EXHIBIT 7-4 COST/RISK ANALYSIS, STABILIZATION

Part 1. Treatment Cost

Treatments	Cost
ES2-Flow Control Structure	$2,600
ES3-Storm Patrol	$10,800
ES5-Structure Protection	$5,368
ES6-Invasive Species Monitoring	$12,435
ES8-Warning Signs	$2,571
ES9-Hazard Removal	$3,362
ES10-Historic Site Sect. 106 Documentation	$3,995

Part2. Probability of Stabilization Treatments Successfully Meeting ESR Objectives

Treatments	Units	%
ES2-Flow Control Structure	Stream Crossing	80
ES3-Storm Patrol	Patrol	100
ES5-Structure Protection	130 Feet	70
ES6-Invasive Species Monitoring	3 Surveys	90
ES8-Warning Signs	29 Signs	80
ES9-Hazard Removal	5.3 Miles	100
ES10-Historic Site Sect. 106 Documentation	1 Job	100

Risk of Resource Value Loss or Damage

Identify the risk (high, medium, low, none or not applicable (NA) of unacceptable impacts or loss of resources.

No Action-Treatment Not Implemented (check one)

Resource Value	None	Low	Mid	High
ES2-Flow Control Structure			**X**	
ES3-Storm Patrol				**X**
ES5-Structure Protection			**X**	
ES6-Invasive Species Monitoring				**X**
ES8-Warning Signs			**X**	
ES9-Hazard Removal				**X**
ES10-Historic Site Sect. 106 Documentation			**X**	

Proposed Action — Treatments Successfully Implemented (check one)

Resource Value	None	Low	Mid	High
ES2-Flow Control Structure		**X**		
ES3-Storm Patrol		**X**		
ES5-Structure Protection		**X**		
ES6-Invasive Species Monitoring			**X**	
ES8-Warning Signs		**X**		
ES9-Hazard Removal			**x**	
ES10-Historic Site Sect. 106 Documentation		**X**		

PART 3. SUMMARY

The costs of the project and probability of success of the proposed treatments are compared with the risks to resource values if: 1) no action is taken, and 2) the proposed action is successfully implemented. Alternatives may be included in this analysis to assist in the selection of the treatments that will cost effectively achieve the ES objectives. Answer the following questions to determine which proposed ES treatments should be selected and implemented.

1. Are the risks to natural resources and private property **acceptable** as a result of the fire if the following actions are taken?

Proposed Action Yes [X]No [ ] Rational for answer: The proposed action will minimize the chance of debris building up behind the Noisy Creek and Peter's Pasture bridges. Weed invasion will be minimal if monitoring takes place. Historic trails and structures will be protected and preserved.

No Action Yes [ ] No [X] Rational for answer: The no action alternative would allow opportunity for high concentrations of debris to clog bridges and could result in damages to downstream infrastructures. Trails and historic structures would risk damage.

Alternative(s) Yes [ ] No [ ] Rationale for answer:

2. Is the probability of success of the proposed action, alternatives or no action acceptable given their costs?

Proposed Action Yes [X]No [ ] Rational for answer: Investment in storm patrol, debris removal, and overflow protection at the Noisy Creek bridge will help reduce the likelihood of bridge damage/blowout that would be much costlier to repair or replace if left untreated.

No Action Yes [ ] No [X] Rational for answer: The costs associated with replacing or repairing bridges will far outweigh the proposed treatment costs. The cost of weed control after significant invasion has occurred is costly and can eventually become futile.

Alternative(s) Yes [ ] No [ ] Rationale for answer:

3. Which approach will most cost-effectively and successfully attain the ESR objectives and therefore is recommended for implementation from a Cost/Risk Analysis standpoint?

Proposed Action Yes [X]No [ ] No action will not attain ESR objectives of controlling debris movement into stream channels, will not control the spread of invasive species further into forest and rangeland areas within and adjacent to the fires, and valuable structures would be at risk.

Comments:

COST/RISK ANALYSIS, REHABILITATION

Part 1. Treatment Cost

Treatments	Cost
R1-Planting	$114,720
R2-Seedling Procurement	$133,152
R3-Stocking Surveys	$5,256
R4-Pest Management	$35,040
R5-Seedling Protection	$4,400
R6-CFI Plot Re-establishment	$15,765
R7-Trail Access	$6,724

Part 2. Probability of Rehabilitation Treatments Successfully Meeting BAR Objectives

Treatments	Units	%
R1-Planting	876 acres	90
R2-Seedling Procurement	876 acres	100
R3-Stocking Surveys	876 acres	100
R4-Pest Management	876 acres	75
R5-Seedling Protection	55 acres	75
R6-CFI Plot Re-establishment	45 plots	100
R7-Trail Access	10.6 Miles	100

Risk of Resource Value Loss or Damage

Identify the risk (high, medium, low, none or not applicable (NA)) of unacceptable impacts or loss of resources.

No Action-Treatment Not Implemented (check one)

Resource Value	None	Low	Mid	High
R1-Planting				**X**
R2-Seedling Procurement				**X**
R3-Stocking Surveys			**X**	
R4-Pest Management				**X**
R5-Seedling Protection			**X**	
R6-CFI Plot Re-establishment				**X**
R7-Trail Access				**X**

Proposed Action — Treatments Successfully Implemented (check one)

Resource Value	None	Low	Mid	High
R1-Planting		**X**		
R2-Seedling Procurement		**X**		
R3-Stocking Surveys		**X**		
R4-Pest Management		**X**		
R5-Seedling Protection		**X**		
R6-CFI Plot Re-establishment		**X**		
R7-Trail Access		**X**		

PART 3. SUMMARY

The costs of the project and probability of success of the proposed treatments are compared with the risks to resource values if: 1) no action is taken, and 2) the proposed action is successfully implemented. Alternatives may be included in this analysis to assist in the selection of the treatments that will cost effectively achieve the BAR objectives. Answer the following questions to determine which proposed BAR treatments should be selected and implemented.

4. Are the risks to natural resources and private property **acceptable** as a result of the fire if the following actions are taken?

Proposed Action Yes [X] No [ ] Rational for answer: The proposed action will insure rapid regeneration of a severely damaged commercial forest resource in the most rapid manner. This will help insure a forest dominated landscape as opposed to a shrub dominated landscape. Infrastructure repairs will help in determining future growth and productivity of burned commercial forestland.

No Action Yes [ ] No [X] Rational for answer: The no action alternative would result in a brush dominated landscape that would not contribute to overall forest productivity for many years which affect revenue for Tribal operations for years to come. Infrastructure improvements would be lost permanently.

Alternative(s) Yes [ ] No [ ] Rationale for answer:

5. Is the probability of success of the proposed action, alternatives or no action acceptable given their costs?

Proposed Action Yes [X] No [ ] Rational for answer: The Department of Forestry has documented reforestation records that demonstrate the ability of the program to regenerate the forest and move it into a productive part of the forest in the future.

No Action Yes [ ] No [X] Rational for answer: With the no action alternative much of the burned area of this fire will become a brush dominated non-productive forest.

Alternative(s) Yes [ ] No [ ] Rationale for answer:

6. Which approach will most cost-effectively and successfully attain the ESR objectives and therefore is recommended for implementation from a Cost/Risk Analysis standpoint?

Proposed Action Yes [X] No [ ] The No Action Alternative will not meet BAR criteria as addressed in the forest assessment and Tribal land management directives for commercial forest lands.

Comments: