Klamath Mountains

ECOREGIONAL ASSESSMENT

APRIL 2004

The Nature Conservancy

SAVING THE LAST GREAT PLACES ON EARTH

Klamath Mountains

ECOREGIONAL CONSERVATION ASSESSMENT

The Nature Conservancy
April 2004

CITATION:

Vander Schaaf, D., M. Schindel, D. Borgias, C. Mayer, D. Tolman, G. Kittel, J. Kagan, T. Keeler-Wolf, L. Serpa, J. Hak, K. Popper. 2004. Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Conservation Assessment. The Nature Conservancy. Portland, Oregon.

For questions regarding the conservation assessment contact the lead author at:
The Nature Conservancy, 821 SE 14th Avenue, Portland, OR 97214, (503) 230-1221

Acknowledgements

The Klamath Mountains Ecoregion Conservation Assessment was the product of many peoples' efforts that spanned three years of time. Some individuals participated throughout the entire process but most people were only involved for a portion of the time, contributing a discrete meaningful piece to the overall product.

This project was made possible through funding provided by The Nature Conservancy programs of Oregon and California. Significant resources and personnel time were also contributed by the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center and the California Natural Diversity Data Base.

The authors want to thank a number of people who assisted with the development of the conservation assessment and the final production of the assessment document. First and foremost the ecoregional assessment core team deserves praise for creating a conservation vision for the Klamath Mountains and then crafting a credible process to do the assessment. Louise Clemency assisted us in preparing for a rollout meeting of the assessment in May 2002. Rebecca Wahl did considerable editing on the assessment documents and did much of the layout for the appendices; Jerry Martin also lent a hand on editing and caught several mistakes that escaped the writers. Mary Finnerty was responsible for transforming the myriad of GIS data layers into legible maps that are integral to the final products. Claire Bronson produced our first graphically designed products and gave us gentle reminders when there were more deadlines to meet. Stephen Anderson coordinated with Claire and provided assistance with the brochure that is being produced simultaneously with the assessment report.

We also need to recognize the considerable effort that technical team members made to the entire assessment process. These people served largely as volunteers to the effort providing information, time and their expertise regarding taxa of concern, special habitats and geographies. The wildlife team thanks Eric Scheuering and John Roth for their assistance. The botany and ecological systems team thanks Roxanne Bitttman, Tom Atzet, Tom Jimmerson, Jim Strittholt, Jeff Campbell and Michael Murray for their assistance. The aquatics team thanks Jeff Dose, Al Olsen, Rich Nawa, Randy Frick, Bill Brock, Mark Bryer and Peter Moyle for review of conservation targets and their input in the development of the aquatic macrohabitat classification. We also thank George Stroud for his work in leading the peer review in California as well as helping finalize portfolio boundaries. Lastly we need to thank the many peer reviewers of the assessment whose comments helped us craft a better product.

Finally the assessment team would like to recognize the people who inhabit the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. They have long realized what a unique, diverse and special place this ecoregion is and they have provided continued encouragement to protect the biodiversity that is inherent there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary **5**

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW **8**

1.1 Introduction 8

1.1.1 Conservation Assessment for the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion *8*

1.2 Ecoregion Overview 9

1.2.1 Geographic Setting *10*

1.2.2 Ecoregional Subdivisions *12*

1.3 Planning Team and Planning Process 14

1.3.1 Ecoregional Planning Team *14*

1.3.2 Ecoregional Planning Process *16*

CHAPTER 2 – ECOREGIONAL CONSERVATION TARGETS AND GOALS **18**

2.1. Conservation Targets 18

2.1.1. Fine Filter Targets *18*

2.1.2 Coarse Filter Targets *20*

2.2 Sources of Distribution Data 22

2.2.1. Fine Filter Targets *23*

2.2.2 Coarse Filter Targets *24*

2.3. Representation Goals 24

2.3.1. Fine Filter Targets *26*

2.3.2 Coarse Filter Targets *27*

CHAPTER 3 – PROTECTED AREAS **29**

3.1 Definitions 29

3.2 Data Sources 30

3.3 Summary of Existing Protected Areas 30

3.4 Protected Areas Assessment 30

CHAPTER 4 – PORTFOLIO DESIGN **32**

4.1 Portfolio Assembly 32

4.1.1 Site Selection Units *32*

4.1.2 Site Selection Model *32*

4.1.3 Assessing Conservation Suitability of Selection Units *34*

4.1.4 Portfolio Design Process *36*

4.1.5 Site Selection Process *37*

4.1.6 Peer Review of Draft Portfolio *37*

CHAPTER 5 - CONSERVATION PORTFOLIO 39
5.1 Portfolio Summary 39
5.2 Terrestrial Portfolio Sites 39
5.2.1 Portfolio Results 39
5.2.2 Terrestrial Conservation Target Assessment 41
5.2.3 Unmet Terrestrial Conservation Goals 42
5.3 Aquatic Portfolio Sites 43
5.3.1 Aquatic Portfolio Results 43
5.3.2 Aquatic Target Assessment 44
5.3.3 Unmet Aquatic Conservation Goals 44
5.4 Terrestrial Point Sites 45
5.4.1 Target Assessment 45

CHAPTER 6 – ASSESSMENT OF THREATS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ABATEMENT STRATEGIES 46
6.1 Assessment of Single and Multi-site Threats 46
6.1.1 Threat of "Fire Suppression" 48
6.1.2 Threat of Incompatible Timber Harvest 49
6.1.3 Threat of Development 50
6.1.4 Invasive Non-Native Disease 50
6.1.5 Livestock Grazing 50
6.2 Threats to Aquatic Sites 51
6.3 Multi-Site Threat Abatement Strategies 52
6.3.1 Strategies to Abate Multi-Site Threats 53
6.3.2 Other Broad-Scale Implementation Needs 55

CHAPTER 7 – LESSONS LEARNED, SECOND ITERATION PLANNING 57
7.1 Data Gaps/Portfolio Design Limitations 57
7.2 Lessons Learned/Best Practices 57
7.3 Data Management 58

TABLES, FIGURES, AND APPENDICES

TABLES **Page**

Table 1. Land Ownership in the Ecoregion. 11
Table 2. Ecoregional Planning Team 16
Table 3. Conservation targets summary for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion 22
Table 4. Conservation Goals for Fine Filter Targets 26

Table 5. Conservation Goals for Ecological Systems in the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion 28

Table 6. Conservation Target Goals Met in Protected Areas. 30

Table 7. Distribution of Ecoregion and Portfolio Sites by State 40

Table 8. Number of terrestrial portfolio sites and their combined area per section and State. Note: some sites straddle the state line and are thus double counted; however, portfolio area is not double counted. 40

Table 9. Land ownership in the ecoregion and in the portfolio. 40

Table 10. Summary of Target Groups Meeting Conservation Goals 42

Table 11. Summary of Aquatic Targets Meeting Conservation Goals 44

Table 12. Threats Assessment Summary for Terrestrial Portfolio Sites 46

Table 13. Aquatic Portfolio Sites Threats. 51

FIGURES — Attached

Figure 1. Shaded Relief Map of Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

Figure 2. Land Ownership in the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

Figure 3. Aquatic Macrohabitats in Ecoregion

Figure 4. Anadromous Fish Distribution in Ecoregion

Figure 5. Level 1 & 2 Protected Areas in Ecoregion

Figure 6. Suitability Index Cost Surface for Ecoregion

Figure 7. Conservation Portfolio

Figure 8. Terrestrial Portfolio

Figure 9. Portfolio Ownership

Figure 10. Aquatic Portfolio

Figure 11. Fire Regimes Condition Class

Figure 12. Terrestrial Ecological Systems Map

APPENDICES — Attached

Appendix 1. Public Land Management Operational Units in the Ecoregion

Appendix 2. Budget for Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Assessment

Appendix 3. Rare Plant Targets

Appendix 4. Terrestrial Animal Targets (Herptiles & Molluscs, Mammals, Birds & Molluscs, Wide-ranging Targets)

Appendix 5. Fish Targets

Appendix 6. Critically Imperiled Plant Association Targets

Appendix 7. Ecological System Targets

Appendix 8. Aquatic Macrohabitats

Appendix 9. Experts and Literature Consulted for Aquatic Classification

Appendix 10. Variables Used to Construct Aquatic Community Classification

Appendix 11. Protected Areas in the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

Appendix 12. Peer Reviewers for Conservation Portfolio

Appendix 13. Conservation Portfolio Sites

Appendix 14. Terrestrial Portfolio Site Ownership

Appendix 15. Portfolio Point Site Targets

Appendix 16. Conservation Targets Represented at Each Portfolio Site

Appendix 17. Conservation Target Assessment

Appendix 18. Unmet Conservation Target Goals

Appendix 19. Aquatic Macrohabitat Representation at Portfolio Sites

Appendix 20. Terrestrial Portfolio Threats Assessment

Appendix 21. Potential Conservation Partner Organizations

Appendix 22. Glossary and References

Executive Summary

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion of northwestern California and southwestern Oregon is one of the most distinctive and complex ecological zones in the western United States. The ecoregion covers 52,792 sq km (20,384 square miles) of dramatic topography, extensive watercourses, unusual and varied geologic substrata, often-abrupt climate changes, diverse vegetation, and sensitive plant and animal habitats. The combination of these unique physical characteristics with the region's complex fire history has created a region rich in endemic plant communities. The dominant vegetation of the ecoregion is coniferous forest. However, the environmental and floristic diversity, combined with a long history of prehistoric and historic disturbances, primarily fire, has created over 400 natural vegetation communities and associations.

The ecoregion contains over 42,270 km (22,784 miles) of streams and rivers. While these watercourses largely drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and the Klamath River system, those on the southern end of the ecoregion drain into San Francisco Bay via the Sacramento River. Historically, this ecoregion is known for some of the best anadromous fish habitat in Oregon and California.

Ownership in the ecoregion is somewhat weighted toward public land that is managed for various purposes by federal and state agencies. The U.S. Forest Service manages 46% of the ecoregion, the Bureau of Land Management manages 10%, and 42% of the ecoregion is private land. Other agencies such as the National Park Service and state forests manage almost 2% of the area.

The goal for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion conservation assessment is to identify the suite of conservation sites and strategies that will ensure the long-term survival of all viable native plant and animals species and natural communities in the ecoregion. The planning team followed portfolio design procedures outlined in *Designing a Geography of Hope* (The Nature Conservancy (TNC), 2000).

The planning team, comprised of representatives from Oregon and California, worked on this effort from October 1999 through June 2002. The project cost approximately $200,000, which included $85,880 in new funds contributed by the field offices in California and Oregon. The Nature Conservancy's Geographic Information System (GIS) resources were used for all data compilation, data management, and analysis tasks of the planning team.

The first step in the planning process was to identify conservation targets, both coarse and fine filter systems and species for the ecoregion. The team identified 557 individual conservation targets distributed in both terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Considerable data, such as the distribution of all plant and animal species targets in the ecoregion, were obtained from the Oregon Natural Heritage Program and the California Natural Diversity Database. Data obtained from other sources included the predicted distribution maps for wide-ranging birds and mammals from the state GAP programs. The distribution data for wide-ranging fish were obtained from StreamNet (an aquatic information network based in the two Pacific Northwest states of Oregon and Washington), the State Heritage Programs, and the US Forest Service in California. Considerable data for invertebrate species targets were obtained from the US Forest Service Interagency Survey and Managed Species database (ISMS) that is maintained for the Northwest Forest Plan.

The core team developed data for aquatic community classification by using abiotic factors to classify and map aquatic habitats in the ecoregion. The aquatic classification model was developed in consultation with regional experts and after reviewing the relevant literature to determine the most important physical variables that distinguish natural aquatic communities in riverine systems.

The planning team set conservation goals for the representation of each target in the portfolio with the overall goal being the protection of the long-term viability of the targets. Conservation goals were developed based on three primary factors: the distribution of the targets across the ecoregion, the number of occurrences or amount of area occupied, and the degree of endangerment for the conservation target.

An essential step in the planning effort was to assess the existing protected areas within the ecoregion. This assessment allowed the team to determine the current level of biodiversity protection in the ecoregion. Existing protected areas also influenced the design of the portfolio of conservation sites. Existing protected areas are numerous and extensive in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. There are 62 federally protected areas in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion totaling 637,603 hectares, 17 state protected areas totaling 9,748 hectares, and an additional 55 private sites totaling 4,115 hectares. This amounts to nearly 12% of the land area (659,240 ha) in the ecoregion.

Due to the complexity of analyzing the variety and abundance of data for conservation targets in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, the planning team chose to use a site selection model to help design a portfolio that achieves the goals efficiently. The SITES site selection model was developed by Ian Ball at the University of Adelaide in conjunction with the National Center Ecosystem Analysis and Synthesis at the University of California, Santa Barbara and The Nature Conservancy for the expressed purpose of assembling ecoregional level conservation plans. The SITES model is an optimization algorithm that combines simulated annealing and iterative improvement modeling concepts to the portfolio design problem. One of the overall goals of the model is to minimize the cost or size of the portfolio.

The site selection process involved exporting the spatial distribution data for the conservation targets and their conservation goals to SITES, along with the existing protected areas GIS layer. Site viability was also assessed within the context of portfolio selection modeling. A Suitability Index reflecting road density, GAP management status, land conversions and other impacts in a site selection unit, was used to rank units for inclusion in the conservation portfolio. The team reviewed several iterations of the site selection run using different methods to build the draft portfolio. One basic decision was to have the model add potential conservation sites to the existing protected areas system in order to meet the conservation goals. The modeled solution constituted the first draft of the portfolio. The planning team reviewed and critiqued the draft based on individual knowledge of the ecoregion. The portfolio was modified to reflect the planning team's assessment of the first draft, and then the final draft of the portfolio was produced. The planning team used the final draft to solicit external peer review from a variety of partners, including public agencies, private organizations, and academic institutions. The second draft portfolio was modified to reflect the peer review and produce the final portfolio of conservation sites for the ecoregion.

The conservation portfolio for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion contains 62 watershed-based sites covering 2,151,141 ha, or roughly 42% of the ecoregion. Thirty-four of these sites are built around existing protected areas. In addition to the watershed-based sites there are 24 aquatic sites in the portfolio that are designed around buffered stream reaches that thread through watersheds. Finally, there were 146 point sites identified as a means to protect G1 ranked species that can best be protected at small, non-landscape based sites.

The aquatic portfolio was selected in conjunction with the terrestrial portfolio. Because small tributaries and streams are so intimately connected to the terrestrial landscape through which they flow, they were attributed to the watershed planning units and evaluated in the Terrestrial SITES runs. River reaches associated with larger streams in the ecoregion were incorporated into the portfolio without the accompanying watershed uplands. Finally, large rivers were added to the portfolio based largely upon salmon passage and lower river

rearing and spawning habitat. A total of 18,800 kilometers of streams were included in the conservation portfolio through this process.

Overall, the conservation portfolio meets nearly 100% of the representation goals for all conservation targets. The exceptions are confined to a few species targets that are more common in adjacent ecoregion sections and to several ecological systems and aquatic targets in the Umpqua Section which are reliant on modeled data.

Threats to the conservation portfolio were assessed on a site by site basis by the core team. Across the 62 portfolio sites 51 listed fire suppression as a threat, 45 sites had inappropriate forestry practices, 34 noted inappropriate grazing and 24 had invasive or alien species. Other threats that affected fewer sites were primary home development, mining and disease.

Initial strategies to conserve the portfolio sites in the ecoregion were developed in joint meetings between the California and Oregon TNC staff. One of the primary strategies that was identified for biodiversity conservation was to work on public land management policy, especially with regard to threats related to decades of fire suppression. Additional high priority strategies include conducting portfolio site inventories with partners, developing exotic species abatement plans, working with sustainable forestry programs and eliminating placer mining in key watersheds.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The mission of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is to preserve the plants, animals, and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. Outlined in *Conservation by Design: a Framework for Mission Success* (TNC 2000a), the ecoregional conservation goal is:

The long-term survival of all viable, native species and community types through the design and conservation of portfolios of sites within ecoregions.

From a conservation planning perspective, ecoregions are defined as "…relatively large areas of land and water that contain geographically distinct assemblages of natural communities. These communities (1) share a large majority of their species, dynamics, and environmental conditions, and (2) function together effectively as a conservation unit at global and continental scales" (Ricketts et al. 1999). The Conservancy has chosen the U.S. Forest Service ECOMAP framework as the base map of ecoregional planning units in the United States (Bailey 1995, 1998).

A portfolio of conservation sites is defined as those areas necessary to maintain the viability of conservation targets over time, including the ecological processes and patterns of biological diversity that sustain those targets.

1.1.1 Conservation Assessment for the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

The goal for the Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Conservation Assessment is to:

Identify the suite of conservation sites and strategies that ensure the long-term survival of all viable native plant and animal species and natural communities in the ecoregion.

This report documents the planning process and results of the portfolio design for this ecoregion. It represents an ecoregional assessment of conservation sites and a set of multi-site strategies for accomplishing their conservation.

The main products of this ecoregional assessment are:

1. **The identification of a portfolio** of sites that collectively conserve biological diversity in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

2. **A compilation of the comprehensive biodiversity information** and data that were used to develop the ecoregional assessment.

3. **A thorough documentation of the planning process**, portfolio design methods, and data management, so that future iterations can efficiently build upon past work.

4. **A plan of implementation** that assesses single and multi-site threats, describes ecoregion-wide strategies for their abatement, and sets site priorities for conservation action.

5. **An identification of the lessons learned** during the planning process and any innovative practices that result from the exercise. Obvious portfolio design limitations and important data gaps whose amendment would improve the comprehensiveness and quality of the next iteration are documented.

1.2 Ecoregion Overview

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion of northwestern California and southwestern Oregon is one of the most distinctive and complex ecological zones in the United States. Stretching across 52,761 sq km (20,371 square miles), its dramatic topography, complex fire history, extensive watercourses, often-abrupt climate changes create a region rich in natural beauty, diverse vegetation, and scientific value. The variability and richness of this region enhance its importance as an ecologically valuable tableau of endemic plant communities, eclectic geologic conditions, and sensitive plant and animal habitats.

Plate tectonics have played a major role in creating the complex mosaic of landforms and rock types in this ecoregion. Some 200 million years ago continental and oceanic plates collided, subducting the oceanic plate beneath the lighter continental mass and spawning volcanoes and earthquakes on the plate above. Seafloor that was scraped off onto the continental face as the rest of the oceanic plate slid below formed much of the Coast Range, while the mantle melted and rose through the continental crust as the volcanoes of the Cascade Mountain Range. The Klamaths began as an island archipelago that extended in a northwest line down from British Columbia and Washington. The island slabs, made up of distinctive layers of rocks and fossils, were carried eastward toward the North American landmass where they were bent, folded, and broken upon collision. As they were accreted to North America, succeeding slabs were thrust beneath each other and cemented to the mainland by granitic intrusives before rotating as much as 100 degrees clockwise (Orr and Orr 1995). This conglomeration of rocks has given the ecoregion exotic and displaced rock types such as ophiolites, which are rich in magnesium and iron, and mineralized with copper, lead, zinc, and serpentinite. Mafics, which are dark-colored igneous rocks high in magnesium and iron and low in silica and oxygen, and precious metals, such as gold, silver, copper, nickel and chromite, are found throughout the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Their presence is largely due to the sea floor spreading processes and more generally to the intrusion of plutonic rocks situated throughout the region.

The geologic underpinnings of the ecoregion are best thought of as a patchwork of folded, faulted, intruded, and metamorphosed rocks that comprise the main geologic features of southern Oregon and northern California. The Klamath mountain range of Oregon and California generally constitutes the region's western and southwestern borders, while the southern Cascades including Mt. Shasta delineate the eastern edge. The Rogue and Umpqua river valleys of Oregon serve as the northern border, and the southern edge of the region is bounded by the California Great Central Valley and Coast Ranges. A series of lesser mountain ranges, including the Siskiyou, Salmon, Marble, and Trinity ranges, are found throughout the south and southwestern boundary area, and Lassen Peak anchors the southeastern corner of the ecoregion.

Several additional features of the physical geography contribute to a landscape of complicated habitat mosaics and the extraordinary biodiversity in this ecoregion. Positioned among several distinct ecoregions, the Klamath Mountains are transitional between the Great Basin, the Coast Ranges of both California and Oregon, the Cascades, the Sierra Nevada, California's Central Valley, and the northern California coast. This distinctive geographic position has resulted in an extensive overlap of major plant communities. Numerous watercourses, including the extensive Rogue and Klamath drainages, dissect the rugged terrain, creating a range of aspects and elevations from sea level to over 3,000 meters. Little glaciation occurred in the ecoregion, which has resulted in maintaining refugia for species that have adapted to the unusual, hostile geologic parent materials. Exposed ultramafic substrates (e.g., serpentine and peridotite) and their floristic associates further contribute to a diverse landscape mosaic. Extreme climatic variations are superimposed over the entire region: there are strong differences in seasonal climates (extended cool, moist winter conditions and hot, semi-arid summers) and a west-east gradient in precipitation (from about 330 cm per year near the coast to about 74 cm in the eastern rain shadow). Because of the region's varied topography, these climatic variations

have produced a wide range of habitat types within a relatively small geographic area. As a result, a diverse assemblage of species, including reptiles, plants, avian fauna, amphibians, and mammals, can be found within the borders of the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

The diversity in vegetation of the Klamath Mountains, with well-known serpentine outcrops, bogs and extensive endemic flora, has been widely cited as among the most diverse in North America (Whittaker 1960, Kruckeberg 1984, Brooks 1987). The Klamath Mountains ecoregion consists primarily of a series of conifer forest ecosystems interspersed with smaller nonforested habitats such as meadows, oak savannas, chaparrals, and several types of wetlands. Nowhere else in North America is there such a concentration of cone-bearing species: 31 conifer species in 10 genera richly endow the area (Coleman and Kruckeberg 1999). The forests are often a mix of conifers and broad-leaved hardwoods from the oak, maple, birch, and laurel families. Forest types vary dramatically in response to special soil types and non-glaciated pockets that act as refugia for species. Ultramafic (mainly serpentinitic) substrates support the most distinctive and unusual forest types, such as open stands of Jeffrey pine *(Pinus jeffreyi)* with a grass-forb layer. The woody and herbaceous flowering plant flora is rich in species and contains 60 species endemic to the region. Such endemics include the prominent *Darlingtonia californica,* often found in wet seeps where springs flow from the contact between the peridotite overburden and the metamorphosed serpentine below (Anderson et al. 1998, Lang 1999).

With such variety in natural diversity and physical environments, the biodiversity that typifies the Klamath Mountains ecoregion can only be preserved via a comprehensive conservation assessment. Such an assessment needs to account for land ownership patterns of the ecoregion, which include a large portion of US Forest Service land and a smaller portion of privately owned holdings in both states. While much of the forested habitat is in public ownership, there is still considerable biotic diversity present on private lands in Scott Valley and the Shasta, Rogue and Umpqua River valleys. These lands, which have undergone extensive conversion for agriculture and urban development, contain some of the most threatened natural communities in the ecoregion and thereby offer some of the greatest challenges for long term conservation of natural diversity (Anderson et al. 1998).

1.2.1 Geographic Setting

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion is comprised of a contiguous complex of mountains and interior valleys dissected by an extensive network of drainages in southwestern Oregon and northwestern California (Figure 1). It is bounded to the west and southwest by the Klamath Mountains of Oregon and California, to the north by the Rogue River and Umpqua River drainages, and to the east by the Cascade Mountains. The southern boundary lies near Mt. Shasta and Lassen Peak. The heart of the ecoregion is the ancient Klamath-Siskiyou mountain system, amounting to 3,056,176 ha of rugged country, consisting of a series of lesser but impressive mountain ranges within the ecoregion. These ranges include the Siskiyou Mountains in the north, followed by the Salmon and Marble Mountains, the Trinity Alps, and the Yolla Bolly range, which falls just beyond the southern border of the ecoregion. The ecoregion covers 5,279,582 ha (20,384 square miles), which is an area approximately one-fifth the size of Oregon. Below is a breakdown of land area by state:

STATE	AREA –SQUARE MILES	AREA – HECTARES	PERCENT
Oregon	6,791	1,758,954	33
California	13,593	3,520,628	67
TOTAL	**20,384**	**5,279,582**	**100**

A diverse and rugged topography characterizes this ecoregion. Abrupt elevation changes of 914 to 1,219 meters from valley floors to mountain summits are not uncommon. At the extreme is Mt. Shasta, where the elevation rises 3,330 m in just 18.5 km. The lowest

elevation in the ecoregion is 30 m, where the Rogue River flows out of the Siskiyou Mountains. Below is the distribution of land at different elevation zones:

ELEVATION ZONE M (FT)	% LAND AREA OF ECOREGION
< 1000m (3,000 ft)	50%
1000-2000m (3,000 - 6,000 ft)	41%
2000-3000m (6,000 - 9,000 ft)	8.95%
> 3000m (9,000 ft)	0.05%

The ecoregion contains over 42,270 km (26,419 miles) of streams and rivers, which is a high density of streams based on an overall length to area ratio. Major rivers draining the Cascades include the Rogue and the Umpqua, which flow to the Pacific Ocean in the state of Oregon. Major rivers draining the Klamath Mountains include the Chetco, Pistol, Smith, Illinois and Applegate Rivers in Oregon and the Salmon, Trinity, Shasta and Scott Rivers in northern California. The Klamath River, which originates in the East Cascades of Oregon, flows through the Klamath Mountains along the Oregon/California border. The Sacramento River drains the southern portion of the ecoregion. This river becomes one of the primary features of another ecoregion, the Central Valley of California, as it flows south towards San Francisco Bay. The Pit River originates on the Modoc Plateau and flows into the Sacramento River above Shasta Reservoir. While the Klamath Mountains ecoregion has an abundance of rivers and streams, lakes and ponds are relatively rare and found almost exclusively in montane environments.

The ecoregion is almost equally split between private land and public land that is managed for various purposes by federal and state agencies (Table 1, Figure 2). Of these government agencies, the U.S. Forest Service is the largest land manager, managing 46% of the land, and the Bureau of Land Management manages 10%. Appendix 1 lists the major public land management operational units in the ecoregion. Forty-two percent of the ecoregion is private land. Aside from mining claims in the mountains, private land is generally restricted to the valley bottoms and contains the best agricultural soils with ready access to water. Tribal lands account for less than one percent of the ecoregion with the largest block occurring on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation in California. Below is a breakdown of land area in the ecoregion by major ownership category.

TABLE 1. Land Ownership of the Ecoregion

Owner	Hectares	Acres	Percentage of ecoregion (ha)
Private	2,191,437	5,412,850	42
Private Preserve	4,116	10,167	<1
Open Water	10,719	26,476	<1
Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs	34,291	84,700	<1
State Forest (OR & CA)	9,577	23,655	<1
Oregon State Parks and Recreation	1,612	3,982	<1
California Department of Forestry	3,542	8,749	<1
California Department of Fish and Game	5,302	13,096	<1

California Parks and Recreation	3,105	7,669	<1
USDA Forest Service	2,420,447	5,978,504	46
USDI Bureau of Land Management	507,094	1,252,519	10
US Army Corps of Engineers	1,371	3,387	<1
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	847	2,092	<1
USDI National Park Service	86,122	212,721	2
TOTAL	**5,279,582**	**13,040,567**	**100**

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion has one of the more extensive protected area systems of the conterminous U.S. ecoregions: 12% of the land falls in existing protected areas. Several large wilderness areas and a national park account for most of the total, but there is an extensive system of smaller public and private preserves throughout the ecoregion. See Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion of protected areas and the biodiversity they protect.

1.2.2 Ecoregional Subdivisions

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion maintains a consistent range of climatic, physical and biological patterns on a broad ecological scale. However, there is a considerable diversity in these patterns when the ecoregion is examined at a finer scale. Guaranteeing the long-term survival of species and natural communities requires taking into account these intra-ecoregional ecological gradients. Important factors such as the inherent variability of species and communities and providing redundancy to ensure their persistence over time must be accounted for in the portfolio design process (Anderson et al. 1999; TNC 2000b). The simplest way to achieve this is to subdivide the ecoregion and set conservation goals for these smaller areas. Two of the reasons TNC chose Bailey's ecoregional classification scheme were because it is hierarchical (TNC 2000b) and because ecoregional subdivisions, called sections, have already been delineated in most ecoregions (McNab and Avers 1994).

There are three sections in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion (Figure 1); their sizes are listed below:

SECTION NAME	HECTARES	ACRES	PERCENTAGE
Klamath	3,317,368	8,193,899	62
Cascades	1,452,738	3,588,263	28
Umpqua	509,476	1,258,406	10
TOTAL	**5,279,582**	**13,040,567**	**100**

Below are brief descriptions of the physical and biological characteristics of the three sections compiled from personal knowledge of the planning team and from McNab and Avers (1994).

Cascades Section – This section is restricted to a narrow band of the Cascade foothills in the Umpqua and Rogue River drainages that broadens to the south beginning near Soda Mountain in southern Oregon to include the entirety of the southern Cascades in California to Lassen Peak. The crest of the mountain chain in this section is aligned toward the north-northwest between the Sierra Nevada and Mt. Shasta and toward the north from Mt. Shasta northward. Elevations range from 600 to 4300 m (2,000 to 14,000 ft) to a high point on Mt.

Shasta. Soils in the mountains are shallow to moderately deep, with primary parent materials including residuum and colluvium from basalt, andesite, tuffs, breccias, and ash related to volcanic activity and subsequent weathering of the mountain range.

The climate in this section is continental with wide fluctuations in precipitation and temperature for periods of years that can result in significant or catastrophic changes in biological communities. Precipitation, primarily rain, ranges from 50 to 203 cm (20 to 80 inches) annually with maximum precipitation occurring in spring and early fall. Winter precipitation occurs as snow. Average January maximum and minimum temperatures are 5 and -2° C (41 and 28° F), respectively. Average April through July growing season maximum and minimum temperatures are 20 and 6° C (68 and 43° F) (30 yr average), respectively, though temperature extremes are common throughout the winter. Strong winds are common throughout the year. The growing season ranges from 25 to 175 days. Climate is influenced by prevailing winds from the west and the general north-south orientation of the mountain ranges. These factors combine to create an intense rain shadow effect in the eastern portions of the section.

The predominant ecological systems in the Cascades section include montane white fir, low elevation mixed conifer, montane mixed conifer, subalpine hemlock and subalpine red and Shasta fir forests. Great Basin shrublands, chapparal communities, and semi-permanent, saturated wetlands are found in this section as well. Important rare plant conservation targets in this section include *Fritillaria eastwoodiae, Cirsium ciliolatum, Microseris howellii* and *M. laciniata ssp detlingii,* and *Sedum albomarginatum.* Endemic plant species in the area include *Rupertia hallii, Gratiola heterosepala,* a rare diversity of lilies including *Calochortus greenei,* and some rare oak/grassland communities. Rare fishes in the area include rough sculpin *(Cottus asperrimus)* and hardhead *(Mylopharodon conocephalus).*

Fire is the dominant natural source of disturbance at lower and middle elevations. Historic occurrence has changed from frequent, low intensity surface fires to infrequent, high intensity stand replacing fires. At higher elevations, historic occurrence has changed from infrequent, low and moderate intensity surface fires to infrequent, low, moderate and high intensity surface or stand replacing fires. Some volcanic activity occurs and areas have been subject to eruptive activity (lava flows and ash fall) within the past 200 years.

Umpqua Section – This is the smallest section in the ecoregion, and it lies entirely in Oregon. It is an intermontane valley in southern Oregon that is centered on the Umpqua River. It runs from Elk Creek (near Yoncalla) down to the Douglas/Josephine county line and includes much of the Cow Creek drainage. By lying between the Cascade and Coast Mountain ranges in western Oregon, winter winds and temperatures are tempered and rainfall is less than surrounding mountain zones. This section includes much of the lower elevations of the Umpqua River system that flows from the Cascades to the Pacific Ocean.

The climate in this section is warm and temperate, has maritime influences, and has much less winter cold than the Cascade section. Precipitation, primarily occurring as rain, ranges from 83 to 127 cm (30 to 50 inches) annually, with maximum precipitation occurring from October to January. Summers are relatively dry. In direct contrast to the Cascade section, the Umpqua section can have up to 279 days in the growing season. Over a 20-year period, average maximum and minimum temperatures in January range from 6.6 to -1°C (43.9 to 30.3°F), respectively, while from February to June, temperatures range from 17 to 5.6°C (63.1 to 41.9° F), respectively.

Natural communities such as the interior valley white oak woodlands, low elevation mixed conifer forests, and upland grasslands characterize the Umpqua section. Important plant conservation targets in this section include *Calochortus umpquaensis* and *C. coxii.* Important endemic species include *Sisrynchium hitchcockii, Camissonia ovata*, Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii, and *Plagiobothrys hirtus.* Salmon targets restricted to the area

include the Umpqua River fall run Chinook *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* and the Umpqua River steelhead *(Oncorhynchus mykiss)*.

Klamath Section – The physiography of this section is complex but is best described as an uplifted and dissected peneplain on strong rocks with extensive monadnock ranges. Mountains in this section have accordant or subequal summits and are generally, but not consistently, aligned north to south. Three-fifths of this section is in northern California and the remainder in southwestern Oregon. The section lies between the southern Cascade Mountains and the Coast Range mountains. Its southern limit is the northern end of the California Great Valley. Elevations of accordant summits increase from west to east. The broad Bear Creek Valley in southern Oregon separates the Klamath Mountains from the western Cascade Mountains to the east. Although the section boasts deep, narrow canyons and mountain peaks reaching over 2,133 m, for the most part the section exhibits regularly recurring relief throughout that represents the old land surface before it was worn down then uplifted for renewed erosion. Elevations range from 30 to 2,743 m with Mt. Ashland at 2,295 m being the highest peak in the Oregon Siskiyou Mountains and Mt. Eddy being the highest point in the California Salmon Mountains. West of the Siskiyou summits, the tilted upland surface drops to 762 m before the land abruptly breaks off to a narrow coastal plain with steep headlands.

Land cover is diverse and consists of natural communities of Douglas fir, tanoak; mixed conifers, including Pacific madrone, Ponderosa pines, canyon live oaks, Oregon white oaks, red and white fir; mixed subalpine forests and chaparral shrublands. The Klamath section is world renown for its serpentinite vegetation that is one of the dominant characteristics of the biodiversity of the ecoregion. Jeffrey pine savannas interspersed with serpentine bogs harbor many of the rare plants found in the ecoregion including *Darlingtonia californica, Calochortus howellii,* and *Lomatium cookii.* Several other rare plants occur in the section, including *Fritillaria gentneri* which is associated with dry Douglas fir woodlands and chaparral and subspecies of *Limnanthes flocossa* that occur in the Rogue Basin. Other important wide-ranging conservation targets in this section include the Pacific fisher *(Martes pennanti)* and northern spotted owl *(Strix occidentalis).* Streams and rivers in this section contain extensive anadromous fish habitat for chinook, coho and steelhead species with noteworthy runs on the Rogue, Illinois, Klamath and Trinity Rivers.

Fire is the predominant natural disturbance, especially high intensity forest fires started by summer thunderstorms. At lower and mid-elevations, historic occurrence has changed from frequent, low intensity ground fires to infrequent, high intensity stand replacing fires. At higher elevations, historic occurrence has changed from infrequent, low and moderate intensity ground fires to infrequent, low, moderate and high intensity surface or stand replacing fires. Wide, multi-year fluctuations in precipitation and temperature are important disturbances and result in significant or catastrophic changes in biological communities. Landslides initiated by climatic, seismic and human events are common in steeper areas of the section. The western part of the section is seismically active and experiences regular activity.

1.3 Planning Team and Planning Process

1.3.1 Ecoregional Planning Team

The planning team for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion consisted of representatives from Oregon and California field offices, Oregon and California Heritage programs, and the Western Resource Science Center in Boulder, Colorado. The Oregon field office was the lead office for the ecoregional assessment, providing team leadership as well as administrative and financial management.

Dick Vander Schaaf of the Oregon field office served as the team leader. The core team remained consistent throughout the planning process and consisted of the people listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Ecoregional Planning Team

OREGON	Dick Vander Schaaf, Senior Conservation Planner, Oregon Field Office
	Jimmy Kagan, Director, Oregon Natural Heritage Program
	Michael Schindel, GIS Analyst, Oregon Field Office
	Jon Hak, GIS Analyst-wildlife biologist, Oregon Natural Heritage Program
	Darren Borgias, Oregon Stewardship Ecologist, Oregon Field Office
	Michael Murray, Ecologist, Oregon Natural Heritage Program
	Deborah Tolman, Ecologist-Writer, Portland State University
CALIFORNIA	Craig Mayer, Senior Conservation Planner, California Field Office
	Larry Serpa, Bay Area Stewardship Ecologist, California Field Office
	Todd Keeler-Wolf, Ecologist, California Natural Diversity Database
WESTERN REGION	Gwen Kittel, Terrestrial Ecologist, Western Resource Science Conservation Center, Boulder, CO

Conservation partners and outside scientific experts contributed to the planning process by providing input on conservation targets, goal setting, and peer review of the draft portfolio.

Tasks such as setting conservation goals, designing the portfolio, and peer review were carried out by the whole team. However, the core team broke into technical subteams to efficiently identify conservation targets for the ecoregion. The subteams were arranged as follows:

TECHNICAL TEAM	TARGETS	TEAM MEMBERS
Botany	plant species	Jimmy Kagan, Todd Keeler-Wolf
Zoology	terrestrial animal species	Jon Hak
Aquatic	aquatic animal species andaquatic communities (systems and macro-habitats)	Larry Serpa, Jon Hak, Dick Vander Schaaf
Coarse Filter targets	plant associations and ecological systems terrestrial habitats	Gwen Kittel, Jimmy Kagan, Todd Keeler-Wolf

The GIS Analyst was responsible for compiling distribution data for all targets identified by the technical teams into a seamless layer for the ecoregion. Additionally, he played a central role in developing the model for mapping the predicted distributions for ecological systems targets.

Communication between team members was excellent and involved regular meetings and conference calls, as well as telephone calls, regular mail, and electronic mail. See the planning timeline in the next section for a schedule of meetings and conference calls.

One of the first steps in the ecoregional planning process was to develop a budget (Appendix 2). The total budget was projected to be $172,640 with $85,880 to be raised as new funds for expenses above and beyond existing staff in the TNC field offices. The actual budget was somewhat larger because GIS needs were initially underestimated. The Western

Science Conservation Center contributed significantly to this project by covering for Gwen Kittel's time and expenses.

1.3.2 Ecoregional Planning Process

The team followed the ecoregional planning procedures outlined in Designing a *Geography of Hope* (TNC 2000b).

The following is a summary of important events and milestones in developing this ecoregional conservation assessment for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion:

October 21, 1999	Conference Call – reviewed team composition, planning process, and project budget.
December 15, 1999	Meeting in San Francisco – ecologists ranked rare plant communities and attributed HUC6 watersheds with known and potential locations of rare plant communities.
January 11-12, 2000	Meeting in Portland – finalized budget, took a virtual tour of the ecoregion with Todd Keeler-Wolf and Jimmy Kagan, set goals for assessment, established preliminary timeline, adjusted ecoregional boundary, designated technical teams.
March 27-28, 2000	Meeting in Medford – initial lists of conservation targets compiled, except aquatic communities, began to acquire vegetation data, conducted an on-the-ground tour of SW OR led by Darren Borgias.
June 26, 2000	Conference Call – reviewed vertebrate animal conservation targets, began to address aquatic communities and set conservation goals for fine filter targets, reviewed protected areas, had group discussion of vegetation classification parameters.
July 13-14, 2000	Meeting in Portland – most conservation targets finalized, worked out final details for compiling all target distribution data, began developing vegetation model with the various data layers, conservation goals set for most groups of targets, decided on portfolio design methodology.
September 8, 2000	Conference Call – discussed vegetation model for ecoregional assessment.
October 24-25, 2000	Meeting in Portland – previewed site selection model (SITES), discussed model in context of our planning area and suggested changes for improvement, also discussed options for suitability index, finalized methods for inclusion of aquatic targets in reserve selection model, set goals for aquatic communities, reviewed protected areas assessment.
March 15, 2001	Meeting in Sacramento – reviewed initial runs of SITES model, discussed minimum area and distance separation modules for ecological systems (vegetation model), modified SITES parameters for one ecosection.
May 7, 2001	Meeting in Portland – reviewed SITES output for initial portfolio, tweaked the boundary length modifiers and suitability index coefficients, finalized the model runs for the entire ecoregion.
May 14, 2001	Revised SITES output – the first draft of portfolio was sent to team members from each state for review and modification.

May 30, 2001	Meeting in Portland – reviewed draft of portfolio as a team and modified it slightly, refined aquatic targets, established peer review process for final draft portfolio.
July-October, 2001	Peer reviewed final draft portfolio.
October 2001	Conference Call – reviewed progress of peer review, discussed priority site ranking.
November 19, 2001	Meeting in Portland – reviewed progress of peer review, reviewed priority site rankings done by each state, resolved how to deal with targets not met, established what text, data, and maps would be in final assessment.
January 2002	Meeting in Portland – discussed peer review results and finalized portfolio layout, conducted threat assessment.
March 2002	Meeting in San Francisco – final portfolio produced, target assessment of targets completed, maps finalized.
May 3-4, 2002	Medford, Oregon – roll-out meeting with CAFO and ORFO staff; discussed threats and multi-site strategies.
June – November 2002	Write up of draft assessment document.
August 2003	Assessment finalized.

CHAPTER 2 – ECOREGIONAL CONSERVATION TARGETS AND GOALS

2.1. Conservation Targets

Conservation by Design identifies all viable aquatic and terrestrial native species and communities as the elements to be represented in ecoregional portfolios of sites (TNC 2000a). This design uses the coarse filter/fine filter approach to biodiversity conservation developed by The Nature Conservancy (Noss 1987). The coarse filter approach is a habitat-level conservation strategy whereby natural aquatic and terrestrial ecological systems are used as conservation targets to represent 85-90% of species and many ecological processes, without having to inventory and manage each species individually. Given the level of our knowledge, however, this ecosystem approach cannot be counted on to maintain and protect all of biodiversity. Some species, especially the rarest, will fall through the pores of the coarse filter because they may have special habitat requirements or require different habitats at different times in their life histories. The fine filter approach is a species level conservation strategy where rare or otherwise imperiled species are used as conservation targets (Noss and Cooperrider 1994).

For practical purposes, the aim is to represent three levels of biological or ecological organization among the potential conservation targets. The three levels include: ecological systems, communities, and species. Selecting targets from each of these levels provides an initial step toward representing all biodiversity.

This section describes the fine filter (individual species and plant communities) and coarse filter targets (ecological systems) used to design the portfolio of conservation sites for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Later sections explain the portfolio representation goals that the planning team set for these targets and the sources of data used to represent their distribution in the ecoregion.

2.1.1. Fine Filter Targets

The planning team identified two main types of fine filter targets: rare species and rare plant communities. Rare plant communities were included as fine filter elements because they often represent unique aspects of biodiversity containing rare species and because they may be restricted to unusual habitats. There were at least some occurrences of rare communities in Natural Heritage Program databases, which also supported their inclusion as conservation targets.

In choosing rare species targets, we used the following guidelines:

- All G1, G2, and federally listed species were included.
- G3 species were considered individually.
- G4 and G5 species were included if they were declining over all or part of their range, if their populations were disjunct from distant ecoregions, or if they were endemic to the ecoregion.

Plants – The Botany technical team identified 101 vascular plants as conservation targets in the ecoregion (Appendix 3); all were ranked G1 through G3. Of these 101 fine filter plant targets, 60% are endemic or near endemic to the ecoregion; many of these species are endemic to a single ecoregional section. Initially, over 300 rare plant species from both Oregon and California were identified as potential targets for the conservation assessment. In general, the Botany technical team included all G1-G2 species for which there was some knowledge of their range. The team felt that any G2 or G3 species occurrences that were peripheral to their range were better addressed in adjacent ecoregional plans.

Molluscs – The animal technical team identified nineteen mollusc species as conservation targets (Appendix 4). They are all ranked G2 and some are endemic to the ecoregion. Many of these species are Survey and Managed Species as identified in the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA 1994). Mollusc occurrence data were obtained from the Interagency Survey Managed Species database (ISMS) that is maintained by the US Forest Service.

Herptiles – The animal technical team identified ten amphibians (5 salamanders, 4 frogs, and one pond turtle) as conservation targets in the ecoregion (Appendix 4). They are ranked G1 – G4, and most are endemic to the Klamath section of the ecoregion.

Birds and Mammals – Eighteen bird and mammal species (Appendix 4) were initially identified as conservation targets, however, target data were either very incomplete or nonexistent for these targets: species were often only being tracked in one of the two states. In order not to bias the site selection process with such stratified data, the bird and mammal targets were not used in the site selection model analytical runs. Instead, these targets were assessed during peer review of the draft conservation portfolio.

Wide-Ranging Targets - Eleven wide-ranging species were identified as conservation targets in the ecoregion, including 8 birds and 3 mammals (Appendix 4). These targets were G4 and G5 species that were determined by experts as important indicator species. The GAP distribution models used for these species proved to be too crude to inform the conservation portfolio and thus, most of these species were not evaluated in the analysis. Only the Pacific fisher *(Martes pennanti)* model, developed by Carlos Carroll (1998) for the area, was used to inform the final portfolio. This model is very specific to the fisher habitat, a wide-ranging carnivore that is considered an excellent indicator of ecosystem health.

Aquatic Species - The Aquatic technical team identified 10 fish species as fine filter conservation targets (Appendix 5). Fish species ranged from narrowly distributed endemic species such as the rough sculpin *(Cottus asperrimus)* to wide-ranging resident and anadromous species, such as steelhead trout in the Klamath Mountains Province ESU. Anadromous species were considered targets at the Evolutionarily Significant Unit level (ESU) as determined by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Thus, a particular anadromous fish species may be included as multiple targets based on the presence of multiple ESUs.

Rare Plant Communities/Associations - In the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, terrestrial ecological communities are defined using the finest level of vegetation classification, the "plant association" level of the U.S. National Vegetation Classification (Grossman et al. 1998). The National Vegetation Classification is a taxonomic, hierarchical, and geographically comprehensive classification developed by The Nature Conservancy and the Natural Heritage Network. Even though communities are classified based upon dominant vegetation, we assume that conservation of these communities includes both biotic components and the abiotic (the environmental structure and function that support the biota). Given that these communities occur in truly rare environmental settings, they were unlikely to be adequately represented in an assessment of the more broadly defined terrestrial ecological systems.

The Ecology technical team identified 136 rare plant communities in the ecoregion. Appendix 6 lists the Critically Imperiled or G1 plant associations. Appendix 7 Part 2 shows how the rare plant communities are distributed among the ecological systems in the ecoregion. These included all G1, G2, and G2G3 ranked communities. Examples of these rare plant community targets range from rare communities that are endemic to the ecoregion, such as those dominated by Port Orford cedar, to more widely distributed types that are highly threatened, such as the Red fir/Sadler oak - pinemat manzanita type of Oregon and adjacent California. Specific locational data were not available for most of these rare communities, so they could not be used to directly inform the SITES model.

Ecologists from the Oregon and California Heritage Programs did attribute HUC6 watersheds where these rare plant communities were likely to occur and this information will be provided to site planners.

2.1.2 Coarse Filter Targets

We employed an ecosystem-based strategy to capture groups of species and processes that operate at a scale larger than that of individual species. This reflects the coarse filter approach that the conservation of multiple, high-integrity examples of all ecological systems will also support the viability of most native species (Noss and Cooperrider 1994). This approach requires that terrestrial and aquatic ecological systems be classified and mapped so that they will be most useful for conservation planning and action.

Terrestrial Ecological Land Units - The modeling of ecological systems was based on the Ecological Land Unit (ELU) concept (Fels and Zobel 1985) that was refined at The Nature Conservancy's Eastern Conservation Science Office for use in ecoregional planning. The landscape is categorized by its landform and given attributes such as summit, slope crest, or toe slope. These attributes are then subdivided according to slope and aspect to derive descriptors, which include steep or south-facing upper slope. Finally, geology classes are added to the ELUs. The product is a term that represents a discrete combination of physical factors that influence plant community distribution. The process used to characterize ELUs is similar to the process used to define aquatic macrohabitats in the ecoregion as both used physical attributes of the landscape to create the initial classification and map.

The vegetation map was created by attributing the ELU polygons with vegetative cover data, where it existed, and then used this information to model the vegetation for the remainder of the ecoregion (Figure 12). In California, the vegetation cover data came from the CALVEG project (CALVEG 2001), that used information from US Forest Service and other sources. In Oregon, a map of potential vegetation at the series level, developed by the US Forest Service (Henderson 2001) was combined with data from over 1000 vegetation inventory plots to inform the ELU polygons. This information was then compared with the CALVEG derived polygons as well as with vegetative community attributed LandSat images (Campbell 2001) to determine cover types. The ELU attributes were also used to subdivide widely distributed cover types, such as Douglas fir forest, into ecological systems, described below.

Terrestrial Ecological Systems - Ecological systems are characterized by both biotic and abiotic components and can be terrestrial or aquatic. Terrestrial ecological systems are groupings of plant and animal communities that:

1. Occur together on the landscape due to similar ecological processes (e.g., fire, hydrology), underlying environmental features (e.g., landforms, soils) or environmental gradients (e.g., elevation, hydrologically-related zones) and;

2. Form a readily identified unit that serves practical needs for mapping, stewardship, and monitoring.

We targeted all native terrestrial ecological systems in the ecoregion. See Appendix 7 for a full list of systems and the plant associations (Part 2) that may be contained within them. Examples of ecological systems include Alpine Dwarf Shrublands (KLGRP02), Subalpine Red Fir Forests (KLGRP04), Montane Mixed Conifer Forests (KLGRP08), and Foothills Mixed Douglas fir-Oak-Pine Woodlands (KLGRP15). Some ecological systems, such as Seasonally Flooded Meadows (KLGRP33) and Permanently to Semipermanently Saturated Meadows (KLGRP34) occur across all elevation zones. Existing knowledge of characteristic spatial pattern, environmental setting, and driving processes for plant associations formed the basis for defining terrestrial ecological systems. Four hundred and twenty two documented plant associations from the National Vegetation Classification

(Association for Biodiversity Information 2001) were used to organize and describe terrestrial ecological systems. While dominant vegetation is commonly used to name these units, they represent an integration of vegetation with their environments and common disturbance regimes. For example, Jeffery pine dominated forests were separated into serpentine versus non-serpentine substrate ecological systems.

This classification provided the basis for biophysical modeling and for integrating all mapped information on the occurrence of terrestrial ecological systems. For example, decisions for "crosswalking" existing vegetation classifications, labeling Natural Heritage community occurrences, and gathering new expert-derived occurrences all used this common classification structure.

Common Plant Associations - This large group of plant associations is accounted for in the ecoregional assessment by the Ecological System targets (Appendix 7 Part 2). For example the Subalpine Red Fir Forests Ecological System represents 12 common plant associations such as the red fir-white fir/pinemat manzanita plant association, currently ranked G4. Common associations were 'crosswalked' between Oregon and California Heritage Program lists just as the rare associations and G ranks were updated where necessary.

Aquatic Macrohabitats - The Aquatic technical team delineated 211 aquatic macrohabitat community targets, represented by a reach-level classification similar to the aquatic classification hierarchy developed by TNC's Freshwater Initiative (Higgins et al. 1998). Appendix 8 contains a list of the aquatic macrohabitats in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. An automated approach in GIS was used to classify all stream segments at a scale of 1:100,000. Information on the biological composition and structure of natural aquatic communities was not available across the entire ecoregion, therefore, the classification was based on abiotic variables that provide an indirect means of identifying potential aquatic community types. Regional experts in aquatic ecology and fisheries, literature review, and available digital data all played a critical role in developing the classification model. Appendix 9 lists the experts and literature consulted in developing the aquatic classification. The aquatic macrohabitats were not assigned global ranks; rather, their relative abundance within the ecoregion was used for assigning representation goals.

