Table S1: Expert Opinion Workshop for determining the suitability values of each land-use designation for each zone

Name	Category	Average Value (of non-blank cells)	Variance (with Travis)	Greg Aplet Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Greg Aplet Justifications/Assumptions	Travis Belote Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Matt Deitz Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Justifications/Assumptions	Pete McKinley Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)
Citizen Inventoried Roadless Area	Suitability for Res Zone	0.28	0.01	0.33		See explanation of IRAs below.	0.3	N	0.35		0.3		High obs value but recognizes some opportunity for restoration	0.1	n
Citizen Inventoried Roadless Area	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.6	0.04	0.33		See explanation of IRAs below.	0.6	N	0.45		0.7		High obs value but recognizes some opportunity for restoration	0.9	n
Citizen Inventoried Roadless Area	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.13	0.02	0.34		See explanation of IRAs below.	0.1	N	0.2		0			0	n
Citizen Inventoried Roadless Area	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.3	0.02	0.1		Citizen inventories carry no official meaning, and I don't think they mean much to the (non-enviro) public.	0.5	N	0.4		0.2			0.3	n
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP)	Suitability for Res Zone	0.82	0.05	1		This seems like a no-brainer. An area has been administratively designated for restoration. We should use it	0.5	N	1	Y	0.6		Mostly restoration but some opportunity for obs and Inn	1	n
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP)	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.08	0.01	0			0.2	N	0		0.2		Mostly restoration but some opportunity for obs and Inn	0	n
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP)	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.1	0.02	0			0.3	N	0		0.2		Mostly restoration but some opportunity for obs and Inn	0	n
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP)	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.67	0.06	0.75		It's not legislated and it's not permanent, but it is "official" and it has stakeholder support.	0.8	N	1		0.3		In actuality a mix of priorities with IRAs and other priorities embedded	0.5	n
Inventoried Roadless Area (USFS)	Suitability for Res Zone	0.24	0.01	0.33		I don't believe roadlessness should be acriterion for assignment. There is nothing in the roadless rule that precludes, for example, the use of fire to change forest conditions. It only precludes road construction and commercial logging. It does allow for trees to be cut in the WUI for community protection, as long as permanent roads are not built. I do think roadlessness should inform naturalness, but that is not what is being considered here.	0.3	N	0.35		0.1		Most of areas should be in Obs but some provision for Res and Inn	0.1	n
Inventoried Roadless Area (USFS)	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.62	0.04	0.33		I don't believe roadlessness should be acriterion for assignment. There is nothing in the roadless rule that precludes, for example, the use of fire to change forest conditions. It only precludes road construction and commercial logging. It does allow for trees to be cut in the WUI for community protection, as long as permanent roads are not built. I do think roadlessness should inform naturalness, but that is not what is being considered here.	0.6	N	0.45		0.8		Most of areas should be in Obs but some provision for Res and Inn	0.9	n
Inventoried Roadless Area (USFS)	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.15	0.01	0.34		I don't believe roadlessness should be acriterion for assignment. There is nothing in the roadless rule that precludes, for example, the use of fire to change forest conditions. It only precludes road construction and commercial logging. It does allow for trees to be cut in the WUI for community protection, as long as permanent roads are not built. I do think roadlessness should inform naturalness, but that is not what is being considered here.	0.1	N	0.2		0.1		Most of areas should be in Obs but some provision for Res and Inn	0	n
Inventoried Roadless Area (USFS)	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.62	0.02	0.9		IRAs may not be "permanent," but their status is about as permanent as you can get.	0.5	N	0.6		0.6		Roadless Ruleand history provides considerable weight	0.5	n
Primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Res Zone	0.23	0.01	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.3	N	0.2		0.2		Many Roadless areas (at least in East) do not reach this classification so should be heavily toward Obs	0.1	n

Name	Category	Average Value (of non-blank cells)	Variance (with Travis)	Greg Aplet Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Greg Aplet Justifications/Assumptions	Travis Belote Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Matt Deitz Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Justifications/Assumptions	Pete McKinley Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)
Primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.69	0.04	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.6	N	0.8		0.8		Many Roadless areas (at least in East_they are SPNM) do not reach this classification_they are SPNM) so should be heavily toward Obs	0.9	n
Primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.09	0.02	0.34		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.1	N	0		0		Many Roadless areas (at least in East_they are SPNM) do not reach this classification so should be heavily toward Obs	0	n
