

3.10. Adjacent Ownerships

Affected Environment

Adjacent Lands of Other Ownerships

Compatibility between the management of National Forests and the management of adjacent private land is important in reducing conflicts. Within the established boundaries of the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) are approximately 381,000 acres of privately owned land, with parcels varying in size from about 5 acres to over 12,000 acres. Additional private land adjoins the Forest's exterior boundary and along interior inclusions (i.e., areas of private land excluded when the TNF was established). More than 2,700 miles of property boundary interface between the National Forest System (NFS) and private land.

The checkerboard pattern of ownership in this area results from the railroad land grants of the 1860's, which were intended to encourage the construction of railroads and schools by granting alternate sections of land to the railroads and the States. The majority of this land is currently owned by Sierra Pacific Industries and other timber land managing companies, resulting in about 2,000 miles of property boundaries between them and the TNF. Many cooperative agreements for road construction and maintenance have been entered into with adjacent land owners; many of which allow for public access across private land. Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) manages more than 250,000 acres in the Sierra Nevada. They are the largest corporate land owner in the TNF. SPI has stated that they are opposed to public off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on their lands. The assumption has been made in estimating environmental effects in this EIS that SPI corporate forest roads would not be available for use by the public.

Scattered throughout the TNF are smaller parcels and tracts of privately owned land. These parcels are mostly the result of homesteads, Native American Allotments, mineral patents, and State School land sales. These small parcels are typically 5 to 100 acres with irregular shapes.

Different land ownerships, by themselves, do not create conflict in regards to public access by wheeled motor vehicles. Different land ownership objectives often do create conflict, even on lands in the same ownership. Opportunities to coordinate with intermingled and adjacent land owners will continue, underlining the importance of developing compatible road and trail management objectives between private and NFS lands.

Recently, more encroachment and trespassing have occurred along the National Forest/private property boundaries, resulting in user-created routes existing on private land. Several of the unauthorized routes under consideration for addition to the NFTS and closed NFTS roads proposed for reopening are on the other side of private lands through which the Forest Service does not have a valid right of way. None of the alternatives add roads or motorized trails to the NFTS on private land without a valid right of way. All additions to the NFTS lie wholly on NFS lands. However, providing additional NFTS motorized recreation opportunities on the other side of private land could have an impact on the private landowners whose land would need to be crossed to get to those opportunities. Prior to making any additions to the NFTS on NFS lands on the other side of these private lands, mitigation measures are specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) that permission must first be obtained from the private land owner to grant public access. Once this permission is obtained, the portion of the

roads and/or trail on NFS lands would be added to the NFTS and then made available for public access. Prior to the permission being obtained, public use of these roads and trails would be prohibited. If the land owner is unwilling to give permission for public access, the portion of those routes on NFS lands would not be added to the NFTS and public use would be prohibited on them. Routes on the other side of lands owned by SPI were excluded from this consideration unless the Forest Service already has a right-of-way or easement. Table 3.10-1 lists those roads and trails on NFS lands which could be added to the NFTS once permission from the private land owner is obtained for public access through their lands.

Table 3.10-1. Routes Potentially Affecting Private Land under Consideration for Addition to the NFTS