Our reach-scale classification consisted of combinations of three abiotic variables - stream order, elevation, and lithology. The ecoregion was initially separated into four Ecological Drainage Unit (EDUs) based on broad-scale biology, geography and stream morphology. The EDUs in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion are Rogue-Umpqua, Klamath, Sacramento and Pit drainages; the EDUs roughly correspond to HUC4 watersheds. Appendix 10 lists all of the variables, including EDUs that act as the fourth variable, and the classes defined within each variable. Unique combinations of variables created 211 targets across the ecoregion. (Not all variables co-occurred within an individual EDU, and some types that were created were later merged with adjoining types based on interpretation of the data).

To apply the classification, we used hydrographic data from StreamNet (for Columbia River, Pacific slope drainages) and USEPA's RF3 files that contain approximately 67,000 linear segments that are attributed with each of the variables. It should be noted that the RF3 files have been superceded by USGS National Hydrography Datasets (NHD) that have improved the original data substantially. The hydrography datasets also contained information used to attribute stream order and watersheds. Upstream influences of geology or elevation were not considered, as had been done in previous "macrohabitat" classifications elsewhere in the country (e.g., Higgins et al. 1998). Therefore, in the strictest sense the classification represents more of a "reach-level" classification than a "macrohabitat" classification. Figure 3 portrays the aquatic macrohabitat classification as it is mapped in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

Table 3 contains a summary of the conservation targets in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, including number of targets in the major target categories, source of distribution data, and representation goals for portfolio design.

TABLE 3. Conservation targets summary for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion

CONSERVATION TARGETS	#	SOURCE OF DISTRIBUTION DATA	REPRESENTATION GOAL FOR PORTFOLIO
FINE FILTER TARGETS			
Plants	101	Heritage programs	Variable depending on conservation rank and degree endemism.
Rare or Imperiled Plant Communities/Associations(G1-G2 incl.G2G3)	134	Heritage programs USFS plot data Limited specific locational data	Potential location info provided to site planners. No goal in portfolio due to lack of sufficient data.
Molluscs	19	USFS Survey and Manage data	Variable depending on conservation rank and degree endemism.
Herptiles	10	USFS Survey and Manage data Heritage Programs	Variable depending on conservation rank and degree endemism.
Birds and Mammals	18	Heritage data	Not used for portfolio selection due to insufficient data.
Wide Ranging Vertebrates	11	GAP distribution data and fisher model	Variable depending on biodiversity value in ecoregion. Only used modeling for Fisher.
Aquatic Species	16	USFS Survey and Manage data StreamNet	20-100% of stream distribution
TOTAL FINE FILTER TARGETS	**309**		
COARSE FILTER TARGETS			
Terrestrial Ecological Systems (includes common plant associations)	37	USFS plot data, USNVC, A Manual of California Vegetation, and the Oregon List of Community Types & ELU modeling	Cover type goals varied depending on biodiversity value, range-wide distribution, and ecoregional abundance (10-50% per Section).
Aquatic Macrohabitats	211	Modeled by stream reach and EO data.	Variable depending on abundance in ecoregion (5-10% of stream distance per HUC3 per Section).
TOTAL COARSE FILTER TARGETS	**248**		

2.2 Sources of Distribution Data

The Nature Conservancy's Geographic Information System (GIS) was used for all data compilation, management, and analysis tasks of the Klamath Mountains ecoregional planning team. One of the major challenges of ecoregional planning, in general, is

acquiring readily available data sets that seamlessly represent the distribution of conservation targets across the ecoregion. In the Klamath Mountains ecoregion this was a complex and time-consuming task for four reasons:

1. The large total number of conservation targets (539),
2. The diversity of types of targets, including the major categories of fine and coarse filter targets discussed above, but also diversity within categories (e.g., aquatic macrohabitats represented both by points and by linear stream reach distance),
3. The inconsistency and outright lack of data between the two states, with the exception of Natural Heritage Program rare species occurrences,
4. The dissected and fragmented relief of the landscape in this ecoregion, which made creating HUC6 coverages, seamless geology layers, consistent land unit processes and training of the model very difficult.

Below is a description of the data sources for fine and coarse filter conservation targets. A discussion of data sources is included at this point because the expression of conservation goals for conservation targets (see next section) is based on the type of distribution data for each target (i.e. point, area, or linear distance).

2.2.1. Fine Filter Targets

Plants – Spatial datasets from the California Natural Diversity Database and Oregon Natural Heritage programs were used in the preparation of the Klamath Mountains ecoregion assessment. Both states use similar methodologies for the spatial representation of their plant and animal element occurrence (EO) data, thus making it possible to merge the two coverages. From the merged coverage a species list was generated for all tracked plant and animal species within the ecoregion. However, those plant species that were tracked in one state and not the other required the scrutiny of each taxon to determine their global distribution relative to the ecoregion. Distributions could be any of five classes: endemic, restricted, limited, widespread, peripheral, and disjunct. The distribution class and the species' Grank were then used to determine a plant's consideration as a target in the assessment. The use of USGS GAP and Hexagon Project data made it possible to include species not tracked by the Natural Heritage programs. Although EOs may be either points or polygons in the Heritage databases, they were represented as points for ecoregional-scale analyses.

Rare or Imperiled Plant Communities/Associations – The USGS 6th field Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC6) watersheds were used as the mapping units for rare plant associations. Watersheds were flagged with either presences or absence of one or more rare associations. Because HUC6 watersheds were used as the site selection unit in designing the portfolio, this is the minimum resolution needed to represent their distribution. See the Portfolio Assembly Methods section (Section 4.1.1) for a discussion of the use of HUC6 watersheds in site selection.

Plant association occurrences came from the Heritage databases and from expert knowledge. Experts included Jimmy Kagan and Darren Borgias, Oregon, and Todd Keeler-Wolf in California. The Terrestrial Coarse Filter Targets team manually flagged watersheds that contained a rare association from expert knowledge. Rare plant associations that had EO records in Heritage programs were attributed to watersheds. Additional refinement will still required to assess extent and viability of these plant associations as site selection targets.

Herptiles - The source of distribution data for these fine filter conservation targets was EO data from the respective Heritage programs.

Molluscs - these taxa have been the subject of extensive inventory efforts on federal lands that were under management direction of the Northwest Forest Plan. These species were included in a larger group of sensitive plant and animal species termed Survey and Manage Species. A federal database supplied TNC with 16,000 records for identified conservation targets. These targets were condensed down to 400 records for 19 species based on proximity of occurrence and omission of duplicate and repeat sightings. Experts consulted included Terry Frest and Barry Roth.

Birds and Mammals - The bird and mammal targets that were initially identified for the planning process were the most problematic of any group of targets in terms of acquiring suitable data. EO data occurred in both California and Oregon Heritage programs but in most cases a species would be tracked in one state but not the other. Thus, occurrence data was noticeably incomplete across the ecoregion for these potential targets resulting in their nonuse in the analysis that developed the conservation portfolio.

Aquatic Species – The distribution of fish targets was mapped using EO data. Distributions of species with narrow populations are represented in the GIS as points derived from respective state EO databases as opposed to range maps.

Distribution data for wide-ranging fish come from California and Oregon Heritage EO data. Figure 4 displays the anadromous fish distribution in the ecoregion. They are derived from StreamNet in Oregon and from US Forest Service records in northern California (Al Olsen, personal communication). StreamNet is an aquatic information network enhanced by the Heritage Program. Linear distance is used to quantify the distribution of wide-ranging fish. See the StreamNet homepage for more information (www.streamnet.org). Experts consulted included Peter Moyle, Al Olsen, Randy Frick and Craig Tuss.

Wide-Ranging Targets - This set of terrestrial animal targets includes wide-ranging birds and mammals that for the most part were not covered by ecoregion-wide EO data. For these species predicted distribution maps from the Oregon and California GAP program were initially used. A habitat model for the Pacific fisher developed by Carlos Carroll (1998) was used to inform the final portfolio about habitat connectivity with specific reference to fishers.

2.2.2 Coarse Filter Targets

Terrestrial Ecological Systems – A suitable, coarse filter habitat classification based on vegetation was created for the Klamath Mountains ecoregional assessment using Ecological Systems protocol discussed in Section 2.1.2. The ecological systems were developed from a list of plant associations thought to be present in the ecoregion. The list was compiled using the following sources: United States National Vegetation Classification System (Grossman et al. 1998), A Manual of California Vegetation (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf 1995), the Oregon Natural Heritage Program, Natural (Presettlement) Vegetation Classification (Kagan et al. 1999), and local USFS guides (Atzet et al. 1996; Jimerson et al. 1995). Over 400 plant associations were identified to occur within the Klamath Mountains ecoregion and crosswalked with 37 ecological systems (Appendix 7). Existing knowledge of characteristic spatial patterns, environmental settings, and driving processes for plant associations formed the basis for defining terrestrial ecological systems.

Aquatic Macrohabitats – The aquatic macrohabitat classification and map was created expressly for the ecoregional assessment using digital data that is available from numerous sources. For a discussion of the development of the classification and the data used in the process see Section 2.1.2.

2.3. Representation Goals

To design a portfolio of sites that includes multiple viable examples of all species and communities in the ecoregion (TNC 2000b), the planning team developed conservation

goals for the representation of each conservation target in the portfolio. We developed portfolio representation goals based on three primary factors:

1. Distribution of the targets across the ecoregion,

2. Number of occurrences or amount of area occupied, depending on the type of distribution data, and

3. Degree of endangerment.

Determining the distribution and number of occurrences to be represented in the portfolio was an informed opinion of the entire planning team. Conservation goals are based on a number of factors, including threats, life history, viability of the occurrences, key ecological processes and disturbance regimes, and known genetic or environmental variability of the target. In almost all cases, however, little target-specific information existed and our short timeline precluded intensive research of the factors that affect long-term viability. Therefore, our representation goals are considered initial objectives and must be tested and refined through time by monitoring and re-evaluating the status and trends of individual targets.

The representation goals are explained below for each group of conservation targets. We used a two-tiered approach to account for the "distribution" and "number" factors mentioned above.

Distribution Factor – We set goals by Ecoregional Section for terrestrial targets. Goals for aquatic targets were set using Ecological Drainage Units (EDUs) as stratification units. This ecoregional stratification was used to (1) account for geographic variability (i.e., ecological and genetic variability, biophysical gradients, etc.), (2) assure dispersion of sites, and (3) reduce the possibility of stochastic extinction events.

Numerical Factor – Within each Section or EDU, numerical representation goals were set for groups of targets, the number or amount depending on the type of distribution data used to represent the target (i.e., occurrence/point, area, or length).

The long-term viability of conservation targets is one of the primary goals of the Klamath Mountains ecoregional assessment. Determining viability for individual targets has proved to be one of the most challenging aspects of conservation planning. Even with the most well studied species, such as the northern spotted owl, it has been difficult for biologists to state with confidence how to achieve or sustain viability over time. Species viability is related to genetics, reproduction rates, and population sizes in addition to habitat suitability, distribution, and connectivity. The population ecology and genetics of most species within the Klamath Mountains ecoregion have not been studied sufficiently to provide the basic information on these species' needs for long-term viability. Habitat information is somewhat more available, in general, but has not been adequately characterized for most species. Habitat models are only beginning to be developed for several rare species such as the northern spotted owl and Pacific fisher.

We addressed species viability in several ways at both the population and habitat level to work within the ecoregional planning framework. For fine filter targets derived from Natural Heritage Program information we did not include data that predated 1980, thus all records we current within the last 20 years. Rare plants make up a large proportion of the conservation targets for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion and have received considerable attention by the Heritage Programs. The Element Occurrence information is quite up to date and many of the rarest species have had population assessments conducted that have addressed viability directly. This has provided a reasonable confidence in the viability of the plant target information, at least.

As most coarse filter target data was derived from models there was no corresponding data cutoff date so we addressed viability for these habitat-based targets through the use of the site suitability index and through the application of a Minimum Dynamic Area rule within the site selection model. The suitability index is described in Section 4.3. In general, the more suitable the site for conservation purposes the more likely that coarse filter targets will be viable at the site for the foreseeable future.

Minimum Dynamic Area is defined for an ecological system as the smallest area covered by an occurrence of an ecological system that will support the dominant ecological processes that drive the system within a suitable landscape context. For most of the ecological systems within the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, fire is the dominant ecological process so the Minimum Dynamic Area calculation is based on fire disturbance patterns. Minimum areas were determined by doubling the average fire disturbance for the elevational zone that captures most of any particular ecological system modified (up or down) to fit within the range of typical polygon size on the vegetation map. The Minimum Dynamic Areas for the 37 ecological systems varied between 0 and 2000 hectares. Systems that are characterized by small patch sizes (alpine barrens and rock gardens, for instance) have no or zero minimum area while large patch sized systems such as mid elevation forests have the largest minimum areas of 2000 ha. The Minimum Dynamic Area comes into play in the site selection model by only allowing conservation goals to be met by sites containing occurrences that meet the minimum area requirements. Minimum Dynamic Areas are listed for the ecological systems in Appendix 7.

2.3.1. Fine Filter Targets

Plants, Molluscs and Herptiles – Conservation goals for rare plants, molluscs and herptile species varied by conservation rank and degree of endemism; the goals are expressed as numbers of EOs. See Table 4 for conservation goals.

Aquatic Species – For fish targets the representation goal varied by groups of species based on rarity and degree of historic decline in the ecoregion. For anadromous species this decline is based on spawning and rearing habitat, while for resident fish, it is based on occupied habitat. The distributions of the target fish species are measured in stream kilometers such that the goal for any target would be met by stream reaches in the portfolio. See Table 4 for conservation goals.

TABLE 4. Conservation Goals for Fine Filter Targets

RANK	CONSERVATION GOAL	SPECIES
PLANTS, MOLLUSCS, HERPTILES		
G1	All viable occurrences.	
G2	All viable occurrences up to 10 per Section for endemics, 8 per Section for non-endemics.	
G3	All viable occurrences up to 5 per Section when occurring in more than one Section, 10 per Section when endemic to a single Section.	
G4	All viable occurrences up to 3 per Section.	
AQUATIC SPECIES		
G1	100% of distribution per EDU	Shortnose sucker
G2 (T2)	50% of distribution per EDU	Rough sculpin, steelhead trout, coho salmon

G3 (T3)	50% of distribution per EDU	Hardhead, Klamath sculpin, chinook salmon (spring and fall runs)
G4	30% of distribution per EDU	Coastal cutthroat trout, chinook salmon (winter run)

Rare Plant Associations – Initial conservation goals for rare plant associations were based on global ranks. G1 target goals were set for 5 occurrences per Section and G2 goals were set for 3 occurrences per Section. These occurrences were manually identified as HUC6s that had a high potential for occurrences of the targets. After initial runs and analysis of the results it was determined to drop the use of the rare plant associations as targets in the portfolio site selection due to the subjective nature of the determination of their potential locations.

Wide-Ranging Species – Wide-ranging animal species targets other than the Pacific fisher were not used in the development of the conservation portfolio due to the lack of specificity of the available GAP distribution data for these species. Because of this, conservation goals related to the species' distribution per section of ecoregion were not applied. The conservation goal for the Pacific fisher was initially set at 20% of its primary suitable habitat, as determined by the habitat model developed by Carlos Carroll (1988).

2.3.2 Coarse Filter Targets

Expressing conservation goals for ecological systems as a percent areal extent of total cover has several advantages when identifying a network of conservation areas. Areal measures have been commonly applied to portfolio design goals at national scales using theory from island biogeography (MacArthur and Wilson 1967, Wilcox 1980) and working hypotheses on the role of species diversity in ecosystem function (e.g. Hart et al. 2001). A well-established relationship exists between habitat area and the number of species that an area can support (e.g. Wilcox 1980). Loss of habitat tends to result, over time, in the loss of species within an approximate range. This relationship formed the basis for international goals (12% of country area) set by IUCN for member countries (WCED 1987). However, one could argue that the goals set by IUCN were far too low. For instance, it is estimated that with an 88% decrease in habitat extent (e.g. conservation goal = 12%), one could expect a decrease over time of 25 - 45% of species supported by the habitat (Wilcox 1980). Regardless of future land use outside of conservation areas, the species/area relationship suggests that our ecoregional goals should generally be set well above 12 %.

We selected an initial goal of 30% of historic extent for most ecological systems in the ecoregion. A conservation goal of 30% of the area for a given ecological system can potentially protect between 70 and 90% of all the species contained within that ecosystem (IUCN 2000). In the Klamath Mountains ecoregion higher goals were set for systems with endemic and limited distributions (greater than 90% of their global distribution is contained within the ecoregion) than for systems with widespread or peripheral distributions.

For ecological systems we considered the system's spatial pattern and distribution relative to the ecoregion (Anderson et al. 1999). Conservation goals are expressed in different forms, depending on the typical spatial pattern of the target occurrences. For large patch and linear systems, ecological systems conservation goals are expressed as a percentage of estimated historic extent (circa 1850), while those for small patch are expressed as number of occurrences. These goals follow similar assumptions and the numerical estimates described by Anderson et al. (1999). Table 5 displays conservation goals for terrestrial ecological systems.

TABLE 5. Conservation Goals for Ecological Systems in the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

DISTRIBUTION RELATIVE TO THE ECOREGION	CONSERVATION GOAL	
	MATRIX FORMING, LARGE PATCH, AND LINEAR	SMALL PATCH
	GOAL PER SECTION (% AREAL EXTENT)	GOAL PER SECTION (% OCCURRENCES)
Endemic Distribution	Matrix 30% Large patch 50%	50%
Limited Distribution	Matrix 20% Large patch 30% Linear 10%	30%
Widespread Distribution	Matrix 10% Large patch 20% Linear 10%	30%
Peripheral Distribution	There were no peripheral systems in this ecoregion	n/a

Variability in an ecological system is often related to differences in the expression of the system due to environmental differences across the system's range. To capture a system's variability, goals are applied on an ecoregional sectional basis so that ecological systems will be represented in the conservation assessment across their natural range or distribution. All goals were stratified across terrestrial sections.

Areal estimates were placed in historic context: we expressed the conservation goal as a percentage of estimated natural cover circa 1850, the time immediately prior to widespread European-American settlement in the Klamath Mountains. Ecosystems are dynamic; they change at varying rates, and have both short-term cycles and long-term trajectories. However, in many places, these dynamics have been abruptly altered through human land use resulting in impacts on native biodiversity (Wilson 1992). Our task is to understand natural ecosystem dynamics, then to evaluate human alterations to these dynamics and mitigate their effects. In the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, these constraints were significant at low elevations where large areas were converted to agriculture and urban uses. Although water diversion and hunting historically supported Native American cultures, most of the rapid and widespread change to the upland matrix of the Klamath Mountains has occurred through over-grazing, fire cycle alterations, and introduction of non-native plants. The year 1850 marks the beginning of the most extensive and rapid human/technology-driven changes to ecosystems, but is recent enough to reflect vegetation patterns under modern climatic conditions. It therefore provides a useful and important reference point.

Aquatic Macrohabitats – For aquatic macrohabitats, the representation goal varied by type based on their abundance (total stream distance) within the ecoregion, as follows:

TOTAL LENGTH WITHIN ECOREGION	GOAL
> 1,000 km (>620 miles)	5% of distribution per type
101 - 1,000 km (62 – 620 miles)	10% of distribution per type
11 - 100 km (6.8 – 62 miles)	20% of distribution per type
<11 km (< 6.8 miles)	50% of distribution per type

CHAPTER 3 – PROTECTED AREAS

3.1 Definitions

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion contains a number of existing extensive protected areas. Level 1 and 2 protected areas (TNC 2001) were chosen for our protected area assessment because they have the highest degree of biodiversity protection and management. These levels are the same as Protection Status 1 and 2 used for Managed Areas in the Natural Heritage Program databases and Management Status 1 and 2 lands used by the GAP Program. They are defined as follows:

> Level 1 – Lands owned by private entities and managed for biodiversity conservation or owned and administered by public agencies and specially designated for biodiversity conservation through legislation or administrative action where natural disturbance events proceed without interference. The agency acting alone cannot change these designations without legislative action or public involvement.
>
> Level 2 – Lands generally managed for their natural values, but that may incur use or habitat manipulations that degrade the quality of natural communities.

Below are the types of protected areas in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

TYPE OF PROTECTED AREA	PROTECTION LEVEL
Wilderness	1
Wild and Scenic River – Wild River	1
National Recreation Area	2
National Monument	1
BLM Wilderness Study Area	2
BLM Area of Critical Environmental Concern	1 or 2
Research Natural Area	1
State Wildlife Management Area	2
National Wildlife Refuge	1 or 2
Forest Service Special Interest Area	1 or 2
BLM Habitat Management Plan Area	2
State Parks and State Park Natural Areas	1 or 2

The Northwest Forest Plan (USDA 1994) set aside a large number of Late Successional Reserves (LSRs) for the protection of the northern spotted owl and other species that rely on similar old growth forest habitats. We chose not to include these administrative designations as Level 1 or 2 protected areas for 2 reasons. First, many of these areas contain significant amounts of disturbed and altered habitats including clearcuts, plantations and roads that at present degrade the integrity of the areas. Active management of younger stands within LSRs is condoned in the Northwest Forest Plan and may have impacts on biodiversity conservation goals. Secondly, because these areas are administratively designated, there is less certainty that the levels of protection will remain high in the face of public policy changes compared to congressionally designated areas such as Wilderness or Wild and Scenic Rivers. Policy changes can occur even in response to natural events such as wildfire and can have devastating impacts to protected areas by promoting management actions that have the effect of impairing ecosystem processes.

3.2 Data Sources

GIS data for Level 1 and 2 protected areas in the ecoregion were compiled from the Managed Area databases for the California and Oregon Natural Heritage Programs. The data was reviewed by the core team and edits were made where more current data could be obtained.

3.3 Summary of Existing Protected Areas

There are 134 protected areas in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, covering 637,603 ha (Appendix 11). Taking into account the overlap in some areas (e.g., Wild Rivers within Wilderness), this amounts to nearly 12% of the land area in the ecoregion (Figure 5). The number and areal extent of protected areas are not distributed evenly, however. They vary considerably by ecoregional section as follows:

SECTION	SECTION AREA (HA)	PROTECTED AREA (HA)	% OF SECTION
Cascades	1,452,738	113,953	8%
Klamath	3,317,368	522,800	16%
Umpqua	509,476	850	<1%
Total	5,279,582	637,603	12%

Data on existing protected areas were used to (1) assess the current level of biodiversity protection in the ecoregion, and (2) assist in the design of the portfolio sites. These uses are both explained in the following sections.

3.4 Protected Areas Assessment

Protected areas in the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion meet conservation goals for a number conservation targets in their entirety and greatly contribute to a number of other target goals throughout the ecoregion. Nevertheless, there remain significant numbers of targets that have no occurrences within existing protected and thus will be reliant upon new areas for their conservation. Table 6, shown below, displays the protection of conservation targets by percent of goal met within protected areas with separation of the targets by groups. This provides a snapshot as to how important the protected areas are for conservation within the ecoregion.

TABLE 6. Conservation Target Goals Met in Protected Areas.

TARGET GROUP	TOTAL NUMBER OF TARGETS	NUMBER OF TARGETS BY PERCENTILE OF TARGET GOALS MET IN PROTECTED AREAS				
		0-25% (0%)	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%+
Ecological Systems	37*	6 (1)	9	9	1	10
Plants	101	70 (46)	8	8	6	9
Herptiles	10	5 (3)	0	2	0	3
Invertebrates	19	16 (12)	3	0	0	0
Fisher	1					1
Fishes	10	5 (3)	5	0	0	0
Aquatic Communities	207	118 (78)	19	6	10	54

** Only 35 Ecological Systems were represented in the ecoregion by this analysis.*

Table 6 shows that goals for target groups are not uniformly met in protected areas in the ecoregion. When comparing the target groups whose goals are met at the 76 percentile and above, it can be seen that the Ecological Systems group (31% met), Aquatic Communities (31% met) and Herptiles (30% met) had the greatest percentage of their goals met in protected areas. In contrast Plants (15% met), Fishes (0% met) and Invertebrates (0% met) faired poorly in terms of the role that existing protected areas played in meeting their conservation goals. The Pacific fisher conservation goal was met entirely in protected areas in the ecoregion. This is not unexpected as the fisher's most suitable habitat is large roadless blocks of forested habitat which are almost entirely contained within the larger protected wilderness areas in the ecoregion.

The protected area assessment also shows which target groups had large percentages of their goals met at the 0 percentile, or in other words, the number of targets that had no occurrences in protected areas. Plants (46% with no occurrences), Invertebrates (63%) and Aquatic Systems (38%) had large numbers of targets that had no occurrences within the current protected areas. In contrast there was only a single Ecological System, Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests, that was not represented in existing protected areas. This result is particularly surprising in that most of the higher elevations in the ecoregion are within wilderness areas and it is assumed that the Foxtail Pine Forests would have been protected.

CHAPTER 4 – PORTFOLIO DESIGN

4.1 Portfolio Assembly

Portfolio design in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion used the SITES biodiversity site selection model as a decision support tool. This section describes site selection units, how the site selection model works, site suitability assessment and the iterative approach used to arrive at the final portfolio.

4.1.1 Site Selection Units

The data used to derive the ecoregional conservation assessment comes in many different forms such that there is a need to have a standard format in which to compile the information and then to evaluate it in the context of conservation. The site selection unit is the standard data format used by the SITES selection model; all data is attributed to the individual site selection units. And the units then become the basic building blocks of the conservation portfolio. USGS 6th field Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC6) watersheds (2,000 - 5,000 ha) were chosen as the primary site selection unit for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion for most of the conservation targets. HUC6 watersheds are reasonable selection units for many conservation targets for the following reasons: (1) they are based in natural landscape features delineated by easily recognized physiographic criteria, (2) their size is a reasonable scale for managing ecologic and hydrologic processes, (3) several units can be neatly aggregated where larger sites are needed, and (4) they approximate the scale of ecologically defined sites that TNC field offices and other land managers might typically work at in this ecoregion, especially when several adjacent HUC6 watersheds are combined to make a larger site.

The concept of using HUC6 watersheds as selection units was complicated by the need to account for existing protected areas (GAP status 1 and 2 lands) and land ownership in the portfolio. Protected area boundaries rarely, if ever, follow HUC6 watershed boundaries, so distinct site selection units representing the protected areas were delineated within larger HUC6 boundaries. By doing this many more site selection units are eventually identified in the ecoregion in order to account for all of the adjustments to the HUC6 coverage. This has been shown to be the most accurate template on which to develop the portfolio.

Given these considerations, a total of 1,624 site selection units were used for the modeling process of the portfolio for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. They range in size from <1 ha to 18,687 ha, with an average size of 3,250 ha. The smallest planning units result from slivers of existing protected areas that fall into adjacent watersheds.

It should be noted that using HUC6 watersheds as selection units inherently produces a large portfolio, in terms of overall area. In some cases the model selected the entire watershed to capture what may have been a small area occupied by a single conservation target. For instance, a peregrine falcon eyrie or a rare plant population may occupy just a few acres but the entire HUC6 watershed was added to the portfolio in order to capture them. However, nearly all HUC6 watersheds also contain coarse filter targets including both ecological system targets and aquatic macrohabitat targets. Therefore, selected HUC6s contribute to meeting these target goals in addition to fine filter target goals.

4.1.2 Site Selection Model

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion is a highly diverse yet data-rich ecoregion, and conservationists have identified nearly 500 conservation targets in both terrestrial and aquatic habitats (Strittholt et al, 1999). Having such a large number of targets, portrayed by a diverse array of distribution data, as well as a complex set of portfolio representation goals, precludes the use of simple inspection methods to arrive at the most efficient, comprehensive, portfolio of biodiversity conservation sites. Overlaying these targets and

goals is an extensive system of existing protected areas and ownership constraints. Due to this complexity, the planning team chose to use a site selection model to help design a draft portfolio that achieves the target-specific conservation goals efficiently. Efficiency is defined as meeting the target goals with as few sites as possible requiring the least total area.

The site selection model used for this project is an optimization model called SITES, developed by Ian Ball from the University of Adelaide in conjunction with the National Conservation Ecosystem Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS) and TNC. The SITES model applies a combination of Simulated Annealing, Heuristic, and Iterative Improvement methods to the portfolio design problem (Ball 1999). The simulated annealing used by SITES is a minimization method, where biodiversity (representation goals for conservation targets) is a constraint to the model that tries to minimize the cost (size of the portfolio). See Pressey et al. (1996) and Possingham et al. (1999) for overviews of these types of models. A brief explanation is given below.

The SITES model can be viewed as a cost function, as follows:

Cost = Area + Species Penalty + Boundary Length

Where the factors are defined as:

Cost minimizing is the objective of the model, in our case a portfolio of conservation sites. The model tries to minimize overall cost, while meeting conservation goals.

Area is the number of hectares needed to capture conservation targets at specified representation goals. In our case, area cost is inherently high because the model must select the entire planning unit to capture a target.

Species Penalty represents the conservation targets (species and communities). It is a penalty for representation goals not met in the portfolio for a particular iteration. If all goals set for conservation targets are met, then the Species Penalty equals zero.

Boundary Length controls the spatial layout of the portfolio. Boundary Length weight can be varied depending on the relative importance of compactness and size desired for the portfolio.

The model begins by generating a completely random portfolio consisting of site selection units and using specified values for the SITES model parameters listed above. Next, it iteratively explores trial solutions by making sequential random changes to this portfolio. Either a randomly selected selection unit (HUC6 watershed), not yet included in the portfolio, is selected, or a selection unit already in the system is deleted. At each step, the overall cost of the new solution is compared with the previous solution, and the best one is accepted. The advantage of this approach is that it potentially can avoid getting trapped in local optima, that is, a core set of selection units always being selected. It allows the portfolio to move temporarily through sub-optimal solution space, and thus increases the number of routes by which the most efficient portfolio might be reached. Initially, any change to the system is accepted, whether it increases or decreases the value of the system. As the number of iterations progress, the algorithm is more and more choosy about which changes it accepts, rejecting those changes that would increase the cost of the portfolio by too large an amount. By the end of a SITES run, only changes that decreases the “cost” of the portfolio are accepted by the model. At this point, the system soon reaches the minimum or most efficient design (Possingham et al. 1999). In our case, each run consisted of 2,000,000 iterative attempts to reach the minimum solution.

The Species Penalty Factor (SPF) acts as a modifier to the Cost function. Without employing a SPF, SITES weights all conservation targets equally. The team chose to engage the SPF modifier to give more importance to fine filter targets in portfolio design. The

primary reason for weighting fine filter targets over coarse filter targets is that our distribution information was much better (i.e., more precise) for the former than for the latter. Most coarse filter target data relied upon modeled distributions, in which there is inherently less confidence in their ability to show realistic data representation. The default value for SPF in SITES is 1.0. Through trial and error we have determined this value is too low. We varied the SPF from 125 for wide-ranging vertebrates to 1,000 for sectional endemic targets, thereby weighting the Species Penalty towards meeting fine filter goals for endemic conservation targets.

The SITES model employs a Boundary Length Modifier (BLM) in the cost function described above in order to address a limitation of the minimum set approach in that it does not account explicitly for spatial relationships among the sites selected for the portfolio (Possingham et al. 1999). Without some modification or additional constraints, the final portfolio will almost always be highly fragmented and clearly ineffectual from an implementation standpoint. This is a major problem because there are both ecological and pragmatic reasons why the portfolio should be spatially contiguous with low edge to area ratios. To address this concern, SITES employs the BLM that in essence adjusts the total boundary length of the portfolio. For a given area, a smaller boundary length gives a more contiguous area but at the cost of increased overall area. By varying the BLM (between 1.0 and 0.0), the planning team can balance the relative importance of compactness and size in portfolio design. After several test runs, we chose a BLM of .001 to input into the SITES model, a very low BLM that is typically results in a highly fragmented portfolio but that has reduced overall total portfolio area.

In summary, the site selection modeling process works as follows:

1. Data for conservation targets and their representation goals are preprocessed in a GIS as per SITES specifications.

2. GIS output data is exported to the SITES model, which operates outside the GIS.

3. The SITES model is run.

4. SITES output is exported to the GIS for visualization and review.

5. If desired, go back to #1, to adjust the data input, or to #3, to reset SITES parameters. Run next iteration.

4.1.3 Assessing Conservation Suitability of Selection Units

Two important considerations have not been addressed in the portfolio assembly discussion so far: the viability of the conservation target occurrences in the selected portfolio site, and the integration of economic and socio-political concerns into portfolio design. Viability for ecological systems targets is partially addressed with the Minimum Dynamic Area factor that is set for each system target (see Section 2.3). Occurrences must meet minimum sizes in order to count towards meeting the conservation goal for the target. The Suitability Index is used to address site viability more broadly as a means to bring social-political concerns into the identification of conservation sites.

Suitability Index – We developed a Suitability Index to assess site selection unit viability within the context of SITES portfolio selection modeling (see also section 2.3 Representation Goals). The Suitability Index was applied to each of the site selection units or HUC6 watersheds as a screen or weight in the model.

This index was used to determine the relative suitability of the HUC6 watersheds for potential inclusion into the conservation portfolio. In other words, the index assessed the probable persistence of natural communities and rare species populations in the watersheds. When SITES was presented with a choice of watersheds to capture a target, the model was

forced to choose the site with higher viability and conservation feasibility. The Suitability Index calculates a cost for each site selection unit based on the management status and ownership of the land, road density, and amount of native habitat converted to nonnative cover types. Cost was measured based on area, and then modified by the anticipated management and restoration costs, as follows:

((Road density of HUC +1) x ((GAP level 3 ha. x 1000) + (GAP level 4 ha. x 3000) + (mine count x 5000) + (dam count x 5000) + (agricultural ha. x 1000) + (urban ha. x 10000))) = Base Cost

The costs attributed to Management Status were determined from the GAP status level and additional cost factors, including road density and habitat conversion. The interaction of these factors is shown in the table below:

MANAGEMENT STATUS[1]	DEFINITION	COST	FACTOR USED TO ASSESS COST
Level 1 & 2	protected areas	free (part of the portfolio)	none
Level 3	public land outside of protected areas	area + public management overhead	Classed road density
Level 4	private land outside of protected areas	area + private land management/restoration overhead	road density + habitat converted + (hectares x 3000)

[1]*see definitions in Scott et al. (1993) and Protected Areas discussion earlier in this report (Chapter 3). The final result of the Suitability Index is a Cost Surface for the ecoregion that shows the combined costs to effect conservation on planning units due to suitability factors. The cost surface is shown in Figure 6.*

Data Sources for Suitability Index

Management Area Levels—GAP Program, Oregon and California

Land Ownership—GAP Programs, OR State GIS Service Center

Mine Sites—Oregon Department of Mining and Geologic Industry (DOGAMI) and theCalifornia CERES database

Dam Sites—Environmental Protection Agency

Road Density—Tiger Files, USDA digital road layer, Region-6 USFS

Additional Site Selection Rules

HUC6s identified as critical watersheds by the American Fisheries Society had their Base Costs divided in half.

HUC6s with more than 50% of their area within urbanized areas had their Base Costs doubled.

HUC6s that consisted solely of Level 1 and Level 2 protected area had a conservation cost of zero.

The following is a brief summary of how we used the suitability index. The equation was applied to every HUC6 unit, although there was essentially no effect on existing protected areas. Some assumptions the team made in choosing parameters for calculating the cost of public vs. private land:

We assumed that the conservation suitability of private land is somewhat lower than the same area of public land.

We assumed that unroaded lands are more suitable than roaded lands and that roads, even at low densities, have a significant negative impact to biodiversity. Therefore, we chose a cost equation that would cause the first few roads in a HUC6 to dramatically increase the cost until a certain road density threshold is reached, after which the rate of cost increase declines.

4.1.4 Portfolio Design Process

Portfolio design was largely a product of the core team that employed successive iterations of the SITES model runs using the conservation target data in conjunction with the SITES parameters. Initial model runs uncovered inconsistencies and errors in the data including limited errors in the Heritage Program EO species data as well as more widespread errors in the vegetation map developed specifically for the ecoregional assessment. These errors were corrected and resulted in considerably better draft portfolios and in a vegetation map that was more acceptable to team members with local knowledge of ecological conditions.

Initial runs also uncovered some data discrepancies that resulted in the core team deciding to completely forgo the utilization of certain data sets. The GAP distribution maps for wide-ranging wildlife species (see section 2.1) were determined to be too coarse and thus highly inaccurate for predicting wildlife habitats within the ecoregion and could not be used. This left nearly all mammals (except for the Pacific fisher) and all birds without data to direct the SITES model to suitable habitats. In addition, the data for rare plant communities (see section 2.1) also lacked sufficient location specificity as they were identified by limited Heritage Program review and was dropped from the SITES analysis. In both instances of the wide-ranging terrestrial animals and the rare plant communities these data problems were discovered during draft portfolio runs.

The core team also used the draft portfolio runs as a means to test how best to merge terrestrial and aquatic conservation target selection. Options tried included running the data as a single large data set in a combined SITES run or running the terrestrial and aquatic separately and merging the resulting terrestrial and aquatic portfolios. The greatest efficiency in terms of the smallest overall area in the conservation portfolio was gained by running the terrestrial and aquatic targets simultaneously.

In the final portfolio the aquatic community targets for first to third order stream reaches were included in SITES run with the terrestrial targets. The fourth order and greater aquatic community targets whose goals were not met in the terrestrial portfolio were subsequently identified in the aquatic portfolio sites in order to meet their conservation goals. This two tiered process for identifying aquatic community target sites was done in order to meet several assumptions regarding aquatic communities. The first to third order community targets were assumed to be intimately tied to the HUC6 watersheds in which they were found and thus it was important to meet their conservation goals within the terrestrial portfolio framework. Conversely the fourth order and larger aquatic community targets are less dependent upon the surrounding watersheds, particularly where these big rivers act as migration corridors for anadromous fish. For these targets it was less important to capture the entire surrounding HUC6 watershed in conserve the target and thus they were more often represented as buffered rivers and streams in aquatic portfolio sites.

Portfolio design addressed the concerns of including Level 1 and Level 2 protected areas and Late Successional Reserves (LSRs), as identified in the Northwest Forest Plan, by trying several conservation scenarios with these large public lands areas. Level 1 and 2 managed areas were included in the final draft portfolio. LSRs were given a 50% reduction

in their costs within the Suitability Index. Cost in LSRs is defined by the overall area of the HUC6 they are contained within.

A considerable effort was made by core team members to delete planning units that were identified by the model for reasons that could not be corroborated by the accompanying data. For instance, when an individual HUC6 was included in the draft portfolio based solely on modeled ecological systems data and the planning unit did not appear to contribute to connectivity within a watershed the planning unit was dropped.

HUC6 boundaries in the larger valleys in the ecoregion (Rogue, Umpqua, Shasta and Scott Valleys) proved to be problematic for several reasons. First, these HUC6 watersheds were invariably larger than upland HUC6 watersheds, sometimes as much as 5 times as large. This resulted in several problems for the SITES model including significantly higher costs for these valley watersheds due to their larger area. To remedy this the largest HUC6 watersheds were split into smaller units with guidance from knowledgeable team members. A second issue associated with HUC6 planning units in the larger valleys was that they were selected in nearly every draft portfolio run due to the presence of high ranking fine filter targets. Nevertheless, the considerable amounts of converted lands and urban areas made them less desirable sites to protect ecological system targets at the landscape scale. When these valley planning units were selected for the fine filter targets they would also sweep in the coarse filter ecological systems present and thus coarse filter goals would be met at these sites that were less conducive to landscape scale management. To correct this problem urban areas and large patches of converted lands were blocked from meeting goals for the coarse filter ecological system targets that may occur within these high cost areas.

The final draft portfolio design also had to meet some loosely specified distributional criteria discerned by visual inspection. It had to have an even distribution of identified planning units across the ecoregion, it had to appear to address issues related to connectivity and it had to include lands that were known to be of conservation importance. At some point portfolio design becomes more art than science and the core team review of the identified HUC6 planning units was deemed sufficient.

4.1.5 Site Selection Process

The portfolio was finalized after the draft portfolio was reviewed internally by the planning team and after most of the peer review was completed as well. In some instances planning units not previously selected by the SITES model were included within a given portfolio site. In other cases when there were only limited biodiversity values in a previously unselected planning unit, even though it may be entirely surrounded by selected HUC6 units, it was not added to the portfolio. Draft portfolio sites were typically a single contiguous area but several sites included more than one parcel. Final portfolio sites remained composed of HUC6 watersheds either singly or in configurations of multiple units with no attempt being made to alter site boundaries beyond the existing HUC6 boundaries. Sites were named after unifying physical features on the landscape such as streams, rivers, mountains or existing protected areas.

4.1.6 Peer Review of Draft Portfolio

The Klamath Mountains ecoregion assessment development benefited from the ready availability of comprehensive Heritage Program and anadromous fish databases. These data sources provided substantial information that assisted the planning team in the selection of relevant conservation targets, setting conservation goals for portfolio representation, and compiling distribution data for targets. With a couple of notable exceptions, input from outside experts was not needed early in the portfolio design process. Expert opinion was used in the development of the aquatic macrohabitat classification and, to a lesser extent, in identifying fish targets. Because adequate data was readily available the planning team

chose not to conduct an expert's workshop to solicit additional data or evaluate the data currently in hand.

Instead of using peer review at the beginning of the portfolio design process, the planning team decided that time would be better spent soliciting peer input of the draft portfolio. To that end, the team met over a period of three months with key people and groups to review the final draft of the portfolio, paying particular attention to the portfolio's adequacy of capturing all "viable native species and community types" in the ecoregion. This peer review of the draft portfolio was done on a state basis. Peer reviewers are listed in Appendix 12.

CHAPTER 5 – CONSERVATION PORTFOLIO

5.1 Portfolio Summary

The conservation portfolio for the Klamath Mountains ecoregion contains a total of 86 sites covering 2,151,141 hectares, or 42% of the ecoregion (Figure 7). Of the total 86 sites in the portfolio, 24 sites are strictly aquatic sites consisting of buffered stream reaches and 62 sites are terrestrial sites that also include significant aquatic conservation targets. The aquatic sites vary in length from 1.6 km at the Lower Rogue River Aquatic Site to over 300 km at the South Fork Trinity River Aquatic Site. The terrestrial sites are also quite varied in size ranging from 449 hectares (Grass Lake Site) to 222,362 hectares (Trinity Alps Site). A complete list of the conservation portfolio sites and site size is included in Appendix 13. The portfolio also contains 146 point sites that capture localized rare plant and animal occurrences that can be best protected at small sites. These sites were given a default size of 10 hectares each. See Appendix 15 for a list of point site conservation targets.

5.2 Terrestrial Portfolio Sites

Terrestrial watershed-based portfolio sites form the backbone of the Klamath Mountains ecoregion conservation portfolio. These sites are polygonal in shape and are based on a single to numerous contiguous HUC6 watersheds. They may contain both aquatic and terrestrial targets, and they are the primary sites in the portfolio where ecological system targets are represented. Appendix 16 displays all of the conservation targets contained within each of the terrestrial and aquatic conservation sites (this appendix is not included in hard-copy versions of the report due to its length).

In the terrestrial portfolio (Figure 8), the larger sites are mostly on US Forest Service and BLM land, while smaller sites are often associated with privately owned land. Large sites are also associated with forested landscapes while the smaller sites may contain valley grasslands and woodlands in addition to forests. Examples of large forested sites include Wild Rogue, Silver and Galice Creek, Kalmiopsis, South Siskiyous, Marble Mountains, and Trinity Alps Sites.

Every major valley in the ecoregion contains a portfolio site. Some examples of these include Umpqua Valley, Rogue River Plains, Shasta Valley, Scott Valley, Weed, and Manton Plains. These sites invariably contain urban areas and a higher percentage of converted lands than upland forest portfolio sites. In some well known valley sites, such as the Rogue River Plains, occurrences of ecological systems were not counted toward meeting the conservation goals for the targets due to the presence of converted lands and the greater difficulty in effecting conservation.

Aquatic based targets are embedded within the terrestrial portfolio since the sites include many headwater streams as well as larger rivers. As the terrestrial portfolio sites are “built” on HUC6 watersheds they often include entire subbasins that are key to aquatic conservation within the overall ecoregional assessment. Examples of terrestrial sites that are important to aquatic conservation include Wild Rogue, Silver and Galice Creeks, Illinois Valley, Little Butte Creek, South Siskiyous, and Trinity Alps Sites.

5.2.1 Portfolio Results

The terrestrial portfolio sites are fairly evenly spread across the ecoregion with Oregon containing a slightly greater proportion based on the relative amount of the ecoregion contained within each state (Table 7).

TABLE 7. Distribution of Ecoregion and Portfolio Sites by State

STATE	ECOREGION (HECTARES)	PERCENT OF ECOREGION (BY STATE)	PORTFOLIO (HECTARES)	PERCENT OF PORTFOLIO BY STATE	PERCENT OF ECOREGION CONTAINED IN PORTFOLIO
Oregon	1,758,954	33%	833,370	39%	47%
California	3,517,013	67%	1,317,771	61%	37%
TOTAL	5,275,967	100	2,151,141	100	42%

As noted above, the portfolio encompasses 41% of the ecoregion but this representation is not spread evenly across each of the ecoregional sections. Table 8 shows that the portfolio includes a greater portion of the Klamath section (45%) than the other two sections. This discrepancy is due to two primary factors: the Klamath section has a greater number of targets that require representation, including most of the serpentine-dependent species and serpentine-based ecological systems, and it contains a greater overall biological diversity than the other Sections. In addition, the Klamath section contains four large wilderness areas that are part of the portfolio.

TABLE 8. Number of terrestrial portfolio sites and their combined area per section and State. *Note: some sites straddle the state line and are thus double counted; however, portfolio area is not double counted.*

Section	State	# of Sites	Portfolio Area (hectares)	Section Area (hectares)	Percent of Section Contained within Portfolio
Cascade	Oregon	4	115375	-	
	California	18	406679	-	
	Total	22	522054	1452496	36%
Klamath	Oregon	21	574717	-	
	California	27	911092	-	
	Total	48	1485808	3317125	45%
Umpqua	Oregon	11	143191	509235	28%

For the most part, the ownership pattern of the terrestrial portfolio approximates the ownership pattern of the ecoregion as a whole, which is split fairly equally between public and private ownership. Table 9 is a comparison of ecoregion and portfolio ownership patterns. Although the portfolio contains proportionately more US Forest Service land and less private land than the ecoregion overall, the portfolio is not designed to be a public lands solution for biodiversity conservation in the Klamath Mountains. Private lands figure prominently in a number of portfolio sites including Manton Plains, Shasta Valley, Umpqua Valley and the Rogue River Plains sites. Nevertheless, public lands dominate many sites, especially those that have large protected areas in their core such as Kalmiopsis, South Siskiyous, Marble Mountains, Trinity Alps and Lassen National Park Sites. Appendix 14 details ownership for each of the portfolio sites. Figure 9 shows the conservation portfolio ownership in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

TABLE 9. Land ownership in the ecoregion and in the portfolio.

LAND OWNER	ECOREGION AREA (HECTARES)	PORTFOLIO AREA (HECTARES)	% OF ECOREGION	% OF PORTFOLIO
Bureau of Land Management	507,094	211,680	9.60	9.86
California Department of Forestry	3542	0	0.07	0
California Department of Fish & Game	5302	2193	0.10	0.10
California Parks & Recreation	3105	2361	0.06	0.11
Army Corps of Engineers	1371	1290	0.03	0.06
Bureau of Indian Affairs	34,291	2923	0.65	0.14
National Park Service	86,122	63,735	1.63	2.97
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife	847	822	0.02	0.04
Oregon State Parks & Recreation	1612	781	0.03	0.04
Private Preserve	4116	2470	0.08	0.12
Private	2,191,437	634,360	41.51	29.56
Oregon Department of Forestry	9577	7490	0.18	0.35
US Forest Service	2,420,447	1,213,614	45.85	56.56
open water	10,719	2165	0.2	0.1
TOTAL	5,279,582	2,145,884	100.01	100.01

As previously mentioned, the existing protected areas were included in the conservation portfolio (see Chapter 3 – Protected Areas). These protected areas were incorporated into the portfolio in two ways. They were embedded within the terrestrial portfolio sites either as existing protected areas to serve as "seeds" for creating new conservation sites or as "stand-alone protected areas" to be counted as part of the 86 sites that constitute the conservation portfolio.

5.2.2 Terrestrial Conservation Target Assessment

Representation goals for conservation targets were set for each ecoregional section as well as for the ecoregion overall. As a result, the assessment of how well the conservation portfolio meets goals was made both at a sectional level and for the entire ecoregion. Table 10 shows a summary of how well representation goals were met for terrestrial target groups in each section and in the overall ecoregion. For example, in the Cascades Section, goals

for Plant Species targets are met for 36 out of 38 targets (95%), while at the ecoregional level goals for Plant Species targets are met for 98 out of 101 targets (97%).

As can be seen in Table 10, relatively few terrestrial targets' conservation goals are not met overall in the portfolio. In fact, the only targets that are not met at the ecoregional level are 3 plant species, *Lomatium engelmannii* (G3), *Lupinus oreganus var. kincaidii* (G2) and *Sisyrinchium hitchcockii* (G2). These species are each endemic to a single section and did not meet the section goals for them. Appendix 17 contains a conservation target by target assessment with each target evaluated on an ecoregional section basis with their sectional conservation goal, amount captured by the portfolio, and percent of goal met by the portfolio. As mentioned earlier, goals were not set for some targets, including northern spotted owls and marbled murrelets. Analysis of the designated critical habitat for those two species shows that the portfolio covers 39.5% of the spotted owl habitat, and 56% of the marbled murrelet habitat.

The conservation portfolio does extremely well at meeting the terrestrial conservation goals. Over 98% of the terrestrially based conservation targets met their goals.

TABLE 10. Summary of Target Groups Meeting Conservation Goals

TARGET GROUP	TOTAL # OF TARGETS	TARGETS MEETING ECOREGIONAL GOALS	CASCADE SECTION GOALS	KLAMATH SECTION GOALS	UMPQUA SECTION GOALS
		(Met/Unmet)	(Met/Unmet)	(Met/Unmet)	(Met/Unmet)
Ecological Systems	37	37/0	25/1	34/0	16/4
Plant Species	101	98/3	36/2	81/2	8/5
Herptile Species	10	10/0	4/2	10/0	6/0
Invertebrate Species	19	19/0	9/1	16/1	1/0
Pacific fisher	1	1/0	1/0	1/0	1/0

5.2.3 Unmet Terrestrial Conservation Goals

The targets whose goals were met less than 100 percent of the time in the final portfolio are listed in Appendix 18. There are several reasons why these goals were unmet:

- Many targets are peripheral to the ecoregion or peripheral to a Section within the ecoregion. The unmet portion of goals for these targets will be made up for in adjacent ecoregions or Sections.

- In some cases the best habitat for some targets was captured in the portfolio and the goal cannot be reasonably met for that Section without including significant amounts of marginal habitat. *Lupinus oreganus var. kincaidii,* a G2-ranked rare plant that had seven occurrences captured within the Umpqua Valley portfolio sites, did not meet its goal of 10 occurrences for the Umpqua section. High HUC6 costs precluded capturing additional occurrences. The species also occurs in the Willamette-Puget-Georgia ecoregion to the north.

- The location and extent of ecological systems targets were predicted by modeling that has inherently unreliable accuracy. Without field verification of the occurrence of these ecological systems and the actual quality of the occurrences, meeting all of

the goals was not warranted at the expense of increasing the overall size of the portfolio. This was most evident in the Umpqua section.

- Opportunities for capturing high quality examples of some low-elevation ecological systems targets in the ecoregion are minimal to nonexistent. Identifying potential restoration sites for these targets was not one of our objectives for this ecoregion but it may be an important consideration for the next iteration.

- Finally, there are a few targets (mammals and birds) that are simply not captured by this portfolio due to lack of data and are gaps that need to be filled by future fieldwork and updating the ecoregional assessment.

5.3 Aquatic Portfolio Sites

The Klamath Mountains Conservation Portfolio contains 24 aquatic sites that complement the terrestrial watershed-based sites. Figure 10 shows the stream-based aquatic portfolio in the ecoregion. The sites include rivers and streams from each of the Ecological Drainage Units (EDUs), although they are mostly concentrated in the Rogue-Umpqua and Klamath EDUs, the largest EDUs in the ecoregion. Nearly all big rivers and streams have reaches in an aquatic portfolio site and many of their remaining reaches are captured in terrestrial portfolio sites, underscoring their importance in protecting the aquatic biodiversity of the ecoregion. The larger rivers and streams contain an inherent level of biodiversity, as well as acting as critical corridors connecting large terrestrial portfolio sites. These corridors are used for anadromous fish migration and for dispersal of young and migration by some large mammals and other species. Rivers that are included within aquatic portfolio sites are the South and North Fork Umpqua, Upper Rogue, nearly all of the Applegate, long stretches of the Klamath, much of the South Fork Trinity and much of the Scott and Salmon Rivers. Some aquatic portfolio sites such as the Shasta River only include reaches that are below dams or reservoirs, while other sites such as the McCloud River include reaches both above and below impoundments. Coastal rivers included within aquatic portfolio sites are the Pistol, North Fork Chetco and mainstem Chetco Rivers.

When the aquatic portfolio is viewed in context with the terrestrial portfolio, it links all of the larger sites with one another thereby forming a network of conservation sites (Figure 7). Only in the southern portion of the ecoregion are a number of sites not connected with one another via the aquatic portfolio.

5.3.1 Aquatic Portfolio Results

Appendix 19 has a list of all of the portfolio sites and the combined length of aquatic community targets (macrohabitats) within each site. Overall, the aquatic portfolio sites contain 1568 km (linear reach measurement) of aquatic community targets. The entire ecoregional conservation portfolio encompasses 15,492 km of aquatic community targets, where nearly 90% of this total is contained in the terrestrial sites. There are over 35,400 km of streams in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion, so nearly 44% of the total ecoregional stream length is included in the portfolio.

The aquatic portfolio sites consist of buffered stream and river reaches of varying lengths that were identified to meet aquatic target goals not previously met within the terrestrial watershed-based sites. These aquatic targets include anadromous fish species and aquatic community types that are specific to fourth order and larger streams and rivers.

The aquatic portfolio sites were added to the conservation portfolio after initial SITES algorithm runs captured aquatic community targets associated with first to third order stream reaches. As noted in Section 4.1.4, an underlying assumption in the portfolio design is that fourth order stream community targets are not as intimately tied to the HUC6 watershed and thus they were not specifically targeted in the SITES runs that used HUC6s

as planning units. The aquatic portfolio sites also addressed concerns that major rivers in lower elevation watersheds were often omitted from portfolios due to the highly degraded nature of the HUC6 watersheds in which they were found. Aquatic experts recommended including the lower river reaches to capture critical conservation targets and to protect ecosystem processes such as anadromous fish migration and flooding. The functioning of these lower river reaches may be less reliant upon the surrounding watersheds than some of the smaller rivers, so adequate representation of aquatic biodiversity may be captured with a buffered stream reach. We chose to buffer the stream reaches in the aquatic portfolio sites by 50 m on each side of the stream, so each kilometer of stream included in a site equates to 10 hectares of site area overall.

5.3.2 Aquatic Target Assessment

Aquatic targets consisting of aquatic macrohabitats and fish species were well represented at portfolio sites in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Overall, most of the targets were met at terrestrial (HUC6) sites where entire watersheds were captured in the site boundaries. The aquatic portfolio sites were key to meeting aquatic macrohabitat targets that are based on fourth order streams. Table 11 is a summary of aquatic target conservation in the portfolio.

Aquatic community targets were met in 195 cases out of 207 or 94% of the time. On an EDU basis the Klamath EDU fared the best by meeting goals for 64 out of a possible 67 aquatic communities (96%) while the Sacramento EDU fared the poorest meeting goals 37 out of 43 times or 86% success.

All fish species target goals were met on an ecoregional basis. An assessment of fish targets on an EDU basis shows that salmonids and rare fish goals were met in the Klamath and Rogue/Umpqua EDUs but not fully met in the Pit or Sacramento EDUs. In the Pit EDU, the steelhead trout target goal was not met and in the Sacramento EDU, the winter and spring run chinook salmon target goals were unmet. These results are questionable at best as steelhead are not known from the Pit River system and the Sacramento winter run chinook salmon is known only from a limited range totaling less than 6 km overall within the ecoregion. The spring run chinook target goal is nearly met in the Sacramento EDU as 48% of the habitat is captured in the portfolio and the goal was 50%.

TABLE 11. Summary of Aquatic Targets Meeting Conservation Goals

TARGET GROUP	TOTAL # OF TARGETS	TARGETS MEETING ECOREGION GOALS	ROGUE/ UMPQUA EDU	KLAMATH EDU	PIT EDU	SACRAMENTO EDU
		(MET/UNMET)	(MET/UNMET)	(MET/UNMET)	(MET/UNMET)	(MET/UNMET)
Aquatic Communities	207	195/12	50/3	64/3	44/0	37/6
Fish Species	10	10/0	6/0	7/0	3/1	1/2

5.3.3 Unmet Aquatic Conservation Goals

Unmet aquatic conservation goals for the ecoregion are restricted to aquatic community targets. Only seven percent of the aquatic community targets did not meet their conservation goal, which is an acceptable target capture rate. Eight of the 15 described aquatic community targets with unmet goals fall within the Sacramento EDU. This EDU is the smallest EDU in the ecoregion and is much more widely represented in the Great Central Valley ecoregion. In this case, it is safe to assume that some of these unmet aquatic community targets may be found in the adjoining ecoregion. Of the remaining 7 unmet aquatic community targets, 4 are described as “shoreline” based targets. Shoreline aquatic communities are defined as having zero stream gradient (there is no difference in the

elevation from the upstream to downstream ends of the stream reach) and are not associated with a given stream order. In other words, these targets are found along lakeshores or along reservoirs. There is little conservation value in reservoirs and there are few natural lakes in the ecoregion, so there is little consequence in not meeting target goals for shoreline-based aquatic communities. Most natural lakes occur in montane environments in the ecoregion and many of the better examples of lakes are located within protected areas such as wilderness.

Several salmonid targets did not meet their goals in the conservation portfolio; these targets included steelhead in the Pit EDU and the winter and spring chinook salmon runs in the Sacramento EDU. As noted in the previous section the presence of these species in the assigned EDU is questionable and hence, not meeting the respective goals is somewhat less disconcerting. Regarding the chinook targets in the Sacramento, these runs are clearly in trouble throughout their ranges. The Central Valley Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) for the spring run and the Sacramento ESU for the winter run both have sustained major habitat loss that extends far beyond the boundary of the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion.

5.4 Terrestrial Point Sites

Point sites were identified in the Klamath Mountains portfolio to capture high ranked targets that were not included in the watershed-based terrestrial sites for various reasons. Most of the time these targets occurred in landscapes that were highly altered or fragmented and therefore the HUC6 planning units would have contributed little if anything to the conservation of viable, functioning ecosystems. The point site targets themselves are unique as most of them are found in small patch habitats and many of them occur in small populations. All of the point site targets are G1 species where the conservation goal was to protect all known viable occurrences in the ecoregion. There are 2 animal species included at point sites, Shasta salamander and shortnosed sucker, and 22 plant species. Appendix 15 lists the point site conservation targets and the number of point sites associated with each target. The Klamath Mountains conservation assessment identified 146 point sites with the majority of these sites being skewed towards just a few species. These species include *Fritillaria gentneri* that is represented by 31 sites, *Rupertia hallii* (18 sites*), Madia doris-nilesiae* (16 sites), *Cirsium ciliolatum* (13 sites) and *Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpus* (12 sites). *Fritillaria* and *Plagiobothrys* are Rogue Basin endemics while *Madia* is endemic to serpentine forests in Trinity County, California, *Rupertia* is located in montane forests in the California Cascades section, and *Cirsium* is found south of Ashland, Oregon, as well as in Northern California on dry grassy and woodland dominated slopes.

5.4.1 Target Assessment

All of the G1 conservation targets met their conservation goals with the point sites being very important for several of the species in particular. The terrestrial point sites were specifically designed to capture those G1 target occurrences that could not be efficiently or effectively protected within HUC6 planning units. Species such as *Frillaria gentneri*, *Cirsium ciliolatum* and *Madia doris-nilesiae* are very dependent upon the point sites to meet their conservation goals as 84%, 87% and 62% respectively of their portfolio occurrences in the ecoregion are at the point sites. The remaining occurrences for these species in the ecoregion are found at terrestrial portfolio sites.

CHAPTER 6 – ASSESSMENT OF THREATS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ABATEMENT STRATEGIES

6.1 Assessment of Single and Multi-site Threats

Threats assessment in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion followed the suggested process outlined in the *Geography of Hope*: a "gestalt" approach was used to complete a cursory assessment of the overall threat at each portfolio site (TNC 2000).

The team assessed the threats for the 62 terrestrial portfolio sites identified through the planning process. The list of threats used in the assessment was obtained from the *Geography of Hope* (TNC 2000), but several other threats were added to meet specific conditions in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Results of the threat assessment for these sites are located in Appendix 20. No attempt was made to determine the severity of the threats at portfolio sites, the urgency of needed conservation action, or the reversibility of identified threats.

The team did not assess threats for the aquatic portfolio sites or the terrestrial point sites in the Klamath Mountains conservation assessment. It was reasoned that the aquatic portfolio sites probably have similar threats since they are all larger riverine systems found at lower elevations in the ecoregion. Threats to the aquatic portfolio sites are thus discussed as a group in Section 6.2. Terrestrial point site threats were not assessed due to a lack of specific knowledge about most of the sites. However, there is limited information related to the dominant threats of the habitats of the 22 plant and 2 animal point site species (see section 5.4). Threat assessments for the point sites will be conducted in another planning venue, perhaps on a conservation target basis.

Table 12 displays the total occurrences of identified threats for the terrestrial portfolio. The Threat Rank shows the most commonly identified threats at the portfolio sites. The most common threats are, in order of their prominence:

THREAT	NUMBER OF SITES
Fire Suppression	55 sites
Incompatible Forestry	46 sites
Incompatible Grazing	35 sites
Invasive/Alien Species	24 sites
Incompatible Primary Home Development	12 sites
Disease	10 sites
Incompatible Mining	10 sites
Incompatible Second Home Development	9 sites

TABLE 12. Threats Assessment Summary for Terrestrial Portfolio Sites

THREAT CODE	THREAT DESCRIPTION	# SITES IN PORTFOLIO	THREAT RANK
1	**AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY**		
1A	Incompatible crop production practices	5	9
1B	Incompatible livestock production practices	0	
1C	Incompatible grazing practices	35	3
1D	Incompatible forestry practices	46	2

2	**LAND DEVELOPMENT**		
2A	Incompatible primary home development	12	5
2B	Incompatible second home/resort development	9	7
2C	Incompatible commercial/industrial development	2	12
2D	Incompatible development of roads or utilities	4	10
2E	Conversion to agriculture or silviculture	2	12
3	**WATER MANAGEMENT**		
3A	Dam construction	0	
3B	Construction of ditches, dikes, drainage or diversion systems	3	11
3C	Channelization of rivers or streams	0	
3D	Incompatible operation of dams or reservoirs	3	11
3E	Incompatible operation of drainage or diversion systems	7	8
3F	Excessive groundwater withdrawal	0	
3G	Shoreline stabilization	0	
4	**POINT SOURCE POLLUTION**		
4A	Industrial discharge	0	
4B	Livestock feedlot	0	
4C	Incompatible wastewater treatment	0	
4D	Marina development	0	
4E	Landfill construction or operation	0	
4F	Water pollution—agricultural runoff	1	13
5	**RESOURCE EXTRACTION**		
5A	Incompatible mining practices	10	6
5B	Incompatible oil or gas drilling	0	
5C	Overfishing or overhunting	0	
5D	Poaching or commercial collecting	0	
6	**RECREATION**		
6A	Incompatible recreational use	3	11
6B	Recreational vehicles	1	13

7	**LAND/RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**		
7A	Fire suppression	55	1
7B	Incompatible management of/for certain species	0	
7C	Increased fire frequency	0	
8	**BIOLOGICAL**		
8A	Invasive/alien species	24	4
8B	Disease	10	6

Threats to biological diversity in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion include a wide range of land and water uses and land management. The location, scope and severity of these threats have been shaped by a complex set of historic and current social and political factors including market factors, attitudes about resources use and conservation, management policies, and knowledge of the ecological systems and skills for conserving them. From the threat assessment, it is quite evident that forest management threats, such as fire suppression and incompatible forestry, are the primary challenges for many of the sites identified for the ecoregion. These threats, along with grazing, have a number of common characteristics. First, these threats are expressed on both public and private land-dominated sites. Secondly, they often occur over wide areas of the landscape and they are not typically restricted to small discrete sites as with many other threats. Thirdly, the threats are present to varying degrees across the ecoregion. The inconsistency in threat severity in the ecoregion complicates threat abatement strategies, and calls for differential responses or a series of strategies. In the same way, because these threats intertwine with the complex ecological setting and social climate of the landscape, threat abatement needs and strategies are further complicated. At the same time the integration of multiple systems and threats provides common ground for conservation that may reach beyond a single threat at a single site.

Based on our preliminary assessment, terrestrial conservation targets that occupy lower and mid-elevations – the low elevation mixed conifer and dry woodlands, riparian forests and woodlands, and grasslands – have been most impacted and/or are experiencing the highest degree of threat, followed by coastal mesic forests. These targets occupy areas that have been subject to the most extensive land conversion and use, are most impacted by incompatible fire-related management, and are most vulnerable to invasion by non-native species.

6.1.1 Threat of "Fire Suppression"

The highest ranked threat to biodiversity in the ecoregion is "fire suppression", which can be thought of as various forms of incompatible fire-related management. The Klamath-Mountains ecoregion has a high frequency of lightning strikes and fire has been a key influence on the region's biological diversity. Incompatible forms of fire-related management is among the most significant threats to biodiversity across the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Figure 11 shows the conservation portfolio as an overlay of the National Fire Condition Class Map. This figure displays where there is overlap between portfolio sites and sites that are significantly departed from their natural fire regimes. The portrayed overlap is particularly noticeable in the Oregon Siskiyou Mountains and the California Trinity Alps, both of which are dominated by portfolio sites, highlighting the importance to abate this broad-based threat to biodiversity conservation in the ecoregion.

Fire suppression, especially over the past 60 years, has had significant impact on ecological systems that historically experienced frequent, low-severity fires. These systems include dry Douglas fir, Ponderosa pine and oak communities, grasslands and shrub-steppe habitats

found on the eastern edge of the project area. Fire exclusion in these systems results in increased density of live stems, a shift in composition to less fire-resilient species, proliferation of ladder fuels, and accumulation of down and dead fuels. These changes in turn modify wildlife habitats, stress older overstory trees, increase vulnerability to insects and disease, and alter hydrology. Fuel patterns have become more continuous and fire events now can be more sweeping across the landscape. When fires do occur in such stands, they can have more severe effects – damaging soils, causing nutrient loss, and increasing mortality of large legacy trees that would have survived fires at a more frequent return interval.

Existing and expanded development in the urban-wildland interface exacerbate the ecological impacts from protecting lives and property when a fire occurs. The risks are increasing from both pre-fire vegetation treatments and fire-fighting techniques. Mechanical thinning and prescribed fire can be beneficial in reducing stand densities and restoring desired ecological conditions and processes in certain ecological types, but may be misapplied in other forest types, reducing ecological integrity. Development in the urban-wildland interface has typically demanded aggressive fire-fighting techniques to protect lives and property. Fire suppression typically employs bulldozer firelines, which can directly affect habitat and hydrology and result in efficient vectors for the spread of invasive exotic plants. Invasive species can also be unintentionally introduced in seed mixtures used in what are likely misguided and ineffective attempts to reduce erosion after wildfires.

Similarly, post-fire salvage logging can impede ecosystem recovery by removing snags or fallen trees needed for wildlife habitat or that play other ecological roles in the post fire and future fire environment. Salvage logging also exacerbates detrimental effects on soils already caused by the fires. Post-fire salvage logging has the potential to reduce salmonid spawning and rearing habitat downstream by reducing recruitment of coarse woody material that would typically be delivered into steep headwaters streams. Other post fire ecosystem restoration efforts such as planting or spreading hay mulch also may alter natural fire recovery processes.

While changes in fire regimes and related management have had an impact across the landscape, drier, low elevation forest and woodlands have been most affected. These habitats include 15 of the 37 ecological systems that contain 160 (40% of the total) imperiled community types and species. Aquatic systems and species are also affected. High severity fires expose soils to erosion on steep sites, potentially increasing sediment delivery to streams.

6.1.2 Threat of Incompatible Timber Harvest

The scope of threat from incompatible forms of timber harvest is one of the greatest in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Logging impacts forest patch/age structure, recruitment, stand structure, and composition. Depending on practices, logging may have minor and short-lived or extensive and long-lasting effects. In many low elevation forest stands, historic selective logging of sugar pine and Ponderosa pine has severely altered the composition and structure. Clear-cut logging and associated road building, especially prominent in the montane and coastal forest systems, was prominent from post World War II to the late 1980's. Road construction and use is a threat especially in mid and upper watersheds in 1st-3rd order streams where anadromous fish spawning and other fish habitat quality can be damaged by altered sediment regimes. These impacts are related to both the density of road stream crossings but also the quality of road construction and maintenance. Reforestation using one or a few species in a single event add additional stresses. Interior dependant species, and the wide-ranging carnivores, birds, herptiles, and invertebrates that depend on these naturally diverse forest habitats and patterns are most strongly impacted.

A timber driven economy during that period dictated many of the features of the forests and social geography. Following the Northwest Forest Plan, contraction of the timber industry resulted in losses to the labor market, yet major expansions in other labor sectors have largely offset these losses. Non-labor earnings (dividends, transfer payments, rent, interest) have risen with the influx of retirees.

6.1.3 Threat of Development

Surprisingly few threats in the selected conservation portfolio are directly related to land development, although primary and secondary home development occurs on a significant number of sites. Urbanization has closely followed the early agricultural development in each of the major valleys in the ecoregion. The emphasis for further development is concentrated along the important transportation corridors, particularly Interstate 5, where most of the region's population lives. While urbanization has increased with immigration, much of that is a retiree and affluent "urban refugee" population that is supportive of environmental conservation. Urban sprawl is constrained to a degree by Oregon and California land use laws. Land development is a threat not only to the direct conservation of biodiversity on sites but also to the long-term ecological management of these sites. The use of prescribed burning, for instance, has been unpopular even in rural areas as it may pose health and property risks to neighboring landowners. Roads are threats that are related to a number of other threat categories including forestry and development. They are pervasive in nearly all sites with the exception of those that have large core Wilderness Areas or designated Roadless Areas.

6.1.4 Invasive Non-Native Disease

Disease was included as a potential threat to be evaluated in the Klamath Mountains assessment in order to address the non-native Port Orford cedar root rot disease caused by *Phytopthera lateralis.* This disease threatens to kill all older Port Orford cedar trees *(Chamaecyparis lawsoniana).* The fungus is a transported between cedar groves or trees by vehicle tires or by hikers' shoes. The disease generally infects trees after they reach 30 years of age, so it is possible that no older stands of this widespread tree may survive unless more effective action is taken. It is assumed that the loss of Port Orford cedars will have a profound effect on many forest and riparian communities in the Klamath Mountains. The tree species is known to play an important ecological role the health of streams in the ecoregion and is important to wildlife as well. Sudden Oak Death syndrome (SOD), another non-native root pathogen, is of growing concern in the Klamath Mountains with known pockets of the disease in the California portion of the ecoregion and one just outside near Brookings, Oregon. The disease causes death in some species of native oaks. As SOD moves northward there could potentially be impacts to oak savanna and forest habitats throughout the ecoregion. Disease was listed as a threat in 10 portfolio sites in the ecoregion where Port Orford cedar is a main component of the focal conservation targets. Sites with occurrences of SOD were also included in the threat analysis, although more sites may need to be added as the disease is monitored and more is learned about its spread and effects.

6.1.5 Livestock Grazing

The extent and duration of grazing in the lower elevations in the foothills surrounding Redding, in the other interior valleys and along the coast affects low elevation non-forested and woodland habitats, riparian habitats, and aquatic species. Seasonal grazing at higher elevations has also occurred to a great extent historically. Grazing has contributed to changes in native terrestrial species composition and structure, often abetting the invasion of exotic plants into heavily grazed areas. Loss of riparian cover has increased stream temperatures in some areas reducing habitat for species that depend on cooler water.

6.2 Threats to Aquatic Sites

Threats to aquatic portfolio sites were not formally assessed on a site by site basis by the core team. In part this was a result of not having the aquatic sites identified when the threat assessment was conducted for the terrestrial portfolio sites. In a coarse-scale examination of the aquatic portfolio sites, however, many of the sites possessed enough similarities that a threat assessment of the entire group of aquatic sites should be sufficient for developing multi-site strategies. For aquatic conservation targets, fourth order streams and low elevation third order streams have been most impacted and/or are experiencing the highest degree of threat.

It is important to note that threats to aquatic sites are often related to impacts that may happen a considerable distance upstream in the watershed or in upland ecological systems seemingly unrelated to the aquatic zone. The Klamath Mountains ecoregion overlaps four Ecological Drainage Units, none of which are wholly contained within the ecoregion. The Pit EDU has its headwaters outside of the ecoregion, the Sacramento EDU discharges beyond the ecoregional border, and the Rogue-Umpqua and Klamath EDUs have both headwaters and downstream termini beyond the ecoregional borders. Thus, aquatic threats that occur both above and below the ecoregional boundaries can have significant impacts to aquatic targets within the ecoregion. Threats that occur downstream from the ecoregion and may impact aquatic targets include dam operation, overfishing, incompatible management of certain species (hatcheries) among others. Threats that occur upstream from the ecoregion and may impact aquatic targets include dam operation, water withdrawal from diversion systems, water pollution, hatchery management, and overfishing.

Threats relevant to aquatic portfolio sites are listed in Table 13.

TABLE 13. Aquatic Portfolio Sites Threats.

AQUATIC THREATS	CURRENT ACTIVE	POTENTIAL FUTURE
WATER MANAGEMENT		
Dam construction	N	N?
Construction of ditches, dikes, drainage or diversion systems	N	Y?
Channelization of rivers or streams	Y	N
Incompatible operation of dams or reservoirs	Y	Y
Incompatible operation of drainage or diversion systems	Y	Y
Excessive groundwater withdrawal	N	N
Shoreline stabilization	Y	Y
POINT SOURCE POLLUTION		
Water pollution—agricultural runoff	Y	Y
RESOURCE EXTRACTION		
Incompatible mining practices	Y	Y
Overfishing or overhunting	Y	N?
LAND/RESOURCE MANAGEMENT		
Incompatible management of/for certain species	Y	Y?

LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Incompatible primary home development	Y	Y
Incompatible second home/resort development	Y	Y
Incompatible commercial/industrial development	N	Y
Incompatible development of roads or utilities	N	Y

Many of the listed threats are currently active: inappropriate actions are still occurring and they are impacting aquatic conservation targets, both species and aquatic communities. A number of these threats will continue to be of concern into the future and some, such as those associated with land development, may increase in scope as development pressures increase in suburban and rural areas of the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. Some of the threats with the broadest impacts are related to dam operations on major rivers. Altered hydrology and outright de-watering of streams is severe in the interior valleys, as are poor water quality (high temperatures, altered nutrients, and toxins) due to riparian alterations, runoff, and point source contributions. Dams built without adequate ladders prevent fish passage to large areas of historically important spawning and rearing habitat, and large low gradient river reaches have been confined to static lines on the floodplain.

Aquatic portfolio sites impacted by major dams include the Klamath River, Trinity River, Shasta River, McCloud River and North Umpqua River Aquatic Sites. Nearly all aquatic sites in the portfolio, and many of the streams in the terrestrial sites have small dams that impede flows and restrict passage of fish to some degree. These lowhead dams may not be as imposing as large flood control or power generation dams are, but they contribute significant cumulative impacts to aquatic biodiversity in streams and rivers.

Hatcheries are another significant impact to aquatic sites, particularly where imperiled anadromous fish runs are focal conservation targets. Hatcheries are captured under the threat termed “incompatible management of certain species”, namely non-native runs of salmon. Hatcheries occur in most significant river systems in the ecoregion but only potentially impact a subset of the anadromous runs per drainage. Improved hatchery management could enhance wild salmon conservation if the emphasis on hatcheries moved from total salmon production to conservation of native, wild salmon runs. Hatcheries with an emphasis on native fish conservation are just beginning to operate in select locations.

6.3 Multi-Site Threat Abatement Strategies

Threat abatement strategies are built upon both the pattern of threats in the ecoregion, and the consideration of other ecoregional characteristics including ownership, conservation targets and opportunity. At the ecoregional assessment roll-out meeting held in May 2002 in Medford, Oregon, a number of threat-related issues were discussed and some strategies were proposed. Over the fall and winter in 2003 the Oregon and California Field Offices participated in two more planning efforts that fell within or overlapped with the ecoregion. In the first of these, the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation Grant Proposal, members of the planning team participated with a broad array of community members, organizations and agencies to develop a conservation proposal for the Rogue Basin and coastal streams within the Ecoregion. In the second, a Klamath Basin-wide Conservation Area Plan, the two field offices worked together to develop a plan. The conservation assessments and strategies developed in these efforts captured important points that were included here.

The strategies considered below address urgent threats and related opportunities, many of which primarily affect targets at lower and middle elevations. The following discussion outlines the broad-scale strategies, and provides several detailed examples of actions that could be considered to effect the strategies. The strategies are grouped under the priority threats, and are offered in a priority order.

6.3.1 Strategies to Abate Multi-Site Threats

THREAT 1. FIRE MANAGEMENT/ ALTERED FIRE REGIME

- Hire fire management position(s). Position(s) would emulate the cost-share position developed with the federal agencies in Central Oregon. Funds for fire management will be driving agency actions over the next few years. This momentum has the potential for great threat abatement and thus having a TNC presence at a programmatic level would be high leverage. This position could focus on key fire-active areas such as the Rogue Basin including the Applegate River Watershed, the Cascade Siskiyou National Monument, and the Illinois Valley, or the low elevation systems within sites in the Klamath River drainage. The fire position(s) would work with the support of existing TNC ecologist and managers in the ecoregion.

    1. Provide credible scientific information on the impacts of fire management for conservation targets. Focus on biodiversity needs related to fire management and link this to management and compatible land use at site, local and regional scales.

    2. Establish natural fire recovery zone(s) for the Biscuit Fire by working with the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, private landowners and communities in the recovery planning and salvage logging planning.

    3. Influence fire management-specific programs and projects in the ecoregion

    4. Promote ecologically appropriate fire-related forest restoration activities that include mechanical thinning and prescribed burning.

    5. Work with the agencies to develop a compatible salvage logging approach that protect ecological function and integrity of target forest systems.

- Utilize expertise of Government Relations staff to assist with soliciting/acquiring funds for ecological restoration through hazard reduction activities in the wildland-urban interface and other priority fire management action on public and private lands.

    1. Increase resources to help private landowners apply prescribed fire.

    2. Work with the agencies and private landowners to develop fire management and suppression plans to improve options for response to wildfire.

    3. Secure state/federal tax incentives that encourage landowners to manage their land compatibly with fire in the landscape.

THREAT 2. INVASIVE/ALIEN SPECIES

- Participate in federal and state agency partnerships to develop and implement weed control strategies for sites and ecosystems.

    1. Implement pilot-demonstration projects to address landscape-scale weed problems (consider Applegate Adaptive Management Area or the Cascade Siskiyou National Monument).

    2. Establish an inter-ownership council (Weed Management Area) to improve coordination and efficiency of weed management efforts. Target control of habitat- or process-modifying species and species in the early stages of invading where success is possible and control is most cost effective.

    3. Establish “weed free areas” where biodiversity values are high and invasion is low. Prioritize allocation of detection and control efforts to maintain these areas.

- Address the problem of aquatic faunal invasives by promoting state policies for hatchery operations that support recovery of wild salmon and steelhead in the region.

- Track State and Federal Agency monitoring and management of POC root rot disease and Sudden Oak Death in the ecoregion.

THREAT 3. INCOMPATIBLE FORESTRY

- Work with partners to adopt commercial timber management in portfolio sites that maintain or enhance biological diversity on managed areas. Partners may include agencies, industrial timberland owners, and non-industrial owners of timberland. This effort would focus on leaving critical biological legacies.

- Utilize expertise of Government Relations staff to assist with supporting federal policy for ecologically compatible restoration logging.

- Support partners in developing new or improving existing incentives (e.g. SalmonSafe, forest certification) that promote protection of habitat, maintenance of connectivity, and restoration and maintenance of habitat quality.

- Support partners in developing markets that support ecologically sustainable timber extraction.

THREAT 4. INCOMPATIBLE GRAZING

- Specify grazing threat with respect to specific targets. Review grazing management plans within portfolio sites and work with agencies and key private owners to improve grazing management to enhance viability of selected target species and systems.

- Develop grazing plans and land management plans with key private owners on selected sites to restore floodplain connectivity on fourth order streams and low elevation, third order streams.

- Identify where grazing may be promoted as a tool (i.e CA floristic province vernal pools), or where maintaining grazing use is beneficial to stem more critical development threats.

THREAT 5. INCOMPATIBLE OPERATION OF DAMS OR RESERVOIRS

- Review operations of key dams, assisting agencies in identifying and adopting changes necessary to manage flow regimes to more closely mimic natural flows, or to remove dams critically limiting fish passage.

    1. Track partner organization feedback from their participation in FERC relicensing opportunities on the Klamath River dams.

    2. Track agency, watershed councils and private partners in prioritizing and implementing strategic removal of in-stream barriers to fish passage.

THREAT 6. SECOND HOME/RESORT DEVELOPMENT

- Secure state/federal tax incentives to encourage land development that will minimize habitat fragmentation and destruction and encourages landowners to protect and properly manage their land.

- Develop and implement county ordinances that help to control development in key sites.

- Support strategic land acquisition/protection by conservation organizations or public agencies by providing advice and technical assistance. Protect habitats underrepresented in current protected sites (including remnant or limited habitat features, intact valley bottom gallery forests, low elevation old growth forests, rare plant sites, and habitat for other conservation targets).

6.3.2 Other Broad-Scale Implementation Needs

ASSESSMENT IMPLEMENTATION

- Promote Annual Coordination between CAFO and ORFO
    1. Coordinate annually, conference call or one-day meeting
    2. Brief field office staff on status of implementation
    3. Incorporate goals/action items into annual plans and objectives
- Develop and implement Monitoring program for the ecoregional portfolio
    1. Develop and implement Measures of Success to evaluate threat abatement for priority sites and focal species, system, and process targets.
    2. Develop monitoring program to evaluate protected status of protected areas.

SITE CONSERVATION PLANNING

- Establish near term priorities for site planning
- Timeline: Complete one site per year per state.
- By the end of the 10-year planning cycle, all priority sites will have been planned.

COLLABORATE IN ONGOING COMMUNITY-BASED AND REGIONAL RESOURCE PLANNING

- Coordination with Agencies
    1. Influence USFS and BLM forest resource planning
    2. Work with agencies on rural interface lands for fire management, ecosystem management
    3. Assess protected status of portfolio: review Forest Plans, assess State and Federal land management planning for protected area establishment and management.
- Enhance capacity and leadership of partner organizations
    1. Identify organizational and technical development needs.
    2. Support networking, education or peer-to-peer exchanges.
    3. Invest in board training, strategic planning, financial management.
    4. Identify and strengthen strategic conservation-related enterprises (eco-tourism, restoration by-products utilization, etc.) through technical assistance, networking and “seed” financial support.
    5. See Appendix 21 for list of potential partner organizations.

LAND / WATER ACQUISITION OR DEDICATION IN PUBLIC RESERVES

- Define gaps in the reserve network, and where appropriate promote establishment of reserves to protect conservation targets that are under-represented in the conservation network, and/or to re-establish connectivity.

- Acquire or support acquisition of fee title or conservation easement by others of key tracts as determined necessary in completed Conservation Area Plans.

CHAPTER 7 – LESSONS LEARNED, SECOND ITERATION PLANNING

7.1 Data Gaps/Portfolio Design Limitations

The planning team's assessment of the first iteration of the Klamath Mountains ecoregion conservation assessment is that it is a very credible first iteration. Nevertheless, several data limitations and gaps were identified by the team or emerged during peer review:

- Some G3/G4 species targets, mostly animals, were not tracked by one or the other state heritage programs, so data was incomplete. These species, which were still considered as targets in the portfolio, need to have these data gaps filled to be more useful in portfolio design.

- Not all targets are adequately protected in each level 1 or 2 managed area where they occur. Future iterations may want to do a protection assessment of each target, either in each managed area, or more broadly.

- The team used predicted or modeled distributions for some targets. The GAP models are only predicted/potential distributions, based largely on habitat, and sometimes species distributions are constrained by other things such as fragmentation or migration barriers. All of these data need to be confirmed with fieldwork or at least have the models refined and tested to increase accuracy. The vegetation map and aquatic macrohabitats were modeled using a geology coverage which included serpentine in the Cascades section. This and other minor errors in the vegetation model should be corrected in future iterations.

- The conservation goals are a "best guess" that would benefit from more study of conservation viability needs. Peer reviewers noted this as a major limitation that influences both the portfolio results as well as the overall acceptability of the process to partners.

- In many cases surrogates for biological communities are an oversimplification, although probably useful at an ecoregional scale. Field verification of the aquatic classification and the vegetation map would strengthen their use in portfolio design and acceptance. The aquatic classification would also benefit from being attributed with fish and aquatic invertebrate distribution data.

- The Suitability Index used in the final SITES runs needs to have some sensitivity analyses run on it to determine how its factors affect the overall Index and, in turn, the resulting portfolio.

- There were certain species, such as neotropical birds and bats, that should have been targets, but had no ecoregion-wide distribution data available. Developing this data should be a priority for the next iteration.

- Resident fish data was incomplete for portions of the ecoregion; this gap needs to be addressed.

7.2 Lessons Learned/Best Practices

- Core team composition needed to include wildlife biologists throughout the planning process. This would have prevented the exclusion of vertebrate animal targets from the analysis due to data concerns.

- The team agreed that it had good species occurrence data, so any experts' knowledge that might have been gained early in the process was not significant when compared to the effort required. The exception to this was with the ecological

systems mapping and aquatic classification that could have benefited from additional review during their development.

- To do the type of portfolio review that was conducted requires more time than was originally allocated. It took nearly three months to line up meetings with all the individuals and groups that reviewed the portfolio and the project could have used even more review.

- The effort invested in threats assessment during the planning process was inadequate to meet many needs of conservation assessment implementers. Greater effort to assess threats would have resulted in a more comprehensive assessment that could be more readily implemented. Most of the threats and strategy development has had to take place long after the assessment was completed and the core team has moved onto new projects.

7.3 Data Management

A master copy of primary data files and intermediate portfolio products will be housed at the Oregon Field Office of The Nature Conservancy. Portfolio shapefiles and corresponding data will also be stored and maintained at the NW Division Ecoregional Data Management Team office in Seattle. Portfolio data will be translated into a database in the Conservation Planning Tool (CPT) format. This database will be distributed to TNC field personnel in Medford, Oregon, and Shasta Valley, California, to assist in implementation projects and ongoing field inventories of portfolio sites. The CPT database will have the ability to be updated with target and site information on a periodic base, acting as a means for measuring conservation success at portfolio sites and for the ecoregion overall. The CPT database will also serve as the first step in the next iteration of the Klamath Mountains ecoregional assessment.

Compact discs (CDs) will be distributed to primary TNC offices (OR, CA) in the ecoregion and will include GIS files pertinent to the portfolio as well as the CPT database. The ecoregional conservation assessment itself will be produced in both hard-copy format and as CDs. A copy will be sent to TNC's Conservation Planning Department at the WorldWide office in Arlington, Virginia. The assessment will also be placed on the TNC intranet site for easy access by interested staff.

Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Assessment Appendices

1. Public Land Management Operational Units in the Ecoregion
2. Budget for Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Plan
3. Rare Plant Targets
4. Terrestrial Animal Targets (Herptiles & Molluscs, Mammals, Birds & Molluscs, Wide-Ranging Targets)
5. Fish Targets
6. Critically Imperiled Plant Association Targets
7. Ecological Systems Targets
8. Aquatic Macrohabitats
9. Experts and Literature Consulted for Aquatic Classification
10. Variables Used to Construct Aquatic Community Classification
11. Protected Areas in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion
12. Peer Reviewers for Conservation Portfolio
13. Conservation Portfolio Sites
14. Portfolio Site Ownership
15. Portfolio Point Site Targets
16. Conservation Targets Represented at Each Portfolio Site—electronic format only
17. Conservation Target Assessment
18. Unmet Conservation Target Goals
19. Aquatic Macrohabitat Representation at Portfolio Sites
20. Terrestrial Portfolio Threats Assessment
21. Potential Conservation Partner Organizations

Appendix 1. Public Land Management Operational Units in the Ecoregion

US Forest Service

Umpqua National Forest	OR
Rogue River National Forest	OR
Siskiyou National Forest	OR
Klamath National Forest	CA
Six Rivers National Forest	CA
Lassen National Forest	CA
Shasta-Trinity National Forest	CA

Bureau of Land Management

Umpqua District	OR
Coos Bay District	OR
Medford District	OR
Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument	OR
Redding District	CA
Eagle Lake District	CA

National Park Service

Oregon Caves National Monument	OR
Lassen Volcanic National Park	CA
Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area	CA

California State Forests

Latour State Forest	CA

Oregon State Parks

Illinois River State Park	OR
Valley of the Rogue State Park	OR
Tou Velle State Park	OR
Joseph Stewart State Park	OR
Casey State Park	OR

California State Parks

Castle Crags State Park	CA
McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State Park	CA

Other State Ownership

Denman Wildlife Management Area	OR

Appendix 2. Budget for Klamath Mountains Ecoregional Plan

ECOREGION NAME: KLAMATH MOUNTAINS	DIRECT	INDIRECT
TEAM MANAGEMENT		
Planning Team Leader: (0.5 FTE 30 mos)	57,500	22,138
CA Planner Co-lead: (0.2 FTE 30 mos)	25,000	9,625
Planning Staff (SW OR, N CA staff, 1 FTE total)	45,000	17,325
Administrative Costs:	6,000	
Phone:		
Postage:		
Xerox + Office Supplies:		
DATA MANAGEMENT		
Heritage:		
Data Purchase:	**10,000**	
Staff:	**20,000**	
Other Data Sources:	**5,000**	
Freshwater Species & Community Data		
WRO/NatureServe Ecologist (.2 FTE 24 mos)	18000	6930
GIS Component:		
Hardware:	**3,000**	
Software:		
Staff-GIS Manager: (0.5 FTE, 30 mos)	**42,500**	**16,363**
Consultants:	**2,000**	
TEAM MEETINGS		
Travel Expenses: (8 meetings)	15,000	
Staff Time: (20K field offices, 10K WRO)	30,000	11,400
WORKSHOPS (Experts/Peer Review)		
Travel Expenses:	**5,000**	
ROLL-OUT MEETING	**4,000**	
TOTAL	$ 288,000.00	83,781
AMT. TO BE RAISED AS NEW, PRIVATE MONEY	**$97,500.00**	**16,363**

Appendix 3. Rare Plant Targets

SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL RANK	ECOREGIONAL (OCCURRENCES) TOTAL	GOAL
Agrostis hendersonii	1	2	2
Allium jepsonii	1	3	3
Arabis koehleri var koehleri	1	9	9
Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	1	14	14
Calochortus coxii	1	12	12
Calochortus persistens	1	6	6
Calochortus umpquaensis	1	17	17
Cirsium ciliolatum	1	16	16
Clarkia borealis ssp arida	1	3	3
Cordylanthus tenuis ssp pallescens	1	32	32
Eriastrum tracyi	1	3	3
Erythronium citrinum var roderickii	1	5	5
Fritillaria gentneri	1	38	38
Hastingsia atropurpurea	1	19	19
Horkelia hendersonii	1	4	4
Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	1	22	22
Limanthes floccosa ssp pumila	1	2	2
Linanthus nuttallii ssp howellii	1	4	4
Lomatium cookii	1	37	37
Lupinus aridus ssp Ashlanensis	1	1	1
Madia doris-nilesiae	1	26	26
Minuartia stolonifera	1	2	2
Neviusia cliftonii	1	8	8
Oenothera wolfii	1	2	2
Orthocarpus pachystachyus	1	4	4
Perideridia erythrorhiza	1	21	21
Phacelia cookei	1	5	5
Phlox hirsuta	1	3	3
Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpus	1	32	32
Plagiobothrys hirtus	1	13	13
Polemonium chartaceum	1	4	4
Rhynchospora californica	1	1	1
Rupertia hallii	1	33	33

SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL RANK	ECOREGIONAL (OCCURRENCES) TOTAL	GOAL
Sedum moranii	1	21	21
Sedum paradisum	1	6	6
Tauschia howellii	1	11	11
Arabis macdonaldiana	2	43	10
Aster vialis	2	8	6
Bensoniella oregana	2	80	13
Calochortus greenei	2	48	11
Calochortus howellii	2	38	10
Camassia howellii	2	20	10
Campanula shelteri	2	9	6
Campanula wilkinsiana	2	19	11
Clarkia gracilis ssp albicaulis	2	7	6
Draba carnosula	2	7	7
Epilobium oreganum	2	56	12
Eriogonum alpinum	2	8	5
Eriogonum hirtellum	2	19	10
Gentiana setigera	2	51	10
Hastingsia bracteosa	2	27	7
Ivesia pickeringii	2	13	7
Juncus leiospermus var leiospermus	2	7	4
Lewisia cotyledon var heckneri	2	21	10
Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	2	10	9
Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	2	58	13
Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii	2	10	5
Madia stebbinsii	2	10	7
Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	2	13	7
Phacelia greenei	2	28	10
Phacelia leonis	2	12	9
Potentilla cristae	2	9	9
Raillardella pringlei	2	21	10
Ranunculus austrooreganus	2	29	12
Sedum albomarginatum	2	3	2
Senecio eurycephalus var lewisrosei	2	4	3
Sidalcea malachroides	2	2	2
Silene marmorensis	2	16	10

SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL RANK	ECOREGIONAL (OCCURRENCES) TOTAL	GOAL
Sisyrinchium hitchcockii	2	4	3
Smilax jamesii	2	12	10
Sophora leachiana	2	61	10
Streptanthus howellii	2	37	10
Thermopsis robusta	2	12	10
Tuctoria greenei	2	1	1
Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	2	44	10
Arabis koehleri var stipata	3	42	10
Arabis modesta	3	17	6
Arctostaphylos hispidula	3	34	11
Asarum marmoratum	3	5	4
Camissonia ovata	3	1	1
Carex gigas	3	24	11
Castilleja elata	3	24	9
Chaenactis suffrutescens	3	19	11
Cupressus bakeri	3	9	5
Epilobium siskiyouense	3	68	10
Erythronium howellii	3	57	10
Fritillaria eastwoodiae	3	50	10
Fritillaria purdyi	3	1	1
Gratiola heterosepala	3	12	5
Lewisia cantelovii	3	6	5
Lomatium engelmannii	3	10	7
Microseris howellii	3	57	10
Monardella purpurea	3	25	10
Navarretia heteranda	3	3	2
Orcuttia tenuis	3	10	7
Pedicularis howellii	3	22	10
Penstemon filiformis	3	58	10
Plagiobothrys glyptocarpus	3	3	3
Sedum oblanceolatum	3	69	10
Senecio hesperius	3	52	10
Lewisia oppositifolia	4	55	3

Appendix 4. Terrestrial Animal Targets

A. Herptiles and Molluscs

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	GRANK	ECOREGIONAL OCCURRENCES	
			TOTAL	GOAL
Hydromantes shastae	Shasta Salamander	1	93	93
Ambystoma californiense	California Tiger Salamander	2	15	15
Plethodon stormi	Siskiyou Mountains Salamander	2	213	13
Clemmys marmorata marmorata	Northwestern Pond Turtle	3	211	15
Plethodon elongatus	Del Norte Salamander	3	301	18
Rana boylii	Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog	3	152	13
Rhyacotriton variegatus	Southern Torrent Salamander	3	52	13
Ascaphus truei	Tailed Frog	4	130	8
Rana aurora aurora	Northern Red-Legged Frog	4	23	7
Rana cascadae	Cascades Frog	4	44	6
Ancotrema voyanum	Hooded Lancetooth	2	22	10
Fluminicola seminalis	Nugget Pebblesnail	2	17	8
Fluminicola species 1		2	2	2
Fluminicola species 14	Tall Pebblesnail	2	6	5
Fluminicola species 16	Toothed Pebblesnail	2	6	3
Fluminicola species 17	Tuscan Pebblesnail	2	1	1
Fluminicola species 18	Wood River Pebblesnail	2	1	1
Fluminicola species 20	Crooked Creek Pebblesnail	2	2	1
Monadenia chaceana	Siskiyou Shoulderband	2	33	13
Monadenia churchi	Klamath Sideband	2	268	14
Monadenia klamathica		2	5	4
Monadenia ochromphalus		2	38	11
Monadenia setosa	Trinity Bristlesnail	2	27	10
Monadenia troglodytes	Shasta Sideband	2	4	4
Monadenia wintu		2	6	6
Trilobopsis roperi	Shasta Chaparral	2	24	4
Trilobopsis tehamana	Tehamana Chaparral	2	5	5
Vespericola pressleyi	Big Bar Hesperian	2	2	2
Vespericola shasta	Shasta Hesperian	2	18	8

B. Wide-ranging Species Targets

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	ECOREGIONAL (HA) TOTAL	ECOREGIONAL (HA) GOAL
Vulpes vulpes necator	Red Fox	G4T2T3		
Gulo gulo luteus	Wolverine	G4T3		
Riparia riparia	Bank Swallow	G5		
Agelaius tricolor	Tri-Colored Blackbird	G3		
Falco peregrinus anatum	Peregrine Falcon	G4T3		
Columba fasciata	Band-Tailed Pigeon	G4		
Strix occidentalis caurina	Northern Spotted Owl	G3T3		
Empidonax traillii	Willow Flycatcher	G5		
Empidonax difficilis	Pacific Slope Flycatcher	G5		
Poecile rufescens	Chestnut-Backed Chickadee	G5		
Martes pennanti	Pacific Fisher	G5	339537	119442

C. Bird and Mammals Targets

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK
Ixobrychus exilis hesperis	Western Least Bittern	G5TU
Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald Eagle	G4
Buteo swainsoni	Swainson's hawk	G5
Grus canadensis tabida	Greater Sandhill Crane	G5T4
Brachyramphus marmoratus	Marbled Murrelet	G3G4
Columba fasciata	Band-tailed Pigeon	G4
Coccyzus americanus occidentalis	Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo	G5T3
Strix occidentalis caurina	Northern Spotted Owl	G3T3
Strix nebulosa	Great Gray Owl	G5
Cypseloides niger	Black Swift	G4
Selasphorus rufus	Rufous Hummingbird	G5
Baeolophus inornatus	Oak Titmouse	G5
Agelaius tricolor	Tricolored Blackbird	G3
Corynorhinus townsendii pallescens	Pale Lump-nosed Bat	G4T4
Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii	Townsend's Western Big-eared Bat	G4T3T4
Tadarida brasiliensis	Brazilian free-tailed Bat	G5
Lynx canadensis	Lynx	G5
Odocoileus virginianaus leucurus	Columbian White-tailed Deer	G5T2Q

Appendix 5. Fish Targets

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	GRANK	ECOREGIONAL STREAM KM	
			TOTAL	GOAL
Chamistes brevirostris	Shortnose Sucker	1	169	169
Cottus asperrimus	Rough Sculpin	2	244	122
Oncorhynchus mykiss (Klamath Mtns. Province ESU)	Steelhead Salmon	2	3841	1920
Cottus klamathensis macrops	Bigeye Marbled Sculpin	3	1277	638
Mylopharodon conocephalus	Hardhead	3	594	297
Oncorhynchus kisutch (Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coast ESU)	Coho Salmon	3	3540	1770
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall run, Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coast ESU)	Fall Chinook Salmon	3	419	210
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring run)	Spring Chinook Salmon	3	1822.586	911.29
Oncorhynchus clarki clarki (Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coast ESU)	Sea-run Cutthroat Trout	4	698.371	232.79
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter run, Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coast ESU)	Winter Chinook Salmon	4	1817.48	605.83

Appendix 6. Critically Imperiled Plant Association Targets

TARGET DESCRIPTION	GRANK
Moss meadow	G1
Port Orford-cedar - Douglas-fir / (California Rhododendron) / Western Turkeybeard Forest	G1
White Fir - Port Orford-cedar - Brewer's Spruce / Huckleberry Oak Forest	G1
Sugar Pine - Ponderosa Pine - Douglas-fir / California Fescue Forest	G1
Douglas-fir / Beaked Hazelnut / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G1
Ponderosa Pine / Greenleaf Manzanita - Tobacco-brush Woodland	G1
Ponderosa Pine - Oregon White Oak / Whiteleaf Manzanita / California Fescue Woodland	G1
Ponderosa Pine - White Oak - Black Oak Savanna	G1
Port Orford-cedar / Evergreen Blueberry Forest	G1
Grand Fir - Sitka Spruce / Salal / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G1
Douglas Fir - Incense Cedar / California Fescue	G1
Port Orford Cedar - White Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G1
Rogue River Plains-Andesite Flow Vernal Pool	G1
Rogue River Plains-Hardpan Vernal Pool	G1
Port Orford-Incense cedar-White Alder	G1?
Buttonbush - (Narrowleaf Willow, Pacific Willow) Seasonally Flooded Shrubland	G1?
Coyotebrush / Beach Wormwood - California Figwort Shrubland	G1G2
Jeffrey Pine / Tufted Reedgrass (CA)	G1G2Q
California Oatgrass Valley Grassland Herbaceous Vegetation	G1Q
California Oatgrass - Idaho Fescue Herbaceous Vegetation	G1Q

Appendix 7. Ecological Systems Targets

Part 1: Target Descriptions

EL CODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	MINIMUM DYNAMIC AREA (HA)	ECOREGIONAL (HA) TOTAL	ECOREGIONAL (HA) GOAL
KLGRP02	Alpine Dwarf Shrublands	0	5399	1080
KLGRP01	Barrens	0	22602	3103
KLGRP10	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	100	4578	2289
KLGRP22	Chaparral	1000	355538	107106
KLGRP12	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	0	71508	21482
KLGRP19	Coastal Herbaceous and Low Shrublands	0	0	0
KLGRP20	Coastal Influenced Canyons	500	138960	28515
CONVERSION	Converted land	NA	57061	0
KLGRP17	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	1000	94259	43719
KLGRP15	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak -Pine Woodlands	1000	622660	144919
KLGRP37	Great Basin Shrublands	400	31638	11499
KLGRP21	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	1000	252928	59409
KLGRP27	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	100	42220	16854
KLGRP11	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	2000	837094	225833
KLGRP30	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	230	164651	23721
KLGRP24	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	100	9501	3824
KLGRP25	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	100	423910	133303
KLGRP08	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	2000	498745	124230
KLGRP28	Montane Riparian Forests	0	88380	14696
KLGRP29	Montane Riparian Shrublands	0	195	21
KLGRP07	Montane White Fir Forests	1000	233007	52255
KLGRP34	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	0	11501	2301
KLGRP09	Port Orford Cedar – Mixed Conifer Forests	1000	48957	24480
KLGRP26	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	100	2265	906
KLGRP33	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	0	3188	342
KLGRP23	Seral Chaparral	100	42501	8632
KLGRP31	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	0	1491	149
KLGRP06	Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	1000	290	58
KLGRP03	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	1000	135002	51934
KLGRP04	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	100	14500	3134
KLGRP05	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	1000	147560	42276

EL CODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	MINIMUM DYNAMIC AREA (HA)	ECOREGIONAL (HA) TOTAL	ECOREGIONAL (HA) GOAL
KLGRP14	Talus and Scree Slopes	0	0	0
KLGRP13	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	1000	451101	136122
KLGRP35	Ultramafic Chaparrals	0	12680	1333
KLGRP36	Upland Grasslands	500	164398	23076
KLGRP32	Vernal Pools	0	0	0
KLGRP18	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	1000	58172	11634
KLGRP16	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	1000	2478	532

Part 2: Plant Associations Found within Each Target

Note: bold headings are the ecological zones and the ecological systems found within those zones. The zones are the broad ecologically based units used for organizing data collection. The ecological systems are aggregated units of associations defined by the environment and driving ecological processes. The plant associations are used for detailed ground mapping and habitat assessment.

Ecoregional Distribution (KME DISTR.)

E=endemic (>80% in ecoregion), L=limited (shared with few other ecoregions), W=widespread, P=peripheral

Patch Type

Li=Linear, LP=Large Patch, M=Matrix, SP=Small Patch.

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
ROCK OUTCROPS AND BARRENS				
Barrens and "Rock Gardens" (KLGRP01)				
	Moss meadow	G1	W	SP
	Rock-garden	G?	W	SP
	Grassy meadows on shallow, stony soils	G?	W	SP
TIMBERLINE-ALPINE				
Alpine Dwarf-shrublands and Meadows (KLGRP02)				
	Alpine Blueberry / Tufted Hairgrass Dwarf-shrubland	G2	W	SP
	Pink Mountain-heath Parkland Dwarf-shrubland	G5	W	SP
	Partridgefoot - Tolmie's Alpine Saxifrage Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Western Moss Heather - Pink Mountain-heath Dwarf-shrubland	G5	W	SP
SUBALPINE FOREST ZONE				
Subalpine Hemlock Forests (KLGRP03)				

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Mountain Hemlock / Cascade Heather (CA)	G5	W	LP
	Mountain Hemlock / Parry Rush (CA)	G5	W	LP
	Mountain Hemlock / Deer Oak / Sidebells Forest	G3G4	W	LP
	Mountain Hemlock / Pipsissewa Forest	G4	W	LP
Supalpine Red Fir Forests (KLGRP04)				
	California Red Fir / Sticky Currant Forest	G3?	W	LP
	Red Fir - Brewer Spruce / Sadler Oak - Thinleaf Huckleberry (CA)	G2	L	SP
	Red Fir - Incense Cedar (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Red Fir / Rhododendron (CA)	G2	W	LP
	Red Fir / Sadler Oak (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Red Fir / Sadler Oak - Pinemat Manzanita (CA)	G2G3	W	LP
	Red Fir - White Fir / Sadler Oak (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Red Fir / Silver Lupine (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Red Fir - White Fir / Bracken (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Red Fir - White Fir / Pinemat Manzanita (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Red Fir - White Fir / Vanilla Leaf (CA)	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Vanilla Leaf (CA)		W	LP
	White Fir - Shasta Red Fir / Vanilla Leaf	G3	W	LP
	Pacific Silver Fir - White Fir / Dwarf Oregon-grape Forest	G3	L	LP
	Pacific Silver Fir - White Fir / Starflower False Solomon's-seal Forest	G4	L	LP
	Red Fir / White-veined Shinleaf (CA)	G4	W	LP
Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests (KLGRP05)				
	White Fir - Shasta Fir / Sadler Oak (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Shasta Red Fir / Deer Oak Forest	G4	E	LP
	Shasta Red Fir / Beautiful Jacob's-ladder Forest	G3	E	LP
	White Fir - Shasta Red Fir / Pipsissewa Forest	G3	E	LP
	White Fir - Shasta Red Fir / Gooseberry species Forest	G3	E	LP
	White Fir - Shasta Red Fir / Wood Rose Forest	GU	E	LP
	(White Fir) - Shasta Red Fir / Creeping Snowberry Forest	GU	E	LP
	Shasta Fir / Blue Wild Rye	G3	L	LP
	Shasta Fir / Black Laurel (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Shasta Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Shasta Fir / Pinemat Manzanita (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Shasta Fir / Prince's Pine (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Shasta Fir / Twinflower (CA)	G2G3	L	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Shasta Fir / White-veined Shinleaf (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Subalpine Fir Scree Woodland	G5?	W	SP
	Alaska Yellow-cedar Subalpine Parkland Woodland	G3	W	LP
Subalpine Pine Forests (KLGRP06)				
	Foxtail Pine Forest / Drummond Windflower	G2	E	LP
	Foxtail Pine/ Stipa occidentale (CA)	G2	E	LP
MONTANE ZONE				
Montane White Fir Forests (KLGRP07)				
	White Fir / Sticky Starwort (CA)	G4	W	LP
	White Fir / Pinemat Manzanita	G2	W	LP
	White Fir / Pipsissewa Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G4	W	LP
	White Fir / Mahala Carpet (CA)	G3G4	W	LP
	White Fir / White-veined Shinleaf (CA)	G4	W	LP
	White Fir / Starflower False Solomon's-seal Forest	G3Q	W	LP
	White Fir / Rocky Mountain Maple Forest	G4	W	LP
	White Fir / Pacific Poison-oak Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Trillium (CA)	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / American Vetch (CA)	G3?	W	LP
	White Fir / Saskatoon Serviceberry / Columbian Windflower Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Saskatoon Serviceberry - Beaked Hazelnut Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Dwarf Oregon-grape Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Dwarf Oregon-grape - Salal Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Deer Oak Forest	G4	W	LP
	White Fir / Snow Dewberry Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Pacific Yew Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Square-twig Blueberry Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Creeping Snowberry Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir / Swampgooseberry	G3	W	LP
Low Elevation Mixed Conifer (Pinus-Pseudotsuga menziesii-Abies) Forests (KLGRP08)				
	White Fir - Ponderosa Pine / Snowberry species Forest	G3	W	LP
	White Fir - Douglas-fir / Piper Oregon-grape Forest	G4	W	M
	White Fir - Douglas-fir / Hillside Oceanspray Forest	G4	W	M
	White Fir - Douglas-fir / Modesty Forest	G3	W	M
	White Fir - Douglas-fir / Dwarf Oregon-grape Forest	G4	L	M

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	White Fir - Incense Cedar / Dwarf Oregon Grape	G3	W	LP
	White Fir - Douglas Fir / Rhododendron	G2G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Black Oak (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Canyon Live Oak (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Canyon Live Oak / Little Oregongrape (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Canyon Live Oak / White-flower Hawkweed (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Grass (CA)	G?Q	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Hazel (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Huckleberry Oak(CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Rhododendron - Sadler Oak (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Sadler Oak (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Sadler Oak - Huckleberry Oak(CA)	G2?	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Sadler Oak - Pinemat Manzanita(CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Thimbleberry (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Vine Maple (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Wild Rose / Twinflower (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir / Yerba de selva (CA)	G3	W	LP
Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer (Pseudotsuga menziesii-Abies) Forests (KLGRP09)				
	Port Orford Cedar - Red Fir / Sadler Oak - Thinleaf Huckleberry (CA)	G2G3	E	LP
	White Fir - Port Orford-cedar - Douglas-fir / (Dwarf Oregon-grape) / Sweet After Death Forest	G2	E	LP
	White Fir - Port Orford-cedar / Deer Oak / Sierran Doghobble - California Rhododendron Forest	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - White Fir / Sadler Oak (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - White Fir / Herb (CA)	G?Q	E	LP
	Port Orford-cedar - Western Hemlock / Salal - California Rhododendron Forest	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford-cedar - Western Hemlock / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G2	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - Port Orford Cedar / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford-cedar - Douglas-fir / (California Rhododendron) / Western Turkeybeard Forest	G1	E	LP
	Port Orford-cedar - Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Salal Forest	G2	E	LP
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar - California Bay (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Port Orford-Cedar - California Bay / Black Huckleberry (CA)	G2	E	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar / Black Huckleberry (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Port Orford-Cedar / Red Huckleberry (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Port Orford-Cedar / Salal (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar / Salal (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar / Vine Maple (CA)	G2G3	E	LP
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar / Little Oregongrape / Twinflower (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar / Spikenard (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford-cedar - Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Salal Forest	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar / Hairy Honeysuckle / Fescue	G3	E	LP
Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer (Pseudotsuga menziesii-Abies) Forests (KLGRP10)				
	White Fir - Port Orford-cedar - Brewer's Spruce / Huckleberry Oak Forest	G1	E	SP
	White Fir - Brewer's Spruce / Pipsissewa Forest	G3	E	LP
	White Fir - Brewer's Spruce / Western Teaberry / Sidebells Forest	G3?	E	LP
	White Fir - Brewer's Spruce / Square-twig Blueberry / Greenleaf Rattlesnake Plantain Forest	G2	E	LP
Montane Mixed Conifer (Psuedotsuga-Pinus-Libocedrus-Abies) Forests (KLGRP11)				
	Sugar Pine - Ponderosa Pine - Douglas-fir / California Fescue Forest	G1	L	LP
	Incense-cedar - Douglas-fir / Pinemat Manzanita Forest	G3	L	LP
	Incense-cedar Forest	G4?	W	LP
	Mixed Conifer / Little Oregongrape (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Mixed Conifer / Mahalla Carpet (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas-fir / Piper Oregon-grape Forest	G3	W	M
	Douglas-fir / Vine Maple Forest	G5?	W	M
	Douglas-fir - Pacific Madrone / Salal Forest	G3	W	M
	Douglas-fir / Salal Forest	G3G4	W	M
	Douglas-fir / Creeping Oregon-grape Forest	G5	W	M
	Douglas-fir / Beaked Hazelnut / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G1	L	SP
	Douglas-fir / Dwarf Oregon-grape Forest	G3	W	M
	Douglas-fir / Salal / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G4	W	M
	Douglas-fir / California Rhododendron Forest	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Ponderosa Pine - California Black Oak / Bracken Fern	G5	W	LP
	Douglas-fir / Pacific Poison-oak Woodland	G4	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Canyon Live Oak Woodland	G4	L	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Douglas Fir - Canyon Live Oak - Madrone / Poison Oak	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Canyon Live Oak / Rockpile (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Madrone (CA)	G5	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Yerba de selva (CA)	G3	L	LP
Chinquapin-Mixed Douglas-fir Forests (KLGRP12)				
	Douglas Fir - Chinkapin / Beargrass (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak - Golden Chinkapin Forest	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Chinkapin / Bracken (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - Chinkapin - Tanoak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Chinkapin / Rhododendron - Little Oregongrape (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Chinkapin / Rhododendron - Sadler Oak / Beargrass (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Chinkapin / Rhododendron / Beargrass(CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Chinkapin / Rhododendron - Salal(CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Chinkapin / Little Oregongrape (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Chinkapin - Tanoak / Little Oregongrape(CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Chinkapin / Little Oregongrape / Vanilla Leaf(CA)	G4	W	LP
Tanoak-Mixed Douglas-fir Forests (KLGRP13)				
	Douglas Fir - White Fir - Tanoak / Little Oregongrape (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Canyon Live Oak Forest	G3G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Canyon Live Oak / Tanoak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak / Black Huckleberry (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak - Black Oak / Poison Oak (CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak / Little Oregongrape (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak / Little Oregongrape - Salal (CA)	G2	L	LP
	Tanoak-Douglas fir-Canyon Live Oak/Dwarf Oregon Grape	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak / Poison Oak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Canyon Live Oak / Rockpile (CA)	G2G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Hazel (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Incense Cedar / California Fescue (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Little Oregongrape - Salal (CA)	G3	L	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Pacific Yew (CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Poison Oak - Hairy Honeysuckle (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Prince Pine (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Rhododendron - Black Huckleberry (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Rhododendron - Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Rhododendron - Salal (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Sugar Pine (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Vanilla Leaf (CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Vine Maple (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Vine Maple - Salal(CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak / Black Huckleberry (CA)	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Black Oak / Wild Rose (CA)	G?	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Pacific Poison-oak Forest	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - California Bay / Poison Oak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Chinkapin / Salal(CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Salal Forest	G4	L	LP
	Bigleaf Maple - Douglas-fir - California Laurel / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G3	L	LP/SP
	Douglas-fir - California Laurel / Pacific Poison-oak Forest	G4	W	M
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Bigleaf Maple / Sword Fern (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Tanoak - Bigleaf Maple - Canyon Live Oak/Western Swordfern	G3	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Western Azalea Forest	G3	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Alpine Blueberry Forest	G4	L	LP
	Douglas-fir / Tanoak / Evergreen Blueberry Forest	G4	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Tanoak / Dwarf Oregon Grape	G3	L	LP
	Tanoak-Douglas Fir/Sadler oak -dwarf oregongrape	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Tanoak - California Coffeeberry	GU	L	LP
MONTANE TALUS OR SCREE				
Talus or Scree Slopes (KLGRP14)				
FOOTHILL WOODLAND ZONE				
Foothill Mixed Douglas-fir-Oak-Pine Woodlands (KLGRP15)				
	Pacific Madrone - Douglas-fir - Oak species / Pacific Poison-oak Woodland	G3G4Q	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Oregon White Oak / Pacific Poison-oak	G3	W	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Woodland			
	Douglas-fir - Oregon White Oak / Common Snowberry Woodland	G2G3	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - Oregon White Oak / Grass (CA)	G3	P	
	Ponderosa Pine / Douglas-fir / Pinemat Manzanita Woodland	G2	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - Douglas-fir / Greenleaf Manzanita Woodland	G3	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - Douglas Fir - Sugar Pine / Chinkapin	G5	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - Douglas Fir / Whiteleaf Manzanita - Buckbrush(OR)	G3	W	LP
	Oregon White Oak / hedgehog dog tail	G2G3	L	SP
	Ponderosa Pine - Douglas Fir Woodland	G3	W	LP
Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands (KLGRP16)				
	Western White Pine-Douglas Fir/ Huckleberry oak-Dwarf tanoak	G2G3	L	LP
	Western White Pine / Western Turkeybeard Woodland	G3	E	SP
	Western White Pine / Angelica (CA)	G2	W	LP
	Western White Pine / Bush Tanoak (CA)	G2G3	W	LP
	Western White Pine / Oceanspray (CA)	G2	W	LP
	Whitebark Pine / Mtn. Spiraea (CA)	G2	W	LP
Foothill Pine (Jeffery, Ponderosa, Knobcone, Foothill) Forests and Woodlands (KLGRP17)				
	Jeffrey Pine / Pinemat Manzanita (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Greenleaf Manzanita - Whiteleaf Manzanita Forest	G2Q	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Greenleaf Manzanita - Tobacco-brush Woodland	G1	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Bitterbrush Woodland	G3G5	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Big Sagebrush (CA)	G3	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / California Brome (CA)	G2?	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Mahalla Carpet (CA)	G3?	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine / Wedgeleaf Ceanothus (CA)	G3?	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - Oregon White Oak / Whiteleaf Manzanita / California Fescue Woodland	G1	E	SP
	Ponderosa Pine - Oregon White Oak / Common Snowberry Woodland	G2G3	L	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - White Oak - Black Oak Savanna	G1	W	LP
	Ponderosa Pine - Canyon Live Oak (CA)	G3?	W	LP
	McNab Cypress Forest	G2?	L	SP
	Foothill Pine Woodland	G4?	W	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Knobcone Pine / Pinemat Manzanita Woodland	G2	W	LP
	Knobcone Pine Woodland	G4?	W	LP
COASTAL FOREST ZONE				
Western Hemlock Coastal Forests (KLGRP18)				
	Western Red Cedar - Western Hemlock Forest / Oregongrape	G3	W	LP
	Western Arborvitae - Western Hemlock / Redwood Sorrel Forest	G2	L	LP
	Western Hemlock / Golden Chinkapin Forest	G3	W	LP
	Western Hemlock / Salal Forest	G4	W	LP
	Western Hemlock / Deer Oak Forest	G3	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Western Hemlock / Hillside Oceanspray Forest	G3	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Western Hemlock / Dwarf Oregon-grape Forest	G2	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Western Hemlock / Salal Forest	G3	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Western Hemlock / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G3?	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - (Western Hemlock) / California Rhododendron Forest	G3	W	LP
	Douglas-fir - Western Hemlock / Tanoak - California Laurel Forest	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Western Hemlock / California Bay (Laurel)	G2	W	LP
	Douglas Fir - Western Hemlock / Tanoak / Rhododendron	G3?	W	LP
	Port Orford-cedar / Evergreen Blueberry Forest	G1	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - Ponderosa Pine - Incense Cedar	G5	L	LP
	Grand Fir - Sitka Spruce / Salal / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G1	P	M
	Red Alder / Pineland Sword Fern Forest	G4	W	LP
COASTAL HERBACEOUS AND LOW SHRUBLAND ZONE (SO. OREGON COAST)				
Coastal herbaceous and Low Shrubland Vegetation (KLGRP19)				
INTERIOR VALLEY ZONE				
Coastal influenced Canyons (KLGRP20)				
	Canyon Live Oak - White Oak / Goldenback Fern (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Canyon Live Oak / Narrowleaf Sword Fern (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Canyon Live Oak Forest	G4?	W	L/LP
Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands (KLGRP21)				
	Blue Oak Woodland	G4?	W	LP
	White Oak - Western Juniper Oak Savanna	G2	W	LP
	White Oak / California Brome (CA)	G2G3	W	LP
	Oregon White Oak / wedgeleaf ceanothus / Idaho Fescue Woodland	G2	E	SP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Oregon White Oak - California Black Oak / Pacific Poison-oak Woodland	G3	E	SP
	Valley Oak Woodland	G2?	W	LP
	California Black Oak Woodland	G4?	W	SP
	Black Oak - Douglas Fir (CA)	G4	W	LP
	Interior Live Oak Woodland	G4?	W	LP
XEROPHYLUS SHRUBLANDS				
Chaparral (Oak, Chamise, Manzanita, Buckbrush, etc.) (KLGRP22)				
	Chamise Shrubland	G4?	W	SP
	Greenleaf Manzanita - Huckleberry Oak Chaparral	G4	W	SP
	Greenleaf Manzanita - Cherry - Bitterbrush Chaparral	G2	W	SP
	Whiteleaf Manzanita - wedgeleaf ceanothus / Idaho Fescue - Lemmon's Needlegrass Shrubland	G2	L	LP
	Coyotebrush / Beach Wormwood - California Figwort Shrubland	G1G2	W	SP
	Bush Chinquapin Shrubland	G4?	W	SP
	Buckbrush / Lemmon Needlegrass	G2	L	SP
	Buckbrush - Birchleaf Mountain Mahogany - Klamath Plum Chaparral	G3	W	SP
	Buckbrush - Fremont Silktassel - Poison Oak Chaparral	G4	W	SP
	Chaparral Whitethorn Shrubland	G4?	W	SP
	Curl-leaf Mountain-mahogany Woodland	G4?	W	SP
	Birchleaf Mountain-mahogany Woodland	G4?	W	SP
	Parry's Rabbitbrush Shrubland	G3G4	W	SP
	Black Crowberry - Salal Dwarf-shrubland	G2	L	SP
	Salal - Evergreen Blueberry / Bracken Shrubland	G3	W	SP
	Hillside Oceanspray Shrubland	G4?	W	SP
	Bitterbrush Shrubland	G3?	W	SP
	(Scrub Oak, Palmer Oak, Turbinella Live Oak, Interior Live Oak) Shrubland	G3?	W	SP
	Brewer Oak Shrubland	G3?	L	LP
	Sadler Oak Shrubland	G4?	E	SP
	Huckleberry Oak Shrubland	G3?	W	LP
	Interior Live Oak Shrubland	G3?	W	SP
Seral Chaparral (Manzanita, Buckbrush) (KLGRP23)				
	Greenleaf Manzanita - Huckleberry Oak Chaparral	G4	W	SP
	Hoary Manzanita - Sticky Manzanita - Buckbrush	G3	W	SP
	Buckbrush - Birchleaf Mountain Mahogany - Klamath Plum	G3	W	SP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Chaparral			
	Buckbrush - Fremont Silktassel - Poison Oak Chaparral	G4	W	SP
	Wedgeleaf Ceanothus - Incense Cedar (CA)	G2G3	W	SP
	Wedgeleaf Ceanothus / Squirreltail (CA)	G2G3	W	SP
	Mountain Whitethorn Shrubland	G3?	W	SP
	Deerbrush - Canyon Live Oak - Blue Wild Rye (CA)	G4	L	LP
	Tanoak - Madrone - Deerbrush (CA)	G3G4	L	LP
	Blue Blossom Shrubland	G4?	W	SP
	Mountain Balm Shrubland	G?	W	SP
Great Basin Shrublands (KLGRP37)				
	Desert Saltbrush Scrub	G3	W	SP
	Alkali Playa	G3	W	SP
	Iodine Bush Series	G3	W	SP
SERPENTINE AND ULTRAMAFIC SUBSTRATE FOREST ZONE				
Mixed-Conifer (Pinus-Psuedotsuga) Serpentine Forests (KLGRP24)				
	Sugar Pine-LodgepolePine/Huckleberry oak-Dwarf tanoak	G2G3	L	LP
	Sugar pine-Lodgepole pine/Huckleberry oak-Pacific Rhododendron	G2G3	L	LP
	Sugar pine-Western White pine/Huckleberry Oak-Dwarf silktassel	G2G3	L	LP
	Western White Pine-Lodgepole Pine/Dwarf tanoak-Pacific Rhododenron	G2	L	LP
	Western White Pine-Sugar Pine/Huckleberry oak-Dwarf tanoak	G2G3	L	LP
	Western White Pine-Douglas Fir/ Huckleberry oak-Dwarf tanoak	G2G3	L	LP
Mixed Evergreen (Psuedotsuga-Sclerophyll) Serpen. & Ultramafic Substrate Forests (KLGRP25)				
	Tanoak-Western white Pine / Huckleberry oak / Common Beargrass	G3	L	LP
	Tanoak / manzanita / Common beargrass	G4	L	LP
	Tanoak - Golden Chinquapin -Sugar pine	G3	L	LP
	Sugar Pine-Chinquapin/Huckleberry oak-Sadler oak	G2G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak- Huckleberry Oak -Ocean Spray	G2	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir / Huckleberry Oak - Bush Tanoak (CA)	G3	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Incense Cedar / California Fescue	G1	L	LP
	Douglas Fir - Jeffrey Pine - Incense Cedar (CA)	G3	L	LP
Chamaecyparis lawsoniana Serpentine and Ultramafic Substrate Forests (KLGRP26)				
	Port Orford Cedar / Western Azalea	G2	E	LP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Port Orford Cedar - White Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G1	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - White Fir - Western White Pine/Huckleberry Oak	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - White Fir / Azalea (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - Western White Pine / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar - Douglas Fir / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Port Orford Cedar / Rhododendron - Salal (CA)	G2	E	LP
Pinus Jefferyi Serpentine and Ultramafic Substrate Forests and Woodlands (KLGRP27)				
	Jeffrey Pine / Tufted Reedgrass (CA)	G1G2Q	L	LP
	Jeffrey Pine / Squawcarpet Wooded Herbaceous Vegetation	G3	W	LP
	Knobcone Pine / Hoary Manzanita	G2	E	LP
	Knobcone Pine / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G3	E	LP
	Douglas Fir - JeffreyPine / California Fescue	G3	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine /Huckleberry Oak - Pinemat manzanita/ Idaho Fescue	G4	E	LP
	Jeffery Pine -Incense Cedar / Buck brush	G3	E	LP
	Jeffery Pine - Incense Cedar / Siskiyou Mat	G3	E	LP
	Low Elevation Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Woodland	G3	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Douglas Fir / Huckleberry Oak / California Fescue (CA)	G3?	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Incense Cedar / Huckleberry Oak (CA)	G3	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Incense Cedar / Huckleberry Oak / Beargrass (CA)	G3	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine / Sadler Oak / Beargrass (CA)	G3?	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Western White Pine / Del Norte Iris (CA)	G3	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine-White Fir / Iris	G2G3?	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine / Serpentine Haplopappus (CA)	G2	E	LP
	Low Elevation Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Savanna	G2	E	LP
	Jeffrey Pine / Idaho Fescue Wooded Herbaceous Vegetation	G3	W	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Western White Pine / Pinemat Manzanita Woodland	G3	W	LP
	Jeffrey Pine - Douglas-fir / Whiteleaf Manzanita Woodland	G3	W	LP
	Jeffrey Pine / Huckleberry Oak Woodland	G4	W	LP
Ultramafic Chaparrals (KLGRP35)				
	Indicative of extreme serpentine chemisty – mapped seperately			
MONTANE AND COASTAL RIPARIAN VEGETATION				
Montane Riparian Forests (KLGRP28)				

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Douglas Fir - California Myrtle / Sword Fern Riparian	GU	W	LP
	Sitka Alder / Subarctic Lady Fern Shrubland	G3G4	W	SP
	White Alder / Indian Rhubarb (CA)	G3	L	Li
	Oregon Ash - Black Cottonwood / Common Snowberry / Stinging Nettle Forest	G3G4	W	Li
	Port Orford-Incense cedar-White Alder	G1?	E	Li
	Port Orford-cedar / Western Azalea / Sedge species Forest	G2	E	Li
	Port Orford Cedar / Western Azalea (CA)		E	Li
	Tanoak - Port Orford Cedar / Black Huckleberry - Azalea (CA)	G2	E	Li
	Black cottonwood		W	Li
	Douglas Fir - Tanoak - Port Orford-Cedar - White Alder / Riparian (CA)	G3	E	Li
	Quaking aspen riparian			
Montane Riparian Shrublands (KLGRP29)				
	Vine Maple	GU	W	Li
	Vine Maple / Lady Fern - Youth-on-age	GU	W	Li
	Speckled Alder / Douglas' Meadowsweet Shrubland	G3	W	SP
	Speckled Alder Shrubland	G?Q	W	SP
	Speckled Alder / Red-osier Dogwood Shrubland	G3G4	W	SP
	Speckled Alder / Mesic Forbs Shrubland	G3G4	W	SP
	Speckled Alder / Common Snowberry Shrubland	G3?	W	SP
	White Alder - Bigleaf Maple (CA)	G4	W	SP
	Water Birch Shrubland	G3Q	W	SP
	Buttonbush - (Narrowleaf Willow, Pacific Willow) Seasonally Flooded Shrubland	G1?	W	SP
LOW ELEVATION (FOOTHILL) AND INTERIOR RIPARIAN VEGETATION				
Low Elevation Riparian Forest and Shrublands (KLGRP30)				
	Black cottonwood		W	Li
	Fremont Cottonwood Forest	G2Q	W	Li
	Oregon Ash / Spreading Rush	G2	L	Li
	Oregon Ash / Snowberry	G4	W	LP
	Marchantia - Apple Moss Riparian	G3	?	Li
	Western Azalea / Camas	G2	L	Li
WETLANDS				
Serpentine (Darlingtonia Fens, California Oatgrass, etc.) Wetlands (KLGRP31)				
	Darlingtonia Ultramafic Fen	G2	L	SP
	California Oatgrass - Tufted Hairgrass Ultramafic Prairie	G2	L	SP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Few-flowered Spikerush - Fringed Cottongrass Ultramafic Fen	G2	L	SP
	California Oatgrass - Tufted Hairgrass Ultramafic Fen	G2	L	SP
	California Sedge Utramafic Fen	G2	L	SP
Vernal Pools (Herbaceous Seasonal Saturated to Semi-Saturated Wetlands) (KLGRP32)				
	Rogue River Plains-Andesite Flow Vernal Pool	G1	E	SP
	Rogue River Plains-Hardpan Vernal Pool	G1	E	SP
	Annual Hairgrass Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
	Brodiea - Annual Hairgrass Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
	Bracted Popcorn Flower - Purslane Speedwell Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
	Bractless Hedge-hyssop - Bracted Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
	Nuttall's Quillwort - Bracted Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G2	W	SP
	Navarretia - Bracted Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G2	W	SP
	Mousetail - Bracted Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
	Goldfields Vernal Pool	G3	L	SP
	Foxtail - Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G3	L	SP
	Dwarf Wooly-heads Vernal Pools	G2	W	SP
	Cascade Downingia - Bracted Popcorn Flower Vernal Pool	G2	L	SP
Seasonally Flooded Meadows and Forb-dominated Wetlands (Carex, Deschampsia, Agrostis, Veratrum,etc.) (KLGRP33)				
	False Hellsebore - Nettle-leaf Horse-mint Herbaceous Vegetation	G3	L	SP
	Angelica - Fendler's Meadow-rue	G3	L	SP
	Diego Bent Grass - Ribbed Sedge (CA)	G3		SP
	Thin Bentgrass - Davis' Knotweed	G2	L	SP
	Brodiea Prairie	GU	W	SP
	Arrowleaf Ragwort - California False Hellebore Herbaceous Vegetation	G4	W	SP
	Toad Rush Marsh	G5	W	SP
	Baltic Rush Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Pale Spikerush Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Tufted Hairgrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G4	W	SP
	Tufted Hairgrass - California Oatgrass Valley Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	W	SP
	Dagger-leaf Marsh	G4	W	SP
	Common Camas Prairie	G4	W	SP
	Northwest Territory Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
	Water Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Brewer's Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G4	W	SP
	Shorthair Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G3?	W	SP
	Nebraska Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G4	W	SP
	Holm's Rocky Mountain Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Northwestern Showy Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	One-sided Sedge - Meadow Barley Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	W	SP
	Shorthair Reedgrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G3?	W	SP
	Bluejoint Reedgrass Western Herbaceous Vegetation	G4Q	W	SP
	Nootka Reedgrass - Blue Wildrye Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	W	SP
Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows and Forb-dominated Wetlands (Carex, Scirpus, Typha, Saxifrage, etc.) (KLGRP34)				
	California Darlingtonia Herbaceous Vegetation	G4?	L	SP
	Dense Sedge - Tufted Hairgrass Prairie	G2G3	W	SP
	Wood Saxifrage	G?	W	Li
	Water Crowfoot Aquatic Bed	G5	W	SP
	Water Purslane - Waterpepper Marsh	G2	W	SP
	Starwort Aquatic Bed (CWWA000053)	G4	W	SP
	Nuttall's Saxifrage - Wallace's Selaginella	G?	W	SP
	Northern Water Meal - Columbia Water Meal Aquatic Bed	G4	W	SP
	Lobb's Water-buttercup Aquatic Bed	G2	L	SP
	(Bolander's Quillwort, Spiny-spore Quillwort, Western Quillwort, Nuttall's Quillwort) Herbaceous Vegetation	G2G3	W	SP
	Floating-leaved Pondweed (Potamogeton natans) Bed	G4	W	SP
	Duckweed Bed	G5	W	SP
	Starwort Aquatic Bed (CWWA000053)	G4	W	SP
	Coontail (Common Hornwort) Aquatic Bed	G5	W	SP
	Watershield Herbaceous Vegetation	G3G4	W	SP
	Potamogeten Natans Bed	G4	W	SP
	Dense Sedge - Spreading Rush Marsh	GU	E	SP
	Small-fruited Bulrush Marsh	G4	W	SP
	Soft Rush Marsh	G5	W	SP
	Narrowleaf Burr-reed Herbaceous Vegetation	GU	W	SP
	Hardstem Bulrush Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP
	Softstem Bulrush Temperate Herbaceous Vegetation	G4	W	SP
	Broadleaf Cattail Western Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	W	SP

	ASSOCIATION COMMON NAME	GLOBAL RANK	KME DISTR.	PATCH TYPE
DRY MEADOWS				
Upland Grasslands (Needlegrass, Oatgrass, Fescue, etc.) (KLGRP36)				
	Squirreltail - Douglas Buckwheat	G2	L	SP
	Dwarf Sagebrush / Idaho Fescue Dwarf-shrub Herbaceous Vegetation	G5	P	SP
	Bluebunch Wheatgrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	W	SP
	Nodding Needlegrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G3?	W	SP
	Foothill Needlegrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G2?	W	SP
	Purple Needlegrass Herbaceous Vegetation	G3?	W	SP
	Cascade Desert-parsley Herbaceous Vegetation	G3	W	SP
	Rogue - Umpqua Upland Grassland	G2	W	SP
	Blue Wildrye Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	W	SP
	California Oatgrass - Red Fescue Herbaceous Vegetation	G2	L	SP
	California Oatgrass Valley Grassland Herbaceous Vegetation	G1Q	L	SP
	California Oatgrass - Idaho Fescue Herbaceous Vegetation	G1Q	L	SP
	Squirreltail - California Oatgrass (CA)	G2	W	SP
	Purple Needlegrass / Purple Sanicle	G3	W	SP

Appendix 8. Aquatic Macrohabitats

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
1101	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	14.7	4.0
1103	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	5.8	2.9
1111	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	25.7	5.2
1112	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	84.9	17.0
1113	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	166.0	16.6
1114	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	300.0	30.0
1121	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	92.7	18.5
1122	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	40.3	8.1
1123	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	461.1	46.1
1124	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	128.4	12.8
1131	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3.1	1.6
1133	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	317.5	31.8
1141	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	569.9	57.0
1142	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	427.6	42.8
1143	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1878.6	93.9
1144	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	297.7	29.8
1153	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	17.2	3.5
1154	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	155.2	15.5
1164	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on limestone substrate in the Sacramento drainage	5.3	2.6
1172	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	271.6	27.2
1173	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2.3	1.2
1174	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	136.3	13.6
1181	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	82.1	16.4
1183	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	446.5	44.7
1184	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3.4	1.7
1201	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	9.7	4.8
1211	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	457.0	45.7

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
1212	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	925.5	92.6
1213	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	114.2	11.4
1214	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1115.9	55.8
1221	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2150.4	107.5
1222	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	37.3	7.5
1223	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1230.4	61.5
1224	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	175.3	17.5
1231	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	349.7	35.0
1232	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	180.4	18.0
1233	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	229.3	22.9
1234	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	165.8	16.6
1241	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3642.4	182.1
1242	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	462.9	46.3
1243	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1620.8	81.0
1244	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	420.3	42.0
1251	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	10.4	5.2
1252	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Pit drainage	10.3	5.2
1253	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	27.8	5.6
1254	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	535.2	53.5
1261	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	38.9	7.8
1262	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Pit drainage	11.9	2.4
1271	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	20.3	4.1
1272	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	32.7	6.5
1273	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2.8	1.4
1274	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	195.4	18.5
1281	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1019.0	51.0
1282	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	149.9	15.0
1283	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	550.2	55.0

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
1284	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	48.1	9.6
1311	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	24.8	5.0
1312	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	109.8	11.0
1314	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	159.4	15.9
1321	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	102.9	10.3
1323	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	7.7	3.9
1324	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2.9	1.5
1331	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	48.9	9.8
1332	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	56.5	11.3
1334	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	20.4	4.1
1341	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	18.0	3.6
1343	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	28.2	5.6
1344	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2.9	1.4
1371	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	18.1	3.6
1374	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	5.0	2.5
1381	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	68.4	13.7
1382	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	10.0	5.0
1383	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1.2	0.6
1441	First order stream over 6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1.0	0.5
1481	First order stream over 6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	0.6	0.3
2101	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	11.2	2.2
2111	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2.2	1.1
2112	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	18.8	3.8
2113	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	46.8	9.4
2114	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	99.2	19.9
2121	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	103.1	10.3
2122	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	15.7	3.1
2123	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	303.4	30.3

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
2124	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	25.4	5.1
2133	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	281.9	28.2
2141	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	286.7	28.7
2142	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	128.7	12.9
2143	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	744.4	74.4
2144	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	92.6	18.5
2153	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4.5	2.3
2154	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	58.1	11.6
2172	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	2.7	1.4
2173	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4.1	2.1
2181	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	29.8	6.0
2183	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	170.2	17.0
2184	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2.3	1.1
2201	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	0.9	0.5
2211	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	63.8	12.8
2212	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	381.6	38.2
2213	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	20.3	4.1
2214	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	447.8	44.8
2221	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	503.1	50.3
2222	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	8.2	4.1
2223	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	175.3	17.5
2224	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	50.4	10.1
2231	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	131.3	13.1
2232	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	142.9	14.3
2233	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	23.7	4.7
2234	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	39.0	7.8
2241	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	925.5	92.6
2242	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	100.1	20.0

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
2243	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	212.1	21.2
2244	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	134.6	13.5
2251	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3.6	1.8
2253	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	7.9	4.0
2254	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	173.8	17.4
2261	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	18.2	3.6
2262	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Pit drainage	0.4	0.2
2271	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	0.6	0.3
2272	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	0.1	0.0
2273	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1.2	0.6
2281	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	275.7	27.6
2282	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	44.1	8.8
2283	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	47.5	9.5
2284	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	20.3	4.1
2311	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3.9	2.0
2312	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	10.5	5.2
2314	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	6.3	3.2
2332	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	0.6	0.3
2334	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1.5	0.8
2372	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	0.2	0.1
2381	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	0.1	0.1
3101	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	5.6	2.1
3111	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3.1	1.5
3112	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	31.3	6.3
3113	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	58.7	11.7
3114	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	99.7	22.2
3121	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	121.0	12.1
3122	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	8.7	4.4

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
3123	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	229.1	22.9
3124	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	43.7	8.7
3131	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1.5	0.8
3133	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	380.5	38.1
3141	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	398.6	39.9
3142	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	82.2	16.4
3143	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	659.5	66.0
3144	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	219.5	10.8
3153	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	7.0	3.5
3154	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	50.2	10.0
3171	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	8.0	4.0
3173	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	6.9	3.5
3181	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	42.9	8.6
3182	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	0.8	0.4
3183	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	156.0	15.6
3184	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	24.8	5.0
3201	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	2.0	1.0
3211	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	87.0	17.4
3212	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	152.0	15.2
3213	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1.3	0.7
3214	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	225.6	22.6
3221	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	277.6	27.8
3222	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	0.5	0.3
3223	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	79.2	15.8
3224	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	17.3	3.5
3231	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	145.6	14.6
3232	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	22.4	4.5
3233	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4.3	2.2

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
3234	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	8.0	4.0
3241	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	497.1	49.7
3242	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	86.5	17.3
3243	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	78.2	15.7
3244	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	49.4	9.9
3251	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3.3	1.6
3253	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	5.3	2.7
3254	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	110.4	11.0
3261	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	4.1	2.0
3271	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	37.0	7.4
3272	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	3.4	1.7
3273	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1.4	0.7
3281	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	166.3	16.6
3282	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	21.4	4.3
3283	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	5.7	2.8
3284	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	15.0	3.0
3312	Third order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	8.9	4.5
4101	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	0.7	1.4
4111	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	11.1	2.2
4112	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	16.9	3.4
4113	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	63.3	12.7
4121	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	139.4	13.9
4122	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	32.9	6.6
4123	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	62.6	12.5
4133	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	259.9	26.0
4141	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	443.8	44.4
4142	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	23.1	4.6
4143	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	172.5	17.3

ELCODE	TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECOREGION (STREAM KM) TOTAL	GOAL
4153	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	7.3	3.7
4171	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	22.0	4.4
4173	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	6.9	3.5
4181	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	49.6	9.9
4183	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	48.4	9.7
4211	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	8.3	4.2
4212	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	29.9	6.0
4221	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	23.3	4.7
4231	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	12.1	2.4
4241	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	107.2	10.7
4271	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	125.8	12.6
4281	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	9.2	4.6

Appendix 9. Experts and Literature Consulted for Aquatic Classification

Experts

Jeff Dose, Umpqua National Forest, Fisheries biologist
Al Olsen, Klamath National Forest, Fisheries biologist
Rich Nawa, Siskiyou Education Project, Fisheries biologist
Chris Frissell, University of Montana, Flathead Lake Biological Station, Fisheries biologist
David Haight, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Fisheries biologist
Randy Frick, Rogue River National Forest, Fisheries biologist
Dan Delany, Siskiyou National Forest, Fisheries biologist
Bill Brock, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Fisheries biologist
Craig Tuss, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Roseburg, Oregon

Literature

Gordon, N. D., T. A. McMahon, B.L. Finlayson. 1992. Stream Hydrology: An Introduction for Ecologists. John Wiley and Sons: Chichester (England), 526 pp.

Higgins, J., M. Lammert, M. Bryer, M. DePhilip, and D. Grossman. 1998. Freshwater conservation in the Great Lakes Basin: Development and application of an aquatic community classification framework. Great Lakes Program, The Nature Conservancy, Chicago, IL.

Hocutt, C.H., and E.O. Wiley, eds. 1986. The Zoogeography of North American Freshwater Fishes. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 866 p.

Maxwell, J.R., C.J. Edwards, M.E. Jensen, S.J. Paustian, H. Parrott, and D.M. Hill. 1995. A Hierarchical Framework of Aquatic Ecological Units in North America (Nearctic Zone). General Technical Report NC-176. USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experimental Station, Madison, WI. 72p.

Slack, J.R. and J.M. Landwehr. 1992. Hydro-Climatic Data Network: A U.S. Geological Survey. Streamflow data set for the United States for the study of climate variations, 1874 - 1988.
USGS OPEN-FILE REPORT 92-129.
http://wwwrvares.er.usgs.gov/hcdn_report/abstract.html

Appendix 10. Variables Used to Construct Aquatic Community Classification

Data Sources

USEPA RF3 dataset ,1:100,000 hydrography

USGS Geology Maps of Oregon and California, Surficial Geology, 1:2,500,000

Digital Elevation Model (DEM)

StreamNet
Stream Order—determined from hydrography dataset
HUC6 watersheds—from hydrography dataset

CALWATER 2.2, California Watershed Map

Introduction

From our research, we determined that the mappable ecosystem attributes that determine lotic (i.e., streams and rivers) aquatic community types in the ecoregion are:

- size (habitat dimensions; flow rate)
- temperature (species limitations)
- chemistry (productivity)
- hydrologic regime (flow pattern/variability)
- channel morphology (velocity; habitat availability)
- connectivity (local zoogeography)

We chose to use five variables to represent these attributes as follows:

1. Stream order – this variable corresponds to the controlling factors of stream size (flow rate and velocity), channel morphology, and hydrologic flow regime. The classes chosen reflect broad changes in stream habitat and flow rates.

Classes:

1: 1st order

2: 2nd order

3: 3rd order

4: 4th order and higher

2. Elevation – this variable corresponds to some species limits, flow regime (snow melt amount and timing), stream temperature, and to some degree, slope. These classes were chosen by experts to reflect changes in vegetation, temperature, and precipitation, as well as aquatic species distributions.

Classes:

1: <2000'

2: 2000'-4000'

3: 4000'-6000'

4: >6000'

3. Lithology – this variable corresponds to flow regime (in conjunction with topography to determine groundwater vs. surface water contribution), water chemistry, stream substrate composition, and stream morphology. The classes group the 39 lithology types acquired from the USGS data. Todd Keeler-Wolf, ecologist with the California Natural Diversity DataBase grouped the geology types into 9 classes.

Classes:

0: Unknown

1: Basalt

2: Granitic (meta-volcanic)

3: Alluvial

4: Sedimentary (sandstone and shale)

5: Volcanic (ash, tuff and mud)

6: Limestone

7: Water

8: Serpentine (ultramafic and gabbro)

4. Ecological Drainage Unit (EDU)—this variable accounts for the biogeographic and physical differences in large stream systems in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion. The EDUs present in the ecoregion are:

1: Klamath

2: Pit

3: Rogue-Umpqua

4: Sacramento

Classification Notation

The aquatic macrohabitat classification of a given stream reach is identified by a 4-digit number with each digit referring to one of the variables noted above. The first digit refers to the stream order, the second digit refers to the elevation class, the third digit refers to lithology and the fourth digit refers to the EDU. Appendix 8 contains a complete list of all macrohabitats identified in the ecoregion.

Note: Reservoirs—reservoirs are denoted in the macrohabitat classification (see Appendix 8) by the "Shoreline" notation in their description. Within the classification code, shoreline is delineated by the lithology variable, Class 7, Water.