Primitive Non-Motorized Area	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.37	0.04	0.25		This derives from forest plans that are being revised, so it is far from "permanent," though it does reflect some analysis and therefore does carry some "official" weight.	0.5	N	0.3		0.1		Although this category identifies some of least impacted lands, there is little Socio-Political weight	0.7	n
Recommended Wilderness Areas (USFS)	Suitability for Res Zone	0.13	0.01	0.2		That said, I would allow for restoration as the appropriate adaptation strategy in some cases, and it may be appropropriate to undertake restoration prior to designation	0.25	N	0.2		0			0	y
Recommended Wilderness Areas (USFS)	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.8	0.04	0.7		If the FS has recommended it, there is a strong chance that it will become wilderness and may be managed as such.	0.5	N	0.8		1			1	y
Recommended Wilderness Areas (USFS)	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.07	0.01	0.1		I would allow that, in rare cases, recommended wilderness may be mor appropriate to manipulate into a novel condition to conserve a highly valued element of biodiversity.	0.25	N	0		0			0	y
Recommended Wilderness Areas (USFS)	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.78	0.01	0.8		Recommended wilderness has gone through an evaluation process and is widely accepted by the agency and stakeholders as appropriate for wilderness designation, though it is not as strong a protection as designated wilderness.	0.8	N	0.9		0.8		These are defacto Wilderness Study Areas - carry at least some temporary protection of Wilderness	0.6	n
Recreational River Corridor	Suitability for Res Zone	0.47	0.02	0.33		The use of the river for recreation should not influence its appropriateness for any particular adaptation strategy.	0.33	N	0.5		0.5		Mix of needs	0.7	n
Recreational River Corridor	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.32	0.01	0.33		The use of the river for recreation should not influence its appropriateness for any particular adaptation strategy.	0.33	N	0.5		0.25		Mix of needs	0.2	n
Recreational River Corridor	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.2	0.02	0.34		The use of the river for recreation should not influence its appropriateness for any particular adaptation strategy.	0.33	N	0		0.25		Mix of needs	0.1	n
Recreational River Corridor	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.31	0.04	0.25		Strong on permanence, weak on protection.	0.1	N	0.7		0.2		Because of mix of needs and flexibility of designation this designation could have flexibility in zoning	0.3	n
Research Natural Area	Suitability for Res Zone	0.07	0.01	0			0.25	N	0		0			0.1	n
Research Natural Area	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.88	0.04	1	Yes	Despite the name, very little manipulation is allowed in RNAs, even for research.	0.5	N	1	y	1	Y		0.9	n
Research Natural Area	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.05	0.01	0			0.25	N	0		0			0	n
Research Natural Area	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.72	0.04	0.8		Though not established by law, RNAs go through a process that results in a pretty strong level of protection. Well understood by the agencies, if not by the public	0.5	N	1		0.8		RNA status would be strong Administrative direction	0.5	n
Scenic River Corridor	Suitability for Res Zone	0.37	0.01	0.33		Actions taken in Scenic River corridors should be sensitive to scenic status, but Scenic designation should not influence the appropriate strategy.	0.33	N	0.5		0.4		Mix of needs	0.3	n
Scenic River Corridor	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.43	0.01	0.33		Actions taken in Scenic River corridors should be sensitive to scenic status, but Scenic designation should not influence the appropriate strategy.	0.33	N	0.5		0.4		Mix of needs	0.6	n

Name	Category	Average Value (of non-blank cells)	Variance (with Travis)	Greg Aplet Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Greg Aplet Justifications/Assumptions	Travis Belote Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Matt Deitz Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Justifications/Assumptions	Pete McKinley Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)
Scenic River Corridor	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.19	0.02	0.34		Actions taken in Scenic River corridors should be sensitive to scenic status, but Scenic designation should not influence the appropriate strategy.	0.33	N	0		0.2		Mix of needs	0.1	n
Scenic River Corridor	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.5	0.05	0.3		Somewhat more protective than Recreation status but not much?	0.5	N	0.8		0.2		Because of mix of needs and flexibility of designation this designation could have flexibility in zoning	0.7	n
Semi-primitive Motorized Area	Suitability for Res Zone	0.39	0	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.33	N	0.4		0.5		Mix of needs	0.4	n
Semi-primitive Motorized Area	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.34	0	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.33	N	0.4		0.25		Mix of needs	0.4	n
Semi-primitive Motorized Area	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.26	0	0.34		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.33	N	0.2		0.25		Mix of needs	0.2	n
