railroad logging era in Idaho, they continue to transport forest products to urban markets. In the late 1920s, Idaho lumber companies became famous for using a "modern" invention—the short bed log truck.

Forest Service Administration

The Forest Reserve Act of 1891 empowered the President of the United States to set aside forest reserves from the public domain. For decades, there had been growing public sentiment to protect what was left of American forests. In 1897, Congress passed the Organic Act, which

clarified the purposes for which forest reserves could be established. The act stipulated that reserves could only be set aside to protect and improve the forest, secure favorable conditions of water flows, and to provide a continuous supply of timber for the citizens of the United States. In 1905, the Forest Service was established to administer forest reserves.

The Boise National Forest was created from the portions of the original Sawtooth, Payette, and Weiser Forest Reserves. In 1905, President Roosevelt established the reserves to protect the timber and watershed values of central Idaho from unregulated grazing and logging. Forest reserves, however, were unpopular in the West. In 1907, western congressmen endorsed a law prohibiting the enlargement of forest reserves in Idaho except by an act of Congress.

The most immediate impact of the new agency was regulation of occupancy and use of forest reserves. Settlement on national forest lands was prohibited until the Forest Homestead Act of 1906 allowed entry to those lands deemed suitable for agriculture. Mining was also regulated.

The Forest Service quickly implemented grazing permits and allotments. Dividing the range between resident and non-resident stockmen, and between cattlemen and sheepmen, was a controversial process. Overgrazing was brought under control, though it escalated again during World War I, when Chicago packers, attempting to boost meat production, loaned money to western stockmen to increase their herds. The result was a rush on national forests for pasture.

The Forest Service also developed policies for timber protection. Foresters worked closely with local communities and industry to implement fire prevention regulations and procedures. In 1908, the Payette National Forest Supervisor, Guy B. Mains, and Boise Payette Lumber Company's land agent, Harry Shellworth, formed the Southern Idaho Timber Protection Association. Known as SITPA, the alliance became a model for cooperative forestry, influencing the Weeks Law of 1911 and the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924.

The Forest Service established a network of fire lookouts through central Idaho, many of them built by the Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC) during the Depression. These structures, some of which are still in use, are historic properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. They contribute to our understanding of Forest Service administrative history and CCC contributions to the conservation of the nation's natural resources in the 1930s.

The Forest Service sold timber from agency land, but only under certain conditions. National forest policy, prior to World War II, focused on supplementing, only when necessary, timber supplies from private land. The Forest Service also sold timber to meet local requirements, giving preference, when possible, to small, independent contractors. Disease and insect infestations were also occasions for a timber sale. After the war, however, private timberlands could not supply the nation's demand for lumber, and the Forest Service began selling more timber. That, combined with truck logging and technological advances in logging equipment, promoted road building and harvesting in steeper environments.

Recreation

One of the most obvious changes that occurred in twentieth century was the rise of recreation on public lands. A boom in outdoor recreation during the 1950s, related to post World War II increases in disposable income and leisure time, created an interest in natural environments and their aesthetic qualities.

Modern recreation, however, does have historical antecedents. Early national forest maps distributed to the public advertised scenic and recreational opportunities. In the 1930s, the Forest Service responded to the rise in recreation created in large part by the automobile. The agency began to approve special use permits for recreational residences and resorts, and employed the CCC to build public campgrounds.

The rise of recreation on national forests after World War II marks a departure point for federal agency management of public lands. Natural resources, though they retain their importance as commodities important to American society, are also prized for their non-market values. As a result, the Forest Service serves increasingly diverse publics. Today, the Boise National Forest manages the land as much for its wilderness and scenic integrity, biological diversity, recreational opportunities, and water and air quality, as it does for traditional uses.

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION

The 1990 Boise National Forest Plan emphasized the production of goods and services tied to the accomplishment of multiple-use objectives, including the production of wood fiber, maintaining or enhancing visual quality, providing recreation opportunities, and protecting and improving fish and wildlife habitat. The revised Plan strives to achieve desired outcomes for restoration or maintenance of vegetation and watershed conditions, including terrestrial, riparian, and aquatic habitats. Goods and services tied to accomplishment of multiple-use objectives will be the product of management actions designed to meet these desired outcomes.

Land management on the Forest is driven by the goals and objectives listed in Chapter III of the Plan. The Responsible Official, in consultation with the Revision Team, reviewed the goals and objectives in the 1990 Plan and found many to be still appropriate, and many that needed to be changed or strengthened. Similarly, some Plan standards and guidelines were also modified or deleted during revision.

Table I-5, on the following page, summarizes the changes in management prescription allocations made in the Plan. The Boise National Forest 1990 Forest Plan allocations, as amended by Pacfish and Infish and the 1998 Biological Opinions (i.e., Alternative 1B in the supporting FEIS), have been cross-walked to similar allocations values used in the revised plan to allow this comparison. Chapter III of the revised Forest Plan will described these allocations and their purpose in greater detail.

**Table I-5. 1990 and Revised Boise Forest Plan Management Prescriptions
In Acres and Percent of Forest**

1990 Plan Management Prescriptions	Acres	%	Revised Plan Management Prescriptions	Acres	%
1.1 - Designated Wilderness	64,000	3	1.1 - Designated Wilderness	64,000	3
1.2 - Recommended Wilderness	181,000	8	1.2 - Recommended Wilderness	183,000	8
2.2 - Research Natural Areas	8,000	<1	2.2 - Research Natural Areas	8,000	<1
2.4 - Boise Experimental Forest	7,000	<1	2.4 - Boise Experimental Forest	7,000	<1
3.1 - Passive Restoration and Maintenance of Aquatic, Terrestrial, and Hydrologic Resources	0	0	3.1 - Passive Restoration and Maintenance of Aquatic, Terrestrial, and Hydrologic Resources	126,000	6
3.2 - Active Restoration and Maintenance of Aquatic, Terrestrial, and Hydrologic Resources	0	0	3.2 - Active Restoration and Maintenance of Aquatic, Terrestrial, and Hydrologic Resources	284,000	13
4.1a - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Inventories Roadless Areas	0	0	4.1a - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Inventories Roadless Areas	28,000	1
4.1b - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Undeveloped Character with Allowance for Salvage Harvest	317,000	14	4.1b - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Undeveloped Character with Allowance for Salvage Harvest	0	0
4.1c - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Unroaded Character with Allowance for Restoration Activities	0	0	4.1c - Undeveloped Recreation: Maintain Unroaded Character with Allowance for Restoration Activities	567,000	25
4.2 - Roaded Recreation Emphasis	124,000	5	4.2 - Roaded Recreation Emphasis	31,000	1
5.1 - Restoration and Maintenance Emphasis within Forested Landscapes	672,000	30	5.1 - Restoration and Maintenance Emphasis within Forested Landscapes	504,000	22
5.2 - Commodity Production Emphasis within Forested Landscapes	820,000	36	5.2 - Commodity Production Emphasis within Forested Landscapes	400,000	18
6.1 - Restoration and Maintenance Emphasis within Shrubland and Grassland Landscapes	10,000	0	6.1 - Restoration and Maintenance Emphasis within Shrubland and Grassland Landscapes	64,000	3
6.2 - Commodity Production Emphasis within Grassland and Shrubland Landscapes	62,000	3	6.2 - Commodity Production Emphasis within Grassland and Shrubland Landscapes	0	0
8.0 - Concentrated Development	2,000	<1	8.0 - Concentrated Development	0	0
Totals	2,267,000	100	Totals	2,267,000	100