Appendix 11. Protected Areas in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion

Cascade Section

AREA NAME	OWNER	AREA (HA)
Antelope Creek Lakes RNA	US Forest Service	228.0
Bell Meadow RNA	US Forest Service	25.2
Butte Valley Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	2375.6
Caribou Wilderness	US Forest Service	8511.0
Cinder Flats Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	308.8
Coon Hollow Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	211.5
Cub Creek RNA	US Forest Service	1545.4
Graham Pinery RNA	US Forest Service	351.3
Green Island Lake RNA	US Forest Service	444.9
Ishi Wilderness	US Forest Service	6764.6
Lassen Volcanic National Park	National Park Service	11880.0
Lassen Volcanic Wilderness	National Park Service	31579.5
McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State Park	California Parks and Recreation	341.9
Mount Shasta Wilderness	US Forest Service	13561.5
Rosenburg Trust (Lassen Land Trust Easement)	Private Preserve	259.2
Shasta Mudflow RNA	US Forest Service	1437.4
Shasta Red Fir RNA	US Forest Service	508.2
Shasta Valley Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	1902.9
Soda Mountain	Bureau of Land Management	5597.8
Soda Mountain National Monument	Bureau of Land Management	25291.9
Soda Ridge RNA	US Forest Service	467.0
Swain Mountain Experimental Forest	US Forest Service	2476.1
Tehama Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	140.5
Thousand Lakes Wilderness	US Forest Service	6641.5
Timbered Crater RNA	US Forest Service	497.9
Warner Valley Wildlife Area	California Dept of Fish and Game	277.2

Klamath Section

AREA NAME	OWNER	AREA (HA)
Adorni RNA	US Forest Service	237.8
BLM (protected) (multiple parcels)	Bureau of Land Management	2924.8
Bridge Creek RNA	US Forest Service	700.8
Carpenterville-Brookings Forest Way	Oregon Parks and Recreation	11.8
Casey	Oregon Parks and Recreation	35.0
Castle Crags State Park	California Parks and Recreation	1539.4
Castle Crags Wilderness	US Forest Service	4052.7
Cedar Basin RNA	US Forest Service	364.9
Chanchelulla Wilderness	US Forest Service	3324.5
China Point Ecological Reserve	California Dept of Fish and Game	85.5
Claire-Engel Lake	Water	6498.6
Corps of Engineers (protected)	Corps of Engineers	342.6
Craigs Creek RNA	US Forest Service	482.0
Crater Creek RNA	US Forest Service	233.0
Denman Wildlife Area	Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife	821.9
Eight Dollar Mt. (TNC)	Private Preserve	18.6
French Creek RNA	US Forest Service	1049.2
H. Boardman Wayside (protected)	Oregon Parks and Recreation	261.4
Haypress Meadows RNA	US Forest Service	499.1
Hennessy Ridge RNA	US Forest Service	760.5
Hosselkus Limestone RNA	US Forest Service	2612.5
Illinois River	Oregon Parks and Recreation	135.4
Indian Creek Brewer RNA	US Forest Service	233.6
Jedediah Smith Redwood State Park	California Parks and Recreation	1154.9
Kalmiopsis Wilderness	US Forest Service	71974.9
L. E. Horton RNA	US Forest Service	461.0
Limestone Bluffs RNA	US Forest Service	374.7
Loeb State Park	Oregon Parks and Recreation	125.2
Lower Table Rock (TNC)	Private Preserve	744.7
Manzanita Creek RNA	US Forest Service	2934.9
Marble Mountain Wilderness	US Forest Service	90580.6
McCloud River Preserve (TNC)	Private Preserve	684.5
Mount Eddy RNA	US Forest Service	354.5
North Trinity Mountain RNA	US Forest Service	583.9
Oliver Mathews RNA	US Forest Service	444.6

AREA NAME	OWNER	AREA (HA)
Oregon Caves National Park	National Park Service	184.4
Pearch Creek RNA	US Forest Service	1192.5
Preacher Meadows RNA	US Forest Service	449.6
Private Preserves (multiple parcels)	Private Preserve	2270.2
Red Buttes Wilderness	US Forest Service	6597.1
Red Mountain RNA	US Forest Service	57.0
Redwood National Park	National Park Service	1026.8
Rock Creek Butte RNA	US Forest Service	272.1
Rogue River (Wild and Scenic)	Private Preserve	0.0
Rough and Ready Creek Preserve (TNC)	Private Preserve	25.9
Rough and Ready Wayside (protected)	Oregon Parks and Recreation	11.1
Round Top Butte Preserve (TNC)	Private Preserve	56.7
Russian Peak Wilderness	US Forest Service	4219.1
Ruth RNA	US Forest Service	35.1
Siskiyou Wilderness	US Forest Service	60122.9
Smokey Creek RNA	US Forest Service	458.1
South Fork Mountain RNA	US Forest Service	222.0
Specimen Creek RNA	US Forest Service	845.6
Stuart Fork RNA	US Forest Service	397.0
Sugar Creek RNA	US Forest Service	1266.8
Trinity Alps Wilderness	US Forest Service	201310.6
USFS Preserve (2 parcels)	US Forest Service	15.5
Upper Goose Creek RNA	US Forest Service	161.5
Whetstone Savanna (TNC)	Private Preserve	51.6
Whiskeytown Unit of Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity	National Park Service	41451.3
Wild Rogue Wilderness	US Forest Service	13771.5
William's Point RNA	US Forest Service	58.5
Yollo-Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness	US Forest Service	136.0

Umpqua Section

AREA NAME	OWNER	AREA (HA)
Bushnell Irwin Rocks ACEC	BLM	388
Popcorn Swale (TNC)	Private Preserve	4.1

Appendix 12. Peer Reviewers for Conservation Portfolio

November 14, 2001 Roseburg

Jeff Dose, Umpqua National Forest Fisheries Biologist
Jean Stanley, Roseburg BLM Planner
Additional BLM reviewers

December 10, 2001 Siskiyou NF Office

Wayne Rolle, Rogue River National Forest Botanist
Tom Atzet, Rogue-Siskiyou Area Ecologist
Anita Seda, Siskiyou National Forest Botanist
Lee Webb, Siskiyou National Forest Botanist
Maria Ulloa, Sisk NF Botanist
Fred Way, Applegate RD Wildlife Biologist

December 11, 2001 ODFW Office Central Point

Simon Wray ODFW Nongame Wildlife Biologist
Merv Wolfer, ODFW Game Biologist
David Haight: ODFW Fish Biologist
Kip Wright, BLM Ashland Wildlife:
Jim Harper, BLM Butte Falls Wildlife:
Roger Schnoes, BLM Glendale Wildlife

December 17, 2001 Medford TNC office

Randy Frick, Rogue NF Fish Biologist
Dan Delany: Sisk NF Fish Biologist
Matt Broyles, BLM, Grants Pass Wildlife Biologist
Frank Betlejewski, BLM, GP Forester/Ecologist
Paul Hosten, BLM, Ecologist
Linda Mazzu: BLM, GP Botanist

Appendix 13. Conservation Portfolio Sites

Aquatic Sites

SITE NAME	STATE	STREAM REACH LENGTH (KM)
Althouse Creek Aquatic Site	OR	30.8
Applegate River Aquatic Site	OR	100.8
Chetco River Aquatic Site	OR	24.0
Cow Creek Aquatic Site	OR	49.5
East Fork Illinois River Aquatic Site	OR	9.3
Fall River Aquatic Site	CA	26.5
Klamath River Aquatic Site	CA	276.3
Little Shasta River Aquatic Site	CA	10.3
Lower Rogue River Aquatic Site	OR	1.6
McCloud River Aquatic Site	CA	36.5
Middle Rogue River Aquatic Site	OR	24.3
North Fork Chetco River Aquatic Site	OR	11.5
North Umpqua River Aquatic Site	OR	19.2
Pistol River Aquatic Site	OR	10.0
Pit River Aquatic Site	CA	2.4
Salmon River Aquatic Site	CA	78.4
Scott River Aquatic Site	CA	79.7
Shasta River Aquatic Site	CA	52.6
Smith River Aquatic Site	OR CA	72.6
South Fork Trinity River Aquatic Site	CA	302.7
South Umpqua River Aquatic Site	OR	102.9
Sucker Creek Aquatic Site	OR	20.5
Trinity River Aquatic Site	CA	197.8
Upper Rogue River Aquatic Site	OR	28.2

Terrestrial Sites

SITE NAME	STATE	AREA (HECTARES)
Anderson Butte Site	OR	4810
Antelope Creek Site	OR	19544
Applegate Site	OR	41466
Ball Mountain Site	CA	10902
Black Mountain Site	CA	9308
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	OR	2463

SITE NAME	STATE	AREA (HECTARES)
Butt Creek Site	CA	32754
Butte Creek Drainage	CA	4431
Calochortus coxii Site	OR	3006
Camas Valley Site	OR	21237
Cascade Foothills Site	OR	42020
Cow Creek Site	OR	16297
Craggy Mountain Site	CA	8211
Elk Creek Site	OR	4626
Fall River Site	CA	61110
Grass Lake Site	CA	449
Hat Creek Site	CA	30330
Hayfork Site	CA	25525
Hennessy Ridge Site	CA	1427
Horse Creek Site	CA	2163
Illinois Valley	OR	50578
Kalmiopsis Site	OR	114691
Klamath River Mainstem Site	CA	16212
Lake Shasta Site	CA	90793
Lassen National Park Site	CA	53052
Little Butte Creek Site	OR	45381
Little Shasta River Drainage	CA	5096
Lower Pitt River Site	CA	37027
Manton Plains Site	CA	12077
Marble Mountains Site	CA	96406
Mount Shasta Site	CA	71274
Myrtle Creek Site	OR	26351
North Fork and Peel Wildflower Site	OR	11610
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	CA	9446
North Fork Feather River Plain	CA	3467
Oregon Caves Site	OR	21376
Orleans Site	CA	36072
Paradise Site	CA	46495
Pistol River Site	OR	16602
Red Butte Site	OR CA	19113
Rogue River Plains	OR	24316
Scott Mountains Site	CA	47223
Scott Valley	CA	34242

SITE NAME	STATE	AREA (HECTARES)
Sexton Mountain Site	OR	46788
Shasta Valley	CA	19594
Silver and Galice Creek Site	OR	81326
Siskiyou Crest Site	OR CA	42453
Slate Creek Site	OR	14952
Smith River Site	OR CA	40972
Soda Mountain Site	OR CA	41968
South Fork Mountain Site	CA	11140
South Siskiyous Site	CA	108669
The Eddy's	CA	52429
Trinity Alps Site	CA	222362
Trinity River Site	CA	2020
Umpqua Valley Site	OR	42642
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	CA	31960
Whiskeytown Site	CA	49542
Wild Rogue Site	OR	82831
Winchuck River Site	OR	9998
Wolf Creek Site	OR	14172
Yellow Creek Site	OR	4344

Appendix 14. Terrestrial Portfolio Site Ownership

**units are hectares*

	OWNER						
PORTFOLIO SITE NAME	BLM	USFS	OTHER FEDERAL	STATE	PRIVATE	WATER	GRAND TOTAL
Anderson Butte Site	2807		0	0	2003		4810
Antelope Creek Site	3474		0	606	15394	70	19544
Applegate Site	12296	22610	451	220	5638	250	41466
Ball Mountain Site	242	5850	0	0	4810		10902
Black Mountain Site	2356	480	0	0	6472		9308
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	608		0	0	1855		2463
Butt Creek Site		25288	0	0	7466		32754
Butte Creek Drainage Site		2772	0	0	1658		4431
Calochortus coxii Site	707		0	0	2299		3006
Camas Valley Site	8896		0	25	12316		21237
Cascade Foothills Site	12010	553	838	490	26866	1262	42020
Cow Creek Site	8776	1011	32	0	6504		16323
Craggy Mountain Site		6047	0	0	2164		8211
Elk Creek Site	1048		0	0	3578		4626
Fall River Site	9258	15972	0	651	35226		61107
Grass Lake Site		1	0	0	448		449
Hat Creek Site	1604	27264	0	0	1462		30330
Hayfork Site	107	23132	0	0	2286		25525
Hennessy Ridge Site		941	0	0	486		1427
Horse Creek Site		1851	0	0	312		2163
Illinois Valley Site	7088	21356	105	803	18675		48027
Kalmiopsis Site	145	112044	34	0	2468		114691
Klamath River Mainstem Site		14139	0	0	2073		16212
Lake Shasta Site	938	54588	81	0	34318		89925
Lassen National Park Site		16547	35576	70	860		53052
Little Butte Creek Site	13271	5551	61	4	26783		45671
Little Shasta River Site	110	1921	0	0	3064		5096
Lower Pitt River Site	384	18020	19	0	18605		37027
Manton Plains Site	963		0	0	11114		12077
Marble Mountains Site		94538	0	0	1868		96406
Mount Shasta Site	2	39784	0	0	31489		71274
Myrtle Creek Site	4773	8769	68	0	12740		26351
North Fork and Peel	2333		0	0	9277		11610
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	2158	82	0	0	7207		9446

PORTFOLIO SITE NAME	OWNER						
	BLM	USFS	OTHER FEDERAL	STATE	PRIVATE	WATER	GRAND TOTAL
North Fork Feather River Plain Site		2550	0	0	917		3467
Oregon Caves Site	702	16903	196	29	3611		21440
Orleans Site		30616	0	0	5455		36072
Paradise Site	3163	7204	0	69	36055		46491
Pistol River Site	960	12561	0	0	3081		16602
Red Butte Site	160	18209	0	0	743		19113
Rogue River Plains Site	1171		587	1024	21499	35	24316
Scott Mountains Site	1986	15681	0	0	29546		47212
Scott Valley Site	377	13479	0	0	20385		34242
Sexton Mountain Site	16707	0	0	527	29821		47055
Shasta Valley Site	390	636	0	1814	16754		19594
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	28009	43308	277	285	9396		81275
Siskiyou Crest Site	924	32555	49	47	8878		42453
Slate Creek Site	1186	5570	0	46	8149		14952
Smith River Site		38390	329	941	1311		40972
Soda Mountain Site	31072	184	0	0	10712		41968
South Fork Mountain Site		7110	0	0	4030		11140
South Siskiyous Site		108150	0	0	519		108669
The Eddy's Site		28193	0	1009	22697		51899
Trinity Alps Site	419	208571	1209	0	12163		222362
Trinity River Site			2020	0			2020
Umpqua Valley Site	2030		0	0	40125	487	42642
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1055	27523	0	0	3382		31960
Whiskeytown Site	2188	4082	27239	0	16029	1	49538
Wild Rogue Site	15020	61124	1161	359	5230	60	82955
Winchuck River Site		9904	84	0	10		9998
Wolf Creek Site	5450		0	4628	4093		14172
Yellow Creek Site	2357		0	0	1987		4344

Appendix 15. Portfolio Point Site Targets

EL CODE	TARGET NAME	GRANK	NUMBER OF POINTS
AAAAD09030	Hydromantes shastae	1	5
AFCJC03010	Chamistes brevirostris	1	2
PDAPI1N050	Perideridia erythrorhiza	1	5
PDAST11047	Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	1	4
PDAST2E0P0	Cirsium ciliolatum	1	13
PDAST650L0	Madia doris-nilesiae	1	16
PDBOR0V0E0	Plagiobothrys hirtus	1	7
PDBOR0V191	Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpus	1	12
PDBRA060Z1	Arabis koehleri var koehleri	1	7
PDCRA0A0P0	Sedum moranii	1	5
PDCRA0A0U3	Sedum paradisum	1	2
PDFAB62010	Rupertia hallii	1	18
PDHYD0C0Y0	Phacelia cookei	1	2
PDLIM02044	Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	1	2
PDONA05061	Clarkia borealis ssp arida	1	1
PDONA0C1K0	Oenothera wolfii	1	1
PDPLM030C0	Eriastrum tracyi	1	2
PDPLM0D100	Phlox hirsuta	1	2
PDSCR1H0L0	Orthocarpus pachystachyus	1	2
PMLIL0D140	Calochortus persistens	1	3
PMLIL0D1N0	Calochortus coxii	1	1
PMLIL0D1P0	Calochortus umpquaensis	1	2
PMLIL0V080	Fritillaria gentneri	1	31
PMPOA040K0	Agrostis hendersonii	1	1

Appendix 16. Conservation Targets Represented at Each Portfolio Site

Appendix 16. Conservation Targets at Portfolio Sites

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total	Target Units
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	18.11	0.7%	51	2641	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.21	0.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	5.03	0.6%	30	900	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	4.20	3.4%	20	124.51	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	8.90	2.4%	33	377	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	1.01	1.0%	14	102	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	8.65	5.6%	17	155	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	2.77	1.6%	21	171	Stream km
Althouse Creek (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.04	0.0%	21	258	Stream km
Anderson Butte Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	370.50	0.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	497.89	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1491.69	0.6%	58	243447	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1886.32	1.6%	50	120730	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	119.56	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	99.92	0.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	263.84	0.3%	53	85755	Hectares
Anderson Butte Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	1.00	3.1%	6	32	Number of EOs
Anderson Butte Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	2.00	2.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Anderson Butte Site	69	2	Aster vialis	PDAST0T3K0	0	1.00	25.0%	4	4	Number of EOs
Anderson Butte Site	95	3	Sedum oblanceolatum	PDCRA0A0T0	0	1.00	2.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Anderson Butte Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	15.61	3.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Anderson Butte Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	3.21	2.6%	14	121.14	Stream km
Anderson Butte Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	3.31	3.2%	14	102	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	1290.11	0.6%	47	232106	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	12832.24	3.3%	58	389604	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	148.41	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2737.32	1.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	192.09	0.4%	37	51191	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	4980.32	4.1%	50	120730	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	3745.23	1.5%	52	243707	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	914.86	1.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	6456.34	9.3%	50	69737	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	8.00	8.1%	24	99	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	65	1	Lomatium cookii	PDAPI1B250	0	3.00	8.1%	3	37	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	76	2	Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	PDAST6E0A1	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	1.00	10.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	109	1	Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	PDLIM02044	0	2.00	10.0%	3	20	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	129	2	Ranunculus austrooreganus	PDRAN0L0E0	0	8.00	33.3%	3	24	Number of EOs
Antelope Creek Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	47.00	0.0%	35	135674	Hectares
Antelope Creek Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	7.52	0.3%	51	2641	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	1.47	3.0%	9	49.16	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	3.32	2.2%	20	148.77	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	3.90	0.5%	37	734.92	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	1153	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1153	0	0.98	6.1%	5	16.12	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Antelope Creek Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	16.43	11.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	34.00	3.8%	30	900	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	3.13	2.5%	20	124.51	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	4.93	1.3%	33	377	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	1.54	9.3%	6	16.58	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	7.97	5.1%	17	155	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	5.73	38.1%	7	15.02	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	3.82	2.2%	21	171	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	10.45	2.6%	34	404	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	3233	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3233	0	1.23	28.9%	4	4.25	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	4.88	7.5%	8	65.24	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	1.86	2.8%	6	66.22	Stream km
Antelope Creek Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	4.12	1.6%	21	258	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	84.00	3.2%	51	2641	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	3.69	1.8%	17	202.47	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	1.96	1.3%	20	148.77	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	0.77	0.2%	20	502.9	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.76	0.5%	20	147.64	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	0.10	0.0%	30	900	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	0.75	0.6%	14	121.14	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	1.67	1.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	0.10	0.1%	14	125	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	0.20	0.2%	14	102	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	23.86	23.2%	14	103	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	5.07	3.0%	21	171	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	0.20	0.4%	7	53.88	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	2.34	4.1%	8	56.77	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	56.57	21.9%	21	258	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	0.84	0.5%	17	168	Stream km
Applegate River (Aquatic)	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	1.96	4.0%	9	48.64	Stream km
Applegate Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	14.32	0.1%	33	14782	Hectares
Applegate Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	304.81	0.4%	17	85196	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Applegate Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	44.47	0.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Applegate Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	0.02	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Applegate Site	6	0	Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	KLGRP06	1000	44.72	15.7%	4	285	Hectares
Applegate Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	3037.69	1.9%	39	158636	Hectares
Applegate Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	5252.29	2.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Applegate Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	322.06	1.2%	17	27529	Hectares
Applegate Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	501.87	14.8%	8	3393	Hectares
Applegate Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	12114.37	3.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Applegate Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	202.25	0.6%	25	34724	Hectares
Applegate Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1.41	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Applegate Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	5106.95	2.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Applegate Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	113.49	5.7%	10	2008	Hectares
Applegate Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	3952.96	3.3%	50	120730	Hectares
Applegate Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1263.65	0.5%	52	243707	Hectares
Applegate Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	483.57	5.1%	20	9531	Hectares
Applegate Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	401.79	0.2%	41	230543	Hectares
Applegate Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	297.80	1.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Applegate Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	3831.47	10.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Applegate Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	2281.50	2.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Applegate Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	10.85	0.7%	16	1563	Hectares
Applegate Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	12.57	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Applegate Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	3.00	4.0%	13	75	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	19.00	59.4%	6	32	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	1.00	7.7%	7	13	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	9.00	14.1%	16	64	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	4.00	7.3%	19	55	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	95	3	Sedum oblanceolatum	PDCRA0A0T0	0	23.00	57.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	1.00	1.6%	8	62	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	139	3	Pedicularis howellii	PDSCR1K0J0	0	9.00	40.9%	5	22	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	142	3	Cupressus bakeri	PGCUP04020	0	5.00	55.6%	4	9	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	1.00	3.7%	8	27	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	157	1	Fritillaria gentneri	PMLIL0V080	0	1.00	16.7%	3	6	Number of EOs
Applegate Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2.00	0.0%	35	135674	hectares
Applegate Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	26.11	1.0%	51	2641	Stream km
Applegate Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	3.83	1.9%	17	202.47	Stream km
Applegate Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	1.69	1.1%	20	148.77	Stream km
Applegate Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	1.00	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Applegate Site	1173	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1173	0	0.29	12.6%	2	2.3	Stream km
Applegate Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	97.86	19.5%	20	502.9	Stream km
Applegate Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	7.33	5.0%	20	147.64	Stream km
Applegate Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	55.71	6.2%	30	900	Stream km
Applegate Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	1.59	0.4%	20	445	Stream km
Applegate Site	1323	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1323	0	4.80	63.9%	2	7.51	Stream km
Applegate Site	1343	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1343	0	3.07	14.6%	2	20.98	Stream km
Applegate Site	1383	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1383	0	1.18	100.0%	1	1.18	Stream km
Applegate Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	5.70	4.7%	14	121.14	Stream km
Applegate Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.93	0.7%	20	124.51	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Applegate Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	22.97	22.5%	14	102	Stream km
Applegate Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	6.05	36.5%	6	16.58	Stream km
Applegate Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	19.30	12.5%	17	155	Stream km
Applegate Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.28	0.6%	12	47.42	Stream km
Applegate Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	16.35	15.9%	14	103	Stream km
Applegate Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	4.88	2.9%	21	171	Stream km
Applegate Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	7.17	1.8%	34	404	Stream km
Applegate Site	3173	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3173	0	5.97	100.0%	1	5.97	Stream km
Applegate Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	14.24	26.4%	7	53.88	Stream km
Applegate Site	3233	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3233	0	0.50	11.8%	4	4.25	Stream km
Applegate Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	18.79	28.8%	8	65.24	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	2.08	0.0%	33	14782	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	3181.74	3.7%	17	85196	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	164.87	1.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	7607.71	6.2%	29	122933	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	203.50	0.1%	39	158636	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	1020.79	0.3%	58	389604	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2574.42	1.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	92.03	0.2%	37	51191	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	2772.91	2.3%	50	120730	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	344.60	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1823.49	0.8%	41	230543	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	151.56	0.4%	36	37279	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1535.33	1.8%	53	85755	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	46.54	0.6%	12	8092	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	122.81	0.2%	50	69737	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	54.55	0.3%	20	15880	Hectares
Ball Mountain Site	148	2	Calochortus greenei	PMLIL0D0H0	0	2.00	7.4%	4	27	Number of EOs
Ball Mountain Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	2.29	0.1%	51	2641	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	2.00	0.1%	26	1436	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	7.74	0.3%	35	2247	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	31.69	17.9%	12	177.24	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	11.91	1.1%	25	1116	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	1311	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1311	0	2.10	13.0%	2	16.14	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	7.04	35.2%	8	20.01	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	3.21	0.9%	22	354	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	2311	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2311	0	2.52	100.0%	1	2.52	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	4.63	1.7%	20	279	Stream km
Ball Mountain Site	3251	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3251	0	1.74	100.0%	1	1.74	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	376.68	2.5%	33	14782	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	1.44	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	135.58	0.1%	39	158636	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Black Mountain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	380.41	0.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	63.74	0.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	338.99	0.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	4071.52	1.7%	58	243447	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	427.49	0.8%	37	51191	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	2965.30	2.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4766.63	2.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	269.55	1.3%	21	19990	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1202.23	1.4%	53	85755	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	1681.84	2.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Black Mountain Site	181	2	Fluminicola seminalis	IMGASG3110	0	1.00	5.9%	4	17	Number of EOs
Black Mountain Site	187	2	Fluminicola species 1	IMGASG3170	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
Black Mountain Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	4.00	13.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Black Mountain Site	196	2	Trilobopsis tehamana	IMGASA2040	0	1.00	20.0%	4	5	Number of EOs
Black Mountain Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	29.00	0.0%	35	135674	hectares
Black Mountain Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	9.02	0.5%	36	1717	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	9.02	1.1%	20	802	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	21.10	0.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	21.10	1.5%	26	1436	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	26.35	1.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	37.23	3.5%	21	1054	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	6.09	0.5%	25	1116	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	3.75	1.5%	17	256	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	15.02	11.9%	15	126	Stream km
Black Mountain Site	4221	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4221	0	9.79	41.3%	5	23.72	Stream km
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	1737.34	0.4%	58	389604	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	227.08	0.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	153.43	0.1%	50	120730	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	49.43	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	34.22	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	250.67	0.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	98	2	Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii	PDFAB2B2W1	0	1.00	14.3%	2	7	Number of EOs
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	10.55	1.4%	37	734.92	Stream km
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.44	0.1%	33	377	Stream km
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	3.84	1.0%	34	404	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	25.87	0.2%	33	14782	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	14543.50	17.1%	17	85196	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	166.91	1.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	1955.98	1.6%	29	122933	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	3476.48	2.2%	39	158636	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	9534.71	4.1%	47	232106	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	14718.88	3.8%	58	389604	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	353.72	0.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	7.46	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	133.59	0.3%	37	51191	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	107.97	0.1%	50	120730	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	3191.09	1.3%	52	243707	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	607.62	6.4%	20	9531	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1235.82	0.5%	41	230543	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	9564.48	25.7%	36	37279	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	4016.71	4.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	1039.13	12.8%	12	8092	Hectares
Butt Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	42.53	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Butt Creek Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	1.00	5.6%	6	18	Number of EOs
Butt Creek Site	78	2	Senecio eurycephalus var lewisrosei	PDAST8H182	0	1.00	25.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
Butt Creek Site	90	2	Campanula wilkinsiana	PDCAM020Z0	0	1.00	5.3%	3	19	Number of EOs
Butt Creek Site	93	2	Sedum albomarginatum	PDCRA0A030	0	3.00	100.0%	1	3	Number of EOs
Butt Creek Site	126	3	Lewisia cantelovii	PDPOR04020	0	1.00	16.7%	2	6	Number of EOs
Butt Creek Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	13.08	0.8%	36	1717	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	12.90	0.6%	35	2247	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1214	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1214	0	57.93	35.1%	5	165.1	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1234	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1234	0	9.92	38.9%	2	25.53	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	32.18	30.6%	7	105.3	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1254	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1254	0	14.13	8.6%	3	165.2	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1314	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1314	0	17.54	20.7%	2	84.63	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	1324	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1324	0	1.79	100.0%	1	1.79	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	2214	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2214	0	19.66	30.3%	3	64.96	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	2234	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2234	0	8.66	64.6%	2	13.4	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	2244	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2244	0	4.85	14.7%	3	33.06	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	2254	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2254	0	13.40	48.6%	2	27.59	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	3214	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3214	0	6.11	19.7%	3	31	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	3254	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3254	0	8.64	79.6%	2	10.86	Stream km
Butt Creek Site	3284	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3284	0	2.34	32.2%	2	7.26	Stream km
Butte Creek Drainage Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	130.75	0.9%	33	14782	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	357.66	0.3%	29	122933	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	5.11	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	817.00	0.4%	47	232106	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	216.08	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	5493.55	2.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1043.77	0.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	17.22	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	5.70	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	88.18	1.1%	12	8092	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	21.86	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	630.64	4.0%	20	15880	Hectares
Butte Creek Drainage Site	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	2.23	29.9%	6	7.47	Stream km
Butte Creek Drainage Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	16.46	9.3%	12	177.24	Stream km
Butte Creek Drainage Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	1.67	1.4%	11	117.74	Stream km
Calochortus coxii Site	151	1	Calochortus coxii	PMLIL0D1N0	0	12.00	100.0%	1	12	Number of EOs
Calochortus coxii Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	6.55	2.1%	10	315	Stream km
Camas Valley Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	0.87	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	522.13	1.9%	17	27529	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	9833.16	2.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	166.57	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2413.58	1.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	3330.96	11.6%	10	28678	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1052.93	0.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1095.24	0.4%	52	243707	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Camas Valley Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	593.62	0.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	2100.46	3.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Camas Valley Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	4.00	4.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Camas Valley Site	69	2	Aster vialis	PDAST0T3K0	0	1.00	25.0%	4	4	Number of EOs
Camas Valley Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	2.00	3.9%	7	51	Number of EOs
Camas Valley Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	2.00	2.5%	6	79	Number of EOs
Camas Valley Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	59.98	8.2%	37	734.92	Stream km
Camas Valley Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	31.29	3.5%	30	900	Stream km
Camas Valley Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	23.35	6.2%	33	377	Stream km
Camas Valley Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	17.33	4.3%	34	404	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	20.11	0.1%	33	14782	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	24.60	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	7891.46	3.4%	47	232106	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	27658.02	7.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	111.37	0.3%	25	34724	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1196.63	0.7%	47	177368	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	15277.32	6.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	1029.06	2.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	8747.65	7.2%	50	120730	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4897.93	2.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	34.83	0.2%	21	19990	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	792.13	8.3%	20	9531	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1528.59	0.7%	41	230543	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	13.49	0.0%	25	27549	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	5055.68	5.9%	53	85755	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	1282.64	15.9%	9	4875	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	1367.72	2.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Cascade Foothills Site	38	2	Ambystoma californiense	AAAAA01147	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	3.00	5.5%	19	55	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	2.00	2.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	80	3	Plagiobothrys glyptocarpus	PDBOR0V0C0	0	2.00	66.7%	2	3	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	2.00	20.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	142	3	Cupressus bakeri	PGCUP04020	0	2.00	22.2%	4	9	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	191	2	Monadenia klamathica	IMGASC701?	0	1.00	25.0%	3	4	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	192	2	Monadenia ochromphalus	IMGASC7?	0	1.00	6.7%	5	15	Number of EOs
Cascade Foothills Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	80.40	4.7%	36	1717	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	89.23	3.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	2.85	5.8%	9	49.16	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.89	0.6%	20	148.77	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	3.05	0.4%	37	734.92	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1153	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1153	0	3.18	19.7%	5	16.12	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1173	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1173	0	2.01	87.4%	2	2.3	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	32.71	57.7%	6	56.68	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	0.71	0.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	6.06	4.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	40.70	4.5%	30	900	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Cascade Foothills Site	1253	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1253	0	26.37	94.8%	2	27.82	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1273	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1273	0	1.60	100.0%	1	1.6	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	5.57	1.3%	20	445	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	1.04	10.2%	6	10.23	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	1.85	1.5%	20	124.51	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	10.93	2.9%	33	377	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2153	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2153	0	3.08	100.0%	1	3.08	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2173	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2173	0	3.67	100.0%	1	3.67	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2213	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2213	0	7.17	44.0%	2	16.28	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	1.39	8.4%	6	16.58	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	1.65	1.1%	17	155	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	2253	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2253	0	6.55	100.0%	1	6.55	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	6.38	42.5%	7	15.02	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	0.40	0.2%	21	171	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	33.88	8.4%	34	404	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3153	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3153	0	7.03	100.0%	1	7.03	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	1.56	2.4%	8	65.24	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	3253	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3253	0	5.33	100.0%	1	5.33	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	12.39	18.7%	6	66.22	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	0.26	0.2%	17	168	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	4153	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4153	0	5.23	71.4%	4	7.32	Stream km
Cascade Foothills Site	4173	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4173	0	6.93	100.0%	1	6.93	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	71.67	2.7%	51	2641	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	2.67	0.4%	37	734.92	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	0.46	0.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	3.83	0.4%	30	900	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	0.46	0.1%	20	445	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	3.34	0.9%	33	377	Stream km
Chetco River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	13.26	3.3%	34	404	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	42.51	13.5%	10	315	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	0.10	0.0%	17	202.47	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.36	0.2%	20	148.77	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.82	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	0.10	0.0%	13	205.15	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.12	0.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	1.13	0.1%	30	900	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	3.24	0.7%	20	445	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	0.20	0.2%	14	121.14	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.32	0.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.37	0.1%	33	377	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	3.43	3.3%	14	103	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	10.41	6.1%	21	171	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	24.50	6.1%	34	404	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	4.18	3.5%	11	120.5	Stream km
Cow Creek (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.23	0.1%	21	258	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	1250.35	4.5%	17	27529	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	4466.46	1.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	69.11	0.2%	25	34724	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	3331.12	1.9%	47	177368	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2172.43	0.9%	58	243447	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	1.72	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	603.41	2.1%	10	28678	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	13.57	0.0%	13	65678	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	353.64	0.3%	50	120730	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	78.90	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	31.47	0.0%	41	230543	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	64.86	0.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	39.21	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Cow Creek Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	8.00	10.7%	13	75	Number of EOs
Cow Creek Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	2.00	15.4%	7	13	Number of EOs
Cow Creek Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	2.00	3.1%	16	64	Number of EOs
Cow Creek Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	1.00	4.2%	8	24	Number of EOs
Cow Creek Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	2.00	2.5%	6	79	Number of EOs
Cow Creek Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	13.68	4.3%	10	315	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	1.20	0.6%	17	202.47	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	15.56	2.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	5.07	1.0%	20	502.9	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	30.96	3.4%	30	900	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	5.14	1.4%	33	377	Stream km
Cow Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	13.15	3.3%	34	404	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	9.02	0.1%	33	14782	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	53.44	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Craggy Mountain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	1184.09	0.5%	47	232106	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	933.87	0.2%	58	389604	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1241.34	0.7%	47	177368	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1760.30	0.7%	58	243447	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1389.99	0.6%	52	243707	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	399.05	2.0%	21	19990	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	829.40	0.4%	41	230543	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	31.13	0.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	311.55	0.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	2.00	6.7%	11	30	Number of EOs
Craggy Mountain Site	196	2	Trilobopsis tehamana	IMGASA2040	0	1.00	20.0%	4	5	Number of EOs
Craggy Mountain Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	128.00	0.1%	35	135674	hectares
Craggy Mountain Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	8.06	0.5%	36	1717	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	8.06	1.0%	20	802	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	19.95	0.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	10.89	0.8%	26	1436	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	19.95	0.9%	35	2247	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	0.04	0.1%	13	41.99	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	15.50	1.5%	21	1054	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	15.24	1.4%	25	1116	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	2181	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2181	0	1.20	16.1%	5	7.44	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.44	0.2%	17	256	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	4.23	1.2%	22	354	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	0.30	0.2%	17	160	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.81	1.3%	12	62.05	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	0.74	0.6%	15	132	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	1.46	1.2%	15	126	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	7.84	2.8%	20	279	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	2.11	1.5%	10	139	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	5.27	1.2%	13	437	Stream km
Craggy Mountain Site	4181	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4181	0	0.62	1.3%	5	46.1	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	1.45	0.1%	51	2641	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	217	4	Oncorhynchus clarki clarki	AFCHA0208A	0	15.85	3.6%	5	435	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	0.08	0.0%	13	205.15	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	0.20	0.0%	20	445	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	2.62	2.1%	14	125	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	4.60	9.7%	12	47.42	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	0.13	0.1%	11	120.5	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	0.01	0.0%	8	56.77	Stream km
East Fork Illinois River (Aquatic)	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	1.61	3.3%	9	48.64	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Elk Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	989.05	0.3%	58	389604	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	144.27	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1114.28	0.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	139.79	0.3%	37	51191	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	503.55	0.4%	50	120730	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	249.49	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	32.62	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	1372.88	2.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Elk Creek Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	2.00	2.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Elk Creek Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	5.04	1.6%	10	315	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	4.50	9.2%	9	49.16	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	9.88	1.3%	37	734.92	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	4.25	41.5%	6	10.23	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.72	0.6%	20	124.51	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	4.86	1.3%	33	377	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	1.39	0.5%	21	258	Stream km
Elk Creek Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	3.67	2.2%	17	168	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	211	2	Cottus asperrimus	AFC4E02030	0	129.62	71.2%	2	182	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	129.62	16.2%	20	802	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	220	3	Mylopharodon conocephalus	AFCJB25010	0	2.00	2.1%	3	95	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	1232	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	1232	0	1.71	1.5%	4	113.53	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	1272	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	1272	0	6.35	22.5%	3	28.19	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	0.16	0.2%	8	86.32	Stream km
Fall River (Aquatic)	2232	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	2232	0	18.26	45.0%	4	40.56	Stream km
Fall River Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	76.51	0.5%	33	14782	Hectares
Fall River Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	2720.74	3.2%	17	85196	Hectares
Fall River Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	47.04	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Fall River Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	24.78	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Fall River Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	761.80	0.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Fall River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	39331.06	10.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Fall River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	7745.67	3.2%	58	243447	Hectares
Fall River Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	4349.50	8.5%	37	51191	Hectares
Fall River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	3298.16	2.7%	50	120730	Hectares
Fall River Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	49052.30	20.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Fall River Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	0.15	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Fall River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	3328.90	3.9%	53	85755	Hectares
Fall River Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	656.79	8.1%	12	8092	Hectares
Fall River Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	953.40	1.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Fall River Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	193.17	1.2%	20	15880	Hectares
Fall River Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	1.00	10.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	137	3	Gratiola heterosepala	PDSCR0R060	0	5.00	41.7%	2	12	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	146	2	Juncus leiospermus var leiospermus	PMJUN011L2	0	5.00	71.4%	2	7	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	162	3	Orcuttia tenuis	PMPOA4G050	0	6.00	60.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	181	2	Fluminicola seminalis	IMGASG3110	0	13.00	76.5%	4	17	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	198	2	Vespericola shasta	IMGASA4070	0	1.00	5.6%	4	18	Number of EOs
Fall River Site	211	2	Cottus asperrimus	AFC4E02030	0	52.46	28.8%	2	182	Stream km
Fall River Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	43.37	5.4%	20	802	Stream km
Fall River Site	220	3	Mylopharodon conocephalus	AFCJB25010	0	67.34	70.9%	3	95	Stream km
Fall River Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	60.31	23.3%	8	259.26	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Fall River Site	1232	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	1232	0	10.41	9.2%	4	113.53	Stream km
Fall River Site	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	17.28	11.4%	6	152	Stream km
Fall River Site	1272	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	1272	0	14.90	52.9%	3	28.19	Stream km
Fall River Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	57.52	66.6%	8	86.32	Stream km
Fall River Site	2232	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	2232	0	13.32	32.8%	4	40.56	Stream km
Fall River Site	2242	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2242	0	1.16	3.7%	4	31	Stream km
Fall River Site	2272	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	2272	0	0.09	100.0%	1	0.09	Stream km
Fall River Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	37.97	44.4%	7	85.61	Stream km
Fall River Site	3232	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	3232	0	4.36	47.5%	3	9.17	Stream km
Fall River Site	3242	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3242	0	22.25	48.0%	4	46.38	Stream km
Fall River Site	3272	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	3272	0	3.44	100.0%	1	3.44	Stream km
Fall River Site	4212	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	4212	0	15.72	65.4%	2	24.02	Stream km
Grass Lake Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	0.01	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Grass Lake Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	0.24	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Grass Lake Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	376.58	4.7%	12	8092	Hectares
Grass Lake Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	0.15	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Grass Lake Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrublands	KLGRP37	400	67.99	0.4%	20	15880	Hectares
Grass Lake Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	23.07	13.0%	12	177.24	Stream km
Hat Creek Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	1154.54	7.8%	33	14782	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	6896.23	8.1%	17	85196	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	14.00	0.1%	17	12076	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	308.16	0.3%	29	122933	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	913.93	0.6%	39	158636	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2424.47	1.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	4038.32	1.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	8033.80	3.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	30.48	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	631.82	0.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	22097.00	9.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	4271.70	1.9%	41	230543	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	846.63	2.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	8345.49	9.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	13.03	0.2%	12	8092	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	205.42	0.3%	50	69737	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	236.70	1.5%	20	15880	Hectares
Hat Creek Site	137	3	Gratiola heterosepala	PDSCR0R060	0	7.00	58.3%	2	12	Number of EOs
Hat Creek Site	162	3	Orcuttia tenuis	PMPOA4G050	0	2.00	20.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
Hat Creek Site	163	2	Tuctoria greenei	PMPOA6N010	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Hat Creek Site	184	2	Fluminicola species 20	IMGASG3320	0	2.00	100.0%	1	2	Number of EOs
Hat Creek Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	64.68	24.9%	8	259.26	Stream km
Hat Creek Site	1312	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1312	0	4.49	5.1%	3	87.29	Stream km
Hat Creek Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	11.32	13.1%	8	86.32	Stream km
Hat Creek Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	8.40	9.8%	7	85.61	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	2.71	0.0%	33	14782	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Hayfork Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	30.31	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Hayfork Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	379.23	0.2%	39	158636	Hectares
Hayfork Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	8231.11	3.5%	47	232106	Hectares
Hayfork Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	1960.43	0.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Hayfork Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	327.88	0.9%	25	34724	Hectares
Hayfork Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	6002.89	3.4%	47	177368	Hectares
Hayfork Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	6000.78	2.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Hayfork Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	90.80	0.2%	37	51191	Hectares
Hayfork Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1.15	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Hayfork Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	679.60	0.3%	52	243707	Hectares
Hayfork Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1481.22	0.6%	41	230543	Hectares
Hayfork Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	19.47	0.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Hayfork Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	4.68	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Hayfork Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	42.21	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Hayfork Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	8.06	0.5%	16	1563	Hectares
Hayfork Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	2.98	0.0%	9	4875	Hectares
Hayfork Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	223.59	0.3%	50	69737	Hectares
Hayfork Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	1.00	1.8%	19	55	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	74	1	Madia doris-nilesiae	PDAST650L0	0	3.00	33.3%	2	9	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	121	1	Eriastrum tracyi	PDPLM030C0	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	127	2	Lewisia cotyledon var heckneri	PDPOR04052	0	1.00	7.7%	3	13	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	185	2	Monadenia setosa	IMGASC7080	0	11.00	44.0%	2	25	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	13.00	10.7%	9	121	Number of EOs
Hayfork Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	5870.00	4.3%	35	135674	hectares
Hayfork Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	17.62	1.0%	36	1717	Stream km
Hayfork Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	69.79	8.7%	20	802	Stream km
Hayfork Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	26.51	1.0%	51	2641	Stream km
Hayfork Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	14.06	1.0%	26	1436	Stream km
Hayfork Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	71.35	3.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1131	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1131	0	2.00	85.5%	2	2.34	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	5.80	4.4%	16	131.43	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	16.94	1.6%	21	1054	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	108.27	9.7%	25	1116	Stream km
Hayfork Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	6.85	1.4%	18	496	Stream km
Hayfork Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	9.69	14.2%	15	68.17	Stream km
Hayfork Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	4.53	1.8%	17	256	Stream km
Hayfork Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	31.79	9.0%	22	354	Stream km
Hayfork Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	5.26	3.3%	17	160	Stream km
Hayfork Site	3131	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3131	0	0.27	19.1%	2	1.41	Stream km
Hayfork Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	4.61	3.7%	15	126	Stream km
Hayfork Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	4.22	1.5%	20	279	Stream km
Hayfork Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	2.46	2.2%	13	113.7	Stream km
Hayfork Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	3.48	0.8%	13	437	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	71.29	0.5%	33	14782	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	14.63	0.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	14.92	0.0%	25	34724	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Hennessy Ridge Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	148.93	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	730.40	0.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	220.00	0.3%	13	65678	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	139.95	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	33.79	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	52.41	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	180	2	Ancotrema voyanum	IMGAS36130	0	2.00	18.2%	4	11	Number of EOs
Hennessy Ridge Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	819.00	0.6%	35	135674	hectares
Hennessy Ridge Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	8.32	0.5%	36	1717	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	8.28	1.0%	20	802	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	8.32	0.3%	51	2641	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	8.32	0.6%	26	1436	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	8.32	0.4%	35	2247	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	9.07	6.9%	16	131.43	Stream km
Hennessy Ridge Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	6.58	1.5%	13	437	Stream km
Horse Creek Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	19.94	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	980.19	0.4%	47	232106	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	609.58	0.2%	58	389604	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	2.59	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	506.24	0.2%	58	243447	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	35.02	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	2.73	0.2%	16	1563	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	7.16	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Horse Creek Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	1.00	3.1%	6	32	Number of EOs
Horse Creek Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Horse Creek Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	154.00	0.1%	35	135674	hectares
Horse Creek Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	3.57	0.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Horse Creek Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	5.75	0.5%	21	1054	Stream km
Horse Creek Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	4.42	3.5%	15	126	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	2769.21	1.7%	39	158636	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	18.98	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	212.66	0.8%	17	27529	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	470.43	13.9%	8	3393	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3576.84	0.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	697.46	2.0%	25	34724	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	6090.26	3.4%	47	177368	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	62.46	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	156.15	0.3%	37	51191	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	7163.07	5.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	54.09	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	535.31	2.7%	21	19990	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	14525.64	6.3%	41	230543	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	6664.42	24.2%	25	27549	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	140.51	0.4%	36	37279	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	7044.37	8.2%	53	85755	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	292.50	24.1%	10	1216	Hectares
Illinois Valley Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	7.00	9.3%	13	75	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	9.00	16.4%	19	55	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	4.00	4.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	65	1	Lomatium cookii	PDAPI1B250	0	22.00	59.5%	3	37	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	66	1	Perideridia erythrorhiza	PDAPI1N050	0	5.00	26.3%	2	19	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	75	3	Microseris howellii	PDAST6E090	0	40.00	78.4%	5	51	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	79	3	Senecio hesperius	PDAST8H1L0	0	46.00	90.2%	3	51	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	24.00	70.6%	6	34	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	85	2	Arabis macdonaldiana	PDBRA06150	0	5.00	20.0%	5	25	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	86	3	Arabis modesta	PDBRA06180	0	1.00	5.9%	2	17	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	88	2	Streptanthus howellii	PDBRA2G0N0	0	13.00	50.0%	3	26	Number of EOs