Semi-primitive Motorized Area	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.31	0.01	0.25		This derives from forest plans that are being revised, so it is far from "permanent," though it does reflect some analysis and therefore does carry some "official" weight.	0.5	N	0.3		0.2		Flexible category	0.3	n
Semi-primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Res Zone	0.27	0	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.25	N	0.35		0.2		Large overlap with Wilderness, IRA, and other categories	0.2	n
Semi-primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.56	0.03	0.33		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.5	N	0.45		0.8		Large overlap with Wilderness, IRA, and other categories	0.7	n
Semi-primitive Non-Motorized Area	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.2	0.01	0.34		I don't think this designation should preclude management to improve resilience, as long as it does not change the primitive character. For example, prescribed fire is not prohibited.	0.25	N	0.2		0.1		Large overlap with Wilderness, IRA, and other categories	0.1	n
Semi-primitive Non-Motorized Area	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.27	0.02	0.25		This derives from forest plans that are being revised, so it is far from "permanent," though it does reflect some analysis and therefore does carry some "official" weight.	0.2	N	0.3		0.1		Although this category identifies some of least impacted lands, there is little Socio-Political weight	0.5	n
USFS Experimental Forest and Range	Suitability for Res Zone	0.21	0.01	0			0.33	N	0.2		0.2		Many experiments relate to restoration issues and some areas are used as controls (obs)	0.3	n
USFS Experimental Forest and Range	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.11	0.02	0			0.33	N	0	Y	0.2		Many experiments relate to restoration issues and some areas are used as controls (obs)	0	n
USFS Experimental Forest and Range	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.69	0.05	1		This seems like the place to aggressively experiment with novel approaches to management.	0.33	N	0.8		0.6	N	Many experiments relate to restoration issues and some areas are used as controls (obs)	0.7	n
USFS Experimental Forest and Range	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.66	0.07	0.9		Pretty permanent. If I'm not mistaken, there is a role for congress in the designation of an experimental forest. I could be wrong though. Nevertheless, the FS rarely de-designates experimental forests (though it has been done).	0.5	N	1		0.3			0.6	n
Wild River Corridor	Suitability for Res Zone	0.19	0.01	0			0.33	N	0.2		0.2		Generally most intact of Wild and Scenic River designations but may have some restoration needs	0.2	n

Name	Category	Average Value (of non-blank cells)	Variance (with Travis)	Greg Aplet Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Greg Aplet Justifications/Assumptions	Travis Belote Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Matt Deitz Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)	Hugh Irwin Justifications/Assumptions	Pete McKinley Values	Hard wired? (Y/N)
Wild River Corridor	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.75	0.05	1		I understand Wild Rivers to carry protections very similar to wilderness.	0.33	N	0.8		0.8		Generally most intact of Wild and Scenic River designations but may have some restoration needs	0.8	n
Wild River Corridor	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.07	0.02	0			0.33	N	0		0			0	n
Wild River Corridor	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.78	0.02	0.9		Very strong but less understood by the public than wilderness	0.5	N	0.9		0.8		Probably strongest language of areas covered by Wild and Scenic River designation	0.8	n
Wilderness Areas (USFS and NPS)	Suitability for Res Zone	0.05	0.01	0			0.25	N	0		0			0	y
Wilderness Areas (USFS and NPS)	Suitability for Obs Zone	0.9	0.04	1	Yes	Untrammeled and observation-only are pretty synonymous in my book.	0.5	N	1	Y	1	Y		1	y
Wilderness Areas (USFS and NPS)	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.05	0.01	0			0.25	N	0		0			0	y
Wilderness Areas (USFS and NPS)	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.96	0.01	1		Strong protection, mandated by law, and well understood.	0.8	N	1		1			1	y
CalFIRE WUI Fire Zone	Suitability for Res Zone	0.34	0.03	0.25		SomeWUI fuel treatments are consistent with ecological restoration.			0.5		0.5		May be many restoration issues to address in WUI	0.1	n
CalFIRE WUI Fire Zone	Suitability for Obs Zone	0	0	0		I don't think we want to advocate for "observation only" in the WUI -- yet, at least. There may come a time when communities are so well prepared for fire that fire and fires can be allowed to burn through them without confidence, but we're not there yet.			0	y				0	n
CalFIRE WUI Fire Zone	Suitability for Inn Zone	0.66	0.03	0.75		We have advocated that THE priority in the WUI is community protection and agencies and property owners should "do what needs to be done," even if it results in novel ecological conditions.			0.5		0.5		May be many restoration issues to address in WUI	0.9	n
CalFIRE WUI Fire Zone	Socio-political Influence (All 3 Objectives)	0.95	0.01	1		The dictates of fire management will be one of the first objections to large observation zones, and it will serve us with this audience to defer strongly to CALFIRE's judgment regarding fire management priorities (even though the boundaries of this zone change with analytical methods and population growth and are about as impermanent as any designation can be).			1		1			0.8	n