Route ID	Description of Need as Part of the NFTS
ARM-5	Trail connecting two routes near Eliot Meadow which connects two National Forest System Roads.
H29-11	Former NFTS road coming off of the 29 Road to the north near Omega going into and dead ending on private land. The majority of the route is on private land.
H293	Former NFTS road on Sleighville Ridge northeast of Camptonville parallel to County Road Road 115 accessing private land at Sleighville House.
H293-19	Former NFTS road 293-19 coming off of County road 293 north of Miller Ranch. First part of road crosses private land.
H293-4-18	Former NFTS road south of Hennes Pass road accessing private land at Gates Orchard.
H34-4	Former NFTS road number 34-4. Makes a small loop to the north off of the Jouberts Road just south of Indian Hill and Highway 49 near Indian Valley. Short segment crosses private land immediately adjacent to the Jouberts Road.
H34-8-3	Former NFTS road accessing dispersed recreation site on private land in Indian Valley just south of Highway 49.
H36-3-1	Former NFTS road east of Malakoff Diggings in Missouri Canyon which makes a loop between two National Forest System roads. One small segment crosses private land near Humbug Creek.
H38	Former NFTS road north of the Sugar Pine Flat Research Natural Area coming off National Forest System road number 38 accessing private land at Pelliam Flat.
H823-1-1	Former NFTS road west of Gold Lake coming of National Forest System road number 9 to the north accessing private land at Howard Creek Meadows.
H833	Former NFTS road west of Malakoff Diggings near Bloody Run. Short segment near intersection with County Road 522 crosses private land.
H88-13	Former NFTS road just south of China Flat OHV staging area connecting a NFTS motorcycle trail with Placer County road 88. Majority of route is on private land.
N25-1-1	Former NFTS road number 25-1-1 connecting NFTS road number 25 just north of Cal-Ida to NFTS road number 25-1. Short segment near junction with the NFTS road 25-1 crosses private land.
N96-12c	Former NFTS road coming north off of the Mosquito Ridge Road near Mosquito Narrows. One segment dead ends at Cedar Springs and the other segment dead ends at Big Oak Flat.
TKN-J4	This trail accesses Andesite Peak and has views along the way.
TKN-J9	This trail follows a powerline and provides an alternative route to other nearby routes with safety concerns.

Route ID	Description of Need as Part of the NFTS
TKN-Q1	This trail is located on top of a buried phone line. It parallels an existing trail that was meant to re-route users; however, some users prefer to follow the buried line rather than the alternative system trail.
YRM-M4	Comes off of Sierra County road number 201 south of the town of Alleghany. Accesses private land at Minnesota Flat.
YRN-M3b	Motorcycle trail connecting the Downie River Trail to Castle Rock Trail. Crosses small segment of private land near Castle Rock Trail.
YRS-AF	South of Fordyce Lake. Comes off of NFTS motorcycle trail and provides access to a small lake. Short segment near intersection with existing trail crosses private land.
YRS-SF5	Comes off of Highway 20 to the north near Bear Valley. One curve in trail touches a parcel of private land.

Adjacent National Forest System Land

The TNF adjoins three other National Forests: Plumas, Eldorado, Humboldt-Toiyabe, as well as the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). Shared administrative duties often occur along the Forest boundaries. The TNF, for example, currently administers a small portion of the Plumas National Forest northeast of Bullards Bar Reservoir. This shared administration is intended primarily to facilitate efficient, economical management of NFS land. Adjacent National Forests currently have coordinated travel management planning to ensure the amount of contrast between respective National Forests is minimized.

Private Land Interface

Private land interface situations may occur when NFS lands are adjacent to private lands that have been, or may be, developing for recreation, rural, residential, urban or commercial uses. When National Forest road and trail management objectives differ from our neighbors, the potential for mutual conflicts exist. Generally these private land interface conflicts arise adjacent to private lands where the land owners have conflicting road and trail management objectives and different perceptions about how NFS roads and trails adjacent or near their property should be managed. Typically these lands range from small communities, towns, and subdivisions to scattered rural residences. Some of these private land owners are concerned that the effects of Forest Service road and trail management will have negative effects on water quality, noise, dust, and recreation opportunities. As a result of these concerns, often private land owners are opposed to motor vehicle use, trespassing by recreationists, and road maintenance. Many people feel the Forest should provide buffers on NFS lands. To add to this complexity, land owners may have conflicting needs and attitudes about management of roads and trails next to them. One land owner may be completely supportive of adjoining motorized recreation opportunities while another resident may be totally opposed due aesthetic concerns, noise, or dust drifting onto their property.

Residential and community development of private lands adjacent to National Forest boundaries is expanding. The Sierra Nevada foothill counties are the fastest growing in the State. It is predicted that, through the subdivision of private lands, the number of land owners within and adjacent to National Forest boundaries will significantly increase. The number of land owners with different road and trail management objectives and perceptions about how NFS roads and trails should be managed will also

increase dramatically. Table 3.10-2 displays the current miles of roads and trails within the Urban/Rural/Wildland Interface (¼ mile of private land, 1990 LRMP) by class of vehicle and season of use.

Table 3.10-2. Motorized Roads and Trails within Urban/Rural/Wildland Interface

Road/Trail Category	Season of Use	Length (miles)
Cross Country Travel		
Acres	N/A	268,400
Unauthorized routes and closed NFTS roads still receiving some motorized use (miles)		596.2
NFTS Roads open to highway legal vehicles only (miles)	Open Seasonally	72.9
	Open Year Around	79.8
NFTS Roads open to all vehicles (miles)	Seasonal Closure	106.0
	Open Year Around	329.7
NFTS Trails open to high clearance trail vehicles (miles)	Seasonal Closure	4.8
	Open Year Around	19.5
NFTS Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles only (miles)	Seasonal Closure	.5
	Open Year Around	3.6
NFTS Trails open to motorcycles only (miles)	Seasonal Closure	3.9
	Open Year Around	22.3
Subtotal NFTS Motorized Roads & Trails		642.9
State, County or other jurisdiction roads	Open Year Around	209.0
Private Roads	Open Year Around	6.2
Total Motorized		1,454.3

Local Plans and Initiatives

County plans, zoning plans: All county plans in the State of California affect all of the private roads within county boundaries. In the counties in the TNF, private lands adjacent to National Forests are generally zoned for very low housing densities (one dwelling per 160 or 640 acres). The regulations for these zones keep roads available for use by the public consistent with the California Vehicle Code.

There will be little effect on county planning from the decisions made from this project. County zoning and regulations are only peripherally affected by TNF management. County plans and zoning are primarily based on locations of existing infrastructure, distance to schools, services, utilities, and land capabilities. There are no direct ties between these plans and route designations on the TNF, so the effects from the decisions made by this project on county plans and the effect of county plans on this decision are minimal.

Other Federal Lands

The Bureau of Land Management has a multiple-use management mission, similar to that of the Forest Service, and the agency's management plans reflect stewardship commitments comparable to those that apply to the National Forests. The Forest Service coordinates management activities and planning at various geographic scales with the Bureau of Land Management, including travel management.

State Parks

Units of the California State Park system, that are in the Sierra Nevada, protect all their wildlife and plants and give special care to sensitive species. State Parks have regulations that prohibit any disturbance or destruction of natural resources. The Forest Service coordinates management activities and planning at various geographic scales with the State Parks, including travel management.

Environmental Consequences

Measures or Factors Used to Assess Environmental Consequences

Management activities proposed in all of the alternatives could directly, indirectly, or cumulatively affect adjacent ownerships. National Forest travel management decisions have the potential to affect adjacent ownerships. The following factors indicate potential effects on adjacent ownerships:

1. Adding motorized roads and trails to the NFTS on the other side of private land,
2. Management of wheeled motorized vehicle activities adjacent to private

1. Motorized Roads and Trails on the Other Side of Private Land

Several of the unauthorized routes under consideration for addition to the NFTS are on the other side of private land. In addition, some of the Maintenance Level 1 roads proposed for reopening are also on the other side private lands. Allowing public motorized use on these routes on the other side of private land could have an impact on the private landowners. Before these routes, on the other side of private land, are designated for public motorized use, permission must first be obtained from the private land owner to grant public access. Prior to the permission being obtained, public use of these routes on the other side of private land would be prohibited. If the land owner is unwilling to give permission for public access, these routes would not be available for public use. Routes on the other side of lands owned by Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) were excluded from this consideration unless the Forest Service already has a right-of-way or easement since they have indicated they are unwilling to encourage use by public motorized vehicles on their land. Table 3.10-3 lists those NFTS roads and trails on the other side of private land which would be made available for public motorized use once permission from the private land owner is obtained for public access.