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Illinois Valley Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	2.00	8.3%	8	24	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	102	2	Gentiana setigera	PDGEN060S0	0	33.00	67.3%	4	49	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	107	3	Monardella purpurea	PDLAM180T0	0	16.00	69.6%	5	23	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	33.00	64.7%	7	51	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	28.00	57.1%	7	49	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	128	4	Lewisia oppositifolia	PDPOR040B0	0	30.00	75.0%	4	40	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	139	3	Pedicularis howellii	PDSCR1K0J0	0	1.00	4.5%	5	22	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	141	2	Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	PDVIO040Y2	0	20.00	62.5%	4	32	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	3.00	11.1%	8	27	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	149	2	Calochortus howellii	PMLIL0D0K0	0	33.00	91.7%	2	36	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	153	2	Camassia howellii	PMLIL0E020	0	2.00	10.0%	5	20	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	155	3	Erythronium howellii	PMLIL0U080	0	29.00	93.5%	3	31	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	159	2	Hastingsia bracteosa	PMLIL0Z020	0	18.00	66.7%	2	27	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	160	1	Hastingsia atropurpurea	PMLIL0Z030	0	19.00	100.0%	1	19	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Illinois Valley Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	406.00	0.3%	35	135674	hectares
Illinois Valley Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	134.65	5.1%	51	2641	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	217	4	Oncorhynchus clarki clarki (Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coast ESU)	AFCHA0208	0	11.01	2.5%	5	435	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	0.02	0.0%	17	202.47	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	22.68	15.2%	20	148.77	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	34.14	4.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	15.47	7.5%	13	205.15	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	1.21	2.1%	6	56.68	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	2.16	0.4%	20	502.9	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	19.18	13.0%	20	147.64	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	33.20	3.7%	30	900	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	80.82	18.2%	20	445	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	18.48	14.8%	20	124.51	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	9.44	2.5%	33	377	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	15.72	12.6%	14	125	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	0.45	0.3%	17	155	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	9.16	19.3%	12	47.42	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	0.97	6.5%	7	15.02	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	35.16	20.6%	21	171	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	11.92	3.0%	34	404	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	18.63	15.5%	11	120.5	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	25.88	10.0%	21	258	Stream km
Illinois Valley Site	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	2.87	5.9%	9	48.64	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	18714.68	11.8%	39	158636	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	13.45	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Kalmiopsis Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	3966.14	14.4%	17	27529	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	1300.56	38.3%	8	3393	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	9929.22	2.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	7707.51	22.2%	25	34724	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	17912.92	10.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	611.18	0.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	7122.75	24.8%	10	28678	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	2269.26	3.5%	13	65678	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	836.75	0.7%	50	120730	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	29700.31	12.9%	41	230543	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	488.67	55.7%	7	877	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	1119.67	4.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	1324.26	3.6%	36	37279	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	5321.22	6.2%	53	85755	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	48.44	4.0%	10	1216	Hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	9.00	12.0%	13	75	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	1.00	4.3%	8	23	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	5.00	9.1%	19	55	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	2.00	2.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	64	3	Lomatium engelmannii	PDAPI1B0K0	0	4.00	40.0%	4	10	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	75	3	Microseris howellii	PDAST6E090	0	1.00	2.0%	5	51	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	79	3	Senecio hesperius	PDAST8H1L0	0	4.00	7.8%	3	51	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	6.00	17.6%	6	34	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	85	2	Arabis macdonaldiana	PDBRA06150	0	2.00	8.0%	5	25	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	88	2	Streptanthus howellii	PDBRA2G0N0	0	12.00	46.2%	3	26	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	3.00	12.5%	8	24	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	99	2	Sophora leachiana	PDFAB3N050	0	7.00	13.7%	3	51	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	102	2	Gentiana setigera	PDGEN060S0	0	11.00	22.4%	4	49	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	107	3	Monardella purpurea	PDLAM180T0	0	4.00	17.4%	5	23	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	128	4	Lewisia oppositifolia	PDPOR040B0	0	5.00	12.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	2.00	2.5%	6	79	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	141	2	Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	PDVIO040Y2	0	1.00	3.1%	4	32	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	7.00	25.9%	8	27	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	149	2	Calochortus howellii	PMLIL0D0K0	0	3.00	8.3%	2	36	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	159	2	Hastingsia bracteosa	PMLIL0Z020	0	9.00	33.3%	2	27	Number of EOs
Kalmiopsis Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	10333.00	7.6%	35	135674	hectares
Kalmiopsis Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	161.38	6.1%	51	2641	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	4.21	2.1%	17	202.47	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	1.02	0.7%	20	148.77	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	48.57	6.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	8.39	4.1%	13	205.15	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	0.79	1.4%	6	56.68	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	49.79	9.9%	20	502.9	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.95	0.6%	20	147.64	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	111.85	12.4%	30	900	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	188.93	42.5%	20	445	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	18.10	14.9%	14	121.14	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	38.69	10.3%	33	377	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	33.72	27.0%	14	125	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Kalmiopsis Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	5.47	5.4%	14	102	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	5.30	3.4%	17	155	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	20.93	44.1%	12	47.42	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	2.11	2.0%	14	103	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	53.76	13.3%	34	404	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	32.17	26.7%	11	120.5	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	3283	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3283	0	3.62	64.0%	2	5.66	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	9.48	16.7%	8	56.77	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	26.40	15.7%	17	168	Stream km
Kalmiopsis Site	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	25.07	51.5%	9	48.64	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	211.28	12.3%	36	1717	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	21.11	2.6%	20	802	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	193.54	7.3%	51	2641	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	211.73	14.7%	26	1436	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	194.64	8.7%	35	2247	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	221	1	Chamistes brevirostris	AFCJC03010	0	169.28	100.0%	1	169.28	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	0.18	2.4%	6	7.47	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	1.08	2.6%	13	41.99	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	2.06	1.6%	16	131.43	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	2.74	6.6%	6	41.30	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	0.09	0.1%	12	177.24	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	1.60	0.2%	21	1054	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	2.06	0.2%	25	1116	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	0.27	0.1%	18	496	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	1.26	4.2%	7	30.07	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	2.16	3.2%	15	68.17	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2181	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2181	0	0.95	12.8%	5	7.44	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.30	0.1%	17	256	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.63	0.2%	22	354	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	0.02	0.0%	17	160	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.28	0.5%	12	62.05	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	1.15	0.9%	15	132	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	1.51	2.4%	7	63.19	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	1.47	1.2%	15	126	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	37.82	13.6%	20	279	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	3271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3271	0	8.65	33.8%	3	25.6	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	46.74	33.6%	10	139	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	126.46	28.9%	13	437	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	4181	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4181	0	31.73	68.8%	5	46.1	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	4221	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4221	0	3.94	16.6%	5	23.72	Stream km
Klamath River (Aquatic)	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	1.10	1.1%	8	103.8	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	79.64	0.5%	33	14782	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	53.64	0.1%	17	85196	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	884.35	0.7%	29	122933	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	816.99	0.5%	39	158636	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2251.25	1.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	1371.20	0.4%	58	389604	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	108.49	0.3%	25	34724	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	3129.09	1.8%	47	177368	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1927.26	0.8%	58	243447	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	3.35	0.2%	10	2008	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	3.38	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	1530.93	2.3%	13	65678	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	611.00	0.3%	52	243707	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	166.27	0.8%	21	19990	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	92.87	1.0%	20	9531	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2502.38	1.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	98.68	0.4%	25	27549	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	1.89	0.1%	16	1563	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	183.53	0.3%	50	69737	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	0.19	0.0%	20	15880	Hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	120	2	Eriogonum hirtellum	PDPGN082T0	0	2.00	11.8%	2	17	Number of EOs
Klamath River Mainstem Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Klamath River Mainstem Site	191	2	Monadenia klamathica	IMGASC701?	0	1.00	25.0%	3	4	Number of EOs
Klamath River Mainstem Site	192	2	Monadenia ochromphalus	IMGASC7?	0	1.00	6.7%	5	15	Number of EOs
Klamath River Mainstem Site	196	2	Trilobopsis tehamana	IMGASA2040	0	2.00	40.0%	4	5	Number of EOs
Klamath River Mainstem Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	785.00	0.6%	35	135674	hectares
Klamath River Mainstem Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	34.08	2.0%	36	1717	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	34.08	4.2%	20	802	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	40.35	1.5%	51	2641	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	34.08	2.4%	26	1436	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	43.99	2.0%	35	2247	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	0.25	0.6%	13	41.99	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	6.21	4.7%	16	131.43	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	31.77	3.0%	21	1054	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	39.43	3.5%	25	1116	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	12.48	2.5%	18	496	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	3.54	5.2%	15	68.17	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	5.27	2.1%	17	256	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.13	0.2%	12	62.05	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	4.29	3.3%	15	132	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	1.73	1.4%	15	126	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	2.79	1.0%	20	279	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	10.38	7.5%	10	139	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	12.00	2.7%	13	437	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	4181	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4181	0	1.67	3.6%	5	46.1	Stream km
Klamath River Mainstem Site	4281	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4281	0	1.34	14.2%	3	9.44	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	617.68	4.2%	33	14782	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	69.97	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	3120.71	1.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	2772.14	0.7%	58	389604	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	4.66	0.0%	25	34724	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	14966.81	8.4%	47	177368	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	33707.95	13.8%	58	243447	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	2796.81	5.5%	37	51191	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	5455.06	4.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	6758.80	2.8%	52	243707	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	656.03	3.3%	21	19990	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	4615.80	2.0%	41	230543	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	10.22	0.0%	25	27549	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	2.00	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	318.67	0.4%	53	85755	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	775.28	1.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	621.12	3.9%	20	15880	Hectares
Lake Shasta Site	39	1	Hydromantes shastae	AAAAD09030	0	21.00	100.0%	1	21	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	4.00	6.3%	16	64	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	6.00	10.9%	19	55	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	4.00	4.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	1.00	10.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	114	1	Clarkia borealis ssp arida	PDONA05061	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	126	3	Lewisia cantelovii	PDPOR04020	0	5.00	83.3%	2	6	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	132	1	Neviusia cliftonii	PDROS14020	0	8.00	100.0%	1	8	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	140	3	Penstemon filiformis	PDSCR1L2A0	0	15.00	60.0%	3	25	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	161	1	Agrostis hendersonii	PMPOA040K0	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	181	2	Fluminicola seminalis	IMGASG3110	0	2.00	11.8%	4	17	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	186	2	Fluminicola species 14	IMGASG3160	0	1.00	16.7%	4	6	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	12.00	40.0%	11	30	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	63.00	52.1%	9	121	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	193	2	Monadenia troglodytes	IMGASC7090	0	3.00	75.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	194	2	Monadenia wintu	IMGASC7???	0	6.00	100.0%	1	6	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	195	2	Trilobopsis roperi	IMGASA2030	0	24.00	100.0%	1	24	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	198	2	Vespericola shasta	IMGASA4070	0	12.00	66.7%	4	18	Number of EOs
Lake Shasta Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2481.00	1.8%	35	135674	hectares
Lake Shasta Site	1112	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1112	0	44.85	99.6%	2	45.01	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1114	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1114	0	4.77	8.5%	3	55.96	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1122	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	1122	0	16.18	97.1%	2	16.66	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1124	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1124	0	22.29	57.5%	3	38.76	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Lake Shasta Site	1142	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1142	0	254.89	93.9%	2	271.32	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1144	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1144	0	59.01	78.4%	4	75.31	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1154	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1154	0	9.05	12.6%	3	71.6	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1164	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on limestone substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1164	0	4.34	100.0%	1	4.34	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1172	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	1172	0	198.68	100.0%	1	198.68	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	11.40	4.4%	8	259.26	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	37.84	24.9%	6	152	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	1282	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	1282	0	19.92	19.4%	2	102.73	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2112	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2112	0	6.80	91.3%	4	7.45	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2114	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2114	0	14.93	41.2%	3	36.21	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2122	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	2122	0	4.47	55.9%	2	8	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2124	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2124	0	1.68	21.9%	2	7.68	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2142	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2142	0	51.78	85.0%	3	60.89	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2144	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2144	0	10.43	53.2%	3	19.6	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2172	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	2172	0	2.46	100.0%	1	2.46	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2242	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2242	0	9.03	29.1%	4	31	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	2282	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	2282	0	2.87	9.5%	2	30.07	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	3112	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3112	0	7.20	42.8%	4	16.82	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	3124	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3124	0	7.46	31.7%	4	23.54	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	3142	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3142	0	43.67	71.7%	3	60.9	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	3242	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3242	0	0.30	0.6%	4	46.38	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	4112	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	4112	0	2.41	14.6%	3	16.5	Stream km
Lake Shasta Site	4142	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	4142	0	1.45	8.7%	2	16.71	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	2366.65	16.0%	33	14782	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	2	0	Alpine Dwarf Shrublands	KLGRP02	0	1041.84	12.4%	2	8405	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	31619.79	37.1%	17	85196	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	286.98	2.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	25126.11	20.4%	29	122933	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	4448.15	2.8%	39	158636	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2843.34	1.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	248.48	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	0.99	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	3437.65	1.4%	52	243707	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2548.35	1.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	3743.20	10.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	29	0	Montane Riparian Shrublands	KLGRP29	0	2.73	3.6%	36	76	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	16015.96	18.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	748.11	9.2%	12	8092	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Lassen National Park Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	8.98	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Lassen National Park Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	1.00	5.6%	6	18	Number of EOs
Lassen National Park Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	12.32	0.7%	36	1717	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	12.32	0.5%	35	2247	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	9.97	3.8%	8	259.26	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1214	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1214	0	29.94	18.1%	5	165.1	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1274	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1274	0	0.99	14.0%	3	7.08	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1312	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1312	0	63.98	73.3%	3	87.29	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1314	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1314	0	67.09	79.3%	2	84.63	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1334	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1334	0	17.70	100.0%	1	17.7	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	1374	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1374	0	5.03	100.0%	1	5.03	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	5.26	6.1%	8	86.32	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2214	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2214	0	24.51	37.7%	3	64.96	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2234	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2234	0	4.74	35.4%	2	13.4	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2312	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2312	0	6.09	100.0%	1	6.09	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2314	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2314	0	6.34	100.0%	1	6.34	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2334	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2334	0	1.52	100.0%	1	1.52	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	2372	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	2372	0	0.19	100.0%	1	0.19	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	4.35	5.1%	7	85.61	Stream km
Lassen National Park Site	3312	0	Third order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3312	0	8.93	100.0%	1	8.93	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	22193.99	9.6%	47	232106	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	12858.61	3.3%	58	389604	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	66.69	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	8658.91	3.6%	58	243447	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	432.41	0.8%	37	51191	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	8063.09	6.7%	50	120730	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4729.91	1.9%	52	243707	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	1333.17	14.0%	20	9531	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	234.29	0.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	143.27	0.4%	36	37279	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1184.38	1.4%	53	85755	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	2634.77	3.8%	50	69737	Hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	38	2	Ambystoma californiense	AAAAA01147	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	10.00	10.1%	24	99	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	76	2	Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	PDAST6E0A1	0	2.00	22.2%	4	9	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	80	3	Plagiobothrys glyptocarpus	PDBOR0V0C0	0	1.00	33.3%	2	3	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	2.00	20.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	109	1	Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	PDLIM02044	0	1.00	5.0%	3	20	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	129	2	Ranunculus austrooreganus	PDRAN0L0E0	0	4.00	16.7%	3	24	Number of EOs
Little Butte Creek Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	1984.00	1.5%	35	135674	hectares
Little Butte Creek Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	66.77	3.9%	36	1717	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	99.96	3.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	0.52	1.1%	9	49.16	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Little Butte Creek Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	0.31	0.2%	17	202.47	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	7.06	4.7%	20	148.77	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	29.21	4.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1153	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1153	0	1.78	11.0%	5	16.12	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	20.83	36.8%	6	56.68	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	28.16	5.6%	20	502.9	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	23.00	15.6%	20	147.64	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	37.42	4.2%	30	900	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	5.23	1.2%	20	445	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	2.06	1.7%	20	124.51	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	23.99	6.4%	33	377	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2213	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2213	0	9.11	56.0%	2	16.28	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	12.92	12.7%	14	102	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	3.36	20.3%	6	16.58	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	5.62	3.6%	17	155	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.51	1.1%	12	47.42	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	0.52	3.5%	7	15.02	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	0.24	0.2%	14	103	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	21.85	12.8%	21	171	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	11.23	2.8%	34	404	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3213	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3213	0	1.35	100.0%	1	1.35	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	10.61	19.7%	7	53.88	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3233	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3233	0	1.68	39.5%	4	4.25	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	3.81	5.8%	8	65.24	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	3283	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3283	0	2.04	36.0%	2	5.66	Stream km
Little Butte Creek Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	4.48	1.7%	21	258	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	8.65	0.3%	51	2641	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	8.65	0.4%	35	2247	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	0.18	0.2%	11	117.74	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	0.01	0.0%	25	1116	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.20	0.1%	22	354	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	4.65	5.8%	9	80	Stream km
Little Shasta River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	5.27	1.9%	20	279	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	2847.28	3.3%	17	85196	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	3.74	0.0%	17	12076	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	268.19	0.2%	29	122933	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	24.82	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	59.88	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	1220.11	0.3%	58	389604	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1130.67	0.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	444.78	0.4%	50	120730	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	172.70	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	126.56	0.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	2787.04	4.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	846.56	5.3%	20	15880	Hectares
Little Shasta River Site	148	2	Calochortus greenei	PMLIL0D0H0	0	6.00	22.2%	4	27	Number of EOs
Little Shasta River Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Little Shasta River Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	0.72	0.0%	51	2641	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	7.01	0.3%	35	2247	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	2.19	29.3%	6	7.47	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	14.94	1.3%	25	1116	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	2.60	0.7%	22	354	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	5.23	8.3%	7	63.19	Stream km
Little Shasta River Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	4.70	1.7%	20	279	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	126.58	0.9%	33	14782	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	28.65	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	493.07	0.3%	39	158636	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	4774.67	2.1%	47	232106	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	19505.83	5.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	55.73	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	4660.43	1.9%	58	243447	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	4765.45	9.3%	37	51191	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	3399.95	2.8%	50	120730	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4402.14	1.8%	52	243707	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	263.22	0.7%	36	37279	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	190.48	0.2%	53	85755	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	39.31	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	31.69	0.2%	20	15880	Hectares
Lower Pitt River Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	1.00	1.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	164	2	Smilax jamesii	PMSMI010D0	0	1.00	8.3%	4	12	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	183	2	Fluminicola species 18	IMGASG3300	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	186	2	Fluminicola species 14	IMGASG3160	0	3.00	50.0%	4	6	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	9.00	7.4%	9	121	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	198	2	Vespericola shasta	IMGASA4070	0	4.00	22.2%	4	18	Number of EOs
Lower Pitt River Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	4.24	0.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	220	3	Mylopharodon conocephalus	AFCJB25010	0	25.51	26.8%	3	95	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1122	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	1122	0	0.48	2.9%	2	16.66	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1142	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1142	0	16.43	6.1%	2	271.32	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	71.50	27.6%	8	259.26	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1222	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	1222	0	12.32	48.1%	2	25.63	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Lower Pitt River Site	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	84.85	55.8%	6	152	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1252	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Pit drainage	1252	0	5.19	100.0%	1	5.19	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	1272	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Pit drainage	1272	0	6.94	24.6%	3	28.19	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2112	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2112	0	0.27	3.6%	4	7.45	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2122	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	2122	0	3.53	44.1%	2	8	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2142	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2142	0	8.85	14.5%	3	60.89	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	6.29	7.3%	8	86.32	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2222	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	2222	0	5.11	96.1%	2	5.32	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	2242	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2242	0	20.11	64.9%	4	31	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3112	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3112	0	0.73	4.3%	4	16.82	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3122	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	3122	0	5.16	100.0%	1	5.16	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3142	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3142	0	10.61	17.4%	3	60.9	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	2.49	2.9%	7	85.61	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3222	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	3222	0	0.49	100.0%	1	0.49	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	3242	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3242	0	10.03	21.6%	4	46.38	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	4112	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	4112	0	1.35	8.2%	3	16.5	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	4122	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	4122	0	22.55	100.0%	1	22.55	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	4142	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	4142	0	15.26	91.3%	2	16.71	Stream km
Lower Pitt River Site	4212	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	4212	0	8.30	34.6%	2	24.02	Stream km
Lower Rogue River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	0.19	0.0%	51	2641	Stream km
Lower Rogue River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.04	0.0%	20	148.77	Stream km
Lower Rogue River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.12	0.0%	33	377	Stream km
Lower Rogue River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.98	0.4%	21	258	Stream km
Lower Rogue River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	0.47	0.3%	17	168	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	370.88	0.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	4417.97	1.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	26.03	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	4295.69	1.8%	58	243447	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	4275.27	8.4%	37	51191	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1915.98	1.6%	50	120730	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	7054.99	2.9%	52	243707	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	521.66	0.6%	53	85755	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	371.44	0.5%	50	69737	Hectares
Manton Plains Site	114	1	Clarkia borealis ssp arida	PDONA05061	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
Manton Plains Site	156	3	Fritillaria eastwoodiae	PMLIL0V060	0	3.00	17.6%	2	17	Number of EOs
Manton Plains Site	1114	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1114	0	19.57	35.0%	3	55.96	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Manton Plains Site	1154	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1154	0	6.90	9.6%	3	71.6	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	1214	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1214	0	12.26	7.4%	5	165.1	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	4.60	4.4%	7	105.3	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	1254	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1254	0	18.45	11.2%	3	165.2	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	2114	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2114	0	5.68	15.7%	3	36.21	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	3114	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3114	0	5.60	47.6%	3	11.76	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	3144	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3144	0	0.01	0.1%	5	15.09	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	3154	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3154	0	4.40	24.6%	2	17.88	Stream km
Manton Plains Site	3214	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3214	0	0.02	0.1%	3	31	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	1128.45	7.6%	33	14782	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	354.59	0.4%	17	85196	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	11.81	0.1%	17	12076	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	14878.25	12.1%	29	122933	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	21771.18	13.7%	39	158636	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	11361.05	4.9%	47	232106	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	5276.41	1.4%	58	389604	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	649.20	1.9%	25	34724	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	15809.82	8.9%	47	177368	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2930.91	1.2%	58	243447	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	519.30	25.9%	10	2008	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	283.65	0.6%	37	51191	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	15253.40	6.3%	52	243707	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	594.13	3.0%	21	19990	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	501.33	5.3%	20	9531	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2598.87	1.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	21.58	0.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	26.33	0.1%	36	37279	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	11.65	1.0%	10	1216	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	142.92	9.1%	16	1563	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	29.09	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	2.73	0.0%	20	15880	Hectares
Marble Mountains Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	1.00	1.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	1.00	5.6%	6	18	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	67	1	Tauschia howellii	PDAPI27050	0	7.00	63.6%	2	11	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	92	2	Silene marmorensis	PDCAR0U0Z0	0	5.00	41.7%	3	12	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	1.00	1.6%	8	62	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	133	2	Potentilla cristae	PDROS1B2F0	0	2.00	10.5%	4	19	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	164	2	Smilax jamesii	PMSMI010D0	0	5.00	41.7%	4	12	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	180	2	Ancotrema voyanum	IMGAS36130	0	4.00	36.4%	4	11	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	192	2	Monadenia ochromphalus	IMGASC7?	0	5.00	33.3%	5	15	Number of EOs
Marble Mountains Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	14195.00	10.5%	35	135674	hectares
Marble Mountains Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	115.51	6.7%	36	1717	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	11.33	1.4%	20	802	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	73.76	2.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	108.13	7.5%	26	1436	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	136.41	6.1%	35	2247	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	4.46	10.6%	13	41.99	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	286.58	27.2%	21	1054	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	145.94	13.1%	25	1116	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Marble Mountains Site	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	2.20	15.1%	6	14.57	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	9.97	2.0%	18	496	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1321	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1321	0	14.64	17.5%	3	83.8	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1371	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1371	0	1.78	10.6%	5	16.8	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	1381	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1381	0	4.35	8.0%	5	54.04	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	12.95	43.1%	7	30.07	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.05	0.1%	15	68.17	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	60.45	23.6%	17	256	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	46.01	13.0%	22	354	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	5.97	3.7%	17	160	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	2381	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2381	0	0.12	100.0%	1	0.12	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	17.32	27.9%	12	62.05	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	17.82	13.5%	15	132	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	32.08	25.5%	15	126	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	25.18	9.0%	20	279	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	0.08	0.1%	10	139	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	4221	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4221	0	0.46	1.9%	5	23.72	Stream km
Marble Mountains Site	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	0.01	0.0%	8	103.8	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	1112	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1112	0	0.16	0.4%	2	45.01	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	0.04	0.0%	6	152	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	2112	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2112	0	0.12	1.6%	4	7.45	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	2142	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2142	0	0.26	0.4%	3	60.89	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	2242	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	2242	0	0.70	2.3%	4	31	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	3112	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3112	0	2.05	12.2%	4	16.82	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	3142	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3142	0	6.62	10.9%	3	60.9	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	3242	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	3242	0	13.80	29.8%	4	46.38	Stream km
McCloud River (Aquatic)	4112	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	4112	0	12.74	77.2%	3	16.5	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	3.37	2.3%	20	148.77	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.10	0.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.05	0.0%	20	147.64	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	0.33	0.0%	30	900	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	4.13	3.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.10	0.0%	33	377	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	9.20	5.4%	21	171	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.75	1.2%	34	404	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	2.28	4.0%	8	56.77	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	48.91	19.0%	21	258	Stream km
Middle Rogue River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	7.83	4.7%	17	168	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	2084.88	14.1%	33	14782	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	2	0	Alpine Dwarf Shrublands	KLGRP02	0	7363.13	87.6%	2	8405	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	14348.41	16.8%	17	85196	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	880.79	7.3%	17	12076	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	26388.11	21.5%	29	122933	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	7573.44	4.8%	39	158636	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	16221.61	7.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	10207.56	2.6%	58	389604	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	12.26	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2364.60	1.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	327.08	16.3%	10	2008	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	717.89	1.4%	37	51191	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	6559.57	5.4%	50	120730	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	29161.13	12.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1270.17	0.6%	41	230543	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	812.10	2.2%	36	37279	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1003.00	1.2%	53	85755	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	23.88	1.5%	16	1563	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	859.74	10.6%	12	8092	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	1447.78	2.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	7639.67	48.1%	20	15880	Hectares
Mount Shasta Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	2.00	3.1%	16	64	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	2.00	11.1%	6	18	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	68	3	Asarum marmoratum	PDARI02070	0	1.00	33.3%	2	3	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	71	3	Chaenactis suffrutescens	PDAST200H0	0	1.00	9.1%	3	11	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	90	2	Campanula wilkinsiana	PDCAM020Z0	0	13.00	68.4%	3	19	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	103	1	Phacelia cookei	PDHYD0C0Y0	0	3.00	100.0%	1	3	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	131	2	Ivesia pickeringii	PDROS0X0D0	0	1.00	7.7%	4	13	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	135	3	Castilleja elata	PDSCR0D0T0	0	1.00	7.7%	3	13	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	136	1	Cordylanthus tenuis ssp pallescens	PDSCR0J0S3	0	6.00	18.8%	3	32	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	138	1	Orthocarpus pachystachyus	PDSCR1H0L0	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	186	2	Fluminicola species 14	IMGASG3160	0	1.00	16.7%	4	6	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	188	2	Fluminicola species 16	IMGASG3310	0	5.00	83.3%	2	6	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	5.00	4.1%	9	121	Number of EOs
Mount Shasta Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss (Klamath Mtns. Province ESU)	AFCHA02097	0	5.02	0.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	37.03	20.9%	12	177.24	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	28.01	10.8%	8	259.26	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	5.20	4.4%	11	117.74	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1232	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	1232	0	70.82	62.4%	4	113.53	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	2.76	1.8%	6	152	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Mount Shasta Site	1262	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Pit drainage	1262	0	5.26	100.0%	1	5.26	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1311	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1311	0	14.04	87.0%	2	16.14	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1312	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1312	0	18.82	21.6%	3	87.29	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	1332	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	1332	0	37.14	100.0%	1	37.14	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	6.87	34.3%	8	20.01	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	1.44	1.7%	8	86.32	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	2232	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	2232	0	8.66	21.4%	4	40.56	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	2332	0	Second order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	2332	0	0.34	100.0%	1	0.34	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	20.46	23.9%	7	85.61	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	1.82	2.3%	9	80	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	3232	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	3232	0	1.69	18.4%	3	9.17	Stream km
Mount Shasta Site	3282	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	3282	0	0.49	2.3%	2	21.34	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	14.50	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	914.98	0.4%	47	232106	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	13937.00	3.6%	58	389604	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	4.33	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1307.11	0.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	16.26	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	87.25	0.3%	10	28678	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	613.90	0.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	182.69	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	5.18	0.1%	20	9531	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1067.42	0.5%	41	230543	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	101.25	0.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	2032.24	2.4%	53	85755	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	52.45	0.6%	9	4875	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	535.41	0.8%	50	69737	Hectares
Myrtle Creek Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	2.00	8.7%	8	23	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	4.00	7.3%	19	55	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	3.00	3.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	69	2	Aster vialis	PDAST0T3K0	0	1.00	25.0%	4	4	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	98	2	Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii	PDFAB2B2W1	0	6.00	85.7%	2	7	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	152	1	Calochortus umpquaensis	PMLIL0D1P0	0	8.00	53.3%	3	15	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	5.00	16.7%	11	30	Number of EOs
Myrtle Creek Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	8.10	2.6%	10	315	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	9.94	0.6%	36	1717	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	24.83	12.3%	17	202.47	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	11.96	1.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	46.20	9.2%	20	502.9	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	1.32	0.9%	20	147.64	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	17.65	2.0%	30	900	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	1253	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1253	0	1.45	5.2%	2	27.82	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Myrtle Creek Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	4.67	1.0%	20	445	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	17.38	14.3%	14	121.14	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	1.58	0.4%	33	377	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	4.00	3.2%	14	125	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	3.35	3.3%	14	102	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.63	1.3%	12	47.42	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	8.04	7.8%	14	103	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.30	1.1%	34	404	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	5.66	4.7%	11	120.5	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	10.77	20.0%	7	53.88	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	4.01	7.1%	8	56.77	Stream km
Myrtle Creek Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	4.28	2.5%	17	168	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	5395.10	1.4%	58	389604	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1253.50	0.5%	58	243447	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	623.36	0.5%	50	120730	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	493.37	0.2%	52	243707	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	78.01	0.8%	20	9531	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	905.39	0.4%	41	230543	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	115.78	0.1%	53	85755	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	21.65	0.3%	9	4875	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	2491.13	3.6%	50	69737	Hectares
North Fork and Peel Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	1.00	1.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
North Fork and Peel Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	1.00	4.3%	8	23	Number of EOs
North Fork and Peel Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	3.00	3.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
North Fork and Peel Site	69	2	Aster vialis	PDAST0T3K0	0	1.00	25.0%	4	4	Number of EOs
North Fork and Peel Site	152	1	Calochortus umpquaensis	PMLIL0D1P0	0	6.00	40.0%	3	15	Number of EOs
North Fork and Peel Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	19.66	6.2%	10	315	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	19.66	1.1%	36	1717	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	1.36	2.8%	9	49.16	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	3.54	2.4%	20	148.77	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	5.46	0.7%	37	734.92	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1153	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1153	0	9.21	57.1%	5	16.12	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	1.61	0.8%	13	205.15	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	4.89	1.0%	20	502.9	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	2.69	0.3%	30	900	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	0.21	0.0%	20	445	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	0.06	0.0%	21	171	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.44	1.1%	34	404	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
North Fork and Peel Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	2.23	1.9%	11	120.5	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	0.56	0.8%	6	66.22	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	4.63	1.8%	21	258	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	3.99	2.4%	17	168	Stream km
North Fork and Peel Site	4153	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4153	0	0.74	10.1%	4	7.32	Stream km
North Fork Chetco River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	11.44	0.4%	51	2641	Stream km
North Fork Chetco River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.64	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
North Fork Chetco River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	5.70	1.5%	33	377	Stream km
North Fork Chetco River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	5.18	1.3%	34	404	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	8.48	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	408.87	0.3%	39	158636	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	1710.19	0.7%	47	232106	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	601.97	0.2%	58	389604	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1144.53	0.6%	47	177368	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2804.87	1.2%	58	243447	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	751.47	1.5%	37	51191	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	42.51	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1496.06	0.6%	52	243707	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	344.47	0.1%	41	230543	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	16.01	0.1%	25	27549	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	7.16	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	109.58	0.7%	20	15880	Hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2135.00	1.6%	35	135674	hectares
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	1224	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1224	0	32.37	47.3%	3	68.44	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	7.62	7.2%	7	105.3	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	2224	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2224	0	19.56	76.7%	2	25.49	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	2244	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2244	0	3.51	10.6%	3	33.06	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	3124	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3124	0	1.39	5.9%	4	23.54	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	3144	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3144	0	0.05	0.3%	5	15.09	Stream km
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	3224	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3224	0	4.70	100.0%	1	4.7	Stream km
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	69.83	0.1%	29	122933	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	1606.06	0.7%	47	232106	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	443.63	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1337.29	0.5%	52	243707	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	2980.77	8.0%	36	37279	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	354.69	0.4%	53	85755	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	65.38	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	162	3	Orcuttia tenuis	PMPOA4G050	0	2.00	20.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	1214	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1214	0	5.74	3.5%	5	165.1	Stream km
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	1234	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1234	0	13.61	53.3%	2	25.53	Stream km
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	4.33	4.1%	7	105.3	Stream km
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	1274	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1274	0	5.08	71.8%	3	7.08	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	17.89	5.7%	10	315	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	17.89	1.0%	36	1717	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	0.17	0.3%	9	49.16	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.21	0.1%	20	148.77	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.07	0.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	0.18	1.8%	6	10.23	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.10	0.1%	20	124.51	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	2.22	1.3%	21	171	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	0.24	0.1%	34	404	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	9.21	13.9%	6	66.22	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	2.99	1.2%	21	258	Stream km
North Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	3.81	2.3%	17	168	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	332.23	0.4%	17	85196	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	53.92	0.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	0.00	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	6	0	Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	KLGRP06	1000	1.08	0.4%	4	285	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	1795.98	1.1%	39	158636	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	3279.58	1.4%	47	232106	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	620.65	2.3%	17	27529	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	247.22	7.3%	8	3393	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	4161.67	1.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	122.15	0.4%	25	34724	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	2348.43	1.3%	47	177368	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	126.03	0.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	43.68	2.2%	10	2008	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	5.26	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	400.72	4.2%	20	9531	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	896.10	0.4%	41	230543	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	882.80	3.2%	25	27549	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	2978.09	8.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	447.15	0.5%	53	85755	Hectares
Oregon Caves Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	4.00	5.3%	13	75	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	2.00	6.3%	6	32	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	2.00	3.1%	16	64	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	107	3	Monardella purpurea	PDLAM180T0	0	1.00	4.3%	5	23	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	1.00	2.0%	7	51	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	139	3	Pedicularis howellii	PDSCR1K0J0	0	9.00	40.9%	5	22	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	1.00	3.7%	8	27	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	155	3	Erythronium howellii	PMLIL0U080	0	1.00	3.2%	3	31	Number of EOs
Oregon Caves Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	10.00	0.0%	35	135674	hectares
Oregon Caves Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	7.65	0.3%	51	2641	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	20.81	4.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	44.79	5.0%	30	900	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	11.10	2.5%	20	445	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	9.63	9.4%	14	102	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Oregon Caves Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	19.18	12.4%	17	155	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	1.20	2.5%	12	47.42	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	5.04	1.2%	34	404	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	0.46	0.9%	7	53.88	Stream km
Oregon Caves Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	15.89	24.4%	8	65.24	Stream km
Orleans Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	241.00	1.6%	33	14782	Hectares
Orleans Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	37.33	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Orleans Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	302.71	0.2%	39	158636	Hectares
Orleans Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	716.37	0.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Orleans Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	241.21	0.9%	17	27529	Hectares
Orleans Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	4069.96	1.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Orleans Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	2925.51	8.4%	25	34724	Hectares
Orleans Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	5649.33	3.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Orleans Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2610.23	1.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Orleans Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	48.05	0.2%	10	28678	Hectares
Orleans Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	5549.21	8.4%	13	65678	Hectares
Orleans Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	589.94	0.2%	52	243707	Hectares
Orleans Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	110.42	0.6%	21	19990	Hectares
Orleans Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	11276.69	4.9%	41	230543	Hectares
Orleans Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	24.27	2.8%	7	877	Hectares
Orleans Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	58.48	0.2%	25	27549	Hectares
Orleans Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	549.46	0.6%	53	85755	Hectares
Orleans Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	1.83	0.1%	16	1563	Hectares
Orleans Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	544.18	6.7%	9	4875	Hectares
Orleans Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	251.81	0.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Orleans Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	4.01	0.0%	20	15880	Hectares
Orleans Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	2.00	2.7%	13	75	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	1.00	7.7%	7	13	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	2.00	3.1%	16	64	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	92	2	Silene marmorensis	PDCAR0U0Z0	0	6.00	50.0%	3	12	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	100	2	Thermopsis robusta	PDFAB3Z0D0	0	9.00	81.8%	2	11	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	118	1	Oenothera wolfii	PDONA0C1K0	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	180	2	Ancotrema voyanum	IMGAS36130	0	1.00	9.1%	4	11	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	191	2	Monadenia klamathica	IMGASC701?	0	2.00	50.0%	3	4	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	192	2	Monadenia ochromphalus	IMGASC7?	0	5.00	33.3%	5	15	Number of EOs
Orleans Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	10815.00	8.0%	35	135674	hectares
Orleans Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	43.19	2.5%	36	1717	Stream km
Orleans Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	36.61	4.6%	20	802	Stream km
Orleans Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	70.91	2.7%	51	2641	Stream km
Orleans Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	70.91	4.9%	26	1436	Stream km
Orleans Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	81.48	3.6%	35	2247	Stream km
Orleans Site	1101	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1101	0	2.35	70.4%	4	3.34	Stream km
Orleans Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	5.39	12.8%	13	41.99	Stream km
Orleans Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	44.50	33.9%	16	131.43	Stream km
Orleans Site	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	28.78	69.7%	6	41.30	Stream km
Orleans Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	8.92	0.8%	21	1054	Stream km
Orleans Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	37.30	3.3%	25	1116	Stream km
Orleans Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	43.13	8.7%	18	496	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Orleans Site	2101	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	2101	0	1.32	48.4%	2	2.73	Stream km
Orleans Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	16.11	23.6%	15	68.17	Stream km
Orleans Site	2181	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2181	0	3.93	52.8%	5	7.44	Stream km
Orleans Site	2201	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	2201	0	0.64	100.0%	1	0.64	Stream km
Orleans Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	10.59	3.0%	22	354	Stream km
Orleans Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	4.44	2.8%	17	160	Stream km
Orleans Site	3101	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3101	0	2.49	100.0%	1	2.49	Stream km
Orleans Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.12	0.2%	12	62.05	Stream km
Orleans Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	14.46	11.0%	15	132	Stream km
Orleans Site	3181	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3181	0	13.11	43.7%	5	29.99	Stream km
Orleans Site	3201	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3201	0	1.93	100.0%	1	1.93	Stream km
Orleans Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	1.78	1.6%	13	113.7	Stream km
Orleans Site	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	5.48	3.9%	10	139	Stream km
Orleans Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	40.69	9.3%	13	437	Stream km
Orleans Site	4181	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4181	0	8.88	19.3%	5	46.1	Stream km
Paradise Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	6.45	0.0%	33	14782	Hectares
Paradise Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	460.80	0.5%	17	85196	Hectares
Paradise Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	3120.37	1.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Paradise Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	23753.87	6.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Paradise Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	199.31	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Paradise Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	15824.65	6.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Paradise Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	20619.64	40.3%	37	51191	Hectares
Paradise Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	5879.26	4.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Paradise Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	11591.61	4.8%	52	243707	Hectares
Paradise Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	3123.78	32.8%	20	9531	Hectares
Paradise Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	1338.88	0.6%	41	230543	Hectares
Paradise Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	4658.42	5.4%	53	85755	Hectares
Paradise Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	332.94	0.5%	50	69737	Hectares
Paradise Site	78	2	Senecio eurycephalus var lewisrosei	PDAST8H182	0	3.00	75.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	101	1	Rupertia hallii	PDFAB62010	0	11.00	100.0%	1	11	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	115	2	Clarkia gracilis ssp albicaulis	PDONA050J1	0	7.00	100.0%	1	7	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	144	1	Rhynchospora californica	PMCYP0N060	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	146	2	Juncus leiospermus var leiospermus	PMJUN011L2	0	2.00	28.6%	2	7	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	147	1	Allium jepsonii	PMLIL022V0	0	3.00	100.0%	1	3	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	156	3	Fritillaria eastwoodiae	PMLIL0V060	0	14.00	82.4%	2	17	Number of EOs
Paradise Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	35.59	2.1%	36	1717	Stream km
Paradise Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	20.83	0.9%	35	2247	Stream km
Paradise Site	1124	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1124	0	1.94	5.0%	3	38.76	Stream km
Paradise Site	1144	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1144	0	7.34	9.7%	4	75.31	Stream km
Paradise Site	1154	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1154	0	55.65	77.7%	3	71.6	Stream km
Paradise Site	1184	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1184	0	3.41	100.0%	1	3.41	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Paradise Site	1214	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1214	0	59.23	35.9%	5	165.1	Stream km
Paradise Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	4.02	3.8%	7	105.3	Stream km
Paradise Site	1254	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1254	0	132.62	80.3%	3	165.2	Stream km
Paradise Site	1274	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1274	0	1.01	14.3%	3	7.08	Stream km
Paradise Site	1284	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1284	0	14.98	38.4%	2	39.02	Stream km
Paradise Site	2144	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2144	0	5.19	26.5%	3	19.6	Stream km
Paradise Site	2154	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2154	0	23.03	100.0%	1	23.03	Stream km
Paradise Site	2214	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2214	0	20.79	32.0%	3	64.96	Stream km
Paradise Site	2254	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2254	0	14.19	51.4%	2	27.59	Stream km
Paradise Site	3114	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3114	0	1.85	15.7%	3	11.76	Stream km
Paradise Site	3124	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3124	0	4.22	17.9%	4	23.54	Stream km
Paradise Site	3144	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3144	0	11.84	78.5%	5	15.09	Stream km
Paradise Site	3154	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3154	0	13.48	75.4%	2	17.88	Stream km
Paradise Site	3184	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3184	0	16.95	100.0%	1	16.95	Stream km
Paradise Site	3214	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3214	0	24.84	80.1%	3	31	Stream km
Paradise Site	3254	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3254	0	2.22	20.4%	2	10.86	Stream km
Pistol River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	10.04	0.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Pistol River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.91	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Pistol River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	4.14	1.1%	33	377	Stream km
Pistol River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.91	1.2%	34	404	Stream km
Pistol River Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	249.55	0.2%	39	158636	Hectares
Pistol River Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	1288.25	4.7%	17	27529	Hectares
Pistol River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	200.32	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Pistol River Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	983.48	0.6%	47	177368	Hectares
Pistol River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	26.98	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Pistol River Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	6141.94	21.4%	10	28678	Hectares
Pistol River Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	12209.09	18.6%	13	65678	Hectares
Pistol River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	103.18	0.1%	50	120730	Hectares
Pistol River Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2686.51	1.2%	41	230543	Hectares
Pistol River Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	10.58	1.2%	7	877	Hectares
Pistol River Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	107.29	0.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Pistol River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	110.59	0.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Pistol River Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	1.00	1.3%	13	75	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	4.00	12.5%	6	32	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	4.00	17.4%	8	23	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	3.00	5.5%	19	55	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	75	3	Microseris howellii	PDAST6E090	0	1.00	2.0%	5	51	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	5.00	20.8%	8	24	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	102	2	Gentiana setigera	PDGEN060S0	0	3.00	6.1%	4	49	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	112	2	Sidalcea malachroides	PDMAL110E0	0	2.00	100.0%	1	2	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	2.00	2.5%	6	79	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	141	2	Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	PDVIO040Y2	0	2.00	6.3%	4	32	Number of EOs

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Pistol River Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	2.00	7.4%	8	27	Number of EOs
Pistol River Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	620.00	0.5%	35	135674	hectares
Pistol River Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	22.76	0.9%	51	2641	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	5.22	2.6%	17	202.47	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	31.81	4.3%	37	734.92	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	6.24	3.0%	13	205.15	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	0.91	1.6%	6	56.68	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	2.80	0.6%	20	502.9	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	22.40	2.5%	30	900	Stream km
Pistol River Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	2.02	0.5%	20	445	Stream km
Pistol River Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	6.77	1.8%	33	377	Stream km
Pistol River Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	3.44	2.8%	14	125	Stream km
Pistol River Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	2.08	2.0%	14	102	Stream km
Pistol River Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	1.03	0.7%	17	155	Stream km
Pistol River Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	7.29	1.8%	34	404	Stream km
Pit River (Aquatic)	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	0.05	0.0%	8	259.26	Stream km
Pit River (Aquatic)	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	0.29	0.3%	8	86.32	Stream km
Pit River (Aquatic)	2232	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	2232	0	0.32	0.8%	4	40.56	Stream km
Pit River (Aquatic)	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	1.75	2.0%	7	85.61	Stream km
Red Butte Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	274.15	1.9%	33	14782	Hectares
Red Butte Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	15.58	0.0%	17	85196	Hectares
Red Butte Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	19.60	0.2%	17	12076	Hectares
Red Butte Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	413.13	0.3%	29	122933	Hectares
Red Butte Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	3210.40	2.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Red Butte Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	8411.53	3.6%	47	232106	Hectares
Red Butte Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	23.29	0.7%	8	3393	Hectares
Red Butte Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3427.35	0.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Red Butte Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	55.99	0.2%	25	34724	Hectares
Red Butte Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1309.39	0.7%	47	177368	Hectares
Red Butte Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	639.20	0.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Red Butte Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	12.82	0.6%	10	2008	Hectares
Red Butte Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	67.21	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Red Butte Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	22.03	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Red Butte Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	1077.35	0.4%	52	243707	Hectares
Red Butte Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	489.92	2.5%	21	19990	Hectares
Red Butte Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	49.00	0.5%	20	9531	Hectares
Red Butte Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2602.62	1.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Red Butte Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	32.16	0.1%	25	27549	Hectares
Red Butte Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	62.79	0.2%	36	37279	Hectares
Red Butte Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	422.22	0.5%	53	85755	Hectares
Red Butte Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	73.53	4.7%	16	1563	Hectares
Red Butte Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	76.12	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Red Butte Site	41	2	Plethodon stormi	AAAAD12180	0	5.00	15.6%	6	32	Number of EOs
Red Butte Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	1.00	1.8%	19	55	Number of EOs
Red Butte Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	1.00	2.9%	6	34	Number of EOs

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Red Butte Site	95	3	Sedum oblanceolatum	PDCRA0A0T0	0	7.00	17.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Red Butte Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	5.00	8.1%	8	62	Number of EOs
Red Butte Site	139	3	Pedicularis howellii	PDSCR1K0J0	0	1.00	4.5%	5	22	Number of EOs
Red Butte Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	724.00	0.5%	35	135674	hectares
Red Butte Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	27.23	5.4%	20	502.9	Stream km
Red Butte Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	31.35	3.5%	30	900	Stream km
Red Butte Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	10.29	2.3%	20	445	Stream km
Red Butte Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	6.42	6.3%	14	102	Stream km
Red Butte Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	23.49	15.2%	17	155	Stream km
Red Butte Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.87	1.8%	12	47.42	Stream km
Red Butte Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	1.07	0.3%	34	404	Stream km
Red Butte Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	10.00	18.6%	7	53.88	Stream km
Red Butte Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	6.06	9.3%	8	65.24	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	38	2	Ambystoma californiense	AAAAA01147	0	4.00	44.4%	4	9	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	4.00	4.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	65	1	Lomatium cookii	PDAPI1B250	0	12.00	32.4%	3	37	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	76	2	Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	PDAST6E0A1	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	82	1	Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpu	PDBOR0V191	0	13.00	68.4%	3	19	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	109	1	Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	PDLIM02044	0	17.00	85.0%	3	20	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	110	1	Limanthes floccosa ssp pumila	PDLIM02045	0	2.00	100.0%	1	2	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	123	3	Navarretia heteranda	PDPLM0C0A0	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	129	2	Ranunculus austrooreganus	PDRAN0L0E0	0	12.00	50.0%	3	24	Number of EOs
Rogue River Plains Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	15.00	0.0%	35	135674	hectares
Rogue River Plains Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	32.51	1.9%	36	1717	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	32.51	1.2%	51	2641	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	31.32	21.1%	20	148.77	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	34.00	4.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1153	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1153	0	0.97	6.0%	5	16.12	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1213	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1213	0	0.23	0.4%	6	56.68	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	1.56	1.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	16.79	1.9%	30	900	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	22.89	18.4%	20	124.51	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	18.91	5.0%	33	377	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	8.38	4.9%	21	171	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	11.91	4.6%	21	258	Stream km
Rogue River Plains Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	1.28	0.8%	17	168	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	67.59	3.9%	36	1717	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	66.52	2.5%	51	2641	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	67.65	4.7%	26	1436	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	72.80	3.2%	35	2247	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Salmon River (Aquatic)	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	0.16	0.4%	13	41.99	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	0.01	0.0%	16	131.43	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	0.90	0.1%	21	1054	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	2.33	0.2%	25	1116	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	0.27	0.1%	18	496	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	0.20	0.7%	7	30.07	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.66	1.0%	15	68.17	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.29	0.1%	17	256	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.31	0.1%	22	354	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	15.99	25.8%	12	62.05	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	6.61	5.0%	15	132	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3181	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3181	0	1.20	4.0%	5	29.99	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	7.40	5.9%	15	126	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	23.94	8.6%	20	279	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	0.17	0.1%	13	113.7	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	2.42	1.7%	10	139	Stream km
Salmon River (Aquatic)	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	15.50	3.5%	13	437	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	255.25	1.7%	33	14782	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	2726.48	22.6%	17	12076	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	2660.27	2.2%	29	122933	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	4982.45	3.1%	39	158636	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2741.28	1.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	103.02	0.4%	17	27529	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3248.91	0.8%	58	389604	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	4150.43	1.7%	58	243447	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	10.58	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1457.71	1.2%	50	120730	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	2632.13	1.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	2450.46	12.3%	21	19990	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	14089.86	6.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	202.55	0.7%	25	27549	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	15.97	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	29.33	2.4%	10	1216	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	363.19	23.2%	16	1563	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	0.11	0.0%	12	8092	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	3584.11	5.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	627.19	3.9%	20	15880	Hectares
Scott Mountains Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	1.00	1.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	70	1	Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	PDAST11047	0	8.00	80.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	71	3	Chaenactis suffrutescens	PDAST200H0	0	1.00	9.1%	3	11	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	77	2	Raillardella pringlei	PDAST7X030	0	2.00	11.1%	3	18	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	87	2	Draba carnosula	PDBRA112T0	0	2.00	28.6%	4	7	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	91	1	Minuartia stolonifera	PDCAR0G110	0	2.00	100.0%	1	2	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	105	2	Phacelia greenei	PDHYD0C1V0	0	17.00	85.0%	3	20	Number of EOs

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Scott Mountains Site	106	2	Phacelia leonis	PDHYD0C2N0	0	1.00	8.3%	3	12	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	11.00	17.7%	8	62	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	119	2	Eriogonum alpinum	PDPGN08060	0	2.00	25.0%	2	8	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	125	1	Polemonium chartaceum	PDPLM0E060	0	1.00	25.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	131	2	Ivesia pickeringii	PDROS0X0D0	0	8.00	61.5%	4	13	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	133	2	Potentilla cristae	PDROS1B2F0	0	4.00	21.1%	4	19	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	136	1	Cordylanthus tenuis ssp pallescens	PDSCR0J0S3	0	1.00	3.1%	3	32	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	138	1	Orthocarpus pachystachyus	PDSCR1H0L0	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	154	1	Erythronium citrinum var roderickii	PMLIL0U042	0	1.00	20.0%	3	5	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Scott Mountains Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	5528.00	4.1%	35	135674	hectares
Scott Mountains Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	21.52	0.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	13.41	0.9%	26	1436	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	41.03	1.8%	35	2247	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1131	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1131	0	0.34	14.5%	2	2.34	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	0.41	1.0%	6	41.30	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	4.22	2.4%	12	177.24	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	1.10	0.1%	21	1054	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	11.84	10.1%	11	117.74	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	42.12	3.8%	25	1116	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1261	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	1261	0	29.81	87.4%	2	34.1	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	86.60	17.5%	18	496	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1331	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1331	0	8.67	46.9%	3	18.47	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1371	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1371	0	1.24	7.4%	5	16.8	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	1381	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1381	0	9.19	17.0%	5	54.04	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2181	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2181	0	0.31	4.2%	5	7.44	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.21	0.1%	17	256	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	1.57	3.0%	6	52.08	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	2.46	0.7%	22	354	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2261	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	2261	0	11.45	98.9%	2	11.58	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	31.04	19.4%	17	160	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	4.31	6.8%	7	63.19	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	3261	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	3261	0	4.09	100.0%	1	4.09	Stream km
Scott Mountains Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	24.61	21.6%	13	113.7	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	72.98	4.3%	36	1717	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	6.27	0.8%	20	802	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	73.46	2.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	73.72	5.1%	26	1436	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	73.49	3.3%	35	2247	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	0.19	0.5%	13	41.99	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Scott River (Aquatic)	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	1.51	0.1%	21	1054	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	0.14	0.1%	11	117.74	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	1.06	0.1%	25	1116	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	0.55	0.1%	18	496	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.17	0.1%	17	256	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	0.10	0.2%	6	52.08	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.33	0.1%	22	354	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	2261	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	2261	0	0.13	1.1%	2	11.58	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	0.01	0.0%	17	160	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.18	0.3%	12	62.05	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	0.01	0.0%	15	132	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	18.90	23.6%	9	80	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	9.50	3.4%	20	279	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	1.86	1.6%	13	113.7	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	12.14	8.7%	10	139	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	7.25	1.7%	13	437	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4221	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4221	0	5.68	23.9%	5	23.72	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4231	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	4231	0	11.04	73.9%	2	14.94	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	6.89	6.6%	8	103.8	Stream km
Scott River (Aquatic)	4281	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4281	0	2.09	22.1%	3	9.44	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	237.94	1.6%	33	14782	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	368.12	0.4%	17	85196	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	9.24	0.1%	17	12076	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	5294.29	4.3%	29	122933	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	3753.48	2.4%	39	158636	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	6064.50	2.6%	47	232106	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3797.77	1.0%	58	389604	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	76.56	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	5007.89	2.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	2.64	0.1%	10	2008	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	6.02	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	363.97	0.3%	50	120730	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4566.55	1.9%	52	243707	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	982.54	4.9%	21	19990	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	29.71	0.3%	20	9531	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	819.21	0.4%	41	230543	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	12.30	0.0%	25	27549	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	1.28	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	11.41	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	72.64	4.6%	16	1563	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	730.36	1.0%	50	69737	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Scott Valley Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	190.49	1.2%	20	15880	Hectares
Scott Valley Site	38	2	Ambystoma californiense	AAAAA01147	0	3.00	33.3%	4	9	Number of EOs
Scott Valley Site	71	3	Chaenactis suffrutescens	PDAST200H0	0	1.00	9.1%	3	11	Number of EOs
Scott Valley Site	105	2	Phacelia greenei	PDHYD0C1V0	0	2.00	10.0%	3	20	Number of EOs
Scott Valley Site	192	2	Monadenia ochromphalus	IMGASC7?	0	3.00	20.0%	5	15	Number of EOs
Scott Valley Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	7537.00	5.6%	35	135674	hectares
Scott Valley Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	29.13	1.7%	36	1717	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	26.84	3.3%	20	802	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	41.66	1.6%	51	2641	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	32.73	2.3%	26	1436	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	68.82	3.1%	35	2247	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	4.31	10.3%	13	41.99	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	94.38	9.0%	21	1054	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	21.80	18.5%	11	117.74	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	28.30	2.5%	25	1116	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	7.59	1.5%	18	496	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1321	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1321	0	15.60	18.6%	3	83.8	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	1371	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1371	0	5.80	34.5%	5	16.8	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	36.23	14.2%	17	256	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	6.22	11.9%	6	52.08	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	10.25	2.9%	22	354	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	1.85	1.2%	17	160	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.03	0.0%	12	62.05	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3131	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3131	0	1.14	80.9%	2	1.41	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	8.65	6.9%	15	126	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	33.38	41.7%	9	80	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	3.87	1.4%	20	279	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	0.49	0.4%	13	113.7	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	4231	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	4231	0	3.90	26.1%	2	14.94	Stream km
Scott Valley Site	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	2.04	2.0%	8	103.8	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2111.67	0.9%	47	232106	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	100.86	0.4%	17	27529	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	7579.48	1.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	100.93	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	3562.33	1.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	2.00	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	4737.08	3.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	49.83	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	2.96	0.0%	20	9531	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	3000.45	1.3%	41	230543	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	9795.89	35.6%	25	27549	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	2027.61	5.4%	36	37279	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Sexton Mountain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	3249.54	3.8%	53	85755	Hectares
Sexton Mountain Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	2.00	2.7%	13	75	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	1.00	1.8%	19	55	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	2.00	2.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	64	3	Lomatium engelmannii	PDAPI1B0K0	0	1.00	10.0%	4	10	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	75	3	Microseris howellii	PDAST6E090	0	1.00	2.0%	5	51	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	82	1	Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpu	PDBOR0V191	0	5.00	26.3%	3	19	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	94	1	Sedum moranii	PDCRA0A0P0	0	1.00	6.3%	2	16	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	10.00	19.6%	7	51	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	8.00	16.3%	7	49	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	152	1	Calochortus umpquaensis	PMLIL0D1P0	0	1.00	6.7%	3	15	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	153	2	Camassia howellii	PMLIL0E020	0	12.00	60.0%	5	20	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	157	1	Fritillaria gentneri	PMLIL0V080	0	4.00	66.7%	3	6	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	158	3	Fritillaria purdyi	PMLIL0V0H0	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Sexton Mountain Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	66.82	2.5%	51	2641	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	22.50	11.1%	17	202.47	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	50.85	34.2%	20	148.77	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	15.11	2.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	8.19	4.0%	13	205.15	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	18.75	3.7%	20	502.9	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	42.09	28.5%	20	147.64	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	30.19	3.4%	30	900	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	26.06	5.9%	20	445	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	5.84	4.8%	14	121.14	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	37.02	29.7%	20	124.51	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	3.17	0.8%	33	377	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	6.24	5.0%	14	125	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	1.46	1.4%	14	102	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	2.65	16.0%	6	16.58	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	9.60	6.2%	17	155	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.65	1.4%	12	47.42	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	0.69	0.7%	14	103	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	23.22	13.6%	21	171	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	3.52	0.9%	34	404	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	2.77	2.3%	11	120.5	Stream km
Sexton Mountain Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	20.14	7.8%	21	258	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	0.11	0.0%	36	1717	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	36.85	1.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	36.79	2.6%	26	1436	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	36.85	1.6%	35	2247	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Shasta River (Aquatic)	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	1.80	24.1%	6	7.47	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	0.85	0.5%	12	177.24	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	0.01	0.0%	25	1116	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	1.01	6.9%	6	14.57	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	0.22	1.1%	8	20.01	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	0.22	0.4%	6	52.08	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.03	0.0%	22	354	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3171	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3171	0	7.97	100.0%	1	7.97	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	16.88	26.7%	7	63.19	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	0.35	0.3%	15	126	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	4.60	5.8%	9	80	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	15.56	5.6%	20	279	Stream km
Shasta River (Aquatic)	3271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3271	0	3.11	12.1%	3	25.6	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	0.26	0.0%	33	14782	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	117.29	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	18672.30	15.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	3589.19	1.5%	52	243707	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	7.57	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	2500.46	30.9%	12	8092	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	9677.73	13.9%	50	69737	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	2496.38	15.7%	20	15880	Hectares
Shasta Valley Site	70	1	Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	PDAST11047	0	1.00	10.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
Shasta Valley Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	19.91	0.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	8.79	0.6%	26	1436	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	19.91	0.9%	35	2247	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	32.34	18.2%	12	177.24	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	3.52	3.0%	11	117.74	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	19.90	1.8%	25	1116	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	4.20	28.8%	6	14.57	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	0.23	1.1%	8	20.01	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	28.58	45.2%	7	63.19	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	4.33	5.4%	9	80	Stream km
Shasta Valley Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	4.74	1.7%	20	279	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	12741.82	8.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	331.50	0.1%	47	232106	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	2486.93	9.0%	17	27529	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	17923.75	4.6%	58	389604	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	5382.09	15.5%	25	34724	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	15839.09	8.9%	47	177368	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	3029.82	1.2%	58	243447	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	66.75	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	185.04	0.6%	10	28678	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	3796.58	5.8%	13	65678	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	3352.86	2.8%	50	120730	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	13.04	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	6503.07	2.8%	41	230543	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	73.68	8.4%	7	877	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	2735.54	9.9%	25	27549	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	681.17	1.8%	36	37279	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	4377.04	5.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	1.00	1.3%	13	75	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	3.00	23.1%	7	13	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	2.00	3.6%	19	55	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	9.00	9.1%	24	99	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	64	3	Lomatium engelmannii	PDAPI1B0K0	0	2.00	20.0%	4	10	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	1.00	2.9%	6	34	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	86	3	Arabis modesta	PDBRA06180	0	16.00	94.1%	2	17	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	94	1	Sedum moranii	PDCRA0A0P0	0	15.00	93.8%	2	16	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	2.00	8.3%	8	24	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	99	2	Sophora leachiana	PDFAB3N050	0	42.00	82.4%	3	51	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	107	3	Monardella purpurea	PDLAM180T0	0	1.00	4.3%	5	23	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	30.00	38.0%	6	79	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	142	3	Cupressus bakeri	PGCUP04020	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	153	2	Camassia howellii	PMLIL0E020	0	3.00	15.0%	5	20	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	155	3	Erythronium howellii	PMLIL0U080	0	1.00	3.2%	3	31	Number of EOs
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	4922.00	3.6%	35	135674	hectares
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	54.54	2.1%	51	2641	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	17.62	8.7%	17	202.47	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	58.85	8.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	2.36	1.2%	13	205.15	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	60.95	12.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	1.66	1.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	122.06	13.6%	30	900	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	48.22	10.8%	20	445	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	1.24	12.1%	6	10.23	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	28.84	23.8%	14	121.14	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	56.14	14.9%	33	377	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	2.79	2.2%	14	125	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	10.98	10.8%	14	102	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	4.35	2.8%	17	155	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	4.21	8.9%	12	47.42	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	0.24	1.6%	7	15.02	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	9.12	8.9%	14	103	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	0.01	0.0%	21	171	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	42.18	10.4%	34	404	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	2.87	2.4%	11	120.5	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	12.55	22.1%	8	56.77	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.96	0.4%	21	258	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	27.01	16.1%	17	168	Stream km
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	4.55	9.4%	9	48.64	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	38.69	0.3%	33	14782	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	360.52	0.4%	17	85196	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	235.32	1.9%	17	12076	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	10809.50	8.8%	29	122933	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	6	0	Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	KLGRP06	1000	164.58	57.7%	4	285	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	9447.86	6.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	14362.72	6.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	58.41	1.7%	8	3393	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	5979.10	1.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	278.00	0.8%	25	34724	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	682.90	0.4%	47	177368	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2834.09	1.2%	58	243447	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	701.46	34.9%	10	2008	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	0.05	0.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	2233.85	1.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	2290.98	0.9%	52	243707	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	250.06	1.3%	21	19990	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	546.64	5.7%	20	9531	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	536.69	0.2%	41	230543	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	3730.36	10.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	29	0	Montane Riparian Shrublands	KLGRP29	0	1.99	2.6%	36	76	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	405.27	0.5%	53	85755	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	393.10	25.2%	16	1563	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	1055.60	1.5%	50	69737	Hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	16.00	25.0%	16	64	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	4.00	17.4%	8	23	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	67	1	Tauschia howellii	PDAPI27050	0	4.00	36.4%	2	11	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	95	3	Sedum oblanceolatum	PDCRA0A0T0	0	9.00	22.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	104	1	Lupinus aridus ssp Ashlanensis	PDFAB2B0J2	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	9.00	14.5%	8	62	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	130	1	Horkelia hendersonii	PDROS0W090	0	4.00	100.0%	1	4	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	142	3	Cupressus bakeri	PGCUP04020	0	1.00	11.1%	4	9	Number of EOs
Siskiyou Crest Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	341.00	0.3%	35	135674	hectares
Siskiyou Crest Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	20.33	0.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	7.83	0.5%	26	1436	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	27.57	1.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	0.47	0.4%	16	131.43	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.18	0.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	12.43	1.2%	21	1054	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	59.90	11.9%	20	502.9	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.37	0.3%	20	147.64	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	50.25	4.5%	25	1116	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Siskiyou Crest Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	53.95	6.0%	30	900	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1251	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1251	0	0.42	100.0%	1	0.42	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	1.19	0.2%	18	496	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1323	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1323	0	2.71	36.1%	2	7.51	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1341	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1341	0	0.19	1.8%	2	10.36	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1343	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1343	0	17.91	85.4%	2	20.98	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1441	0	First order stream over 6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1441	0	1.02	100.0%	1	1.02	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	1481	0	First order stream over 6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1481	0	0.58	100.0%	1	0.58	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	0.19	0.6%	7	30.07	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	2.01	1.6%	20	124.51	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.66	1.0%	15	68.17	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	5.78	1.5%	33	377	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	6.72	2.6%	17	256	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	19.69	19.3%	14	102	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2233	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2233	0	1.59	9.6%	6	16.58	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	20.94	5.9%	22	354	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	28.05	18.1%	17	155	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2251	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2251	0	1.27	72.2%	2	1.76	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	1.51	0.9%	17	160	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	5.64	3.3%	21	171	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	0.07	0.1%	15	132	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	7.88	2.0%	34	404	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	0.21	0.2%	15	126	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3223	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3223	0	7.60	14.1%	7	53.88	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3233	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3233	0	0.84	19.8%	4	4.25	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	1.59	0.6%	20	279	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	9.96	15.3%	8	65.24	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	2.78	2.4%	13	113.7	Stream km
Siskiyou Crest Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.90	0.3%	21	258	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	82.74	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	791.18	23.3%	8	3393	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	2126.41	0.5%	58	389604	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Slate Creek Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	193.88	0.6%	25	34724	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	2490.47	1.4%	47	177368	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	844.04	0.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	54.71	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1261.55	1.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	3245.24	1.4%	41	230543	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	2052.21	7.4%	25	27549	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	54.52	0.1%	36	37279	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1687.31	2.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Slate Creek Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	2.00	3.6%	19	55	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	64	3	Lomatium engelmannii	PDAPI1B0K0	0	3.00	30.0%	4	10	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	75	3	Microseris howellii	PDAST6E090	0	8.00	15.7%	5	51	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	79	3	Senecio hesperius	PDAST8H1L0	0	1.00	2.0%	3	51	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	99	2	Sophora leachiana	PDFAB3N050	0	2.00	3.9%	3	51	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	1.00	2.0%	7	49	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	128	4	Lewisia oppositifolia	PDPOR040B0	0	1.00	2.5%	4	40	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	153	2	Camassia howellii	PMLIL0E020	0	2.00	10.0%	5	20	Number of EOs
Slate Creek Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	49.00	0.0%	35	135674	hectares
Slate Creek Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	42.88	1.6%	51	2641	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	2.38	1.6%	20	148.77	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	12.44	1.7%	37	734.92	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	2.87	1.4%	13	205.15	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	1.42	0.3%	20	502.9	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	7.03	4.8%	20	147.64	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	20.22	2.2%	30	900	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	16.89	3.8%	20	445	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	1.24	1.0%	14	121.14	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	9.56	7.7%	20	124.51	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	5.82	1.5%	33	377	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	4.77	3.8%	14	125	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2223	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2223	0	2.43	2.4%	14	102	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	2.90	1.9%	17	155	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	0.86	1.8%	12	47.42	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	3.76	3.7%	14	103	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	2.78	1.6%	21	171	Stream km
Slate Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	7.59	1.9%	34	404	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	63.77	3.7%	36	1717	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	77.07	2.9%	51	2641	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	63.77	4.4%	26	1436	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	217	4	Oncorhynchus clarki clarki	AFCHA0208A	0	64.11	14.7%	5	435	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	63.79	2.8%	35	2247	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	1.40	0.7%	17	202.47	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Smith River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	1.04	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	2.24	1.1%	13	205.15	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	0.36	0.3%	14	121.14	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.00	0.0%	33	377	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	5.15	4.1%	14	125	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	17.17	16.7%	14	103	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	16.70	4.1%	34	404	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	25.94	21.5%	11	120.5	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	1.42	0.6%	21	258	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	1.17	0.7%	17	168	Stream km
Smith River (Aquatic)	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	0.04	0.1%	9	48.64	Stream km
Smith River Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	267.76	1.8%	33	14782	Hectares
Smith River Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	1499.91	0.9%	39	158636	Hectares
Smith River Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	443.93	0.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Smith River Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	2220.84	8.1%	17	27529	Hectares
Smith River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3516.31	0.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Smith River Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	753.62	2.2%	25	34724	Hectares
Smith River Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	7422.46	4.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Smith River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1811.91	0.7%	58	243447	Hectares
Smith River Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	2197.54	3.3%	13	65678	Hectares
Smith River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	65.83	0.1%	50	120730	Hectares
Smith River Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	454.88	0.2%	52	243707	Hectares
Smith River Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	86.45	0.4%	21	19990	Hectares
Smith River Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	0.19	0.0%	20	9531	Hectares
Smith River Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	23920.49	10.4%	41	230543	Hectares
Smith River Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	15.79	1.8%	7	877	Hectares
Smith River Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	1.96	0.0%	25	27549	Hectares
Smith River Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	384.46	1.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Smith River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1506.97	1.8%	53	85755	Hectares
Smith River Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	234.48	19.3%	10	1216	Hectares
Smith River Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	1988.03	24.6%	9	4875	Hectares
Smith River Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	33.28	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Smith River Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	14.00	18.7%	13	75	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	3.00	23.1%	7	13	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	3.00	4.7%	16	64	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	2.00	3.6%	19	55	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	68	3	Asarum marmoratum	PDARI02070	0	2.00	66.7%	2	3	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	1.00	2.9%	6	34	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	85	2	Arabis macdonaldiana	PDBRA06150	0	14.00	56.0%	5	25	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	88	2	Streptanthus howellii	PDBRA2G0N0	0	1.00	3.8%	3	26	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	1.00	4.2%	8	24	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	102	2	Gentiana setigera	PDGEN060S0	0	2.00	4.1%	4	49	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	128	4	Lewisia oppositifolia	PDPOR040B0	0	4.00	10.0%	4	40	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	135	3	Castilleja elata	PDSCR0D0T0	0	11.00	84.6%	3	13	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	141	2	Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	PDVIO040Y2	0	9.00	28.1%	4	32	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	1.00	3.7%	8	27	Number of EOs
Smith River Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	1844.00	1.4%	35	135674	hectares
Smith River Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	78.16	4.6%	36	1717	Stream km
Smith River Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	99.11	3.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Smith River Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	78.16	5.4%	26	1436	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Smith River Site	217	4	Oncorhynchus clarki clarki	AFCHA0208A	0	158.67	36.5%	5	435	Stream km
Smith River Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	115.26	5.1%	35	2247	Stream km
Smith River Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	1.56	3.2%	9	49.16	Stream km
Smith River Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	41.10	20.3%	17	202.47	Stream km
Smith River Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	45.43	6.2%	37	734.92	Stream km
Smith River Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	100.74	49.1%	13	205.15	Stream km
Smith River Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	19.78	4.4%	20	445	Stream km
Smith River Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	18.95	15.6%	14	121.14	Stream km
Smith River Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	14.86	3.9%	33	377	Stream km
Smith River Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	24.01	19.2%	14	125	Stream km
Smith River Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	11.57	11.2%	14	103	Stream km
Smith River Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	15.85	3.9%	34	404	Stream km
Smith River Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	19.83	16.5%	11	120.5	Stream km
Smith River Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	3.57	2.1%	17	168	Stream km
Smith River Site	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	2.31	4.7%	9	48.64	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	45.62	0.3%	33	14782	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	26.00	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	66.38	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	1250.54	0.5%	47	232106	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	31993.02	8.2%	58	389604	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1606.69	0.9%	47	177368	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	12825.81	5.3%	58	243447	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	807.31	1.6%	37	51191	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	5262.90	4.4%	50	120730	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	10017.52	4.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	0.31	0.0%	21	19990	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	149.71	1.6%	20	9531	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	229.03	0.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	1094.31	2.9%	36	37279	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	3227.70	3.8%	53	85755	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	11444.22	16.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Soda Mountain Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	2.00	3.6%	19	55	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	3.00	3.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	72	1	Cirsium ciliolatum	PDAST2E0P0	0	3.00	100.0%	1	3	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	76	2	Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	PDAST6E0A1	0	5.00	55.6%	4	9	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	82	1	Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpu	PDBOR0V191	0	1.00	5.3%	3	19	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	108	2	Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	PDLIM02041	0	3.00	30.0%	6	10	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	2.00	3.9%	7	51	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	148	2	Calochortus greenei	PMLIL0D0H0	0	18.00	66.7%	4	27	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	157	1	Fritillaria gentneri	PMLIL0V080	0	1.00	16.7%	3	6	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	181	2	Fluminicola seminalis	IMGASG3110	0	1.00	5.9%	4	17	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	1.00	0.8%	9	121	Number of EOs
Soda Mountain Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	564.00	0.4%	35	135674	hectares
Soda Mountain Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	7.49	0.4%	36	1717	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	7.49	0.9%	20	802	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	7.49	0.5%	26	1436	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	21.06	0.9%	35	2247	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Soda Mountain Site	1101	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1101	0	0.95	28.4%	4	3.34	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	1.12	2.7%	13	41.99	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	14.21	10.8%	16	131.43	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	2.82	0.4%	37	734.92	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1201	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1201	0	0.04	0.8%	2	4.85	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	10.73	6.1%	12	177.24	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	11.84	1.1%	21	1054	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	1.42	1.2%	11	117.74	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	13.34	9.0%	20	147.64	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	82.44	7.4%	25	1116	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	27.02	3.0%	30	900	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	1.83	12.6%	6	14.57	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.60	0.9%	15	68.17	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	2.24	11.2%	8	20.01	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	3.50	1.4%	17	256	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	29.89	8.4%	22	354	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	11.34	7.3%	17	155	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2251	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2251	0	0.49	27.8%	2	1.76	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	1.71	1.1%	17	160	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3111	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3111	0	2.33	100.0%	1	2.33	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	4.61	3.5%	15	132	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	1.83	2.9%	7	63.19	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	2.70	2.1%	15	126	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	10.96	3.9%	20	279	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3243	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3243	0	4.29	6.6%	8	65.24	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	3271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	3271	0	13.84	54.1%	3	25.6	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	4211	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4211	0	1.20	14.4%	2	8.34	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	4221	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4221	0	3.85	16.2%	5	23.72	Stream km
Soda Mountain Site	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	3.83	3.7%	8	103.8	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	26.62	0.2%	33	14782	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	7.60	0.0%	29	122933	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	60.28	0.0%	39	158636	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
South Fork Mountain Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	2572.75	1.1%	47	232106	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	657.70	0.2%	58	389604	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	1382.47	4.0%	25	34724	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	1849.24	1.0%	47	177368	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2533.77	1.0%	58	243447	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	568.42	0.9%	13	65678	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	183.19	0.1%	52	243707	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	209.19	1.0%	21	19990	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	635.38	0.3%	41	230543	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	0.20	0.0%	25	27549	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	9.83	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	7.13	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	19.54	1.6%	10	1216	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	2.62	0.0%	9	4875	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	412.74	0.6%	50	69737	Hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	1.00	7.7%	7	13	Number of EOs
South Fork Mountain Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	1.00	2.0%	7	49	Number of EOs
South Fork Mountain Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2126.00	1.6%	35	135674	hectares
South Fork Mountain Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	16.49	1.0%	36	1717	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	19.99	2.5%	20	802	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	13.49	0.5%	51	2641	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	13.49	0.9%	26	1436	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	19.99	0.9%	35	2247	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1103	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1103	0	4.22	100.0%	1	4.22	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	5.10	3.9%	16	131.43	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	4.26	0.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1201	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1201	0	4.81	99.2%	2	4.85	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	3.66	0.3%	21	1054	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	18.27	1.6%	25	1116	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	2.18	0.4%	18	496	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	9.83	14.4%	15	68.17	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	7.89	2.2%	22	354	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	1.96	1.2%	17	160	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	0.60	0.5%	15	132	Stream km
South Fork Mountain Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	11.68	2.7%	13	437	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	224.83	13.1%	36	1717	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	20.83	2.6%	20	802	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	221.09	8.4%	51	2641	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	191.12	13.3%	26	1436	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	237.65	10.6%	35	2247	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1101	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1101	0	0.03	0.9%	4	3.34	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	0.56	7.5%	6	7.47	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	5.82	13.9%	13	41.99	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	3.98	3.0%	16	131.43	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	0.01	0.0%	6	41.30	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	0.23	0.1%	12	177.24	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	0.67	0.1%	21	1054	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	5.82	0.5%	25	1116	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	0.43	0.1%	18	496	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2111	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2111	0	0.07	3.5%	2	1.98	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	0.41	1.4%	7	30.07	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	1.17	1.7%	15	68.17	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	0.34	1.7%	8	20.01	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	0.18	0.1%	17	256	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	10.06	2.8%	22	354	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	0.05	0.0%	17	160	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	0.31	0.5%	12	62.05	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	4.89	3.7%	15	132	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	3181	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3181	0	0.09	0.3%	5	29.99	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	0.13	0.1%	15	126	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	30.20	10.8%	20	279	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4111	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4111	0	7.71	67.9%	2	11.36	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	50.57	36.4%	10	139	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	94.15	21.5%	13	437	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4171	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	4171	0	11.19	50.5%	2	22.15	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4181	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4181	0	3.20	6.9%	5	46.1	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	24.01	23.1%	8	103.8	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	4271	0	40.38	32.6%	3	123.98	Stream km
South Fork Trinity River (Aquatic)	4281	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	4281	0	6.01	63.7%	3	9.44	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	586.75	4.0%	33	14782	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	9.55	0.0%	17	85196	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	48.34	0.4%	17	12076	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	2292.49	1.9%	29	122933	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	13191.30	8.3%	39	158636	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	14985.20	6.5%	47	232106	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	5999.71	21.8%	17	27529	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	10	0	Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP10	100	0.00	0.0%	8	3393	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	9226.73	2.4%	58	389604	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	4101.53	11.8%	25	34724	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	13264.77	7.5%	47	177368	Hectares

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
South Siskiyous Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1812.21	0.7%	58	243447	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	44.36	2.2%	10	2008	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	378.93	0.7%	37	51191	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	658.07	1.0%	13	65678	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1.79	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	2201.87	0.9%	52	243707	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	9126.67	45.7%	21	19990	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	579.98	6.1%	20	9531	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	29324.04	12.7%	41	230543	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	2241.17	8.1%	25	27549	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	166.20	0.2%	53	85755	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	21.04	1.7%	10	1216	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	61.18	3.9%	16	1563	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	980.21	12.1%	9	4875	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	89.91	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	1062.81	6.7%	20	15880	Hectares
South Siskiyous Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	10.00	13.3%	13	75	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	42	3	Rhyacotriton variegatus	AAAAJ01020	0	2.00	15.4%	7	13	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	3.00	4.7%	16	64	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	84	3	Arabis koehleri var stipitata	PDBRA060Z2	0	1.00	2.9%	6	34	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	85	2	Arabis macdonaldiana	PDBRA06150	0	3.00	12.0%	5	25	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	87	2	Draba carnosula	PDBRA112T0	0	2.00	28.6%	4	7	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	100	2	Thermopsis robusta	PDFAB3Z0D0	0	2.00	18.2%	2	11	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	106	2	Phacelia leonis	PDHYD0C2N0	0	3.00	25.0%	3	12	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	1.00	2.0%	7	49	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	2.00	3.2%	8	62	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	120	2	Eriogonum hirtellum	PDPGN082T0	0	15.00	88.2%	2	17	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	127	2	Lewisia cotyledon var heckneri	PDPOR04052	0	1.00	7.7%	3	13	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	135	3	Castilleja elata	PDSCR0D0T0	0	1.00	7.7%	3	13	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	139	3	Pedicularis howellii	PDSCR1K0J0	0	2.00	9.1%	5	22	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	164	2	Smilax jamesii	PMSMI010D0	0	2.00	16.7%	4	12	Number of EOs
South Siskiyous Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	6562.00	4.8%	35	135674	hectares
South Siskiyous Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	8.10	0.5%	36	1717	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	111.91	4.2%	51	2641	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	38.04	2.6%	26	1436	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	217	4	Oncorhynchus clarki clarki	AFCHA0208A	0	185.13	42.6%	5	435	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	155.24	6.9%	35	2247	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	15.80	37.6%	13	41.99	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	31.54	15.6%	17	202.47	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	20.48	15.6%	16	131.43	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	90.89	12.4%	37	734.92	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	7.87	19.1%	6	41.30	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	43.85	21.4%	13	205.15	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	73.70	7.0%	21	1054	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	90.58	8.1%	25	1116	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	141.45	28.5%	18	496	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	8.60	7.1%	14	121.14	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	8.14	11.9%	15	68.17	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	28.84	7.6%	33	377	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
South Siskiyous Site	2181	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2181	0	1.05	14.1%	5	7.44	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	13.39	10.7%	14	125	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	12.75	5.0%	17	256	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	34.44	9.7%	22	354	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	45.82	28.6%	17	160	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	8.68	14.0%	12	62.05	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	3.57	3.5%	14	103	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	26.70	20.2%	15	132	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	29.65	7.3%	34	404	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3181	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3181	0	9.11	30.4%	5	29.99	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3183	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3183	0	6.13	5.1%	11	120.5	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	6.14	4.9%	15	126	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	13.45	4.8%	20	279	Stream km
South Siskiyous Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	18.05	15.9%	13	113.7	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	97.39	30.9%	10	315	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	3.41	0.2%	36	1717	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	0.37	0.8%	9	49.16	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	0.43	0.2%	17	202.47	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	1.05	0.7%	20	148.77	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.51	0.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	0.10	0.0%	20	445	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	0.08	0.8%	6	10.23	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	0.17	0.1%	14	121.14	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.48	0.4%	20	124.51	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.74	0.2%	33	377	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	0.10	0.1%	14	125	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	0.21	1.4%	7	15.02	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	0.24	0.2%	14	103	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	0.44	0.3%	21	171	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	0.20	0.0%	34	404	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	14.39	21.7%	6	66.22	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	8.21	14.5%	8	56.77	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	45.21	17.5%	21	258	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	23.13	13.8%	17	168	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4153	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4153	0	0.49	6.7%	4	7.32	Stream km
South Umpqua River (Aquatic)	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	6.32	13.0%	9	48.64	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	18.29	0.7%	51	2641	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.19	0.1%	20	148.77	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.08	0.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	0.75	0.5%	20	147.64	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	0.12	0.0%	30	900	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	0.10	0.0%	33	377	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	14.70	8.6%	21	171	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.44	1.1%	34	404	Stream km
Sucker Creek (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	0.10	0.0%	21	258	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	902.15	6.1%	33	14782	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	1798.89	14.9%	17	12076	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	2711.71	2.2%	29	122933	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	6	0	Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	KLGRP06	1000	74.57	26.2%	4	285	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	5634.45	3.6%	39	158636	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	5807.24	2.5%	47	232106	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	128.51	0.5%	17	27529	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	2537.51	0.7%	58	389604	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	722.71	0.4%	47	177368	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	4078.12	1.7%	58	243447	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	515.62	1.0%	37	51191	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1308.89	1.1%	50	120730	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	7865.03	3.2%	52	243707	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	111.77	0.6%	21	19990	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	395.32	4.1%	20	9531	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	17265.86	7.5%	41	230543	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	244.15	0.9%	25	27549	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	60.36	0.2%	36	37279	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	353.31	0.4%	53	85755	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	57.90	4.8%	10	1216	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	166.66	10.7%	16	1563	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	1761.25	21.8%	12	8092	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	35	0	Ultramafic Chaparrals	KLGRP35	0	0.13	0.0%	9	4875	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	834.52	1.2%	50	69737	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	1025.18	6.5%	20	15880	Hectares
The Eddy's Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	6.00	9.4%	16	64	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	3.00	5.5%	19	55	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	5.00	27.8%	6	18	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	70	1	Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	PDAST11047	0	1.00	10.0%	3	10	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	71	3	Chaenactis suffrutescens	PDAST200H0	0	2.00	18.2%	3	11	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	77	2	Raillardella pringlei	PDAST7X030	0	6.00	33.3%	3	18	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	87	2	Draba carnosula	PDBRA112T0	0	2.00	28.6%	4	7	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	89	2	Campanula shelteri	PDCAM020W0	0	9.00	100.0%	1	9	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	3.00	6.1%	7	49	Number of EOs

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
The Eddy's Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	16.00	25.8%	8	62	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	119	2	Eriogonum alpinum	PDPGN08060	0	6.00	75.0%	2	8	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	125	1	Polemonium chartaceum	PDPLM0E060	0	3.00	75.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	133	2	Potentilla cristae	PDROS1B2F0	0	3.00	15.8%	4	19	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	136	1	Cordylanthus tenuis ssp pallescens	PDSCR0J0S3	0	25.00	78.1%	3	32	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	140	3	Penstemon filiformis	PDSCR1L2A0	0	4.00	16.0%	3	25	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	148	2	Calochortus greenei	PMLIL0D0H0	0	1.00	3.7%	4	27	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	182	2	Fluminicola species 17	IMGASG3290	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	186	2	Fluminicola species 14	IMGASG3160	0	1.00	16.7%	4	6	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	187	2	Fluminicola species 1	IMGASG3170	0	1.00	50.0%	2	2	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	188	2	Fluminicola species 16	IMGASG3310	0	1.00	16.7%	2	6	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	2.00	1.7%	9	121	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	198	2	Vespericola shasta	IMGASA4070	0	1.00	5.6%	4	18	Number of EOs
The Eddy's Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	4239.00	3.1%	35	135674	hectares
The Eddy's Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	5.03	2.8%	12	177.24	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1212	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	1212	0	13.34	5.1%	8	259.26	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1222	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	1222	0	13.31	51.9%	2	25.63	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	7.26	6.2%	11	117.74	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1232	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	1232	0	30.59	26.9%	4	113.53	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1242	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Pit drainage	1242	0	8.91	5.9%	6	152	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	18.25	3.7%	18	496	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1282	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	1282	0	82.81	80.6%	2	102.73	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1331	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1331	0	4.23	22.9%	3	18.47	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1371	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1371	0	1.23	7.3%	5	16.8	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1381	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1381	0	4.06	7.5%	5	54.04	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	1382	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	1382	0	9.02	100.0%	1	9.02	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2112	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2112	0	0.26	3.5%	4	7.45	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	1.91	9.5%	8	20.01	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2212	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	2212	0	4.04	4.7%	8	86.32	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2222	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Pit drainage	2222	0	0.21	3.9%	2	5.32	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	14.46	27.8%	6	52.08	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2262	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Pit drainage	2262	0	0.37	100.0%	1	0.37	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	2.66	1.7%	17	160	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	2282	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	2282	0	27.20	90.5%	2	30.07	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3112	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3112	0	6.84	40.7%	4	16.82	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3182	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	3182	0	0.84	100.0%	1	0.84	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3211	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3211	0	4.85	7.7%	7	63.19	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
The Eddy's Site	3212	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Pit drainage	3212	0	10.19	11.9%	7	85.61	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	4.68	5.9%	9	80	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3232	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Pit drainage	3232	0	3.12	34.0%	3	9.17	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	1.82	1.6%	13	113.7	Stream km
The Eddy's Site	3282	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Pit drainage	3282	0	20.85	97.7%	2	21.34	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	3339.30	22.6%	33	14782	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	3	0	Subalpine Hemlock Forests	KLGRP03	1000	6778.80	8.0%	17	85196	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	5608.51	46.4%	17	12076	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	19949.85	16.2%	29	122933	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	30173.56	19.0%	39	158636	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	40218.13	17.3%	47	232106	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	6030.91	1.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	4215.63	12.1%	25	34724	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	30297.77	17.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	23084.29	9.5%	58	243447	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	16	0	Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP16	1000	239.39	11.9%	10	2008	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	770.14	1.5%	37	51191	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	54.21	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	18857.90	7.7%	52	243707	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	3490.88	17.5%	21	19990	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	358.90	3.8%	20	9531	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	21865.16	9.5%	41	230543	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	107.86	0.4%	25	27549	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	848.87	2.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	29	0	Montane Riparian Shrublands	KLGRP29	0	71.16	93.6%	36	76	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	224.47	0.3%	53	85755	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	226.72	18.6%	10	1216	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	215.24	13.8%	16	1563	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	410.72	0.6%	50	69737	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	29.51	0.2%	20	15880	Hectares
Trinity Alps Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	1.00	1.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	46	4	Rana cascadae	AAABH01060	0	8.00	44.4%	6	18	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	71	3	Chaenactis suffrutescens	PDAST200H0	0	6.00	54.5%	3	11	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	77	2	Raillardella pringlei	PDAST7X030	0	10.00	55.6%	3	18	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	85	2	Arabis macdonaldiana	PDBRA06150	0	1.00	4.0%	5	25	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	87	2	Draba carnosula	PDBRA112T0	0	1.00	14.3%	4	7	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	90	2	Campanula wilkinsiana	PDCAM020Z0	0	5.00	26.3%	3	19	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	92	2	Silene marmorensis	PDCAR0U0Z0	0	1.00	8.3%	3	12	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	96	1	Sedum paradisum	PDCRA0A0U3	0	4.00	100.0%	1	4	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	105	2	Phacelia greenei	PDHYD0C1V0	0	1.00	5.0%	3	20	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	106	2	Phacelia leonis	PDHYD0C2N0	0	8.00	66.7%	3	12	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	116	2	Epilobium oreganum	PDONA060P0	0	7.00	14.3%	7	49	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	117	3	Epilobium siskiyouense	PDONA06100	0	17.00	27.4%	8	62	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	127	2	Lewisia cotyledon var heckneri	PDPOR04052	0	11.00	84.6%	3	13	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	131	2	Ivesia pickeringii	PDROS0X0D0	0	3.00	23.1%	4	13	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	140	3	Penstemon filiformis	PDSCR1L2A0	0	6.00	24.0%	3	25	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	154	1	Erythronium citrinum var roderickii	PMLIL0U042	0	2.00	40.0%	3	5	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	164	2	Smilax jamesii	PMSMI010D0	0	4.00	33.3%	4	12	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	180	2	Ancotrema voyanum	IMGAS36130	0	4.00	36.4%	4	11	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	185	2	Monadenia setosa	IMGASC7080	0	14.00	56.0%	2	25	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	189	2	Monadenia chaceana	IMGASC7150	0	1.00	3.3%	11	30	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	13.00	10.7%	9	121	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	196	2	Trilobopsis tehamana	IMGASA2040	0	1.00	20.0%	4	5	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	197	2	Vespericola pressleyi	IMGASA4170	0	2.00	100.0%	1	2	Number of EOs
Trinity Alps Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	35105.00	25.9%	35	135674	hectares
Trinity Alps Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	103.84	6.0%	36	1717	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Trinity Alps Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	301.09	37.5%	20	802	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	115.67	4.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	118.81	8.3%	26	1436	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	371.12	16.5%	35	2247	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	3.08	7.3%	13	41.99	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	7.89	6.0%	16	131.43	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1181	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1181	0	1.53	3.7%	6	41.30	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	440.63	41.8%	21	1054	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	61.69	52.4%	11	117.74	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	295.49	26.5%	25	1116	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1261	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on limestone substrate in the Klamath drainage	1261	0	4.29	12.6%	2	34.1	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	3.30	22.6%	6	14.57	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	133.02	26.8%	18	496	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1321	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1321	0	53.56	63.9%	3	83.8	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1331	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1331	0	5.57	30.2%	3	18.47	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1341	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1341	0	10.17	98.2%	2	10.36	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1371	0	Shoreline between 4000-6000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1371	0	6.75	40.2%	5	16.8	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	1381	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1381	0	36.25	67.1%	5	54.04	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	14.63	48.7%	7	30.07	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	14.49	21.3%	15	68.17	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	114.20	44.6%	17	256	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2231	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	2231	0	29.51	56.7%	6	52.08	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	116.88	33.0%	22	354	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	2271	0	0.55	100.0%	1	0.55	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	53.90	33.7%	17	160	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	11.63	18.7%	12	62.05	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	23.32	17.7%	15	132	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3181	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3181	0	6.48	21.6%	5	29.99	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3221	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3221	0	39.76	31.6%	15	126	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	4.83	6.0%	9	80	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	65.26	23.4%	20	279	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	31.10	27.4%	13	113.7	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Trinity Alps Site	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	3.12	2.2%	10	139	Stream km
Trinity Alps Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	11.86	2.7%	13	437	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	127.02	7.4%	36	1717	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	10.89	1.4%	20	802	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	99.60	3.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	127.10	8.9%	26	1436	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	140.32	6.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1101	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1101	0	0.01	0.3%	4	3.34	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1121	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1121	0	0.29	0.7%	13	41.99	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	4.50	3.4%	16	131.43	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	1.02	0.1%	21	1054	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	1.27	0.1%	25	1116	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	0.54	0.1%	18	496	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	1381	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1381	0	0.19	0.4%	5	54.04	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	2121	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2121	0	0.43	1.4%	7	30.07	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.78	1.1%	15	68.17	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	0.67	0.2%	22	354	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	0.83	0.5%	17	160	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	3121	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	3121	0	6.57	10.6%	12	62.05	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	26.27	19.9%	15	132	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	23.09	20.3%	13	113.7	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	4121	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4121	0	5.84	4.2%	10	139	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	93.06	21.3%	13	437	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	12.84	12.4%	8	103.8	Stream km
Trinity River (Aquatic)	4271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	4271	0	19.59	15.8%	3	123.98	Stream km
Trinity River Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	2.36	0.0%	33	14782	Hectares
Trinity River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	264.90	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Trinity River Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	107.63	0.3%	25	34724	Hectares
Trinity River Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	266.36	0.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Trinity River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	418.67	0.2%	58	243447	Hectares
Trinity River Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	199.28	0.7%	10	28678	Hectares
Trinity River Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	683.23	1.0%	13	65678	Hectares
Trinity River Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	4.00	0.0%	21	19990	Hectares
Trinity River Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	0.20	0.0%	41	230543	Hectares
Trinity River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	19.81	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Trinity River Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	33.49	0.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Trinity River Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	1127.00	0.8%	35	135674	hectares
Trinity River Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	4.70	0.3%	36	1717	Stream km
Trinity River Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	4.70	0.6%	20	802	Stream km
Trinity River Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	4.70	0.2%	51	2641	Stream km
Trinity River Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	4.70	0.3%	26	1436	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Trinity River Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	4.70	0.2%	35	2247	Stream km
Trinity River Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	4.21	3.2%	16	131.43	Stream km
Trinity River Site	2101	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	2101	0	1.41	51.6%	2	2.73	Stream km
Trinity River Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.23	0.3%	15	68.17	Stream km
Trinity River Site	4141	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4141	0	9.08	2.1%	13	437	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	11283.47	2.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	108.79	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	6264.48	2.6%	58	243447	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	49.61	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	3376.00	2.8%	50	120730	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	2488.68	1.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	17.42	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	1295.17	1.5%	53	85755	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	12695.80	18.2%	50	69737	Hectares
Umpqua Valley Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	1.00	4.3%	8	23	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	2.00	3.6%	19	55	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	16.00	16.2%	24	99	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	66	1	Perideridia erythrorhiza	PDAPI1N050	0	14.00	73.7%	2	19	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	81	1	Plagiobothrys hirtus	PDBOR0V0E0	0	11.00	100.0%	1	11	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	83	1	Arabis koehleri var koehleri	PDBRA060Z1	0	3.00	100.0%	1	3	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	1.00	2.0%	7	51	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	113	3	Camissonia ovata	PDONA03150	0	1.00	100.0%	1	1	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	133	2	Potentilla cristae	PDROS1B2F0	0	10.00	52.6%	4	19	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	8.00	29.6%	8	27	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	145	2	Sisyrinchium hitchcockii	PMIRI0D0S0	0	4.00	100.0%	1	4	Number of EOs
Umpqua Valley Site	173	1	NEW577-QUG - unnamed plant community	NEW577-QUG	0	1.78	9.9%	2	18	
Umpqua Valley Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	86.72	27.5%	10	315	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	67.84	4.0%	36	1717	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	1113	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1113	0	36.36	74.0%	9	49.16	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	14.26	9.6%	20	148.77	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	73.31	10.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	2113	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2113	0	3.44	33.6%	6	10.23	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	6.66	5.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	15.21	4.0%	33	377	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	3113	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3113	0	0.97	6.5%	7	15.02	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	13.20	7.7%	21	171	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	17.04	4.2%	34	404	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	4113	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4113	0	27.81	42.0%	6	66.22	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	10.64	4.1%	21	258	Stream km
Umpqua Valley Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	5.91	3.5%	17	168	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	25.72	1.5%	36	1717	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	26.27	1.0%	51	2641	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	0.60	0.4%	20	148.77	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	0.20	0.0%	37	734.92	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	0.10	0.0%	30	900	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	0.33	0.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	0.10	0.1%	21	171	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	0.36	0.1%	34	404	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	10.46	4.1%	21	258	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	15.15	9.0%	17	168	Stream km
Upper Rogue River (Aquatic)	4153	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4153	0	0.86	11.7%	4	7.32	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	23.30	0.2%	33	14782	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	648.26	0.5%	29	122933	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	1311.30	0.8%	39	158636	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	14417.45	6.2%	47	232106	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	332.49	0.1%	58	389604	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	115.52	0.3%	25	34724	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	3016.78	1.7%	47	177368	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1404.81	0.6%	58	243447	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	638.14	1.2%	37	51191	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	58.36	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	2565.80	1.1%	52	243707	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	13.85	0.1%	21	19990	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	6741.49	2.9%	41	230543	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	523.42	1.9%	25	27549	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	60.11	0.2%	36	37279	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	8.13	0.5%	16	1563	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	34	0	Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	KLGRP34	0	1.68	0.0%	12	8092	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	78.97	0.1%	50	69737	Hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	73	2	Madia stebbinsii	PDAST650K0	0	10.00	100.0%	1	10	Number of EOs
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	74	1	Madia doris-nilesiae	PDAST650L0	0	6.00	66.7%	2	9	Number of EOs
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	122	1	Linanthus nuttallii ssp howellii	PDPLM090V4	0	4.00	100.0%	1	4	Number of EOs
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	14.00	11.6%	9	121	Number of EOs
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2931.00	2.2%	35	135674	hectares
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	2.16	0.1%	36	1717	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	24.33	3.0%	20	802	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	37.88	1.7%	35	2247	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	1.21	0.9%	16	131.43	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1144	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1144	0	0.10	0.1%	4	75.31	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	5.84	0.6%	21	1054	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1224	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1224	0	1.79	2.6%	3	68.44	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	51.93	4.7%	25	1116	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	45.36	43.1%	7	105.3	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	11.49	2.3%	18	496	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1284	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1284	0	24.04	61.6%	2	39.02	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1344	0	First order stream between 4000-6000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1344	0	1.27	100.0%	1	1.27	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	2.89	1.1%	17	256	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	14.20	4.0%	22	354	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	2244	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2244	0	24.70	74.7%	3	33.06	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	2281	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	2281	0	2.27	1.4%	17	160	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	2284	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2284	0	7.05	100.0%	1	7.05	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	3144	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3144	0	0.12	0.8%	5	15.09	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	5.32	1.9%	20	279	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	3244	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3244	0	4.16	100.0%	1	4.16	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	1.88	1.7%	13	113.7	Stream km
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	3284	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3284	0	4.92	67.8%	2	7.26	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1	0	Barrens	KLGRP01	0	246.75	1.7%	33	14782	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	4	0	Subalpine Red Fir Forests	KLGRP04	100	2.33	0.0%	17	12076	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	5	0	Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	KLGRP05	1000	122.30	0.1%	29	122933	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	626.38	0.4%	39	158636	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	4504.60	1.9%	47	232106	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	3624.87	0.9%	58	389604	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	243.89	0.7%	25	34724	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	6505.07	3.7%	47	177368	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	13604.77	5.6%	58	243447	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	5971.94	11.7%	37	51191	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1044.41	0.9%	50	120730	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	4152.75	1.7%	52	243707	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	23	0	Seral Chaparral	KLGRP23	100	8.80	0.0%	21	19990	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	2584.81	1.1%	41	230543	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	4.44	0.0%	36	37279	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	26.36	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	31	0	Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	KLGRP31	0	273.92	22.5%	10	1216	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	33	0	Seasonally Flooded Meadows	KLGRP33	0	16.75	1.1%	16	1563	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	254.16	0.4%	50	69737	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	37	0	Great Basin Shrubalnds	KLGRP37	400	9.35	0.1%	20	15880	Hectares
Whiskeytown Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	1.00	1.8%	19	55	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	1.00	1.0%	24	99	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	131	2	Ivesia pickeringii	PDROS0X0D0	0	1.00	7.7%	4	13	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	154	1	Erythronium citrinum var roderickii	PMLIL0U042	0	2.00	40.0%	3	5	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	190	2	Monadenia churchi	IMGASC7010	0	1.00	0.8%	9	121	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	193	2	Monadenia troglodytes	IMGASC7090	0	1.00	25.0%	2	4	Number of EOs
Whiskeytown Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	8006.00	5.9%	35	135674	hectares
Whiskeytown Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	70.90	4.1%	36	1717	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	212	3	Cottus Klamathensis macrops	AFC4E02151	0	8.39	1.0%	20	802	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	70.04	2.7%	51	2641	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	216	4	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter)	AFCHA0205B	0	70.90	4.9%	26	1436	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	219	2	Oncorhynchus mykiss ssp 2	AFCHA02097	0	74.43	3.3%	35	2247	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1111	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1111	0	0.51	6.8%	6	7.47	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1114	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1114	0	31.62	56.5%	3	55.96	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1124	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1124	0	14.53	37.5%	3	38.76	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1141	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1141	0	1.73	1.3%	16	131.43	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Whiskeytown Site	1144	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1144	0	8.86	11.8%	4	75.31	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1174	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1174	0	32.00	100.0%	1	32	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1211	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1211	0	15.50	8.7%	12	177.24	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1221	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	1221	0	1.97	0.2%	21	1054	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1224	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1224	0	34.28	50.1%	3	68.44	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1231	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	1231	0	3.02	2.6%	11	117.74	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1241	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	1241	0	45.46	4.1%	25	1116	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1244	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	1244	0	7.19	6.8%	7	105.3	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	1271	0	2.03	13.9%	6	14.57	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	1281	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	1281	0	19.87	4.0%	18	496	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2111	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2111	0	1.91	96.5%	2	1.98	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2114	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2114	0	15.60	43.1%	3	36.21	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2124	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2124	0	6.00	78.1%	2	7.68	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2141	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2141	0	0.06	0.1%	15	68.17	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2144	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2144	0	3.98	20.3%	3	19.6	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2211	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2211	0	1.16	5.8%	8	20.01	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2221	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Klamath drainage	2221	0	4.10	1.6%	17	256	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2224	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	2224	0	5.93	23.3%	2	25.49	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	2241	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	2241	0	6.16	1.7%	22	354	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3114	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3114	0	4.31	36.6%	3	11.76	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3124	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3124	0	10.47	44.5%	4	23.54	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3141	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3141	0	0.12	0.1%	15	132	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3144	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage	3144	0	3.07	20.3%	5	15.09	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3231	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Klamath drainage	3231	0	2.72	3.4%	9	80	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3241	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	3241	0	2.45	0.9%	20	279	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	3281	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Klamath drainage	3281	0	3.61	3.2%	13	113.7	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	4111	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4111	0	3.65	32.1%	2	11.36	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	4171	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	4171	0	10.96	49.5%	2	22.15	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	4211	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Klamath drainage	4211	0	7.14	85.6%	2	8.34	Stream km
Whiskeytown Site	4241	0	Fourth order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Klamath drainage	4241	0	53.08	51.1%	8	103.8	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Whiskeytown Site	4271	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage	4271	0	64.01	51.6%	3	123.98	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	7	0	Montane White Fir Forests	KLGRP07	1000	4208.91	2.7%	39	158636	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	3.44	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	5596.06	20.3%	17	27529	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	5326.43	1.4%	58	389604	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	3173.15	9.1%	25	34724	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	9734.05	5.5%	47	177368	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	66.92	0.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	10820.19	37.7%	10	28678	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	30891.14	47.0%	13	65678	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1779.49	1.5%	50	120730	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	9011.33	3.9%	41	230543	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	228.52	26.1%	7	877	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	626.71	1.7%	36	37279	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	633.95	0.7%	53	85755	Hectares
Wild Rogue Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	9.00	12.0%	13	75	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	7.00	30.4%	8	23	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	1.00	1.8%	19	55	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	7.00	7.1%	24	99	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	8.00	33.3%	8	24	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	107	3	Monardella purpurea	PDLAM180T0	0	1.00	4.3%	5	23	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	134	2	Bensoniella oregana	PDSAX02010	0	41.00	51.9%	6	79	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	143	3	Carex gigas	PMCYP03560	0	4.00	14.8%	8	27	Number of EOs
Wild Rogue Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	666.00	0.5%	35	135674	hectares
Wild Rogue Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	47.96	1.8%	51	2641	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	40.06	19.8%	17	202.47	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1133	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1133	0	1.98	1.3%	20	148.77	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	66.54	9.1%	37	734.92	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1183	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1183	0	13.01	6.3%	13	205.15	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	50.57	10.1%	20	502.9	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	1.58	1.1%	20	147.64	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	95.40	10.6%	30	900	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	19.01	4.3%	20	445	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2123	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2123	0	11.80	9.7%	14	121.14	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	5.40	4.3%	20	124.51	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	46.88	12.4%	33	377	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2183	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2183	0	8.90	7.1%	14	125	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	4.35	2.8%	17	155	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	2283	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2283	0	3.52	7.4%	12	47.42	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	5.13	1.3%	34	404	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	4123	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4123	0	17.89	31.5%	8	56.77	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	4133	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4133	0	6.41	2.5%	21	258	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Wild Rogue Site	4143	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4143	0	39.25	23.4%	17	168	Stream km
Wild Rogue Site	4183	0	Fourth order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	4183	0	3.91	8.0%	9	48.64	Stream km
Winchuck River Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	35.69	1.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Winchuk River Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	1688.71	6.1%	17	27529	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	625.27	0.2%	58	389604	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	12	0	Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP12	0	1779.67	5.1%	25	34724	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	419.26	0.2%	47	177368	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	178.58	0.1%	58	243447	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	18	0	Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	KLGRP18	1000	138.95	0.5%	10	28678	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	20	0	Coastal Influenced Canyons	KLGRP20	500	5090.58	7.8%	13	65678	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	39.28	0.0%	50	120730	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	24.30	0.0%	53	85755	Hectares
Winchuk River Site	40	3	Plethodon elongatus	AAAAD12050	0	5.00	6.7%	13	75	Number of EOs
Winchuk River Site	43	4	Ascaphus truei	AAABA01010	0	10.00	15.6%	16	64	Number of EOs
Winchuk River Site	45	3	Rana boylii	AAABH01050	0	3.00	5.5%	19	55	Number of EOs
Winchuk River Site	97	3	Arctostaphylos hispidula	PDERI04230	0	2.00	8.3%	8	24	Number of EOs
Winchuk River Site	207	5	Martes pennanti	AMAJF01020	0	2575.00	1.9%	35	135674	hectares
Winchuk River Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	34.81	4.7%	37	734.92	Stream km
Winchuk River Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	4.09	0.5%	30	900	Stream km
Winchuk River Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	11.61	3.1%	33	377	Stream km
Winchuk River Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	4.55	1.1%	34	404	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	8	0	Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP08	2000	100.79	0.0%	47	232106	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	9	0	Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forest	KLGRP09	1000	780.46	2.8%	17	27529	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	7136.74	1.8%	58	389604	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	21.46	0.0%	47	177368	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	2364.64	1.0%	58	243447	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	31.47	0.1%	37	51191	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	1897.06	1.6%	50	120730	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	50.50	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	24	0	Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	KLGRP24	100	0.22	0.0%	20	9531	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	25	0	Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	KLGRP25	100	53.29	0.0%	41	230543	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	26	0	Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	KLGRP26	100	35.39	4.0%	7	877	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	27	0	Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	KLGRP27	100	365.91	1.3%	25	27549	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	28	0	Montane Riparian Forests	KLGRP28	0	477.72	1.3%	36	37279	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	282.41	0.3%	53	85755	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	471.28	0.7%	50	69737	Hectares
Wolf Creek Site	63	3	Clemmys marmorata marmorata	ARAAD02031	0	8.00	8.1%	24	99	Number of EOs
Wolf Creek Site	111	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	PDLIM02053	0	2.00	3.9%	7	51	Number of EOs
Wolf Creek Site	153	2	Camassia howellii	PMLIL0E020	0	1.00	5.0%	5	20	Number of EOs
Wolf Creek Site	209	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall)	AFCHA0205E	0	17.50	5.6%	10	315	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	210	3	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring)	AFCHA02054	0	7.50	0.4%	36	1717	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	213	3	Oncorhynchus kisutch (winter)	AFCHA02032	0	11.22	0.4%	51	2641	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1123	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1123	0	4.41	2.2%	17	202.47	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	20.00	2.7%	37	734.92	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1223	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1223	0	8.79	1.7%	20	502.9	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1233	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1233	0	3.85	2.6%	20	147.64	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	23.38	2.6%	30	900	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	1283	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1283	0	1.23	0.3%	20	445	Stream km

Portfolio Site	SITES Target ID	G Rank	Conservation Target	Element Code	Minimum Dynamic Area	Portfolio Site Total	Proportion of Target at Site	No. of Sites with Target	Ecoregional Portfolio Total for	Target Units
Wolf Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	11.34	3.0%	33	377	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	2243	0	Second order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2243	0	2.25	1.5%	17	155	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	3123	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on granitic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3123	0	2.92	2.8%	14	103	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	3133	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3133	0	6.86	4.0%	21	171	Stream km
Wolf Creek Site	3143	0	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	3143	0	11.60	2.9%	34	404	Stream km
Yellow Creek Site	11	0	Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	KLGRP11	2000	5981.01	1.5%	58	389604	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	13	0	Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	KLGRP13	1000	157.15	0.1%	47	177368	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	15	0	Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	KLGRP15	1000	1074.74	0.4%	58	243447	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	17	0	Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP17	1000	515.42	1.0%	37	51191	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	21	0	Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	KLGRP21	1000	182.20	0.2%	50	120730	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	22	0	Chaparral	KLGRP22	1000	110.29	0.0%	52	243707	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	30	0	Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	KLGRP30	230	80.17	0.1%	53	85755	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	36	0	Upland Grasslands	KLGRP36	500	670.12	1.0%	50	69737	Hectares
Yellow Creek Site	44	4	Rana aurora aurora	AAABH01021	0	3.00	13.0%	8	23	Number of EOs
Yellow Creek Site	173	1	NEW577-QUG - unnamed plant community	NEW577-QUG	0	0.02	0.1%	2	18	
Yellow Creek Site	1143	0	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1143	0	4.17	0.6%	37	734.92	Stream km
Yellow Creek Site	1243	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	1243	0	2.99	0.3%	30	900	Stream km
Yellow Creek Site	2133	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2133	0	2.57	2.1%	20	124.51	Stream km
Yellow Creek Site	2143	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage	2143	0	4.64	1.2%	33	377	Stream km

Appendix 17. Conservation Target Assessment

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Ecological Systems (ha)																
Alpine Dwarf Shrublands	5399.3	1080.0	4202.5	True	5399.2	540.0	4202.4	True	0.1	0.0	0.1	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Barrens	22204.2	3103.0	10378.0	True	8697.0	870.6	2728.2	True	13507.2	695.3	7649.8	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Brewer Spruce - Mixed Conifer Forests	4578.5	2289.2	3284.1	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4578.5	2289.2	3284.1	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Chaparral	355537.5	107106.0	143488.1	True	180306.9	36061.5	79494.8	True	160365.8	31571.2	59016.9	True	14864.9	2972.3	4976.5	True
Chinkapin - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	71507.5	21482.0	36072.2	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	71438.4	21431.5	36003.1	True	69.1	20.7	69.1	True
Coastal Herbaceous and Low Shrublands	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Coastal Influenced Canyons	138959.8	28515.0	78846.4	True	2866.8	573.0	1018.3	True	136049.3	27194.9	77799.0	True	43.7	8.7	29.2	True
Converted land	57060.7	0.0	0.0	True	45431.3	0.0	0.0	True	3941.2	0.0	0.0	True	7688.3	0.0	0.0	True
Foothill Pine Forests and Woodlands	94258.9	43719.0	31929.2	True	53922.1	16176.1	20348.4	True	38020.3	10650.1	11312.8	True	2316.4	694.8	268.0	False
Foothills Mixed Doug Fir - Oak - Pine Woodlands	622660.3	144919.0	185730.4	True	109480.2	21894.3	45089.0	True	447341.3	87626.3	123152.5	True	65838.8	13167.6	17489.0	True
Great Basin Shrublands	31637.8	11499.0	10094.1	True	25859.8	5127.5	7280.7	True	5778.0	1155.6	2813.3	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Interior Valley Oak Savannas and Woodlands	252928.1	59409.0	77063.7	True	71832.5	14366.1	28218.1	True	150531.8	24505.4	41064.0	True	30563.7	6112.6	7781.7	True
Jeffrey Pine Serpentine Forests	42219.9	16854.0	28512.6	True	0.3	0.1	0.3	True	42219.6	16853.8	28512.3	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Low Elevation Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	838093.4	225833.0	292080.7	True	298762.2	59751.1	100858.2	True	331751.7	65480.9	129602.7	True	207579.5	41515.9	61619.7	True
Low Elevation Riparian Forests and Woodlands	164651.7	23721.0	59530.6	True	76450.0	7645.5	24132.5	True	70945.3	6706.5	31090.2	True	17256.5	1725.9	4308.0	True
Mixed Conifer Serpentine Forests	9501.2	3824.0	6268.5	True	3209.2	962.8	3200.8	True	4730.7	1419.2	2954.7	True	1561.3	468.4	112.9	True
Mixed Evergreen Serpentine and Ultramafic Forests	423910.0	133303.0	240673.1	True	19290.2	5787.1	6442.5	True	385133.8	115518.2	228515.7	True	19486.0	5845.8	5715.0	False
Montane Mixed Conifer Forests	498744.6	124230.0	167662.2	True	121034.6	24207.7	34315.9	True	373028.2	74605.6	132525.3	True	4681.8	936.4	821.0	False
Montane Riparian Forests	88379.0	14696.0	28916.1	True	60008.0	6001.4	11275.8	True	27924.8	2649.5	17305.8	True	446.2	44.6	334.6	True
Montane Riparian Shrublands	194.5	21.0	27.1	True	16.4	2.5	1.4	False	178.1	5.3	25.8	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Montane White Fir Forests	233007.3	52255.0	117108.2	True	27996.7	5599.0	7103.8	True	204967.3	40993.5	109989.9	True	43.3	8.7	14.5	True
Permanently to Semi-permanently Saturated Meadows	11501.4	2301.0	2577.4	True	11497.8	1150.2	2574.7	True	3.7	2.5	2.7	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Port Orford Cedar - Mixed Conifer Forests	48956.6	24480.0	31403.8	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	41781.4	20890.7	28869.8	True	7175.2	3587.6	2534.0	False
Port Orford Cedar Serpentine Substrate Forests	2264.9	906.0	920.9	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1183.2	473.3	920.9	True	1081.7	432.7	0.0	True
Seasonally Flooded Meadows	3187.9	342.0	1348.7	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	3187.9	159.4	1348.7	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Seral Chaparral	42500.9	8632.0	17508.9	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	42500.9	8500.2	17508.9	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Serpentine Wetlands (Darlingtonia)	1490.9	149.0	1459.5	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1490.9	178.9	1459.5	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Subalpine Foxtail Pine Forests	290.3	58.1	285.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	290.3	58.1	285.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Subalpine Hemlock Forests	135001.7	51934.0	38886.8	True	124660.3	24932.1	32871.6	True	10341.5	2068.3	6015.2	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Subalpine Red Fir Forests	14499.9	3134.0	8654.3	True	1174.3	235.8	730.7	True	13325.7	2665.1	7923.6	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Subalpine Shasta Fir Forests	147560.1	42276.0	69109.0	True	63752.7	12751.1	25190.2	True	83807.5	16761.5	43918.8	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Talus and Scree Slopes	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Tanoak - Mixed Doug Fir Forests	451100.6	136122.0	174382.0	True	1775.8	533.2	729.1	True	443123.1	132795.9	169719.2	True	6201.7	1860.8	3933.7	True
Ultramafic Chaparrals	12680.0	1333.0	9905.5	True	654.4	65.4	641.4	True	10667.7	1066.8	9190.0	True	1358.0	135.8	74.1	True
Upland Grasslands	164398.4	23076.0	44220.9	True	59125.7	5913.3	13526.2	True	33184.5	3229.5	10067.8	True	72088.3	7208.2	20627.0	True
Vernal Pools	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Western Hemlock Coastal Forests	58171.6	11634.3	28677.8	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	52155.9	10431.2	24656.2	True	6015.7	1203.1	4021.6	True
Western White Pine Forests and Woodlands	2477.8	532.0	1700.2	True	178.9	35.8	163.5	True	2298.9	459.8	1536.7	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Animals (no. of occurences)																
Ambystoma californiense	48.0	0.0	15.0	True	1.0	1.0	0.0	False	47.0	10.0	15.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Ancotrema voyanum	22.0	0.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	22.0	10.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Ascaphus truei	125.0	0.0	64.0	True	3.0	3.0	2.0	False	119.0	3.0	59.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True
Clemmys marmorata marmorata	202.0	0.0	106.0	True	24.0	5.0	18.0	True	103.0	5.0	57.0	True	75.0	5.0	31.0	True
Fluminicola seminalis	17.0	0.0	17.0	True	15.0	8.0	15.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Fluminicola species 1	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fluminicola species 14	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fluminicola species 16	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fluminicola species 17	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fluminicola species 18	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fluminicola species 20	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Hydromantes shastae	26.0	0.0	26.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	25.0	25.0	25.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Martes pennanti	339537.0	0.0	119442.0	True	3499.0	700.0	2105.0	True	336000.0	67200.0	117299.0	True	38.0	8.0	38.0	True
Monadenia chaceana	33.0	0.0	31.0	True	6.0	6.0	6.0	True	22.0	8.0	20.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True
Monadenia churchi	268.0	0.0	123.0	True	15.0	8.0	15.0	True	253.0	8.0	108.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monadenia klamathica	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	0.0	1.0	1.0	True	4.0	4.0	3.0	False	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monadenia ochromphalus	38.0	0.0	16.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	38.0	10.0	16.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monadenia setosa	34.0	0.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	34.0	10.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monadenia troglodytes	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monadenia wintu	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	6.0	6.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Plethodon elongatus	163.0	0.0	73.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	154.0	8.0	64.0	True	9.0	8.0	9.0	True
Plethodon stormi	44.0	0.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	44.0	10.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Rana aurora aurora	23.0	0.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	16.0	3.0	16.0	True	7.0	3.0	7.0	True
Rana boylii	109.0	0.0	99.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	97.0	5.0	87.0	True	7.0	5.0	7.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Rana cascadae	34.0	0.0	28.0	True	16.0	3.0	4.0	True	18.0	3.0	24.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Rhyacotriton variegatus	43.0	0.0	13.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	41.0	5.0	10.0	True	2.0	2.0	3.0	True
Trilobopsis roperi	24.0	0.0	24.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	22.0	8.0	22.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Trilobopsis tehamana	5.0	0.0	5.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Vespericola pressleyi	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Vespericola shasta	18.0	0.0	17.0	True	5.0	5.0	4.0	False	13.0	8.0	13.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fish (stream km.) note: fish were analyzed by EDU, not section.																
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (fall, S. OR/N. CA Coast ESU)	404.4	202.2	287.3	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (spring, S. OR/N. CA Coast ESU)	1832.6	914.3	1676.1	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Cottus asperrimus	64.6	31.8	64.6	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Cottus klamathensis macrops	1312.8	652.4	1220.5	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oncorhynchus kisutch (S. OR/N. CA Coast ESU)	2667.0	1335.0	2512.4	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oncorhynchus tshawytscha (winter, S. OR/N. CA Coast ESU)	1506.5	451.9	1403.7	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oncorhynchus clarki clarki (S. OR/N. CA Coast ESU)	423.4	128.8	423.3	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oncorhynchus mykiss (Klamath Mtns. ESU)	2307.1	1154.9	2211.5	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Mylopharodon conocephalus	99.4	50.2	92.1	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Chamistes brevirostris	31.3	31.3	31.3	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Plants (no. of occurences)																
Agrostis hendersonii	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Allium jepsonii	3.0	0.0	3.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Arabis koehleri var koehleri	9.0	0.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	9.0	9.0	9.0	True
Arabis koehleri var stipitata	42.0	0.0	35.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	42.0	10.0	35.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Arabis macdonaldiana	43.0	0.0	34.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	43.0	10.0	34.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Arabis modesta	17.0	0.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	17.0	10.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Arctostaphylos hispidula	34.0	0.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	33.0	8.0	22.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True
Asarum marmoratum	5.0	0.0	3.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	4.0	4.0	2.0	False	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Aster vialis	8.0	0.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	7.0	7.0	6.0	False
Balsamorhiza hookeri var lanata	14.0	0.0	14.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	11.0	11.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Bensoniella oregana	80.0	0.0	79.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	76.0	8.0	75.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True
Calochortus coxii	12.0	0.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	12.0	12.0	12.0	True
Calochortus greenei	48.0	0.0	30.0	True	47.0	8.0	29.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Calochortus howellii	38.0	0.0	36.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	38.0	10.0	36.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Calochortus persistens	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	6.0	6.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Calochortus umpquaensis	17.0	0.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	15.0	15.0	15.0	True
Camassia howellii	20.0	0.0	20.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	20.0	10.0	20.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Camissonia ovata	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True
Campanula shelteri	9.0	0.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	9.0	9.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Campanula wilkinsiana	19.0	0.0	19.0	True	14.0	8.0	14.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Carex gigas	24.0	0.0	22.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	24.0	10.0	22.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Castilleja elata	24.0	0.0	13.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	23.0	5.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Chaenactis suffrutescens	19.0	0.0	11.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	18.0	5.0	10.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Cirsium ciliolatum	15.0	0.0	15.0	True	6.0	12.0	6.0	True	9.0	3.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Clarkia borealis ssp arida	3.0	0.0	3.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Clarkia gracilis ssp albicaulis	7.0	0.0	7.0	True	7.0	7.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Cordylanthus tenuis ssp pallescens	32.0	0.0	32.0	True	9.0	9.0	9.0	True	23.0	23.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Cupressus bakeri	9.0	0.0	9.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	7.0	5.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Draba carnosula	7.0	0.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	7.0	7.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Epilobium oreganum	57.0	0.0	42.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	55.0	8.0	41.0	True	1.0	1.0	0.0	False
Epilobium siskiyouense	68.0	0.0	63.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	68.0	10.0	63.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Eriastrum tracyi	3.0	0.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Eriogonum alpinum	8.0	0.0	8.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	8.0	8.0	8.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Eriogonum hirtellum	19.0	0.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	19.0	10.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Erythronium citrinum var roderickii	5.0	0.0	5.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Erythronium howellii	57.0	0.0	37.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	57.0	10.0	37.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Fritillaria eastwoodiae	50.0	0.0	19.0	True	50.0	10.0	19.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fritillaria gentneri	37.0	0.0	38.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	36.0	36.0	37.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Fritillaria purdyi	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Gentiana setigera	51.0	0.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	51.0	10.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Gratiola heterosepala	12.0	0.0	12.0	True	12.0	10.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Hastingsia atropurpurea	19.0	0.0	19.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	19.0	19.0	19.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Hastingsia bracteosa	27.0	0.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	27.0	10.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Horkelia hendersonii	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Ivesia pickeringii	13.0	0.0	13.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	12.0	8.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Juncus leiospermus var leiospermus	7.0	0.0	7.0	True	7.0	7.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lewisia cantelovii	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lewisia cotyledon var heckneri	21.0	0.0	13.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	21.0	10.0	13.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lewisia oppositifolia	55.0	0.0	47.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	55.0	3.0	47.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Limanthes floccosa ssp bellingeriana	10.0	0.0	10.0	True	8.0	8.0	8.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Limanthes floccosa ssp grandiflora	22.0	0.0	22.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	20.0	20.0	20.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Limanthes floccosa ssp pumila	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	58.0	0.0	49.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	53.0	8.0	45.0	True	3.0	3.0	2.0	False
Linanthus nuttallii ssp howellii	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Lomatium cookii	37.0	0.0	37.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	34.0	34.0	34.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lomatium engelmannii	10.0	0.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	10.0	10.0	9.0	False	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lupinus aridus ssp Ashlanensis	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii	10.0	0.0	7.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	10.0	10.0	7.0	False
Madia doris-nilesiae	26.0	0.0	26.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	26.0	26.0	26.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Madia stebbinsii	10.0	0.0	10.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	10.0	10.0	10.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Microseris howellii	57.0	0.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	57.0	10.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Microseris laciniata ssp detlingii	13.0	0.0	9.0	True	12.0	8.0	8.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Minuartia stolonifera	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Monardella purpurea	25.0	0.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	25.0	8.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Navarretia heteranda	3.0	0.0	1.0	True	2.0	2.0	0.0	False	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Neviusia cliftonii	8.0	0.0	8.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	6.0	6.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Oenothera wolfii	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Orcuttia tenuis	10.0	0.0	10.0	True	10.0	10.0	10.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Orthocarpus pachystachyus	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Pedicularis howellii	22.0	0.0	22.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	22.0	10.0	22.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Penstemon filiformis	58.0	0.0	30.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	58.0	10.0	30.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Perideridia erythrorhiza	21.0	0.0	21.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	16.0	16.0	16.0	True
Phacelia cookei	5.0	0.0	5.0	True	5.0	5.0	5.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Phacelia greenei	28.0	0.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	28.0	10.0	23.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Phacelia leonis	12.0	0.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	12.0	10.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Phlox hirsuta	6.0	0.0	3.0	True	4.0	1.0	1.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Plagiobothrys figuratus ssp corallicarpus	32.0	0.0	32.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	31.0	31.0	31.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Plagiobothrys glyptocarpus	3.0	0.0	3.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Plagiobothrys hirtus	13.0	0.0	13.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	13.0	13.0	13.0	True
Polemonium chartaceum	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Potentilla cristae	9.0	0.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	9.0	9.0	9.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Raillardella pringlei	21.0	0.0	18.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	21.0	10.0	18.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Ranunculus austrooreganus	29.0	0.0	21.0	True	9.0	8.0	4.0	False	20.0	8.0	17.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Rhynchospora californica	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Rupertia hallii	33.0	0.0	33.0	True	33.0	33.0	33.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sedum albomarginatum	3.0	0.0	3.0	True	3.0	3.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sedum moranii	21.0	0.0	21.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	21.0	21.0	21.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sedum oblanceolatum	69.0	0.0	43.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	69.0	10.0	43.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sedum paradisum	6.0	0.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	6.0	6.0	6.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Senecio eurycephalus var lewisrosei	4.0	0.0	4.0	True	4.0	4.0	4.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Senecio hesperius	52.0	0.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	52.0	10.0	51.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sidalcea malachroides	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	2.0	2.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Silene marmorensis	16.0	0.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	16.0	10.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sisyrinchium hitchcockii	4.0	0.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	4.0	4.0	3.0	False

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Smilax jamesii	12.0	0.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	12.0	10.0	12.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Sophora leachiana	61.0	0.0	54.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	61.0	10.0	54.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Streptanthus howellii	37.0	0.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	37.0	10.0	27.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Tauschia howellii	11.0	0.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	11.0	11.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Thermopsis robusta	12.0	0.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	12.0	10.0	11.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Tuctoria greenei	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	1.0	1.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Viola lanceolata ssp occidentalis	44.0	0.0	33.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	44.0	10.0	33.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Martes pennanti	339537.0	0.0	119442.0	True	3499.0	700.0	2105.0	True	336000.0	67200.0	117299.0	True	38.0	8.0	38.0	True
Rare Plant Associations (no.)																
Abies concolor - Chamaecyparis lawsoniana - Picea breweriana / Quercus vacciniifolia F	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Abies grandis - Pseudotsuga menziesii / Lithocarpus densiflorus / Polystichum munitum	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Chamaecyparis lawsoniana - Abies shastensis / Quercus sadleriana / Vaccinium membranum	1.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Picea breweriana - Chamaecyparis lawsoniana - Abies concolor / Quercus vaccinifolia	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Pinus balfouriana / Anenome drummondii	2.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Pinus jeffreyi / Calamgrostis nootkensis	2.0	0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Pinus monticola - Pinus lambertiana / Quercus vaccinium	4.0	0.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Pinus ponderosa - Calocedrus decurrens	5.0	0.0	3.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Pinus ponderosa - Quercus garryana / Arctostaphylos viscida / Festuca californica Wood	4.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Psuedotsuga menziesii - Lithocarpus densifolora / Quercus vaccinium-Holodicus dumosa	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Quercus garryana - Juniperus occidentalis / Ceanothus cuneatus / Festuca idahoensis	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	1.8	True
Quercus garryana - Juniperus occidentalis / Ceanothus cuneatus / Festuca idahoensis	5.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Quercus garryana / Ceanothus cuneatus / Festuca idahoensis Woodland	5.0	0.0	1.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

TARGET DESCRIPTION	ECO-REG TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL	ECO-REG PORT TOTAL	ECO-REG GOAL MET	CASC SECT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL	CASC PORT TOTAL	CASC SECT GOAL MET	KLAM SECT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL	KLAM PORT TOTAL	KLAM SECT GOAL MET	UMPQ SECT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL	UMPQ PORT TOTAL	UMPQ SECT GOAL MET
Quercus garryana / Ceanothus cuneatus / Festuca idahoensis Woodland, PIPO-Q in same Huc.	1.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True
Weird Chaparral with Cercocarpus betuloides		0.0	2.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True	0.0	0.0	0.0	True

Appendix 18. Unmet Conservation Target Goals

Aquatic Macrohabitat Targets

ELEMENT ID	PORTFOLIO AMOUNT		TARGET DESCRIPTION
	(#)	(KM)	
1101	4	3.04	First order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage
1251	5	0	First order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Klamath drainage
1274	18	7	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Sacramento drainage
2113	9	8.2	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage
2184	1	0	Second order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on serpentine substrate in the Sacramento drainage
2273	1	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage
3114	22	12	Third order stream between 0 - 2000 feet on basaltic substrate in the Sacramento drainage
3234	3	0	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on alluvial substrate in the Sacramento drainage
3244	7	4	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on sedimentary substrate in the Sacramento drainage
3254	11	10	Third order stream between 2000-4000 feet on volcanic substrate in the Sacramento drainage
3273	1	0	Shoreline between 2000-4000 feet on unknown substrate in the Rogue/Umpqua drainage
4101	1	0	Shoreline between 0 - 2000 feet on unknown substrate in the Klamath drainage

Ecological Systems Targets

Section Goal (ha)	Portfolio Amount (ha)	Target Name	Section Containing Unmet Goals
2	1	Montane riparian shrublands	Cascade
937	821	Montane mixed conifer forests	Umpqua
3588	2534	Port Orford cedar - mixed conifer forests	Umpqua
695	268	Foothill pine forests and woodlands	Umpqua
5847	5715	Mixed evergreen serpentine and ultramafic forests	Umpqua

Species Targets

EL CODE	SECTION GOAL (OCCUR-RENCES)	PORTFOLIO (OCCUR-RENCES)	TARGET NAME	SECTION CONTAINING UNMET GOALS	
AAAAA01147	1	0	Ambystoma californiense	Cascade	2
AAABA01010	3	2	Ascaphus truei	Cascade	4
PDPLM0C0A0	2	0	Navarretia heteranda	Cascade	3
PDRAN0L0E0	8	4	Ranunculus astrooreganus	Cascade	2
PDAPI1B0K0	10	9	Lomatium engelmannii	Klamath	3
PDARI02070	4	2	Asarum marmaratum	Klamath	3
PDAST0T3K0	7	6	Aster vialis	Umpqua	2
PDFAB2B2W1	10	7	Lupinus oreganus var kincaidii	Umpqua	2
PDLIM02053	3	2	Limanthes gracilis ssp gracilis	Umpqua	2
PDONA060P0	1	0	Epilobium oreganum	Umpqua	2
PMIRI0D0S0	4	3	Sisyrinchium hitchcockii	Umpqua	2

Appendix 19. Aquatic Macrohabitat Representation at Portfolio Sites

PORTFOLIO SITE	TOTAL AQUATIC COMMUNITY TARGETS (STREAM KM)
Althouse Creek Aquatic Site	30.81
Anderson Butte Site	22.13
Antelope Creek Site	109.76
Applegate River Aquatic Site	100.84
Applegate Site	301.48
Ball Mountain Site	64.84
Black Mountain Site	71.88
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	14.83
Butt Creek Site	197.15
Butte Creek Drainage Site	20.36
Calochortus coxii Site	0
Camas Valley Site	131.95
Cascade Foothills Site	242.42
Chetco River Aquatic Site	24.02
Cow Creek Aquatic Site	49.51
Cow Creek Site	71.08
Craggy Mountain Site	55.8
East Fork Illinois River Aquatic Site	9.25
Elk Creek Site	29.27
Fall River Aquatic Site	26.48
Fall River Site	258.73
Grass Lake Site	9.07
Hat Creek Site	88.89
Hayfork Site	206.17
Hennessy Ridge Site	15.65
Horse Creek Site	10.17
Illinois Valley Site	357.56
Kalmiopsis Site	689.32
Klamath River Aquatic Site	276.25
Klamath River Mainstem Site	133.28
Lake Shasta Site	850.16
Lassen National Park Site	256.63
Little Butte Creek Site	268.9
Little Shasta River Aquatic Site	10.31
Little Shasta River Site	29.66
Lower Pitt River Site	318.84

Lower Rogue River Aquatic Site	1.61
Manton Plains Site	77.49
Marble Mountains Site	688.42
McCloud River Aquatic Site	36.49
Middle Rogue River Aquatic Site	24.31
Mount Shasta Site	260.85
Myrtle Creek Site	172.08
North Fork and Peel	45.62
North Fork Chetco River Aquatic Site	11.52
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	69.2
North Fork Feather River Plain Site	28.76
North Umpqua River Aquatic Site	19.2
Oregon Caves Site	128.1
Orleans Site	296.34
Paradise Site	418.8
Pistol River Aquatic Site	9.96
Pistol River Site	92.01
Pit River Aquatic Site	2.41
Red Butte Site	116.78
Rogue River Plains Site	148.24
Salmon River Aquatic Site	78.36
Scott Mountains Site	275.59
Scott River Aquatic Site	79.73
Scott Valley Site	285.83
Sexton Mountain Site	330.71
Shasta River Aquatic Site	52.61
Shasta Valley Site	97.84
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	519.76
Siskiyou Crest Site	327.45
Slate Creek Site	104.96
Smith River Aquatic Site	72.63
Smith River Site	319.56
Soda Mountain Site	266.97
South Fork Mountain Site	74.46
South Fork Trinity River Aquatic Site	302.67
South Siskiyous Site	790.67
South Umpqua River Aquatic Site	102.87
Sucker Creek Aquatic Site	20.48
The Eddy's Site	302.34
Trinity Alps Site	1604.74

Trinity River Aquatic Site	197.79
Trinity River Site	14.93
Umpqua Valley Site	224.81
Upper Rogue River Aquatic Site	28.16
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	210.54
Whiskeytown Site	429.06
Wild Rogue Site	441.59
Winchuck River Site	55.06
Wolf Creek Site	96.63
Yellow Creek Site	14.37
TOTAL:	**15724.81**

Appendix 20. Terrestrial Portfolio Threats Assessment

Portfolio Site Threats

PORTFOLIO SITE	THREATS
Anderson Butte Site	1C, 7A, 8A
Antelope Creek Site	8A, 2A, 2C, 1C, 1D, 1A, 2E, 7A
Applegate Site	1D, 7A, 8B
Ball Mountain Site	1C, 1D, 7A
Black Mountain Site	1C, 7A, 8A
Bushnell - Irwin Rocks Site	1D, 7A, 8A
Butt Creek Site	1D, 7A
Butte Creek Drainage Site	8A, 7A, 1C
Calochortus coxii Site	7A, 5A, 8A
Camas Valley Site	1C, 1A, 1D, 7A, 3E
Cascade Foothills Site	7A, 1C, 1D, 8A
Cow Creek Site	1C, 1D, 5A, 7A
Craggy Mountain Site	1C, 7A, 8A
Elk Creek Site	1D, 1C, 8A, 7A
Fall River Site	3E, 1C, 2B, 7A
Grass Lake Site	1C, 3B, 3E, 6A, 8A
Hat Creek Site	7A, 1D, 1C, 2B
Hayfork Site	7A, 1D, 2A
Hennessy Ridge Site	1D, 7A
Horse Creek Site	1D, 7A, 8B
Illinois Valley Site	2A, 1A, 1D, 7A, 5A, 8A, 3E
Kalmiopsis Site	1D, 7A, 5A, 8B
Klamath River Mainstem Site	3D, 5A, 4F
Lake Shasta Site	1D, 1C, 7A, 2A, 2B
Lassen National Park Site	7A
Little Butte Creek Site	7A, 1C, 1D, 8A
Little Shasta River Site	1C, 1D, 2B, 7A, 8A
Lower Pitt River Site	1C, 7A, 8A
Manton Plains Site	8A, 2B, 1C, 7A
Marble Mountains Site	1D, 7A, 1C, 5A
Mount Shasta Site	1D, 3E, 7A
Myrtle Creek Site	1D, 7A, 1C, 2A
North Fork and Peel Site	1C, 1D, 7A
North Fork Cottonwood Creek Site	7A, 1D

North Fork Feather River Plain Site	1C, 3B, 3D, 8A
Oregon Caves Site	1D, 7A, 8B
Orleans Site	1D, 2D
Paradise Site	7A, 2B, 2A, 1D
Pistol River Site	1D, 6A, 7A, 8A, 8B
Red Butte Site	1D, 7A, 8B
Rogue River Plains Site	8A, 2A, 2C, 1C, 1A, 2E
Scott Mountains Site	1D, 7A
Scott Valley Site	2A, 8A, 3E, 1A, 1C, 7A, 1D
Sexton Mountain Site	1D, 7A, 1C
Shasta Valley Site	3E, 3B, 2A, 8A, 1C,
Silver and Galice Creeks Site	1D, 7A, 5A, 2D
Siskiyou Crest Site	1C, 6A, 7A, 2A
Slate Creek Site	1D, 7A
Smith River Site	5A, 1D, 8B, 7A
Soda Mountain Site	7A, 8A, 5A, 1C, 1D, 6B
South Fork Mountain Site	1D, 1C, 7A
South Siskiyous Site	7A, 1D, 8B
The Eddy's Site	1D, 7A, 8B, 5A
Trinity Alps Site	1D, 1C, 7A, 2D
Trinity River Site	7A, 1D, 1C
Umpqua Valley Site	2A, 7A, 1C, 1D, 8A
Upper Trinity South Fork Site	1C, 1D, 7A
Whiskeytown Site	3D,2A, 2B, 7A
Wild Rogue Site	1D, 2D, 7A, 2B
Winchuck River Site	1D, 7A, 8B
Wolf Creek Site	1D, 7A, 1C, 8A
Yellow Creek Site	1D, 7A, 1C, 8A

Key to Threats

THREAT CODE	THREAT DESCRIPTION
1	**Agriculture & Forestry**
1A	Incompatible crop production practices
1B	Incompatible livestock production practices
1C	Incompatible grazing practices
1D	Incompatible forestry practices
2	**Land Development**
2A	Incompatible primary home development

2B	Incompatible second home/resort development
2C	Incompatible commercial/industrial development
2D	Incompatible development of roads or utilities
2E	Conversion to agriculture or silviculture
3	**Water Management**
3A	Dam construction
3B	Construction of ditches, dikes, drainage or diversion systems
3C	Channelization of rivers or streams
3D	Incompatible operation of dams or reservoirs
3E	Incompatible operation of drainage or diversion systems
3F	Excessive groundwater withdrawal
3G	Shoreline stabilization
4	**Point Source Pollution**
4A	Industrial discharge
4B	Livestock feedlot
4C	Incompatible wastewater treatment
4D	Marina development
4E	Landfill construction or operation
4F	Water pollution—agricultural runoff
5	**Resource Extraction**
5A	Incompatible mining practices
5B	Incompatible oil or gas drilling
5C	Overfishing or overhunting
5D	Poaching or commercial collecting
6	**Recreation**
6A	Incompatible recreational use
6B	Recreational vehicles
7	**Land/Resource Management**
7A	Fire suppression
7B	Incompatible management of/for certain species
7C	Increased fire frequency
8	**Biological**
8A	Invasive/alien species
8B	Disease

Appendix 21. Potential Partner Organizations

Governmental

US Forest Service

BLM

National Park Service

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

California Department of Fish & Game

California Department of Forestry

Oregon Department of Forestry

Oregon Department of Agriculture

US Fish and Wildlife Service

NOAA/NMFS

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

Non-Governmental

World Wildlife Fund

Sustainable Northwest

Southern Oregon Land Conservancy

Klamath Bird Observatory

Jefferson Sustainable Development Initiative

Siskiyou Regional Education Project

Watershed Research and Training Center

Headwaters

Councils

Watershed Councils

Fire Safe Councils

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Appendix 22. GLOSSARY and REFERENCES

Aquatic Macrohabitat—a community target that is represented by a reach-level classification similar to the aquatic classification hierarchy developed by TNC's Freshwater Initiative (Higgins et al. 1998). For this classification, an automated approach in GIS was used to classify all stream segments at a scale of 1:100,000. Typically, the Nature Conservancy's approach in establishing freshwater priorities across large geographic areas uses all available data on species distributions as well as physical and geographic features. However, information on the biological composition and structure of natural aquatic communities was not available across the entire ecoregion, therefore the classification was based on abiotic variables that provide an indirect means of identifying potential aquatic community types. The reach-scale classification combined five abiotic variables - stream order, elevation, lithology, upstream connectivity, and downstream connectivity.

Regional experts in aquatic ecology and fisheries, literature review and available digital data all played a critical role in developing the classification model. The aquatic systems were not assigned global ranks; rather, their relative abundance within the ecoregion was used for assigning representation goals.

CNDDB (California Natural Diversity Database)—database containing spatial datasets of plant and animal element occurrences (EOs) for the state of California. This database is a statewide inventory of the locations and condition of the state's rarest species and natural communities. The CNDDB is a "heritage program" and is part of a nationwide network of similar programs. The goal of this database is to provide the most current information on the state's most imperiled elements of natural diversity and to provide tools to analyze these data.

Coarse Filter approach—a habitat-level conservation strategy where natural aquatic and terrestrial ecological systems are used as conservation targets to represent 85-90% of species and many ecological processes, without having to inventory and manage each species individually. This ecosystem-based approach is designed to support the viability of most native species through the conservation of multiple, high-integrity examples of all ecological systems.

Conservation Goals—goals developed by the planning team for the representation of each conservation target in the portfolio. The portfolio representation goals are based on three primary factors:

1. Distribution of the targets across the ecoregion,
2. Number of occurrences or amount of area occupied, depending on the type of distribution data, and
3. Degree of endangerment.

A two-tiered approach was used to account for the "distribution" and "number" factors mentioned above:

Distribution Factor – Goals for terrestrial targets were set by Ecoregional Section. Goals for aquatic macrohabitat targets were set using Ecological Drainage Units (EDUs) as stratification units. This ecoregional stratification was used to (1) account for geographic variability (i.e., ecologic and genetic variability, biophysical gradients, etc.), (2) assure dispersion of sites, and (3) reduce the possibility of stochastic extinction events.

Numerical Factor - Within each Section or EDU, numerical representation goals were set for groups of targets, the number or amount depending on the type of distribution data used to represent the target (i.e., occurrence/point, area, or length).

Determining the distribution and number of occurrences to be represented in the portfolio was an informed opinion of the entire planning team. Conservation goals are based on a number of factors, including threats, life history, viability of the occurrences, key ecological processes and disturbance regimes, and known genetic or environmental variability of the target. However, target specific information was often lacking, and there was no time to conduct extensive research of factors that affect long-term viability. Therefore, the representation goals are considered initial objectives and must be tested and refined through time by monitoring and re-evaluating the status and trends of individual targets.

Conservation Target—an individual species or community (either terrestrial or aquatic) for which conservation goals were established.

Ecological System—characterized by both biotic and abiotic components and can be terrestrial or aquatic. Terrestrial ecological systems are groupings of plant and animal communities that (1) occur together on the landscape due to similar ecological processes (e.g., fire, hydrology), underlying environmental features (e.g., landforms, soils) or environmental gradients (e.g., elevation, hydrologically-related zones), and (2) form a readily identified unit that serves practical needs for mapping, stewardship, and monitoring. For more information on aquatic systems, see “aquatic macrohabitats.”

Ecoregion—a relatively large area of land and water that contains geographically distinct assemblages of natural communities. These communities (1) share a large majority of their species, dynamics, and environmental conditions, and (2) function together effectively as a conservation unit at global and continental scales (Ricketts et al. 1999).

Ecological section—ecoregional subdivisions that have been delineated in most ecoregions (McNab and Avers 1994). These sections are critical because conservation target goals are set on a sectional basis rather than on an ecoregional basis. The three sections in the Klamath Mountain Ecoregion are the Klamath, Cascades, and Umpqua sections. The physical and biological characteristics of the three sections can be found in the ecoregional plan as well as in McNab and Avers (1994).

EDU (Ecological Drainage Unit)—a designated drainage unit within a larger aquatic system that is based on broad-scale biology, geography and stream morphology. The EDUs in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion are Rogue-Umpqua, Klamath, Sacramento and Pit drainages. These EDUs roughly correspond to HUC4 watersheds.

EL Codes—alphanumeric codes created and used by the heritage programs to universally classify animals, plants, and ecological systems.

ELU (Ecological Land Units)—a unit of land representing a discrete combination of physical factors that influence plant distribution. Modeling of plant communities was based on the Ecological Land Unit (ELU), a concept using a technique developed by Fels and Zobel (1995) and refined at the Nature Conservancy's Eastern conservation science office. The landscape is categorized by its landform and given attributes such as summit, slope crest, or toe slope. These attributes are then subdivided according to slope and aspect to derive descriptors, which include steep or south-facing upper slope. Finally, geology classes are added to the ELUs. The product is a term that represents a discrete combination of physical factors that influence plant community distribution. The process used to characterize ELUs is similar to the process used to define aquatic macrohabitats in the ecoregion as both used physical attributes of the landscape to create the initial classification and map.

EO (Element Occurrences)—an area of land and/or water in which an element is present, or the spatial representation of a species or ecological community at a specific location. An element refers to a unit of natural biological diversity, and can represent species, natural communities, or other non-taxonomic biological entities. An element occurrence generally delineates a species population or ecological community stand, and represents the geo-referenced biological feature that is of conservation or management interest. Element occurrences are documented by voucher specimens (where appropriate) or other forms of observations. A single element occurrence may be documented by multiple specimens or observations taken from different parts of the same population, or from the same population over multiple years. See www.natureserve.org for more information.

EOs may be either points or polygons in the Heritage databases, but for ecoregional-scale analyses they were represented as points.

Fine Filter approach—a species-level conservation strategy where rare or otherwise imperiled species are used as conservation targets. These species may have specialized habitat requirements or may require different habitats at different times in their life histories. The fine filter approach is used for individual species and rare plant associations.

GAP (Gap Analysis Program)—a national program designed to provide broad geographic information on the status of ordinary species (those not threatened with extinction or naturally rare) and their habitats. Gap analysis is a scientific method for identifying the degree to which native animal species and natural communities are represented in our present-day mix of conservation lands. Those species and communities not adequately represented in the existing network of conservation lands constitute conservation "gaps." GAP is the first state- and national-level effort to complete the following:

- map existing natural vegetation to the level of dominant or co-dominant plant species;
- map predicted distribution of native vertebrate species;
- map public land ownership and private conservation lands
- show the current network of conservation lands;
- compare distributions of any native vertebrate species, group of species, or vegetation communities of interest with the network of conservation lands;
- provide an objective basis of information for local, state, and national options in managing biological resources.

Vegetation is mapped from satellite imagery and other records using the National Vegetation Classification System (FGDC 1996). Native animal species ranges are mapped by using museum and agency specimen collection records in conjunction with known general ranges and the animal's affiliation with the previously mapped vegetation types and other physical characteristics. These data are combined and displayed with a computerized geographic information system (GIS) at a cartographic scale of 1:100,000.

GIS (Geographic Information System)—the computerized mapping and analysis system used for all the data compilation, management, and analysis tasks of the Klamath Mountains ecoregional planning team.

Grank (Global Rank)—a global (range-wide) status rank assigned to an element by NatureServe scientists or by a designated lead office in the Natural Heritage Network.

An element is assigned one global rank (called a G-rank), which applies across its entire range; a national rank (N-rank) for each nation in its range; and a subnational rank (S-rank) for each state, province, or other subnational jurisdiction in its range (e.g. Yukon Territory).

In general, NatureServe scientists assign global, U.S., and Canadian national ranks with guidance from local data centers, especially for endemic elements, and from experts on particular taxonomic groups. Local data centers assign subnational ranks for elements in their respective jurisdictions.

The conservation rank of an element known or assumed to exist within a jurisdiction is designated by a whole number from 1 to 5, preceded by a G (Global), N (National), or S (Subnational) as appropriate. The numbers have the following meaning:

1 = critically imperiled

2 = imperiled

3 = vulnerable to extirpation or extinction

4 = apparently secure

5 = demonstrably widespread, abundant, and secure.

G1, for example, indicates critical imperilment on a range-wide basis—that is, a great risk of extinction. S1 indicates critical imperilment within a particular state, province, or other subnational jurisdiction, in other words, a great risk of extirpation of the element from that subnation, regardless of its status elsewhere.

Use of standard ranking criteria and definitions makes Natural Heritage ranks comparable across element groups—thus G1 has the same basic meaning whether applied to a salamander, a moss, or a forest community. Standardization also makes ranks comparable across jurisdictions, which in turn allows NatureServe scientists to use the national and subnational ranks assigned by local data centers to determine and refine or reaffirm global ranks.

See www.natureserve.org for more complete rank definitions and further discussion on the ranking system for each type of element.

Hexagon Project—a USGS environmental sampling and monitoring project that involved attributing data to a hexagon grid over the entire United States. Each hexagon covered approximately 648 square km (157,000 acres) and was attributed with data that was similar to data used in the USGS GAP Program.

HUC (Hydrologic Unit Code)—the code developed and used by the USGS to categorize every river in the United States. The United States is divided and sub-divided into successively smaller hydrologic units that are classified into four levels: regions, sub-regions, accounting units, and cataloging units. The hydrologic units are arranged within each other, from the smallest (cataloging units) to the largest (regions). Each hydrologic unit is identified by a unique hydrologic unit code (HUC) consisting of two to eight digits based on the four levels of classification in the hydrologic unit system.

The USGS 6th field Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC6) watersheds (2,000 - 5,000 ha) were used as the planning units for the ecoregional plan. HUC6 watersheds are reasonable selection units for many conservation targets because: (1) they are based in natural landscape features delineated by easily recognized physiographic criteria; (2) their size is a reasonable scale for managing ecologic and hydrologic processes; (3) several units can be neatly aggregated where larger sites are needed; and (4) they approximate the scale of ecologically defined sites TNC field offices and other land managers might typically work at in this ecoregion, especially when several adjacent HUC6 watersheds are combined to make a larger site.

ISMS (Interagency Survey and Managed Species)—species found in a federal database created and maintained by the US Forest Service. This database is the result of extensive

inventory efforts on federal lands that are under management direction of the Northwest Forest Plan.

In the Klamath ecoregional plan, ISMS data were used for mollusc species. The federal database supplied TNC with 16,000 records for identified conservation targets. These targets were condensed down to 400 records for 19 species based on proximity of occurrence and omission of duplicate and repeat sightings.

Oregon Natural Heritage Program (ORNHP) is a cooperative, interagency effort to identify the plant, animal, and plant community resources of Oregon. The program is managed by the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center, part of the Oregon State University's Institute for Natural Resources, under a cooperative agreement with the Oregon Division of State Lands. The Natural Heritage Program was established by the Oregon Natural Heritage Act, and is overseen by the Natural Heritage Advisory Council, a board appointed by the Governor.

The Oregon Natural Heritage Program has three main program areas. It works to voluntarily establish natural areas in Oregon, manages the Rare and Endangered Invertebrate Program for the State of Oregon, and manages the Oregon Natural Heritage Databank, containing comprehensive information on ecologically and scientifically significant natural areas in the state.

Portfolio of Conservation Sites—those areas necessary to maintain the viability of conservation targets over time, including the ecological processes and patterns of biological diversity that sustain these targets.

Protected Lands—lands containing Level 1 and 2 designations under the Protection Status used for Managed Areas in the Natural Heritage Program databases as well as GAP Management Status. Level 1 and 2 conservation areas have the highest degree of biodiversity protection and management. They are defined as follows:

> Level 1 – Lands owned by private entities and managed for biodiversity conservation or owned and administered by public agencies and specially designated for biodiversity conservation through legislation or administrative action where natural disturbance events proceed without interference. The agency acting alone cannot change these designations without legislative action or public involvement.
>
> Level 2 – Lands generally managed for their natural values, but that may incur use or habitat manipulations that degrade the quality of natural communities.

Selection Unit—the basic landscape unit of planning used in the SITES selection model to which all data is attributed and from which initial conservation portfolios are derived. The selection unit used in the Klamath Mountains ecoregional plan is the HUC6 watershed, a basic hydrologic unit that is widely used by various agencies and organizations for planning and land management. HUC6 watersheds typically vary in size between 2000-5000 hectares. Selection units can also be regularly shaped with hexagons being the most common example. They vary between 750 to 4000 hectares depending on data and planning needs.

SITES—the site selection model used for this project. It is an optimization model that was developed by Ian Ball from the University of Adelaide in conjunction with NCEAS and TNC. SITES applies a combination of Simulated Annealing, Heuristic, and Iterative Improvement methods to the portfolio design problem (Ball 1999). Simulated annealing used by SITES is a minimization method, where biodiversity (representation goals for conservation targets) is a constraint to the model that tries to minimize the cost (size of the portfolio). See Pressey et al. (1996) and Possingham et al. (1999) for overviews of these types of models. A brief explanation is given below.

The SITES model can be viewed as a cost function, as follows:

Cost = Area + Species Penalty + Boundary Length

where:

Cost minimizing is the objective of the model, in our case a portfolio of conservation sites. The model tries to minimize overall cost, while meeting conservation goals.

Area is the number of hectares needed to capture conservation targets at specified representation goals. In our case, area cost is inherently high because the model must select the entire planning unit to capture a target.

Species Penalty represents the conservation targets (species and communities). It is a penalty for representation goals not met in the portfolio for a particular iteration. If all goals set for conservation targets are met, then the Species Penalty equals zero.

Boundary Length controls the spatial layout of the portfolio. Boundary Length weight can be varied depending on the relative importance of compactness and size desired for the portfolio.

StreamNet—an aquatic information network containing data for Washington and Oregon. StreamNet has information on species distribution and habitat use (spawning, rearing, and migration) tied to the Pacific Northwest River Reach File System (an ecoregion-wide, 1:100,000 scale hydrography layer). This network covers Oregon and Washington. Linear distance is used to quantify the distribution of wide-ranging fish. See the StreamNet homepage for more information (www.streamnet.org).

For the Klamath Mountains ecoregional plan, Streamnet was used to acquire distribution data for wide-ranging fish.

Stream Order—Geologists classify the segments ("links") of a drainage pattern using a convention in which its number ("stream order") increases as the size and number of tributaries increase. The steep, small segments are designated as 1 (or "first order"). Wherever two segments of the same order join downstream, the order of the downstream segment is increased by 1; two first-order drainages join to form a second-order drainage, and so on. Note that "stream order" in a drainage network is not determined by the presence or absence of flowing water, but by the shape of the land surface, which determines where flow will be concentrated when water is present.

- Debris flows tend to form on steep slopes and accelerate downslope until the flow slows and stops. The base of a steep slope is most likely to be exposed to small debris flows from small, steep drainage channels, first and second order drainages.
- Locations in and near the mouths of relatively steep, larger ravines, which are generally second and third order drainage channels, can be vulnerable to unexpectedly large flow surges if surface runoff is bulked by debris flows in the drainage basin upstream.
- Still larger drainages, such as canyons (fourth and fifth order drainages), generally have gentler gradients, and larger volumes of slurry are needed to maintain flow. During intense rainstorms these larger streams can receive both increased surface runoff and increased input of debris flows, which may cause large surges of debris-laden flood water.

USNVCS (United States National Vegetation Classification System)—used for compiling a list of plant associations in the ecoregion. See Grossman et al. 1998.

REFERENCES

Anderson, W.E., M. M. Bormann, and W. C. Krueger. 1998. The Ecological Provinces of Oregon, A treatise on the basic ecological geography of the state. SR 990, May, 1998. Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, Corvallis, Oregon

Anderson, M, P. Comer, D. Grossman, C. Groves, K. Poiani, M. Reid, R. Schneider, B. Vickery, A. Weakley. 1999 Guidelines for representing ecological communities in ecoregional conservation plans. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA. 74 p.

Atzet, T., White, D.E., McCrimmon, L.A., Martinez, P.A., Fong, P.R., and V.D. Randall. 1996. Field Guide to the Forested Plant Associations of Southwestern Oregon. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Technical Paper R6-NR-ECOL-T{-17-96. September.

Association for Biodiversity Information, 2001. Website: www.natureserve.com.

Bailey, R.G. 1995. Descriptions of the ecoregions of the United States. Miscellaneous Publication 1391. USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC. 108 p., plus map.

Bailey, R.G. 1998. Ecoregions: the ecosystem geography of the oceans and continents. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Ball, I. 1999. Spexan Manual (v3.1). Department of Applied and Molecular Ecology, Waite Campus, The University of Adelaide, Glen Osmond, South Australia.

Brooks, R.F. 1987. Serpentine and Its Vegetation: a Multi-Disciplinary Approach. Dioscorides Press, Portland, OR. 454 pp.

Butterfield, B.R., B. Csuti, and J.M. Scott. 1994. Modeling vertebrate distributions for gap analysis. Pages 53-68 in R.I. Miller, editor, Mapping the Diversity of Nature, Chapman Hall, London.

CALWATER. 1997. California Watershed Map (CALWATER Version 2.2). California Spatial Information Library. Website http:gis.ca.gov.

Campbell, Jeff. 2001. LandSat images for the Rogue Valley, Oregon. Electronic data.

Carroll, C. 1998. Predicting the distribution of the fisher (Martes pennanti) in Northwestern California, U.S.A. using survey data and GIS modeling. M.S.thesis. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

Cincotta, R.P. and R. Engleman. .2000. .Nature's place: human population and the future of biological diversity. Population Action International, Washington DC.

Coleman, R.G., and A.R. Kruckeberg. 1999. Geology and plant life of the Klamath-Siskiyou mountain region. Natural Areas Journal. Vol.19 (4). 320-340.

Comer, P. 2001. Observations and recommendations for setting conservation goals in ecoregional plans. The Nature Conservancy, Internal Memo.

Fels, J. and R. Zobel 1995. Landscape position and classified landtype mapping for the statewide DRASTIC mapping project. North Carolina State University. Technical Report VEL.95.1 to the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Management.

Gordon, N. D., T. A. McMahon, B.L. Finlayson. 1992. Stream Hydrology: An Introduction for Ecologists. John Wiley and Sons: Chichester (England), 526 pp.

Grossman, D.H., Faber-Langendoen, D., Weakley, A.S., Anderson, M., Bourgeron, P., Crawford, R., Goodin, K., Landaal, S., Metzler, K., Patterson, K., Pyne, M., Reid, M., and L. Sneddon. 1998. International Classification of Ecological Communities: Terrestrial Vegetation of the United States. Volume 1, The National Vegetation Classification System: Development, Status, and Applications. The Nature Conservancy. Arlington, VA.

Hart, M.M., R.J. Reader, & J.N. Klironomos. 2001. Biodiversity and Ecosystem Function: Alternate Hypotheses or a single Theory? Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America Vol. 82, No. 1. pp.88-90.

Henderson, J. 2001. Plant Association Groups (PAGs) for Western Oregon. US Forest Service. Electronic data.

Higgins, J., M. Lammert, M. Bryer, M. DePhilip, and D. Grossman. 1998. Freshwater conservation in the Great Lakes Basin: Development and application of an aquatic community classification framework. Great Lakes Program, The Nature Conservancy, Chicago, IL.

Hocutt, C.H., and E.O. Wiley, eds. 1986. The Zoogeography of North American Freshwater Fishes. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 866 p.

Jeo, R.M., M.A. Sanjayan, D. Sizemore. 2001. A Conservation Area Design for the Central Coast Region of British Columbia, Canada. Round River Studies. A report prepared for the Sierra Club of British Columbia, Greenpeace, Forests Action Network, and the Raincoast Conservation Society. Round River Conservation Studies, Salt Lake City, UT.

Jimerson, T.M., Hoover, L.D., McGee, E.A., DeNitto,G., and R.M. Creasy. 1995. A Field Guide to Serpentine Plant Associations and Sensitive Plants in Northwestern California. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, R5-ECOL-TP-006

Kagan, J.S., Christy, J.A., and J.H. Titus. 1999. Oregon Natural Heritage Program (Presettlement) Classification, Oregon Natural Heritage Program, Portland, Oregon. 56 p.

Kruckeberg, A.R. 1984. California Serpentines: Flora, Vegetation, Geology, and Management Problems. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. 180 pp.

Lang, F.A. 1999. Klamath-Siskiyou Natural History. Natural Areas Journal Vol. 19: 298-299.

Lee, D.C., J. Sedell, B. Rieman, R. Thurow, and J. Williams. 1997. Broadscale Assessment of aquatic species and habitats. U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report, PNW-405 (volume 3):1057-1496.

MacArthur, R.H. and E.O. Wilson. 1967. The Theory of Island Biogeography. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Master, L.L. 1991. Assessing threats and setting priorities for conservation. Conservation Biology 5:559-563.

Maxwell, J.R., C.J. Edwards, M.E. Jensen, S.J. Paustian, H. Parrott, and D.M. Hill. 1995. A Hierarchical Framework of Aquatic Ecological Units in North America (Nearctic Zone). General Technical Report NC-176. USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experimental Station, Madison, WI. 72p.

McNab, W.A., and P.E. Avers, compilers. 1994. Ecological subregions of the United States: Section descriptions. WO-WSA-5. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

Noss, R.F. 1987. From plant communities to landscapes in conservation inventories: A look at The Nature Conservancy. Biological Conservation 41:11-37.

Noss, R.F., and A.Y. Cooperrider. 1994. Saving nature's legacy: Protecting and restoring biodiversity. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 416 p.

Orr, E. and W. Orr. 1995. Geology of the Pacific Northwest. McGraw Hill, New York.

Pacific Rivers Council, 1998. Saving Idaho's Last Best Places: Preliminary Identification of Aquatic Diversity Areas and Critical Refuges with Recommendations on their Management. 64pp.

Possingham, H., I. Ball, and S. Andelman. 1999. Mathematical methods for identifying representative reserve networks. Chapter 16 in S. Ferson and M.A. Burgman, editors, Quantitative methods for conservation biology, Springer-Verlag, New York.

Pressey, R.L., H.P. Possingham, and C.R. Margules. 1996. Optimality in reserve selection algorithms: When does it matter and how much? Biological Conservation 76:259-267.

Quigley, T.M., R.W. Haynes, and R. T. Graham. 1996. Integrated Scientific Assessment for Ecosystem Management in the Interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. 303pp.

Ricketts, T.H., E. Dinerstein, D.M. Olson, C.J. Loucks, W. Eichbaum, D. DellaSalla, K. Kavanaugh, P. Hedao, P. Hurley, K. Carney, R. Abell, and S. Walters. 1999. Terrestrial ecoregions of North America: a conservation assessment. Island Press, Washington, DC.

Ritter, S. Idaho Partners in Flight draft Idaho bird conservation plan. July 1999 Draft. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID.

Sawyer, J. O. and T. Keeler-Wolf. 1995. A Manual of California Vegetation. California Native Plant Society. San Francisco.

Scott, J.M., F. Davis, B. Csuti, R. Noss, B. Butterfield, C. Groves, J. Anderson, S. Caicco, F. D'Erchia, T.C. Edwards, J. Ulliman, and R.G. Wright. 1993. Gap analysis: A geographical approach to protection of biological diversity. Wildlife Monographs 123:1-41.

Slack, J.R. and J.M. Landwehr. 1992. Hydro-Climatic Data Network: A U.S. Geological Survey streamflow data set for the United States for the study of climate variations, 1874 - 1988. USGS OPEN-FILE REPORT 92-129. http://wwwrvares.er.usgs.gov/hcdn_report/abstract.html

Strittholt, J.R., R.F., Noss, P.A. Frost, K. Vance-Borland, C Carroll, and G Hielman Jr. 1999. A conservation assessment and science-based plan for the Klamath-Siskiyou Ecoregion. A report to the Siskiyou Education Project, Earth Designs Consultants and Conservation Biology Institute, Corvallis, OR. 113 pp.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC). 2000a. Conservation by design: A framework for mission success. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA. 16 p.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC). 2000b. Designing a geography of hope: Guidelines ecoregion-based conservation in The Nature Conservancy. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA. 84 p.

USDA, 2001. CALVEG. US Forest Service, Region 1, San Francisco.

USDA, 2001. Vegetation Plot Data. US Forest Service, Region 6 Area Ecology Program. Electronic data.

WCED. 1987. Our Common Future. New York: Oxford University Press for the UN World Commission on Environment and Development.

Whittaker, R.H. 1960. Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California. Ecological Monographs 30:279-338.

Wilcox, B.A. 1980. Insular Ecology and Conservation. In Conservation Biology: An Ecological-Evolutionary Perspective, M.E. Soule; and B.A. Wilcox, Eds. (Sinauer, Sunderland, MA.,), pp. 95-118.

Wilson, E. O. 1992. The Diversity of Life. Norton, New York.