Table 3.10-3. Additions to the NFTS and Reopening of Maintenance Level 1 roads on the other side of Private Land by Alternative

Action Proposed	Route ID	Description	Alt 1 ¹	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7
Additions to the NFTS	ARM-5	Trail connecting two routes near Eliot Meadow which connects two NFTS roads.	X	X		X	X		X
	H29-11	Former NFTS road coming off of the 29 Road to the north near Omega going into and dead ending on private land. The majority of the route is on private land.	X				X		
	H293	Former NFTS road on Sleighville Ridge northeast of Camptonville parallel to County Road Road 115 accessing private land at Sleighville House.	X				X		
	H293-4-18	Former NFTS road south of Henness Pass road accessing private land at Gates Orchard.	X				X		
	H34-8-3	Former NFTS road accessing dispersed recreation site on private land in Indian Valley just south of Highway 49.	X				X		
	H36-3-1	Former NFTS roads east of Malakoff Diggings in Missouri Canyon which makes a loop between two NFTS roads. One small segment crosses private land near Humbug Creek.	X				X		
	H833	Former NFTS road west of Malakoff Diggings near Bloody Run. Short segment near intersection with County road 522 crosses private land.	X				X		
	H88-13	Former NFTS road just south of China Flat OHV staging area connecting a National Forest System motorcycle trail with Placer County road 88. Majority of route is on private land.	X				X		
	TKN-J4	This trail accesses Andesite Peak and has views along the way.	X	X			X	X	X
	TKN-J9	This trail follows a powerline and provides an alternative route to other nearby routes with safety concerns.	X	X		X	X	X	X
	TKN-Q1	This trail is located on top of a buried phone line. It parallels an existing trail that was meant to re-route users; however, some users prefer to follow the buried line rather than the alternative system trail.	X	X			X	X	
	YRM-M4	Comes off of Sierra County road number 201 south of the town of Alleghany. Accesses private land at Minnesota Flat	X	X			X	X	X
	YRN-M3b	Motorcycle trail connecting the Downie River Trail to Castle Rock Trail. Crosses small segment of private land near Castle Rock Trail.	X	X			X		X
	YRS-AF	South of Fordyce Lake. Comes off of National Forest System motorcycle trail and provides access to a small lake. Short segment near intersection with existing trail crosses private land.	X	X		X	X	X	X
YRS-SF5	Comes off of Highway 20 to the north near Bear Valley. One curve in trail touches a parcel of private land.	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Subtotal Number of Road/Trail Additions to the NFTS			15	8	0	4	15	6	7

¹ Alternative 1 does not propose any additions to the NFTS or reopening of maintenance level 1 roads, the numbers shown indicate the continued use of routes unauthorized for public motorized access

Action Proposed	Route ID	Description	Alt 1 ¹	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7
Reopening ML 1 Roads	N96-12c	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road coming north off of the Mosquito Ridge Road near Mosquito Narrows. One segment dead ends at Cedar Springs and the other segment dead ends at Big Oak Flat.	X				X		
	N25-1-1	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road number 25-1-1 connecting NFTS road number 25 just north of Calda to National Forest System road number 25-1. Short segment near junction with the 25-1 Road crosses private land.	X				X		
	H823-1-1	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road west of Gold Lake coming of National Forest System road number 9 to the north accessing private land at Howard Creek Meadows.	X				X		
	H38	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road north of the Sugar Pine Flat Research Natural Area coming off NFTS road number 38 accessing private land at Pelliam Flat.	X				X		
	H34-4	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road number 34-4. Makes a small loop to the north off of the Jouberts Road just south of Indian Hill and Highway 49 near Indian Valley. Shorth segment crosses private land immediately adjacent to the Jouberts Road.	X				X		
	H293-19	Maintenance Level 1 NFTS road 293-19 coming off of County Road 293 north of Miller Ranch. First part of road crosses private land.	X				X		
Subtotal Reopening ML 1 Roads			6				6		
Number of Routes Requiring Access Through Private Land			21	8	0	4	21	6	7

Under the No Action Alternative, unauthorized use by wheeled motorized vehicles on all of the roads and trails listed in Table 3.10-3 would be expected to continue unless action was taken by the private land owner to stop public access. Alternative 3 would prohibit use by wheeled motorized vehicles on all routes unauthorized for motor vehicles on NFS lands which are on the other side of private land. Alternatives 2, 4, 6 and 7 have a minor amount of unauthorized roads and trails on the other side of private land where use by wheeled motorized vehicles would be allowed to continue. Alternative 5 has 21 routes on the other side of private land where use by wheeled motorized vehicles would be allowed to continue. This use, however, would only be allowed once the private land owner has given permission for public access. Prior to such permission being given, public use by wheeled motorized vehicles would be prohibited.

Alternative 1

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel is not prohibited in Alternative 1. This cross country travel could result in additional unauthorized trespass onto private land by wheeled motor vehicles. This trespass could create conflicts with the private land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: There are no additions of any roads, trails, or areas to the NFTS in Alternative 1.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established in Alternative 1. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: There are no changes to the NFTS in this alternative.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There are no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 1 would have the greatest cumulative effect on adjacent private lands. Wheeled public motorized use on all 21 routes on the other side of private land would not be prohibited. In addition, not prohibiting cross country travel could result in the proliferation of more trespass onto private land.

Alternative 2

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 2. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 2 proposes to add 8 unauthorized routes to the NFTS on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: None of the “Open Areas” being established in this alternative are on the other side of private land. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 2 would not reopen any Maintenance Level 1 (ML 1) roads on the other side of private land. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not impact private land.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 2 would reduce the impacts on private land by prohibiting cross country travel and reducing the number of routes on the other side of private land requiring permission from the land owner from 21 to 8.

Alternative 3

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 3. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: There would be no proposed additions of any roads trails or areas to the NFTS in Alternative 3.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established in Alternative 3. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: There would be no changes to the NFTS in this alternative. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 3 would reduce the impacts on access across private land by prohibiting cross country travel and reducing the number of routes on the other side of private land requiring permission from the land owner from 21 to zero.

Alternative 4

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 4. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 4 proposes to add 4 unauthorized routes to the NFTS on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established in Alternative 4. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 4 would not reopen any ML 1 roads on the other side of private land. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 4 would reduce the impacts on access across private land by prohibiting cross country travel and reducing the number of routes on the other side of private land requiring permission from the land owner from 21 to 4.

Alternative 5

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 5. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 5 proposes to add 15 unauthorized routes to the NFTS on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established in Alternative 5. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 5 would reopen 6 ML 1 roads on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not impact private land.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 5 would reduce the impacts on access across private land by prohibiting cross country travel and requiring permission from the private land owners for the 21 routes on the other side of private land prior to their being designated on the motor vehicle use map.

Alternative 6

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 6. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 6 proposes to add 6 unauthorized routes to the NFTS on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: None of the “Open Areas” being established in this alternative are on the other side of private land. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 6 would not reopen any ML 1 roads on the other side of private land. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not impact private land.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 6 would reduce the impacts on access across private land by prohibiting cross country travel and reducing the number of routes on the other side of private land requiring permission from the land owner from 21 to 6.

Alternative 7

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 7. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes onto private lands. This prohibition would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 7 proposes to add 7 unauthorized routes to the NFTS on the other side of private land. The mitigation measures specified in Appendix A (Site Specific Road, Trail and Open Area Information) require that permission from the private land owner granting public access first be obtained prior to designating these routes on the motor vehicle use map.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established in Alternative 7. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 7 would not reopen any ML 1 roads on the other side of private land. Changing the season of use or class of vehicles on NFTS roads and motorized trails crossing private land are not anticipated to effect adjacent ownerships.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 2 would reduce the impacts on access across private land by prohibiting cross country travel and reducing the number of routes on the other side of private land requiring permission from the land owner from 21 to 7.

2. Management of wheeled motorized vehicle activities adjacent to private land

Private land interface situations may occur when NFS lands are adjacent to private lands that have been, or may be, developed for recreation, rural, residential, urban or commercial uses. When National Forest road and trail management objectives differ from our neighbors, the potential for mutual conflicts exist. Generally these private land interface situations arise adjacent to private lands where the land owners have conflicting road and trail management objectives and different perceptions about how NFS roads and trails adjacent or near their property should be managed.

All of the action alternatives reduce the number of miles of roads and trails open to wheeled motorized vehicles within ¼ mile of private land (Urban/Rural/Wildland Interface, 1990 LRMP). The largest decrease is Alternative 3. The smallest decrease is in Alternative 5. In addition, all of the action alternatives prohibit cross country travel within ¼ mile of private land which will reduce the proliferation of additional unauthorized routes. Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 impose wet weather restrictions on all native surface roads and trails which limit their use to the summer months.

Alternative 1

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would not be prohibited in Alternative 1 on 268,400 acres within ¼ mile of private land. Cross country travel would also result in the continued use of approximately 596.2 miles of unauthorized routes within ¼ mile of private land. This use would create conflicts with the private land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: There would be no addition of any roads trails or areas to the NFTS in Alternative 1. Since there would be no additions, there would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent land owners from this element.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 1. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: There would be no changes to the NFTS in this alternative.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 1 would have the greatest cumulative effect on lands within ¼ mile of adjacent private land. The amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use remains at 1,454.3 miles. It would not prohibit cross country travel on 268,400 acres within ¼ mile of private land.

Alternative 2

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 2. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel

would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 2 would add an additional 16.3 miles of motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land to the NFTS. These additional roads and motorized trails would have the potential to have adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: Two areas totaling 35.3 acres would be established as “Open Areas” within ¼ mile of private land. These additional established “Open Areas” would increase the potential for adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 2 would approve mixed use on 63.7 miles of NFTS within ¼ mile of private land. Due to increased motor vehicle use this would have an adverse impact on adjacent land owners. It would also change the class of vehicle on 38.6 miles of NFTS within ¼ mile of private land as a result of changed maintenance levels. This would result in additional noise and dust impacts as a result of OHV use. The season of use would be shortened on 1 mile of NFTS roads and motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land which would lessen the impact on the same private land owners. No ML 1 roads would be reopened.

Amendments to Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not have any impacts to adjacent land owners.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 2 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 876.6. It would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,434.8 acres to 35.3 within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Alternative 3

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 3. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: There would be no additions of any roads trails or areas to the NFTS in Alternative 3. Since there would be no additions, there would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent land owners from this element.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 3. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: There would be no changes to the NFTS in this alternative.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 3 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 858.2. It

would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,434.8 acres to zero within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Alternative 4

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 4. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 4 would add an additional 7.5 miles of motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land to the NFTS. These additional roads and motorized trails would have the potential to have adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 4. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 4 would not approve mixed use on any NFTS within ¼ mile of private land. It would however change the class of vehicle on 1.5 miles of NFTS within ¼ mile of private land as a result of changed maintenance levels. This would result in additional noise and dust impacts as a result of OHV use. The season of use would be shortened on 376.5 miles of NFTS roads and motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land which would lessen the impact on the same private land owners. No ML 1 roads would be reopened.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 4 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 867.1. It would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,400 acres to zero within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Alternative 5

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 5. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 5 would add an additional 21.3 miles of motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land to the NFTS. These additional roads and motorized trails would have the potential to have adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 5. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 5 would approve mixed use on 63.7 miles of NFTS roads within ¼ mile of private land. It would also change the class of vehicle on 38.6 miles of NFTS within ¼ mile of private land as a result of changed maintenance levels. These changes in the class of vehicles would allow OHV use on these roads presently restricted to highway legal vehicles only. This would result in additional noise and dust impacts to adjacent land owners as a result of OHV use. 10.5 miles of ML 1 roads would be reopened within ¼ mile of private land. This would increase the amount of motor vehicle use near private land and would potentially have an adverse impact on the land owners. These adverse impacts would be mitigated by shortening the season of use on 394.4 miles of NFTS roads and motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not have any impacts to adjacent land owners.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 5 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 892.2. It would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,434.8 acres to zero within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Alternative 6

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 6. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 6 would add an additional 16.0 miles of motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land to the NFTS. These additional roads and motorized trails would have the potential to have adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: One new area totaling 3.9 acres would be established as an “Open Area” within ¼ mile of private land. This additional established “Open Area” would increase the potential for adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Changes to the NFTS: Alternative 6 would approve mixed use on 4.1 miles of NFTS roads within ¼ mile of private land. It would also change the class of vehicle on 27.5 miles of NFTS within ¼ mile of private land as a result of changed maintenance levels. These changes in the class of vehicles would allow OHV use on these roads presently restricted to highway legal vehicles only. This would result in additional noise and dust impacts to adjacent land owners as a result of OHV use. Only .4 miles of Maintenance Level 1 roads would be reopened within ¼ mile of private land. This would increase the amount of motor vehicle use near private land and potentially have an adverse impact on the land owners. These adverse impacts would be mitigated by shortening the season of use on 387.5 miles of NFTS roads and motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: The Forest Plan Amendment would not have any impacts to adjacent land owners.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 6 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 879.7. It would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,434.8 acres to 3.9 within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Alternative 7

Cross Country Travel: Cross country travel would be prohibited in Alternative 7. This would limit the proliferation of new unauthorized routes adjacent to private lands. The prohibition of cross country travel would also result in reducing use on all unauthorized roads, trails and areas not added to the NFTS. These changes would have a positive effect on adjacent land owners.

Additions to the NFTS: Alternative 2 would add an additional 10.8 miles of motorized trails within ¼ mile of private land to the NFTS. These additional roads and motorized trails would have the potential to have adverse effects to the adjacent land owners.

Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas”: “Open Areas” would not be established within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 7. There would be no potential adverse impacts on adjacent private land owners from this element.

Changes to the NFTS: The only changes to the NFTS within ¼ mile of private land in Alternative 7 would be changing the class of vehicle on 1.5 miles of NFTS as a result of changed maintenance levels. This change in the class of vehicles would allow OHV use on these roads presently restricted to highway legal vehicles only. This would result in additional noise and dust impacts to adjacent land owners as a result of OHV use.

Amendments to the Forest Plan: There would be no amendments to the Forest Plan in this alternative.

Cumulative Effects: Alternative 7 would reduce the impacts within ¼ mile of adjacent private land by lowering the amount of mileage available for wheeled motorized use from 1,454.3 miles to 869. It would also reduce the acreage of cross country use from 268,400 acres to zero within ¼ mile of private land. The cumulative effect would be a reduction in the impacts to adjacent land owners.

Table 3.10-4. Miles of roads and trails for each alternative within ¼ mile of private land by class of vehicle and season of use

Action type		Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7
1. Cross country travel								
(miles)		596.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
(acres)		268,400	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Additions to the NFTS	a. Roads added to the NFTS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	b. Motorized Trails added to the NFTS	0	16.3	0.0	7.5	21.3	16.0	10.8
3. Establishment of Motorized “Open Areas” (acres)		0	35.3	0	0	0	3.9	0
4. Changes to the NFTS	a. Change in Class of Vehicles resulting from approval of mixed use	0	63.7	0.0	0.0	63.7	4.1	0.0
	b. Change in Class of Vehicles resulting from changes in maintenance levels	0	38.6	0.0	1.5	38.6	27.5	1.5
	c. Change in Season of Use	0	1.0	0.0	376.5	394.4	387.5	0.0
	d. Reopening Maintenance Level 1 Roads	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.4	0.0
5. Amendments to the Forest Plan		No Effect						
Total Miles*		1454.3	876.6	858.2	867.1	892.2	879.7	869.0
Total Acres		268,434.8	35.3	0	0	0	3.9	0

*Includes State, County and private roads. Alternative 1 also includes unauthorized routes and closed NFTS roads still receiving some motorized use.

Summary of Effects Analysis across All Alternatives

The following table summarizes the effects analysis for adjacent ownerships by ranking each alternative regarding how well it provides for each of the indicators. The following rankings were used: A score of 7 indicates the alternative has the least impact for adjacent ownerships related to the indicator. A score of 1 indicates the alternative has the greatest adverse impact for adjacent ownerships.

Table 3.10-5. Comparison of Effects to Adjacent Ownerships

Indicator	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5	Alt 6	Alt 7
Number of additions to the NFTS and reopening of Maintenance Level 1 Roads crossing private requiring prior approval from the private land owner	1	3	7	6	2	5	4
Management of wheeled motorized activities within ¼ mile of private land.	1	4	7	6	2	3	5
Average	1	3.5	7	6	2	4	4.5

