Motorized Travel Management Final Environmental Impact Statement February 2010

Volume 2: Appendix A – M

Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service
Cooperating Agencies: None
Responsible Official: J. Sharon Heywood, Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002
(530)226-2500
For further information, contact: Tom Kisanuki
USDA Service Center
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002
(530) 226-2500
(530) 226-2490 (TTY/TDD)
(530) 226-2470 (FAX)

Abstract: This Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) describes the environmental effects of a proposal by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest to:

(1) Prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel off designated National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads, motorized trails, and areas by the public except as allowed by permit or other authorization (excluding snowmobile use).

(2) Amend the Shasta-Trinity National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B) in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel;

(3) Add 44.20 miles of unauthorized routes to the current NFTS for public motor vehicle use. Approximately 36.51 miles of unauthorized routes would be added as roads classified open to all vehicles classes (highway-legal and nonhighway-legal), and approximately 7.69 miles of unauthorized routes would be added as motorized trails. Of the motorized trails proposed, about 0.85 miles would be open to "all trail class vehicles," 1.44 miles would be classified as "motorcycle only" and 5.40 miles would be open to "vehicles 50 inches or less in width." Seasonal restrictions would apply to approximately 0.15 miles of the proposed roads and trails.

(4) Add areas open to motor vehicle travel below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake (28,403 acres) and Trinity Lake (15,644 acres) within the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area. These

areas would be open to highway-legal vehicles with a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour to protect cultural resources.

(5) Amend the Forest Plan to allow six specific routes in or near cultural sites identified in the Forest Plan under Prescription XI: Heritage Resource Management.

These actions are needed in order to implement the 2005 Travel Management Rule while providing for a diversity of motor vehicle recreation opportunities and motorized access to dispersed recreation areas on the STNF. The non-significant Forest Plan amendment to prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel is needed to bring the Forest Plan into compliance with the Travel Management Rule. The non-significant Forest Plan amendment to allow motorized use near Prescription XI heritage sites is needed to provide valuable recreation access and opportunity. If the proposed action or an action alternative is not implemented, the continued unmanaged and unregulated cross-country motor vehicle travel would further harm natural and cultural resources, and continue to cause conflict with other uses across the landscape and in the reservoir open areas. The FEIS discloses environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, a no-action alternative, and four additional action alternatives developed to meet the purpose and need and to respond to issues raised by the public. An action alternative (Modified Alternative 2) was developed between publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and this FEIS in response to public comments and new analysis. Modified Alternative 2 is identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative. Mitigations to minimize environmental effects are proposed and evaluated, and monitoring assigned. The interdisciplinary team identified unavoidable adverse effects to recreation due to the elimination of cross-country motor vehicle travel, cultural resources due to the addition of two particular routes to the NFTS, and public safety as a result of the motorized mixed-use proposals. The responsible official considered an array of legal, environmental, economic, and social factors in deciding upon a course of action. The selected alternative is described in the accompanying record of decision.

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

A separate Record of Decision will be published that identifies the Selected Alternative. That decision is subject to administrative appeal under 36 CFR 215. Instructions for filing an appeal will be provided in the Record of Decision.

Implementation Date

If no appeals are filed within the 45-day appeal period, implementation of the decision may occur on, but not before, five business days from the close of the appeal filing period. When appeals are filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

Summary of the Final Environmental Impact Statement

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the availability and capability of motor vehicles, particularly off-highway vehicles (OHVs) and sport utility vehicles (SUVs), has increased tremendously. Nationally, the number of OHV recreationists has climbed sevenfold in the past 30 years, from approximately 5 million in 1972 to 36 million in 2000. California is experiencing the highest level of OHV use of any state in the nation.

On the Shasta-Trinity National Forest and on national forest system lands across the nation, unmanaged motor vehicle use has resulted in miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resources. These routes do not have the same status as National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads and trails. In 2003, the Pacific Southwest Region of the Forest Service entered into a memorandum of intent with the California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission and the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation to begin an effort to inventory, designate, and map OHV roads, trails, and open areas for the 18 national forests in California.

In 2005, the Forest Service published final travel management regulations (Travel Management Rule 36 CFR 212 prohibiting cross-county motor vehicle travel and requiring all national forests to designate roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle use on national forest system lands. In order for an unauthorized route or area to be designated for motor vehicle travel, it must first be added to the NFTS.

The STNF began the multi-step process of implementing the Travel Management Rule in 2005 by identifying approximately 5,219 unauthorized routes totaling 1,252 miles. These routes and the use occurring below the high-water marks in the reservoirs formed the basis for the subsequent detailed analysis, using an interdisciplinary process to identify proposals for limited additions to the NFTS. This process included a review of applicable law, regulation, and policy, input from the public, and preliminary effects analyses conducted by an earth science team. The action alternatives propose additions of various miles and acres in accordance with the 2005 Travel Management Rule at 36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B.

Also in accordance with Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR §212.56), following a decision on this proposal, the STNF will publish a motor vehicle use map (MVUM) identifying all NFTS roads, trails, and areas that are designated for motor vehicle use. The MVUM shall specify the classes of vehicles and season of use for which motor vehicle use is designated. Upon publication of the MVUM, possession or operation of a motor vehicle on NFS lands will be prohibited other than in accordance with those designations.

The STNF currently manages and maintains approximately 5,329 miles of NFTS roads and 87 miles of NFTS motorized trails with a variety of standards. This analysis does not revisit previous decisions that resulted in the current National Forest Transportation System. The current proposal is just one of many in

the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's continuing effort to manage the transportation system in a sustainable and cost-effective manner.

What Action is proposed?

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest (STNF) proposes the following actions:

(1) Prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel off designated National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads, motorized trails, and areas by the public except as allowed by permit or other authorization (excluding snowmobile use). The Forest is currently open to cross-country travel across 1,632,316 acres, including more than 1,200 miles of unauthorized routes and open areas below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir. This use is currently unregulated.

(2) Add approximately 44 miles of unauthorized routes (roads and trails) to the existing NFTS for public motor vehicle use, with seasonal and vehicle class restrictions assigned to some routes. The Forest is considering limited additions to the NFTS to improve motorized recreation opportunity and access. The routes would be selected based on their capability to benefit motorized recreation with minimal environmental impact.

(3) Add open areas below the high-water mark on Shasta Lake and Trinity Lake, with vehicle class restricted to highway-legal vehicles and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour to protect cultural resources. The motor vehicle use in the reservoir open areas provides access to the shoreline for day use activities and camping. The many cultural resources below the high-water marks would be protected with a speed limit and vehicle class restriction. Seasonal restrictions in the Trinity Lake open area were studied in the DEIS and subsequently removed from the proposed action.

(4) Amend the STNF's Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country travel. The Forest Plan currently allows motor vehicle travel off designated roads, trails, and areas. The Forest Plan would be amended to prohibit cross-country travel in compliance with the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212).

(5) Amend the Forest Plan to be consistent with motor vehicle use on six specific routes in or near cultural sites identified in the Forest Plan under Prescription XI: Heritage Resource Management. The routes are proposed because they provide valuable motorized recreation opportunity and access. Resource protection measures for the heritage sites are assigned and evaluated in this analysis.

Why is the Action being proposed?

1) All national forests are required to implement the 2005 Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212). This action is intended to implement Subpart B, which prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel off designated roads, trails, and areas in order to reverse the trend of resource damage that occurs with cross-country travel and the use and proliferation of unauthorized routes. Unmanaged motor vehicle

travel on the STNF has resulted in damage to natural and cultural resources across the landscape and below the high-water marks in the reservoirs. Motor vehicle travel must be addressed with a new and environmentally sound approach that meets the need for motorized recreation and access while protecting resources. The proposed action meets the requirements of the Travel Management Rule by prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel while adding roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS to provide motorized recreation access and opportunity. In particular, this action will provide access for dispersed recreation activities and will enhance the NFTS by providing additional loops, extended rides, and opportunities for diverse experiences for a variety of vehicle classes. The proposed routes and areas were selected for study because they address recreation needs for access and opportunity and expand the NFTS with minimal environmental impact.

2) In addition to prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel and expanding the NFTS, there is a need for consistency between the Forest Plan and the Travel Management Rule, CFR Part 212, Subpart B. A review of the Forest Plan has found that it is not fully consistent with the new Travel Management Rule. The current Forest Plan allows some public motor vehicle travel off designated routes. This use conflicts with the Travel Management Rule at 36 CFR 212.50(a) which states, “Motor vehicle use off designated roads and trails and outside designated areas is prohibited by 36 CFR 261.13.”

3) A second non-significant Forest Plan amendment is needed for consistency with the Forest Plan where it prohibits off-highway vehicle use in prescription XI cultural management areas (pages 4-50 - 4-51). Several NFTS routes in this area are important routes for OHV users and are currently in conflict with the prohibition of prescription XI. The proposed routes benefit motorized recreation by providing access to dispersed recreation sites or serving as part of an extended loop ride. Protection measures would be assigned to Prescription XI heritage resources to ensure the long-term integrity of these sites.

The underlying need to which the Shasta-Trinity National Forest is responding with this action is to protect natural and cultural resources from further damage by unmanaged motor vehicle travel across the landscape and in the reservoir open areas while providing for continued motorized recreation access and opportunity.

What would it mean not to meet the Needs?

The no-action alternative (alternative 1) was analyzed to disclose the effects of continuing the current management, which does not meet the needs described above.

If the proposed action or an action alternative is not selected and implemented, the continued unmanaged and unregulated cross-country motor vehicle travel would further harm natural and cultural resources, and continue to conflict with other uses. The cultural resources in the reservoirs and across the landscape would be subject to continued adverse effects from motorized recreation activities. Watersheds and aquatic habitats would continue to be at risk from the proliferation and use of routes created without

the benefit of engineering design or maintenance. The potential disturbance and trampling of wildlife and plants (including threatened, endangered, and sensitive species) would continue with unregulated year-round motor vehicle use. Conflicts with other uses, including non-motorized recreation and permitted uses in the reservoirs, would continue.

If the need for motorized recreation access and opportunity on the NFTS is not met, there will likely be increased violations as the public travels off the NFTS to pursue dispersed recreation activities.

If the proposed action or an action alternative is not selected and implemented, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest will be non-compliant with the federal regulatory mandate codified in the Travel Management Rule at 36 CFR 212.

Would Other Alternatives Meet the Need?

The process of scoping for this project included the investigation of concerns among Forest Service and other agency resource specialists as well as interaction with interested and affected individuals and organizations. Scoping identified the following significant issues which were used in developing the action alternatives:

Table S-1. List of significant issues

Issue # and Topic		
#1	Reduced Motorized Access and Recreation Opportunity	The proposed action will adversely affect the quality of motorized recreation and provides insufficient public access to STNF lands. The prohibition on cross-country travel, restrictions below the high-water mark of the reservoirs, and the addition of only 44 miles of routes to the NFTS unfairly limits motorized recreation.
#2	Impacts on Nonmotorized Recreation	Public motorized use of roads, trails, and open areas as described in the proposed action will adversely affect nonmotorized recreation experiences due to noise, damage to roads and resources, and user conflicts.
#3	Motor Vehicle Resource Impacts	Public motorized use of roads, trails, and areas as described in the proposed action will adversely affect natural resources including soils, water quality, vegetation, air quality, scenery, aquatic habitat and populations, and wildlife habitat and populations, and may increase sedimentation, erosion, and the spread of noxious weeds. Resources and experiences found in designated special areas in the national forest will be adversely affected as well.

The STNF developed and studied four additional action alternatives to meet the purpose and need and to respond to the significant issues listed above. The five alternatives (the proposed action, the no-action, and the three action alternatives) considered in detail for this analysis are listed in Table S-2. The alternatives are described fully in chapter 2 of this document. In addition, many alternatives were considered but eliminated from detailed analysis. These are also described in chapter 2.

Table S-2. List of alternatives considered in detail

Alternative 1: No-action Alternative	The no-action alternative provides a baseline for comparing the other alternatives. This alternative maintains the status quo. Under the no-action alternative, current management plans would continue to guide management of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. No changes would be made to the current NFTS (approximately 5,329 miles of roads and 87 miles of trails open to wheeled motor vehicle travel) and no cross-country travel prohibition would be implemented in areas that are currently open to cross-country summertime use. The Travel Management Rule would not be implemented, and no motor vehicle use map (MVUM) would be produced. Motor vehicle travel by the public would not be limited to designated routes and would continue on the existing unauthorized routes (1,252 miles). Cross-country travel could continue on 1,632,316 acres of national forest lands outside of designated wilderness. Unrestricted motor vehicle use below the high-water marks on the reservoirs would continue. The agency would take no affirmative action on any unauthorized routes or open areas.
Alternative 2: Proposed Action	Alternative 2 is the proposed action described in the notice of intent (NOI) published in the Federal Register on August 8, 2008 (Vol. 73, No.154), with some modifications. It was designed to meet the purpose and need for travel management as described in the NOI and includes additions to the NFTS that provide access to dispersed recreation sites. It was developed by the Forest's interdisciplinary team and included field surveys of many unauthorized routes. Alternative 2: · Prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel. · Adds 36.51 miles of NFTS roads and 7.69 miles of NFTS motorized trails, with seasonal and vehicle class restrictions assigned to some routes. · Adds open areas below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake (28,403 acres) and Trinity Lake (15,644 acres)[a] with vehicle class restricted to highway-legal vehicles and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour to protect cultural resources. · Amends the Forest Plan with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel. · Amends the Forest Plan to allow six specific routes in or near cultural sites identified in the Forest Plan under Prescription XI: Heritage Resource Management.
Modified Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	Modified Alternative 2 was developed in response to public comments on the DEIS and upon further study by the interdisciplinary team. This alternative is based on Alternative to and provides a balanced response to all significant issues. Modified Alternative 2: · Prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel. · Adds 21.34 miles of NFTS roads and 14.34 miles of NFTS motorized trails, with seasonal and vehicle class restrictions assigned to some routes. · Adds open areas below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake (28,403 acres) and Trinity Lake (15,644 acres)[a] with vehicle class restricted to highway-legal vehicles and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour to protect cultural resources. · Proposes motorized mixed-use on 21.31 miles of existing NFTS maintenance level 3 roads, · Amends the Forest Plan with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel.
Alternative 3: Cross Country Travel Prohibition Only	Alternative 3 responds to issues related to quiet, nonmotorized recreation and impacts to natural resources (significant issues #2 and #3) by prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel off of designated roads, trails, and areas. No facilities would be added to the NFTS. This alternative provides a baseline for comparing the impacts of other alternatives that propose additions to the NFTS. Alternative 3: · Prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel · Amends the Forest Plan with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel.

Alternative 4: Minimize Impacts to Natural Resources and Roadless Areas	Alternative 4 responds to the nonmotorized recreation and resource issues (significant issues #2 and #3) by limiting additions to the NFTS and increasing restrictions to reduce conflicts and to provide additional resource protection. This alternative prohibits cross-country travel and avoids additions and changes to the NFTS in areas where resource concerns were raised externally and internally. Alternative 4: · Prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel · Adds 0.88 miles as NFTS roads and 14.68 miles as NFTS motorized trails, with seasonal and vehicle class restrictions assigned to some routes. · Adds open areas below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake (28,403 acres), Trinity Lake (15,644 acres), and Iron Canyon Reservoir (429 acres)[a] with vehicle class restricted to highway-legal vehicles and a maximum speed limit of 10 miles per hour to protect cultural resources. · Proposes motorized mixed-use on 30.41 miles of existing NFTS maintenance level 3 roads, pending a mixed-use analysis and decision by the responsible official. · Amends the Forest Plan with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel.
Alternative 5: Improved Access and Motorized Recreation Opportunities	Alternative 5 responds to the motorized recreation access and opportunities issue (significant issue #1) by providing additional routes and reducing restrictions. Route additions and motorized mixed-use road segments were chosen to provide loops and extended rides. This alternative would maximize motorized recreation opportunities, including those accessing dispersed recreation activities. Alternative 5 incorporates many additions to the NFTS suggested by the public and intended to enhance access and motorized recreation opportunities. Alternative 5: · Prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel · Adds 43.49 miles as NFTS roads and 62.62 miles as NFTS motorized trails, with vehicle class and seasonal restrictions assigned to some routes. · Adds open areas below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake (28,403 acres), Trinity Lake (15,644 acres), and Iron Canyon Reservoir (429 acres)[a] with all vehicle classes allowed, and a maximum speed limit of 10 miles per hour to protect cultural resources. · Proposes motorized mixed-use on 30.41 miles of existing NFTS maintenance level 3 roads, pending a mixed-use analysis and decision by the responsible official. · Amends the Forest Plan with a non-significant amendment to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule in prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel · Amends the Forest Plan to allow seven specific routes in or near cultural sites identified in the Forest Plan under Prescription XI: Heritage Resource Management.

a - Actual acres of open areas below the high-water mark on the reservoirs vary depending on water levels and season of use restrictions. Topography further limits access by motor vehicles.

What are the Effects of the Alternatives?

The interdisciplinary team gave a hard look at the five alternatives to predict the environmental impacts associated with each. Resource evaluations include recreation, watersheds, aquatic resources, wildlife, cultural resources, botanical resources, non-native invasive plants, visual resources, inventoried roadless areas, socio-economics, transportation management, geology, and air quality. Each resource area used multiple and detailed measurement indicators to evaluate and disclose the estimated environmental effects. These are described along with data sources and methodology in each resource section in chapter 3.

The resource specialists evaluated the results of each analysis and ranked the environmental impact of each alternative by indicator. Table S-3 summarizes the environmental consequences by providing an average ranking of each alternative by resource area. Detailed information is in chapter 3. Rankings are scored on a scale of 1 to 5 from most (1) to least (5) impact. The effects of modified alternative 2 are discussed in chapter 3.

Table S-3. Comparison of environmental consequences

Resource Area	Rankings of alternatives, averaged across indicators				
	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Nonmotorized Recreation	1	3	4	3.5	2
Motorized Recreation	5	3	1	2	4
Watersheds	1	3.2	5	3.4	2.4
Aquatic Resources	1	3	5	4	2
Herpetofauna	1	3	5	4	2
Wildlife	1	3	5	4	2
Cultural Resources	1	3	5	4	2
Botany	1	3	5	4	2
Nonnative Invasive Species	1	3	5	4	2
Visuals	1	4	5	4.5	3.5
Roadless Areas	1	3	5	4	2
Air Quality	1	4	5	4	2.5
Geology	1	3	5	4	2

Are there any ways to mitigate adverse effects?

Implementation of the action alternatives were evaluated with mitigation measures incorporated to preclude adverse effects as follows:

Wildlife - season of use restrictions and retention of felled hazard trees in late-successional reserves.

Cultural resources – site avoidance, linear protection, padding, barriers, signage, education, vegetative screening, and closures on routes; speed limits, vehicle class restrictions, and closures in reservoir open areas.

Non-native invasive plants - hand treatment of known weed sites on designated routes.

Watersheds - best management practices and season of use restrictions.

Air quality – testing routes for presence of naturally occurring asbestos prior to designation in the Motor Vehicle Use Map.

Even with the above mitigation measures applied, the analyses indicate that adverse effects are expected as follows:

Prohibiting cross-country travel – While no biologically relevant adverse effects are expected from this action, social impacts would occur due to restricted motor vehicle access as discussed in the recreation analysis in this chapter. Mitigation measures have not been identified.

Additions to the NFTS – The potential exists for adverse effects to one cultural resource site accessed by two proposed routes. No effective protection measure allowing motor vehicle use in these routes is available in the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement with the State Historic Preservation

Officer (SHPO). Further consultation with SHPO is required if the routes are designated. In addition, Alternative 5 permits all vehicle classes including non-highway-legal vehicles in the open areas below the high water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir. This will allow access to a larger area of the lake bottoms than if vehicle class was restricted to highway legal only, and increases the potential for adverse effects to cultural resources. Although these effects will be monitored and mitigated according to the protection measures outlined in appendix E of the Motorized Recreation PA, alternative 5 may require further SHPO consultation to insure site protection.

Changes to the existing NFTS – Motorized mixed-use on the NFTS segments proposed and analyzed could result in adverse public safety concerns as discussed in appendix C. Mitigation measures were considered but safety concerns are not easily mitigated at this time and are predicted to be unavoidable if the routes are designated for motorized mixed-use.

Alternative 1 - Unavoidable adverse effects are expected due to continued cross-country motor vehicle travel and use of unauthorized routes, including those known to be adversely affecting forest resources. No mitigations would be proposed to reduce, avoid, or eliminate those effects.

What Factors will be used in making the Decision?

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest Supervisor is the responsible official for this project and will sign the record of decision to implement the proposed action, an alternative to the proposed action, or take no action.

The responsible official will consider how the alternatives meet the purpose and need for action; and will evaluate a combination of environmental, economic, social, and legal factors in deciding upon a course of action. Important considerations include:

- The legal requirement to adopt the Travel Management Rule and how the alternatives implement Subpart B of the Rule.
- The size of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's current transportation system and the recreation access and opportunities it supports.
- How proposed additions may diversify recreation opportunities on the NFTS.
- The Forest's ability to address the current road maintenance and administrative needs based on the availability of resources and funding.
- The environmental impacts of the current NFTS to national forest resources as well as the effects of proposed additions to the NFTS. The responsible official will carefully consider any unavoidable adverse effects and irretrievable or irreversible commitment of resources.

What Monitoring is Necessary that is not included in the Proposed Action or Alternatives?

Monitoring will continue in accordance with Forest Service policy and existing requirements directed by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. In addition, monitoring needs for particular resources are described in Appendix D: Mitigation and Monitoring and Appendix L: Cultural Resources Management. No additional monitoring beyond the required and proposed is anticipated.

Which Alternative is Preferred?

Based on consideration of the environmental consequences and other factors as noted above, alternative 2 with some modifications was found to best meet the purpose and need for action, and provide the best balance of environmental protection and motorized recreation opportunity and access. The selected alternative is identified and studied in the FEIS as “modified alternative 2.” The rationale is discussed in the accompanying Record of Decision.

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Route Specific Data A-1

Appendix B: Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions Relevant to Cumulative Effects B-1

Appendix C: Process for Designation of Motorized Mixed Use on Shasta-Trinity National Forest Roads C-1

Appendix D: Mitigation and Monitoring D-1

Appendix E: Law Enforcement E-1

Appendix F: Annual Maintenance Cost by Alternative F-1

Appendix G: Route Disposition G-1

Appendix H: Civil Rights Impact Analysis H-1

Appendix I: Analysis of Public Comment I-1

Appendix J: Public Uses (Roads) White Paper J-1

Appendix K: County Interests and Coordination K-1

Appendix L: Cultural Resource Management L-1

Appendix M: Comparison of Alternative 2 and Modified Alternative 2 ..... M-1

List of Tables

Table B-1. Shasta-Trinity National Forest special use authorizations B-3

Table B-2. Existing seasonal closures on NFTS routes B-4

Table B-3. Existing seasonal closures on NFTS routes to protect bald eagles B-8

Table B-4. Roads within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest managed by other agencies..... B-9

Table B-5. Present (current) and reasonably foreseeable projects, Shasta-Trinity National Forest B-10

Table B-6. Present and reasonably foreseeable road proposals and decisions on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest B-14

Table C-1. Existing NFTS level 3 roads proposed for motorized mixed-use in alternatives 4 and 5..... C-2

Table C-2. Existing NFTS level 3 roads proposed for motorized mixed-use in modified alternative 2 ..... C-3

Table C-3. Unauthorized routes proposed for all vehicle classes in alternatives 2, 4, and 5 ..... C-4

Table C-4. Unauthorized routes proposed for all vehicle classes in modified alternative 2 ..... C-5

Table D-1. Closures by route; the season of use for each route applies to all alternatives in which the route is proposed..... D-1

Table D-2. Existing seasonal restrictions for wildlife below the high water mark D-2

Table D-3. Routes in LSRs potentially affected by leaving felled hazard trees D-2

Table D-4. Specific proposed routes that will be monitored for impacts to known botanical resources by alternative D-3

Table D-5. Noxious weed sites on proposed trail routes that will be treated by hand by alternative D-4

Table D-6. Seasonal restrictions by route number to mitigate erosion hazards D-4

Table D-7. Routes tested for naturally occurring asbestos prior to designation on the motor vehicle use map D-10

Table F-1. Miles of NFTS roads combined with proposed additions F-1

Table G-1. Resource Ranking Criteria..... G-4

Table I- 1. Public concern statements by commenter's name and organization I-4

Table I- 2. Public concern statements organized by subject I-10

Table I- 3. Response to site-specific road, trail and area comments I-163

Table I- 4. Response to comment attachments.....I-180

Table J-1. Road Mileage on the Shasta-Trinity NF by Maintenance Level (1/15/2010)..... J-2

Table L-1. Primary site protection and monitoring measures L-2

Table L-2. Heritage mitigations by route L-4

Table L-3. Routes in or near LRMP heritage resources management prescription XI sites L-6

Table L-4. Heritage monitoring interval L-10

Table L-5. Potential effects to, and management of, cultural resources by route L-14

Table L-6. Potential effects to, and management of, lake-bottom sites grouped by effect L-22

Appendix A: Route Specific Data

Appendix A is comprised of two parts. The first part is a set of tables which display changes to the NFTS by alternative. The second part of the appendix displays the site specific resource information and required mitigation measures for each unauthorized route proposed for addition to the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS).

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

Alternative 2 - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Level 2 Roads						
JG30	2	0.18	$801	$96	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JG31	2	0.21	$952	$114	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM244	2	0.96	$4,384	$524	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM25	2	0.19	$879	$105	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM44	2	0.15	$695	$83	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM72	2	0.06	$288	$34	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Dec. 31
NRA1	2	0.60	$2,722	$326	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA2	2	0.30	$1,356	$162	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA3	2	0.22	$993	$119	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
pm2004	2	0.32	$1,459	$174	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
pm304	2	0.03	$148	$18	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
rm1036	2	2.16	$9,802	$1,172	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
rm706	2	0.07	$318	$38	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE194	2	0.04	$181	$22	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE314	2	0.07	$329	$39	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE416	2	2.04	$9,287	$1,111	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE476	2	0.16	$748	$89	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE477	2	0.15	$702	$84	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE508	2	0.12	$557	$67	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU13	2	0.26	$1,197	$143	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU17	2	0.04	$173	$21	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU18	2	0.03	$128	$15	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Jan. 31
SFMU4	2	0.02	$ 75	$9	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU5	2	0.06	$266	$32	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU6	2	0.02	$ 75	$9	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU7	2	0.01	$ 55	$7	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong

Alternative 2 - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
SW234	2	0.14	$624	$75	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1004	2	0.12	$556	$67	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1098	2	0.05	$215	$26	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1238	2	0.04	$180	$22	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC349	2	0.22	$989	$118	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC828	2	0.08	$347	$41	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC838	2	0.14	$657	$79	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC899	2	0.06	$274	$33	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU2	2	0.54	$2,453	$293	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU3	2	0.15	$690	$83	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU5	2	0.22	$1,004	$120	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU6	2	0.15	$696	$83	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1B005A	2	0.09	$424	$51	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1S39B	2	0.23	$1,037	$124	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U27N02G	2	0.09	$424	$51	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U29N28D	2	1.55	$7,020	$840	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U30N27S	2	0.05	$238	$29	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U30N29E	2	0.74	$3,375	$404	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U34N26DA	2	0.26	$1,195	$143	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U34N26DAA	2	0.09	$413	$49	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U35N05A	2	1.74	$7,909	$946	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U35N85A	2	0.19	$867	$104	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U36N35AA	2	0.71	$3,209	$384	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U36N35AB	2	0.10	$453	$54	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N13D	2	0.71	$3,241	$388	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N35A	2	0.65	$2,934	$351	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N84AA	2	1.59	$7,237	$866	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N88XCB	2	0.49	$2,232	$267	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N88XE	2	0.25	$1,148	$137	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N91YA	2	0.63	$2,857	$342	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414A	2	0.59	$2,671	$319	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414C	2	0.19	$885	$106	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414CA	2	0.12	$542	$65	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414D	2	0.15	$670	$80	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414F	2	0.18	$829	$99	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414FA	2	0.04	$187	$22	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18A	2	2.52	$11,441	$1,368	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18AA	2	2.08	$9,464	$1,132	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong

Alternative 2 - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
U41N18AAD	2	0.82	$3,722	$445	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N55D	2	1.21	$5,493	$657	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N55E	2	1.60	$7,262	$869	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U42N18A	2	3.89	$17,656	$2,112	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U42N18AA	2	2.43	$11,024	$1,319	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12L	2	0.06	$285	$34	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12LA	2	0.06	$254	$30	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**36.51**	**$165,854**	**$19,837**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Trails						
pm702	Motorized Trail	0.04	$174	$21	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
rm090	Motorized Trail	0.07	$299	$36	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
rm1226	Motorized Trail	0.10	$450	$54	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
SW256	Motorized Trail	0.33	$1,515	$181	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC1249	Motorized Trail	0.06	$250	$30	All Trail Class Vehicles	Aug. 16-Jan. 31
TC1829	Motorized Trail	0.14	$659	$79	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC319	Motorized Trail	0.12	$522	$62	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U29N28C	Motorized Trail	0.51	$2,318	$277	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
U31N02Q	Motorized Trail	0.28	$1,271	$152	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U4N12D	Motorized Trail	3.38	$15,351	$1,836	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV01X	Motorized Trail	0.36	$1,613	$193	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UOHV02J	Motorized Trail	0.53	$2,410	$288	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV18	Motorized Trail	0.15	$697	$83	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV50A	Motorized Trail	0.43	$1,969	$236	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UOHV50C	Motorized Trail	0.14	$633	$76	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UT29N30HA	Motorized Trail	0.80	$3,655	$437	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UT29N30HAB	Motorized Trail	0.25	$1,153	$138	50" and less in width	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**7.69**	**$34,939.00**	**$4,179.00**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Alternative 2 Modified

Alternative 2 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Level 2 Roads						
IV001	2	0.02	$ 80	$10	All vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV002	2	0.01	$ 65	$8	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV007	2	0.06	$273	$33	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV008	2	0.01	$ 54	$6	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV009	2	0.07	$305	$36	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV010	2	0.07	$297	$36	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV011	2	0.03	$140	$17	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV012	2	0.02	$ 69	$8	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV013	2	0.04	$167	$20	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV014	2	0.06	$260	$31	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV015	2	0.07	$119	$101	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV016	2	0.04	$ 59	$50	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV017	2	0.02	$ 36	$31	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV018	2	0.05	$ 85	$72	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV020	2	0.06	$ 88	$75	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV021	2	0.04	$ 67	$57	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM72	2	0.06	$101	$86	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Dec. 31
NRA2	2	0.30	$476	$403	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA3	2	0.22	$348	$295	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
pm304	2	0.03	$ 52	$44	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
rm1036	2	2.16	$3,438	$2,913	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE416	2	2.04	$3,257	$2,760	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE508	2	0.12	$195	$166	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU17	2	0.04	$ 61	$51	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU18	2	0.03	$ 45	$38	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Jan. 31
SFMU5	2	0.06	$ 93	$79	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU7	2	0.01	$ 19	$16	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC349	2	0.22	$347	$294	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC838	2	0.14	$231	$195	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC857	2	0.49	$786	$666	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC899	2	0.06	$ 96	$81	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1B005A	2	0.09	$149	$126	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1S39B	2	0.23	$364	$308	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U29N28D	2	1.55	$2,462	$2,086	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U30N27S	2	0.05	$ 84	$71	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong

Alternative 2 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
U30N29E	2	0.74	$1,184	$1,003	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U36N35AA	2	0.71	$1,126	$954	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U36N35AB	2	0.10	$159	$134	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N13D	2	0.71	$1,137	$963	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N35A	2	0.65	$1,029	$872	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N84AA	2	1.59	$2,538	$2,151	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N88XCB	2	0.49	$783	$663	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N91YA	2	0.63	$1,002	$849	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18A	2	2.52	$4,013	$3,400	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18AA	2	2.08	$3,320	$2,813	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U42N18AA	2	2.43	$3,867	$3,276	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12L	2	0.06	$100	$85	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12LA	2	0.06	$ 89	$76	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**21.34**	**$35,114**	**$28,507**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Trails						
NRA1	Motorized Trail	0.60	$955	$809	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
pm211	Motorized Trail	1.43	$2,283	$1,934	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm216	Motorized Trail	0.34	$547	$464	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm090	Motorized Trail	0.07	$105	$89	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
rm1101	Motorized Trail	0.29	$465	$394	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1216	Motorized Trail	0.39	$614	$520	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1226	Motorized Trail	0.10	$158	$134	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
rm145	Motorized Trail	0.37	$593	$503	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm146	Motorized Trail	0.56	$894	$757	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1603	Motorized Trail	0.29	$470	$398	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm720	Motorized Trail	0.27	$433	$367	50" and less in width	Yearlong
SFMU9	Motorized Trail	0.02	$ 37	$31	50" and less in width	Yearlong
SW234	Motorized Trail	0.14	$219	$185	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
SW256	Motorized Trail	0.33	$531	$450	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC1489	Motorized Trail	1.78	$2,838	$2,405	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC1829	Motorized Trail	0.14	$231	$196	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC319	Motorized Trail	0.12	$183	$155	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
TC508	Motorized Trail	0.24	$387	$328	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC851	Motorized Trail	0.07	$117	$99	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC855	Motorized Trail	0.32	$504	$427	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC856	Motorized Trail	0.04	$ 64	$55	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC860	Motorized Trail	0.05	$ 74	$63	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N31H	Motorized Trail	0.26	$411	$348	50" and less in width	Yearlong

Alternative 2 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
U29N33B	Motorized Trail	0.91	$1,442	$1,222	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N73E	Motorized Trail	0.14	$222	$188	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N73G	Motorized Trail	0.98	$1,558	$1,320	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U30N36B	Motorized Trail	0.86	$1,364	$1,155	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U34N26DA	Motorized Trail	0.26	$419	$355	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U34N26DAA	Motorized Trail	0.09	$145	$123	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414A	Motorized Trail	0.59	$937	$794	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414C	Motorized Trail	0.19	$310	$263	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414CA	Motorized Trail	0.12	$190	$161	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414D	Motorized Trail	0.15	$235	$199	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414F	Motorized Trail	0.18	$291	$246	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
U414FA	Motorized Trail	0.04	$ 66	$56	All Trail Class Vehicles	Yearlong
UOHV01X	Motorized Trail	0.36	$566	$479	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV02J	Motorized Trail	0.53	$845	$716	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV18	Motorized Trail	0.15	$244	$207	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV50A	Motorized Trail	0.43	$691	$585	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UOHV50C	Motorized Trail	0.14	$222	$188	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**14.35**	**$22,862**	**$19,371**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Alternative 3 – Cross-country Travel Prohibition Only

There are no changes to the existing transportation system under alternative 3.

Alternative 4 – In Response to Resource Issues

Alternative 4 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Level 2 Roads						
mc090	2	0.88	$1,394	$1,182	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Jan. 31
Totals	**N/A**	**0.88**	**$1,394**	**$1,182**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Trails						
ea495	Motorized Trail	0.45	$716	$607	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea512	Motorized Trail	0.49	$778	$659	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea514	Motorized Trail	0.20	$315	$267	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea514b	Motorized Trail	0.45	$725	$614	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea515	Motorized Trail	0.37	$594	$503	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea516	Motorized Trail	0.28	$444	$376	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea523	Motorized Trail	0.75	$1,203	$1,019	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea530	Motorized Trail	0.40	$635	$538	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea531	Motorized Trail	0.40	$639	$542	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532	Motorized Trail	0.14	$223	$189	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532a	Motorized Trail	0.72	$1,144	$970	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532b	Motorized Trail	0.50	$801	$679	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea535	Motorized Trail	0.87	$1,390	$1,178	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea537	Motorized Trail	1.06	$1,689	$1,431	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea593	Motorized Trail	0.30	$471	$399	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm090	Motorized Trail	0.07	$105	$89	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1212	Motorized Trail	0.15	$235	$199	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm789	Motorized Trail	0.10	$161	$137	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm790	Motorized Trail	0.10	$156	$132	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm791	Motorized Trail	0.16	$258	$219	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm792	Motorized Trail	0.03	$ 54	$46	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
U33N51F	Motorized Trail	0.32	$511	$433	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U40N84B	Motorized Trail	0.75	$1,200	$1,017	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N26C	Motorized Trail	3.81	$6,066	$5,140	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N26E	Motorized Trail	1.81	$2,877	$2,438	50" and less in width	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**14.68**	**$23,392**	**$19,820**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Alternative 5 – In Response to Access Issues

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Level 2 Roads						
IV001	2	0.02	$ 28	$24	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV002	2	0.01	$ 23	$19	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV007	2	0.08	$ 130	$110	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV008	2	0.01	$ 19	$16	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV009	2	0.07	$107	$91	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV010	2	0.07	$104	$88	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV011	2	0.03	$ 49	$42	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV012	2	0.02	$ 24	$21	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV013	2	0.04	$ 59	$50	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV014	2	0.06	$ 91	$77	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV015	2	0.07	$119	$101	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV016	2	0.04	$ 59	$50	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV017	2	0.02	$ 36	$31	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV018	2	0.05	$ 85	$72	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV020	2	0.06	$ 88	$75	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
IV021	2	0.04	$ 67	$57	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JG30	2	0.18	$281	$238	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JG31	2	0.21	$334	$283	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM244	2	0.96	$1,538	$1,303	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM25	2	0.19	$308	$261	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM44	2	0.15	$244	$207	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
JM72	2	0.06	$101	$86	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Dec. 31
mc090	2	0.88	$1,394	$1,182	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Jan.31
mc091	2	0.20	$312	$265	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA1	2	0.60	$955	$809	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA2	2	0.30	$476	$403	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
NRA3	2	0.22	$348	$295	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
pm2004	2	0.32	$512	$433	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
pm304	2	0.03	$ 52	$44	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
rm1036	2	2.16	$3,438	$2,913	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
rm706	2	0.07	$112	$95	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE194	2	0.04	$ 64	$54	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE314	2	0.07	$115	$98	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE416	2	2.04	$3,257	$2,760	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE476	2	0.16	$262	$222	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
SE477	2	0.15	$246	$209	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SE508	2	0.12	$195	$166	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU13	2	0.26	$420	$356	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU17	2	0.04	$ 61	$51	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU18	2	0.03	$ 45	$38	All Vehicle Classes	Aug. 16-Jan.31
SFMU4	2	0.02	$ 26	$22	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU5	2	0.06	$ 93	$79	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU6	2	0.02	$ 26	$22	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SFMU7	2	0.01	$ 19	$16	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
SW234	2	0.14	$219	$185	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1004	2	0.12	$195	$165	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1098	2	0.05	$ 76	$64	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1238	2	0.04	$ 63	$53	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1451	2	0.13	$207	$176	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1451A	2	0.17	$264	$223	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1462A	2	1.69	$2,697	$2,285	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC1489	2	1.78	$2,838	$2,405	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC349	2	0.22	$347	$294	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC828	2	0.08	$122	$103	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC838	2	0.14	$231	$195	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC857	2	0.49	$786	$666	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TC899	2	0.06	$ 96	$81	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU2	2	0.54	$860	$729	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU3	2	0.15	$242	$205	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU5	2	0.22	$352	$298	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
TRMU6	2	0.15	$244	$207	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1B005A	2	0.09	$149	$126	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U1S39B	2	0.23	$364	$308	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U27N02G	2	0.09	$149	$126	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U29N28D	2	1.55	$2,462	$2,086	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U29N73G	2	0.98	$1,558	$1,320	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U30N27S	2	0.05	$ 84	$71	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U30N29E	2	0.74	$1,184	$1,003	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U34N26DA	2	0.26	$419	$355	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U34N26DAA	2	0.09	$145	$123	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U35N05A	2	1.74	$2,774	$2,351	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U35N85A	2	0.19	$304	$258	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U36N35AA	2	0.71	$1,126	$954	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
U36N35AB	2	0.10	$159	$134	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N13D	2	0.71	$1,137	$963	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N35A	2	0.65	$1,029	$872	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N84AA	2	1.59	$2,538	$2,151	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N88XCB	2	0.49	$783	$663	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N88XE	2	0.25	$403	$341	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U40N91YA	2	0.63	$1,002	$849	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414A	2	0.59	$937	$794	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414C	2	0.19	$310	$263	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414CA	2	0.12	$190	$161	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414D	2	0.15	$235	$199	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414F	2	0.18	$291	$246	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U414FA	2	0.04	$ 66	$56	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18A	2	2.52	$4,013	$3,400	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18AA	2	2.08	$3,320	$2,813	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N18AAD	2	0.82	$1,306	$1,106	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N55D	2	1.21	$1,927	$1,633	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U41N55E	2	1.60	$2,547	$2,158	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U42N18A	2	3.89	$6,193	$5,247	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U42N18AA	2	2.43	$3,867	$3,276	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12L	2	0.06	$100	$85	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
U4N12LA	2	0.06	$ 89	$76	All Vehicle Classes	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**43.51**	**$69,318**	**$58,733**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Unauthorized Routes Converted to Trails						
ea073	Motorized Trail	0.31	$488	$413	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea284	Motorized Trail	0.68	$1,085	$919	50" and less in width	Aug. 16-Jan.31
ea333	Motorized Trail	0.21	$337	$286	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea334	Motorized Trail	0.73	$1,160	$983	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea339	Motorized Trail	1.90	$3,022	$2,560	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea345	Motorized Trail	0.25	$398	$337	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea472	Motorized Trail	0.05	$ 82	$69	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea473	Motorized Trail	0.49	$782	$662	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea474	Motorized Trail	0.62	$994	$842	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea475	Motorized Trail	0.17	$263	$223	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea495	Motorized Trail	0.45	$716	$607	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea512	Motorized Trail	0.49	$778	$659	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea514	Motorized Trail	0.20	$315	$267	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea514b	Motorized Trail	0.45	$725	$614	50" and less in width	Yearlong

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
ea515	Motorized Trail	0.37	$594	$503	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea516	Motorized Trail	0.28	$444	$376	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea523	Motorized Trail	0.75	$1,203	$1,019	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea530	Motorized Trail	0.40	$635	$538	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea531	Motorized Trail	0.40	$639	$542	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532	Motorized Trail	0.14	$223	$189	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532a	Motorized Trail	0.72	$1,144	$970	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea532b	Motorized Trail	0.50	$801	$679	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea535	Motorized Trail	0.87	$1,390	$1,178	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea537	Motorized Trail	1.06	$1,689	$1,431	50" and less in width	Yearlong
ea593	Motorized Trail	0.30	$471	$399	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc092	Motorized Trail	0.22	$350	$297	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc097	Motorized Trail	0.10	$161	$136	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc098	Motorized Trail	0.31	$488	$414	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc102	Motorized Trail	0.67	$1,072	$908	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc104	Motorized Trail	0.17	$275	$233	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc105	Motorized Trail	0.05	$ 75	$63	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc106	Motorized Trail	0.26	$409	$346	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc110	Motorized Trail	0.44	$706	$598	50" and less in width	Yearlong
mc115	Motorized Trail	0.74	$1,179	$999	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pc025	Motorized Trail	2.10	$3,339	$2,829	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pc026	Motorized Trail	0.21	$331	$280	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm047	Motorized Trail	0.14	$224	$190	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm048	Motorized Trail	0.17	$274	$232	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm052	Motorized Trail	0.20	$326	$276	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm211	Motorized Trail	1.43	$2,283	$1,934	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm216	Motorized Trail	0.34	$547	$464	50" and less in width	Yearlong
pm702	Motorized Trail	0.04	$ 61	$52	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm090	Motorized Trail	0.07	$105	$89	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1101	Motorized Trail	0.29	$465	$394	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1206	Motorized Trail	0.47	$742	$629	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1210	Motorized Trail	0.07	$107	$91	50" and less in width	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1211	Motorized Trail	0.12	$189	$160	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1212	Motorized Trail	0.15	$235	$199	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1213	Motorized Trail	0.08	$134	$113	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1216	Motorized Trail	0.39	$614	$520	Motorcycle Only	May 1-Oct. 30
rm1226	Motorized Trail	0.10	$158	$134	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm145	Motorized Trail	0.37	$593	$503	50" and less in width	Yearlong

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	Proposed Operational Maintenance Level	Miles	Implementation Costs	Annual Maintenance Costs	Vehicle Class	Season of Use
rm146	Motorized Trail	0.56	$894	$757	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm1603	Motorized Trail	0.29	$470	$398	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm720	Motorized Trail	0.27	$433	$367	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm737	Motorized Trail	0.23	$362	$307	50" and less in width	Yearlong
rm789	Motorized Trail	0.10	$161	$137	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm790	Motorized Trail	0.10	$156	$132	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm791	Motorized Trail	0.16	$258	$219	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm792	Motorized Trail	0.03	$ 54	$46	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
rm793	Motorized Trail	0.71	$1,136	$962	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
SE512	Motorized Trail	0.52	$825	$699	50" and less in width	Yearlong
SFMU9	Motorized Trail	0.02	$ 37	$31	50" and less in width	Yearlong
SW256	Motorized Trail	0.33	$531	$450	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC1249	Motorized Trail	0.06	$ 88	$74	50" and less in width	Aug. 16-Jan.31
TC1427	Motorized Trail	1.04	$1,659	$1,406	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC1491	Motorized Trail	0.38	$611	$518	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC1829	Motorized Trail	0.14	$231	$196	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC319	Motorized Trail	0.12	$183	$155	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC507	Motorized Trail	0.62	$994	$842	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC508	Motorized Trail	0.24	$387	$328	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC851	Motorized Trail	0.07	$117	$99	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC855	Motorized Trail	0.32	$504	$427	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC856	Motorized Trail	0.04	$ 64	$55	50" and less in width	Yearlong
TC860	Motorized Trail	0.05	$ 74	$63	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N28C	Motorized Trail	0.51	$813	$689	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N31H	Motorized Trail	0.26	$411	$348	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N33B	Motorized Trail	0.91	$1,442	$1,222	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U29N73E	Motorized Trail	0.14	$222	$188	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U30N36B	Motorized Trail	0.86	$1,364	$1,155	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U31N02Q	Motorized Trail	0.28	$446	$378	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U33N51F	Motorized Trail	0.32	$511	$433	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U40N50A	Motorized Trail	0.51	$806	$683	50" and less in width	Aug. 16-Jan.31
U40N84B	Motorized Trail	0.75	$1,200	$1,017	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15D	Motorized Trail	0.20	$318	$270	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15DA	Motorized Trail	0.67	$1,070	$907	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15H	Motorized Trail	0.29	$459	$389	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15J	Motorized Trail	1.56	$2,487	$2,107	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15K	Motorized Trail	0.54	$863	$732	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15KA	Motorized Trail	0.21	$330	$280	50" and less in width	Yearlong

Alternative 5 Modified - Changes to National Forest Transportation System						
Route Number	**Proposed Operational Maintenance Level**	**Miles**	**Implementation Costs**	**Annual Maintenance Costs**	**Vehicle Class**	**Season of Use**
U42N15M	Motorized Trail	0.95	$1,517	$1,286	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15MC	Motorized Trail	1.10	$1,751	$1,483	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15N	Motorized Trail	0.14	$230	$195	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15NA	Motorized Trail	0.83	$1,326	$1,124	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N15NB	Motorized Trail	0.24	$387	$328	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N18B	Motorized Trail	1.07	$1,712	$1,451	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N26C	Motorized Trail	3.81	$6,066	$5,140	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N26E	Motorized Trail	1.81	$2,877	$2,438	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N73A	Motorized Trail	0.35	$561	$476	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N73AA	Motorized Trail	0.03	$ 44	$37	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N73B	Motorized Trail	0.36	$567	$481	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N84C	Motorized Trail	0.40	$636	$539	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U42N84CA	Motorized Trail	0.07	$111	$94	50" and less in width	Yearlong
U4N12D	Motorized Trail	3.38	$5,384	$4,562	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV01X	Motorized Trail	0.36	$566	$479	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV02J	Motorized Trail	0.53	$845	$716	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV18	Motorized Trail	0.15	$244	$207	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UOHV50A	Motorized Trail	0.43	$691	$585	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UOHV50C	Motorized Trail	0.14	$222	$188	Motorcycle Only	Yearlong
UT29N30HA	Motorized Trail	0.80	$1,282	$1,086	50" and less in width	Yearlong
UT29N30HAB	Motorized Trail	0.25	$404	$343	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we006	Motorized Trail	0.49	$782	$663	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we007	Motorized Trail	1.01	$1,606	$1,360	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we019	Motorized Trail	1.55	$2,466	$2,089	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we022	Motorized Trail	0.84	$1,334	$1,130	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we039	Motorized Trail	1.22	$1,947	$1,649	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we040	Motorized Trail	0.09	$144	$122	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we043	Motorized Trail	1.11	$1,766	$1,497	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we067	Motorized Trail	0.06	$102	$86	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we072	Motorized Trail	0.09	$143	$121	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we540	Motorized Trail	0.88	$1,399	$1,185	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we542	Motorized Trail	0.39	$614	$520	50" and less in width	Yearlong
we545	Motorized Trail	0.79	$1,255	$1,063	50" and less in width	Yearlong
Totals	**N/A**	**62.62**	**$99,775**	**$84,539**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Route Cards

The following pages display specific information for each proposed motorized road or trail to be added to the NFTS.

- The unique route ID number for each proposed route which is used throughout the document and on maps.
- A description of the road or trail including vehicle class, season of use, length (miles), alternatives that include the route, opportunity type (access, motorized recreation, or both), and location.
- Site specific information for each route including;
    - Resource information regarding watershed, botany, wildlife, fisheries, cultural resources, and recreation.
- Mitigation measures required for each resource mentioned above (if any). Required mitigation measures do not include routine operation and maintenance activities such brushing, signing, clearing, culvert and bridge maintenance, debris slide clearance, patrolling routes, etc.
- Monitoring requirements, if applicable, should the motorized trail be added to the NFTS.

Route Number	**ea073**	Length (Miles)	**0.31**	Map Location	**T40N, R3E, Sec 5**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **The ineligible site was revisited and route was surveyed, the railroad spur in that area has been converted to a system road. No effect to Cultural Resources** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea284**	Length (Miles)	**0.68**	Map Location	**T42N, R2E, Sec 18**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Aug. 16-Jan.31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route goes through northern goshawk habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: August 16 to January 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea333**	Length (Miles)	**0.21**	Map Location	**T40N, R3E, Sec 33**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed. Railroad spur is now a road. No effect to Cultural Resources** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	ea334	Length (Miles)	0.73	Map Location	T40N, R3E, Sec 34

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	24-50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

No soils or watershed concerns for this route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Linear features were revisited and surveyed. The historic railroad spur now a road or is indistinguishable for most of the length of the route. A very short section of poor grade was located off to the south-west of the route.

Mitigation Measures

There will be no effect for most of the railroad spur, but barricading the short spur may be necessary pending evaluation.

Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**ea339**	Length (Miles)	**1.90**	Map Location	**T40N, R3E, Sec 34**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Linear features were revisited and surveyed. One spur is 30 m or more from route, and another spur is indistiguishable** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques. Flag for avoidance if heavy equipment used in route conversion to NFTS.** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea345**	Length (Miles)	**0.25**	Map Location	**T40N, R3E, Sec 30**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Logging camp site was revisited and route was surveyed. No features remain at site; railroad grade will require barriers.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Near vernal pool in an area of suspected tadpole habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea472**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T40N, R2E, Sec 4**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	ea473	Length (Miles)	0.49	Map Location	T40N, R2E, Sec 4

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea474**	Length (Miles)	**0.62**	Map Location	**T40N, R2E, Sec 4**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Area was revisited. A railroad spur is indistinguishable throughout the entire area. The route is within a large recently logged plantation** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea475**	Length (Miles)	**0.17**	Map Location	**T40N, R2E, Sec 4**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Area was revisited. A railroad spur is indistinguishable throughout the entire area. The route is within a large recently logged plantation** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea495**	Length (Miles)	**0.45**	Map Location	**T41N, R2E, Sec 21**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea512**	Length (Miles)	**0.49**	Map Location	**T41N, R4E, Sec 17**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea514**	Length (Miles)	**0.20**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 32**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea514b**	Length (Miles)	**0.45**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 32**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea515**	Length (Miles)	**0.37**	Map Location	**T41N, R4E, Sec 6**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea516**	Length (Miles)	**0.28**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 32**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea523**	Length (Miles)	**0.75**	Map Location	**T42N, R3E, Sec 36**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea530**	Length (Miles)	**0.40**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 32**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea531**	Length (Miles)	**0.40**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 32**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	ea532	Length (Miles)	0.14	Map Location	T42N, R3E, Sec 36

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	24-50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea532a**	Length (Miles)	**0.72**	Map Location	**T42N, R3E, Sec 25**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea532b**	Length (Miles)	**0.50**	Map Location	**T42N, R3E, Sec 36**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea535**	Length (Miles)	**0.87**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea537**	Length (Miles)	**1.06**	Map Location	**T41N, R4E, Sec 6**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**ea593**	Length (Miles)	**0.30**	Map Location	**T43N, R3E, Sec 22**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV001**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV003**	Length (Miles)	**0.00**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
Routes IV003. IV004, IV005, IV006, and IV007 combined and listed on route card for IV007 with a total mileage of 0.06 miles					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV004**	Length (Miles)	**0.00**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
Routes IV003. IV004, IV005, IV006, and IV007 combined and listed on route card for IV007 with a total mileage of 0.06 miles					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV005**	Length (Miles)	**0.00**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

Routes IV003. IV004, IV005, IV006, and IV007 combined and listed on route card for IV007 with a total mileage of 0.06 miles

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**IV006**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
Routes IV003. IV004, IV005, IV006, and IV007 combined and listed on route card for IV007 with a total mileage of 0.06 miles					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV007**	Length (Miles)	**0.06**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
Routes IV003. IV004, IV005, IV006, and IV007 combined and listed on route card for IV007 with a total mileage of 0.06 miles					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV008**	Length (Miles)	**0.01**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV009**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV010**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV011**	Length (Miles)	**0.03**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV012**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV013**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements — **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**IV014**	Length (Miles)	**0.06**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV015**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV016**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV017**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV018**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T2N, R7E, Sec 25**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV020**	Length (Miles)	**0.06**	Map Location	**T2N, R7E, Sec 25**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**IV021**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	JG30	Length (Miles)	0.18	Map Location	T36N, R7W, Sec 22
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	ATV	Tread Width	24-50 Inches	Corridor Width	24-50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	JG31	Length (Miles)	0.21	Map Location	T36N, R7W, Sec 15
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	ATV	Tread Width	24-50 Inches	Corridor Width	24-50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**JM244**	Length (Miles)	**0.96**	Map Location	**T36N, R7W, Sec 1**
Field Review Comments					
Main access to camp sites.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Site is minimally impacted. No revisit or survey necessary.** Mitigation Measures **Place barriers and vegetative screening** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	JM25	Length (Miles)	0.19	Map Location	T36N, R7W, Sec 1
Field Review Comments					
Access to lake, etc.					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**JM44**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T36N, R7W, Sec 15**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	JM72	Length (Miles)	0.06	Map Location	T36N, R7W, Sec 2
Field Review Comments					
Access to lake and camping.					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Dec. 31**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Dec. 31**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Dec. 31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route goes through bald eagle habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: August 16 to December 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc090**	Length (Miles)	**0.88**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 2**
Field Review Comments					
Turns into trail on north end.					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Jan. 31**
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Jan.31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route goes through northern goshawk habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: August 16 to January 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Not within a Riparian Reserve** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc091**	Length (Miles)	**0.20**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 2**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Non-fish-bearing non-perennial stream with crossing** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc092**	Length (Miles)	**0.22**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 3**
	Field Review Comments				
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Non-fish-bearing non-perennial stream** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc097**	Length (Miles)	**0.10**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 3**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc098**	Length (Miles)	**0.31**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 3**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc102**	Length (Miles)	**0.67**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 7**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc104**	Length (Miles)	**0.17**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 7**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc105**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 7**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc106**	Length (Miles)	**0.26**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 7**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc110**	Length (Miles)	**0.44**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 18**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**mc115**	Length (Miles)	**0.74**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 18**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area		Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area			

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**NRA1**	Length (Miles)	**0.60**	Map Location	**T34N, R8W, Sec 28**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**NRA2**	Length (Miles)	**0.30**	Map Location	**T36N, R7W, Sec 17**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	NRA3	Length (Miles)	0.22	Map Location	T36N, R7W, Sec 8
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Isatis tinctoria -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**pc025**	Length (Miles)	**2.10**	Map Location	**T40N, R5W, Sec 36**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**pc026**	Length (Miles)	**0.21**	Map Location	**T40N, R5W, Sec 36**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**PM047**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T30N, R120w, Sec 35**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150' and 300 feet of 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**PM048**	Length (Miles)	**0.17**	Map Location	**T30N, R120w, Sec 35**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**pm052**	Length (Miles)	**0.20**	Map Location	**T29N, R120w, Sec 2**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**pm2004**	Length (Miles)	**0.32**	Map Location	**T27N, R10W, Sec 7**
Field Review Comments					
Traverses plantation to hunter's camp.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Site is minimally impacted. No revisit or survey necessary.** Mitigation Measures **Place barrriers and vegetative screening using linear protection techniques.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**PM211**	Length (Miles)	**1.43**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 7**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**PM216**	Length (Miles)	**0.34**	Map Location	**T29N, R120w, Sec 13**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					

Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred. One cultural resource was not relocated.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**pm304**	Length (Miles)	**0.03**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 20**
Field Review Comments					
***Dubakella Creek. Fire ring and camp present.**					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known Cultural resource was revisited and does not require mitigation.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route in riparian reserve of non-fish-bearing stream** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**pm702**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T1S, R7E, Sec 36**
Field Review Comments					
This is a wide spot by the road.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	rm090	Length (Miles)	0.07	Map Location	T28N, R10W, Sec 8

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

No soils or watershed concerns for this route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**rm1036**	Length (Miles)	**2.16**	Map Location	**T27N, R9W, Sec 5**
Field Review Comments					
Good road. Well maintained. Eastern portion can be fixed with 2 waterbars.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Forest Plan Endemic Ericameria ophitidis present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Site is minimally impacted. No revisit or survey necessary.** Mitigation Measures **Place barriers and vegetative screening, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**RM1101**	Length (Miles)	**0.29**	Map Location	**T28N, R10W, Sec 21**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**rm1206**	Length (Miles)	**0.47**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 23**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Beegum**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1210**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 27**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Beegum**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**May 1-Oct. 30**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: May 1-Oct. 30** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1211**	Length (Miles)	**0.12**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 28**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**WEST BEEGUM**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Beegum**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: May 1-Oct. 30** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1212**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 28**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: May 1-Oct. 30** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1213**	Length (Miles)	**0.08**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 28**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**WEST BEEGUM**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Beegum**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: May 1-Oct. 30** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1216**	Length (Miles)	**0.39**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 22**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**W. Beegum**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Beegum**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**May 1-Oct. 30**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: May 1-Oct. 30** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm1226**	Length (Miles)	**0.10**	Map Location	**T28N, R9W, Sec 9**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**RM145**	Length (Miles)	**0.37**	Map Location	**T28N, R10W, Sec 21**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures**.** **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**RM146**	Length (Miles)	**0.56**	Map Location	**T28N, R10W, Sec 29**
Field Review Comments					
Currently self closing					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**RM1603**	Length (Miles)	**0.29**	Map Location	**T28N, R11W, Sec 6**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	rm706	Length (Miles)	0.07	Map Location	T29N, R11W, Sec 28
Field Review Comments					
***"Hell to Find" Lake**					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm720**	Length (Miles)	**0.27**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 32**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Forest Plan Endemic Ericameria ophitidis present in this location.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**RM737**	Length (Miles)	**0.23**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Forest Plan Endemic Ericameria ophitidis present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**rm789**	Length (Miles)	**0.10**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm790**	Length (Miles)	**0.10**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm791**	Length (Miles)	**0.16**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm792**	Length (Miles)	**0.03**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**rm793**	Length (Miles)	**0.71**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Motorcycle**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**24-50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Sensitive plant Harmonia doris- nilesiae present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SE194**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T35N, R1W, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**DEVILS ROCK**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**DEVILS ROCK**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	SE314	Length (Miles)	0.07	Map Location	T35N, R2W, Sec 20
Field Review Comments					
Needs some rock and rolling dips on main road, spilling onto route.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural reource was revisited and will not be affected** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SE416**	Length (Miles)	**2.04**	Map Location	**T34N, R2W, Sec 30**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Devil's Rock**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SE476**	Length (Miles)	**0.16**	Map Location	**T36N, R2W, Sec 27**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**East Fork Mt.**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Important cultural resouce was revisited. Current recreation uses are damaging site.** Mitigation Measures **Drop route or consult with SHPO.** Monitoring Requirements **Not if route is dropped**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SE477**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T36N, R2W, Sec 27**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**East Fork Mt.**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Important cultural resouce was revisited. Current recreation uses are damaging site.** Mitigation Measures **Drop route or consult with SHPO.** Monitoring Requirements **Not if route is dropped**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SE508**	Length (Miles)	**0.12**	Map Location	**T35N, R3W, Sec 8**
Field Review Comments					
Turn out off main road; parking.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	SE512	Length (Miles)	0.52	Map Location	T36N, R3W, Sec 24
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**EAST GIRARD**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**No**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Forest Plan Endemic Arnica venosa present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SFMU13**	Length (Miles)	**0.26**	Map Location	**T3N, R5E, Sec 25**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was revisited and will not be affected. Two known resources were searched for and not found on the route, and are assumed to be mislocated or destroyed.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	SFMU17	Length (Miles)	0.04	Map Location	T29N, R11W, Sec 32
Field Review Comments					
Goes in 60 feet to end at brush field. Fire ring present.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SFMU18**	Length (Miles)	**0.03**	Map Location	**T29N, R120w, Sec 24**
Field Review Comments					
Fire rings present.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Jan. 31**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Jan. 31**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Aug. 16-Jan.31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route goes through northern goshawk habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: August 16 to January 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SFMU4**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T1N, R6E, Sec 23**
Field Review Comments					
This is a road to Miller Spr. campsite.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was searched for and not found on the route, and is assumed to be mislocated or destroyed.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SFMU5**	Length (Miles)	**0.06**	Map Location	**T1N, R6E, Sec 11**
Field Review Comments					
Access to rock pit.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	SFMU6	Length (Miles)	0.02	Map Location	T1N, R6E, Sec 25
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Centaurea diffusa -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SFMU7**	Length (Miles)	**0.01**	Map Location	**T1N, R7E, Sec 23**

Field Review Comments

This is a wide spot in the road.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

In late-successional reserve

Mitigation Measures

Felled hazard trees left along the route.

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized**

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**SFMU9**	Length (Miles)	**0.02**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
This is an Indian Valley campsite.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SW234**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T1N, R6E, Sec 11**
Field Review Comments					
This is an Indian Valley campsite.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was searched for and not found on the route, and is assumed to be mislocated or destroyed.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This is an Indian Valley campsite.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**SW256**	Length (Miles)	**0.33**	Map Location	**T3N, R5E, Sec 25**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was searched for and not found on the route, and is assumed to be mislocated or destroyed. Known cultural resource was revisited and will not be affected.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1004**	Length (Miles)	**0.12**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 7**

Field Review Comments

Road to Butter Creek Meadow.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1098**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T32N, R120w, Sec 2**
	Field Review Comments				
Dispersed camping site for hunters along flat ridgetop					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1238**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T32N, R11W, Sec 7**
Field Review Comments					
Good road and campsite along Big Creek.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC1249	Length (Miles)	0.06	Map Location	T32N, R11W, Sec 19
Field Review Comments					
Access to Big Creek. Last segment that goes to the creek is steep and loose.					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Aug. 16-Jan. 31**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Aug. 16-Jan.31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve; northern goshawk habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route; season of use: August 16 to January 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1427**	Length (Miles)	**1.04**	Map Location	**T31N, R11W, Sec 13**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**ATV**	Tread Width	**24-50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**WELLS MOUNTAIN**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**No**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1451**	Length (Miles)	**0.13**	Map Location	**T31N, R11W, Sec 36**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1451A**	Length (Miles)	**0.17**	Map Location	**T31N, R11W, Sec 36**
Field Review Comments					
0					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by HRM.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC1462A	Length (Miles)	1.69	Map Location	T31N, R11W, Sec 25
Field Review Comments					
0					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1489**	Length (Miles)	**1.78**	Map Location	**T31N, R11W, Sec 33**
Field Review Comments					
Not as depicted on map					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Sensitive plant Eriastrum tracyi present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Perennial stream; non-fish-bearing - route enters riparian zone** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC1491**	Length (Miles)	**0.38**	Map Location	**T30N, R11W, Sec 5**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC1829	Length (Miles)	0.14	Map Location	T3N, R8E, Sec 33

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Sensitive plant Harmonia doris- nilesiae present in this location.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**TC319**	Length (Miles)	**0.12**	Map Location	**T2N, R7E, Sec 29**
	Field Review Comments				
Access to plantation, water pond, creek at end of road.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**S. Fork Trinity**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC349**	Length (Miles)	**0.22**	Map Location	**T1N, R8E, Sec 17**
Field Review Comments					
Access to campsite.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a riparian reserve of a perennial non-fish-bearing stream with crossing** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC507	Length (Miles)	0.62	Map Location	T30N, R11W, Sec 6
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC508	Length (Miles)	0.24	Map Location	T30N, R11W, Sec 5

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**TC828**	Length (Miles)	**0.08**	Map Location	**T1N, R7E, Sec 26**
Field Review Comments					
Access to campsite.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC838**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T1N, R8E, Sec 18**

Field Review Comments

Access to Big Flat of Naufus Creek.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC851**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC855**	Length (Miles)	**0.32**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TC856**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T2N, R8E, Sec 31**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC857	Length (Miles)	0.49	Map Location	T2N, R8E, Sec 31

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	ATV	Tread Width	24-50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.

Mitigation Measures

None require unless vehicle use increases.

Monitoring Requirements — **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	**TC860**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T2N, R7E, Sec 25**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	TC899	Length (Miles)	0.06	Map Location	T2N, R7E, Sec 2
Field Review Comments					
Fire ring.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TRMU2**	Length (Miles)	**0.54**	Map Location	**T5N, R8E, Sec 30**
Field Review Comments					
DeLoma River access. End of route goes to an excellent sandy beach along the river for boat access, fishing, swimming, and camping.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TRMU3**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T5N, R8E, Sec 29**
Field Review Comments					
Boat launch/ pick-up area & night camping at end.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Trinity Alps**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TRMU5**	Length (Miles)	**0.22**	Map Location	**T33N, R120w, Sec 5**
Field Review Comments					
Access to beach and fishing.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was revisited and route surveyed, vandalism is damaging site.** Mitigation Measures **Recommend fencing or covering the bank that is being vandalized along the route with netting/sod, or dropping route** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**TRMU6**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T33N, R120w, Sec 5**

Field Review Comments

End of route goes through riparian.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was revisited and route surveyed, vandalism is damaging site.** Mitigation Measures **Recommend fencing or covering the bank that is being vandalized along the route with netting/sod, or dropping route** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U1B005A**	Length (Miles)	**0.09**	Map Location	**T29N, R10W, Sec 3**
Field Review Comments					
Access to culvert cache.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a riparian reserve of a perennial non-fish-bearing stream with multiple crossings** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U1S39B**	Length (Miles)	**0.23**	Map Location	**T1S, R8E, Sec 9**

Field Review Comments

Route is next to Rattlesnake Creek

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Monitoring Requirements

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural**

This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site

Mitigation Measures

Route Number	U27N02G	Length (Miles)	0.09	Map Location	T27N, R11W, Sec 29
Field Review Comments					
Blowdown across road.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U29N28C**	Length (Miles)	**0.51**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 12**
Field Review Comments					
Longer then depicted on map					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U29N28D	Length (Miles)	1.55	Map Location	T28N, R11W, Sec 1
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	2WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U29N31H**	Length (Miles)	**0.26**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 28**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U29N33B**	Length (Miles)	**0.91**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 28**
Field Review Comments					
Upgrade planned for Jones thinning.					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use. Possible serpentine soils.** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**U29N73E**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T29N, R120w, Sec 13**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U29N73G**	Length (Miles)	**0.98**	Map Location	**T29N, R120w, Sec 14**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Forest Plan Endemic Eriogonum libertini present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**U30N27S**	Length (Miles)	**0.05**	Map Location	**T29N, R11W, Sec 6**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U30N29E**	Length (Miles)	**0.74**	Map Location	**T28N, R11W, Sec 17**
Field Review Comments					
Route does not connect to 28N27 as indicated. Terminates at "A" spur/rm747.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a documented dispersed recreation site** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U30N36B**	Length (Miles)	**0.86**	Map Location	**T30N, R120w, Sec 14**
Field Review Comments					
Dormant slides present, some serpentine.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**U31N02Q**	Length (Miles)	**0.28**	Map Location	**T30N, R9W, Sec 18**
Field Review Comments					
Appears to be a firebreak.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U33N51F**	Length (Miles)	**0.32**	Map Location	**T33N, R11W, Sec 24**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Possible serpentine soils** Mitigation Measures **If testing indicates presence of naturally occurring asbestos, inclusions will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.**

Route Number	**U34N26DA**	Length (Miles)	**0.26**	Map Location	**T33N, R8W, Sec 5**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Spartium junceum - present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U34N26DAA**	Length (Miles)	**0.09**	Map Location	**T33N, R8W, Sec 5**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U35N05A	Length (Miles)	1.74	Map Location	T34N, R6W, Sec 24
Field Review Comments					
Excellent outslope road in selective cut area (10-15 years ago)					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**BACKBONE**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**No**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed and no sites were identified.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U35N85A**	Length (Miles)	**0.19**	Map Location	**T35N, R8W, Sec 15**

Field Review Comments

Access to lake from County Road.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In riparian reserve upstream from Lewiston Dam** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U36N35AA	Length (Miles)	0.71	Map Location	T34N, R8W, Sec 3
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U36N35AB	Length (Miles)	0.10	Map Location	T34N, R8W, Sec 4
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Not within a Riparian Reserve** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N13D**	Length (Miles)	**0.71**	Map Location	**T40N, R1W, Sec 24**
Field Review Comments					
Closed at northern junction					
Observed Use Type	**2WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Cultural resources were revisited and route surveyed. Railroad spur has been converted to a road and there is no effect for that spur.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N35A**	Length (Miles)	**0.65**	Map Location	**T40N, R4W, Sec 4**

Field Review Comments

Road crosses plantation.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Carduus nutans -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N50A**	Length (Miles)	**0.51**	Map Location	**T40N, R3E, Sec 33**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Aug. 16-Jan.31**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route goes through northern goshawk habitat (sensitive species)** Mitigation Measures **Season of use: August 16 to January 31**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed, railroad spur has been converted to a road. No effect to Cultural Resources** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N84AA**	Length (Miles)	**1.59**	Map Location	**T40N, R3W, Sec 20**

Field Review Comments

Road accesses plantation.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Urban** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N84B**	Length (Miles)	**0.75**	Map Location	**T40N, R3W, Sec 20**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N88XCB**	Length (Miles)	**0.49**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 33**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Cirsium vulgare -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N88XE**	Length (Miles)	**0.25**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 34**

Field Review Comments

Cross road

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Cirsium vulgare -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U40N91YA**	Length (Miles)	**0.63**	Map Location	**T40N, R4W, Sec 4**

Field Review Comments

Road accesses plantation.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Carduus nutans -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U414A**	Length (Miles)	**0.59**	Map Location	**T33N, R10W, Sec 29**
Field Review Comments					
River access.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U414C**	Length (Miles)	**0.19**	Map Location	**T33N, R10W, Sec 29**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U414CA**	Length (Miles)	**0.12**	Map Location	**T33N, R10W, Sec 29**
Field Review Comments					
River access.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed. No sites were identified.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U414D**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T33N, R10W, Sec 32**
Field Review Comments					
Access to river & private property across river.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U414F	Length (Miles)	0.18	Map Location	T33N, R10W, Sec 32
Field Review Comments					
Access to river & private property across river.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U414FA**	Length (Miles)	**0.04**	Map Location	**T33N, R10W, Sec 32**

Field Review Comments

Access to river & private property across river.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**All Trail Class Vehicles**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is within a Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U41N18A**	Length (Miles)	**2.52**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 22**
Field Review Comments					
Access to plantation. Needs more rolling dips.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U41N18AA**	Length (Miles)	**2.08**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 27**

Field Review Comments

Access to plantation.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U41N18AAD**	Length (Miles)	**0.82**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 28**
Field Review Comments					
Access to plantation. Steep crossing.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U41N55D**	Length (Miles)	**1.21**	Map Location	**T41N, R4W, Sec 34**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U41N55E	Length (Miles)	1.60	Map Location	T41N, R4W, Sec 27
Field Review Comments					
Access to plantation. Steep Crossing.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream. Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15D**	Length (Miles)	**0.20**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 20**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light, heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U42N15DA	Length (Miles)	0.67	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 20
Field Review Comments					
Very steep near creek					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15H**	Length (Miles)	**0.29**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 21**
Field Review Comments					
too steep					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15J**	Length (Miles)	**1.56**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 16**
Field Review Comments					
Very steep - north end.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Carduus nutans -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed and no sites were identified. Known cultural resource not affected.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15K**	Length (Miles)	**0.54**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 16**
Field Review Comments					
Very steep near creek					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed. Railroad spur has been converted to a road and is in poor condition. No effect to Cultural Resources.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U42N15KA	Length (Miles)	0.21	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 16
Field Review Comments					
Very steep					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Carduus nutans -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15M**	Length (Miles)	**0.95**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 10**
Field Review Comments					
Main road ok rest close					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Mt. Shasta**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed and railroad grade is not affected.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U42N15MC	Length (Miles)	1.10	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 10
Field Review Comments					
Suitable					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed and no new sites were identified. Known cultural resource is not affected.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15N**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 16**
Field Review Comments					
Very steep					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U42N15NA	Length (Miles)	0.83	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 15
Field Review Comments					
Very steep - north end.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N15NB**	Length (Miles)	**0.24**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 15**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N18A**	Length (Miles)	**3.89**	Map Location	**T42N, R3W, Sec 6**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route has light use and was not surveyed. Known cultural resource was revisited, and further effects are unlikely due to deteriorated condition and use as a road.** Mitigation Measures **None required unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within Riparian Reserves of multiple non-fish bearing, non-perennial streams; approx. 7 stream crossings and a section that runs adjacent to a non-fish-bearing stream** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N18AA**	Length (Miles)	**2.43**	Map Location	**T42N, R3W, Sec 8**
Field Review Comments					
Tire tracks in soft ash, not really ruts.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route has light use and was not surveyed. Known cultural resource was revisited, and further effects are unlikely due to deteriorated condition and use as a road.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a riparian reserve of non-fish-bearing non-perennial with crossing** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N18B**	Length (Miles)	**1.07**	Map Location	**T42N, R3W, Sec 9**
Field Review Comments					
Traverses an arch site. Not accessible from 43N19.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Sensitive plant Phacelia cookei present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Cultural resource is minimally impacted. No revisit necessary. Light vehicle use have deferred complete survey.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques. Deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N26C**	Length (Miles)	**3.81**	Map Location	**T42N, R4E, Sec 31**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N26E**	Length (Miles)	**1.81**	Map Location	**T42N, R3E, Sec 36**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N73A**	Length (Miles)	**0.35**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 8**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed. Railroad spur has been converted to a road and is in poor condition. No effect to Cultural Resources.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U42N73AA	Length (Miles)	0.03	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 8

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	Undetermined	Corridor Width	Undetermined

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Cultural resouce is minimally impacted, no site visit necessary. Deferred Survey for part of route.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases. present** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N73B**	Length (Miles)	**0.36**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 8**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Cultural resouce is minimally impacted, no site visit necessary. Deferred Survey for part of route.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases. present** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N84C**	Length (Miles)	**0.40**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 9**
Field Review Comments					
Very steep - south end.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route was surveyed and no sites were identified.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **None**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U42N84CA**	Length (Miles)	**0.07**	Map Location	**T42N, R4W, Sec 9**
Field Review Comments					
steep crossings					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U4N12D**	Length (Miles)	**3.38**	Map Location	**T1N, R6E, Sec 25**
Field Review Comments					
Access to gas pipeline. Portion steep or blocked by logs and boulders.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**Trinity Alps**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Centaurea diffusa -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **In late-successional reserve** Mitigation Measures **Felled hazard trees left along the route.**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized** **This route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**U4N12L**	Length (Miles)	**0.06**	Map Location	**T2N, R6E, Sec 33**

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	U4N12LA	Length (Miles)	0.06	Map Location	T2N, R6E, Sec 33
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Road**	**All Vehicle Classes**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**UOHV01X**	Length (Miles)	**0.36**	Map Location	**T33N, R5W, Sec 16**

Field Review Comments

Route is on rocky and shallow to bedrock. Part is an old road, the rest is an unauthorized route on the contour with sharp curves. Erosion control needed.

Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**

Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Low - no survey required, site is ineligible for the NRHP** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Route is within the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**UOHV02J**	Length (Miles)	**0.53**	Map Location	**T33N, R5W, Sec 17**
Field Review Comments					
Ridgeline trail goes out to a point with views of Keswick & Shasta Dam. Goes along ridge of weathered rock so little erosion. Moderate difficulty route.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Not Rated** **Route is within the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**UOHV18**	Length (Miles)	**0.15**	Map Location	**T33N, R5W, Sec 16**
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Route located between 150 and 300 feet from 303D stream** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Noxious Weed Cytisus scoparius -present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Treat weed sites by hand pulling.**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **Route is within the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**UOHV50A**	Length (Miles)	**0.43**	Map Location	**T33N, R6W, Sec 2**
Field Review Comments					
Motorcycle trail only, using old skid road. Needs some rolling dips for erosion control.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Not Rated** **Route is within the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	**UOHV50C**	Length (Miles)	**0.14**	Map Location	**T33N, R6W, Sec 2**
Field Review Comments					
Motorcycle trail only. Trail on contour.					
Observed Use Type	**Undetermined**	Tread Width	**Undetermined**	Corridor Width	**Undetermined**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**
4			
5	**Trail**	**Motorcycle Only**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No survey required. No Cultural Resources intersect route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Not Rated** **Route is within the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area.** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	UT29N30HA	Length (Miles)	0.80	Map Location	T27N, R11W, Sec 7

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	Undetermined	Corridor Width	Undetermined

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River**

Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed. Sensitive area or erosive soils.

Mitigation Measures

Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.

Monitoring Requirements — **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**

Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

No species of concern on route.

Mitigation Measures

None

Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

In late-successional reserve

Mitigation Measures

Felled hazard trees left along the route.

Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Known cultural resource was searched for but not found. It is assumed to be either mislocated or destroyed.

Mitigation Measures

Deferred survey to identify additional sites

Monitoring Requirements — **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**

Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Risk and Information

Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.

Mitigation Measures

None

Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures

Resource Information: — ROS Class **Semi-Primitive/Motorized**

None

Mitigation Measures

None

Route Number	UT29N30HAB	Length (Miles)	0.25	Map Location	T27N, R11W, Sec 7

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	Undetermined	Tread Width	Undetermined	Corridor Width	Undetermined

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **S. Fork Trinity River** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **None** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we006	Length (Miles)	0.49	Map Location	T42N, R3W, Sec 15

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource is minimally impacted, no site visit necessary, but part of route requires survey.** Mitigation Measures **Deferred survey to identify additional sites** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we007	Length (Miles)	1.01	Map Location	T42N, R3W, Sec 9
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource is minimally impacted. No revisit required deferred survey applied to remainder of route.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we019	Length (Miles)	1.55	Map Location	T42N, R3W, Sec 8
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource is minimally impacted. No revisit required deferred survey applied to remainder of route.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Within a Riparian Reserve on a MIS fish bearing stream – Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we022	Length (Miles)	0.84	Map Location	T42N, R3W, Sec 4

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource is minimally impacted. No revisit required deferred survey applied to remainder of route.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we039	Length (Miles)	1.22	Map Location	T43N, R3W, Sec 28
Field Review Comments					
No comments recorded					
Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches
Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Sensitive plant Phacelia cookei present in this location.** Mitigation Measures **Monitor and apply mitigations such as barriers or NNIS treatment as needed**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural resource was revisited and is affected. Survey along rest of route is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **Place barriers or repair existing fence, and enhance natural vegetative screening.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we040	Length (Miles)	0.09	Map Location	T43N, R3W, Sec 32

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we043	Length (Miles)	1.11	Map Location	T42N, R3W, Sec 8

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we067	Length (Miles)	0.06	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 9

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we072	Length (Miles)	0.09	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 9

Field Review Comments

No comments recorded

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **No soils or watershed concerns for this route.** Mitigation Measures **None** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we540	Length (Miles)	0.88	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 5

Field Review Comments

Surrounded by Pvt land

Observed Use Type	ATV	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Known cultural Resouce was revisited and determined to be in poor condition. Features are unlikely to be affected, but should be monitored. Survey of route may be deferred.** Mitigation Measures **Linear protection techniques, deferred survey** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor for identification annually until survey is done, monitor for effects annually for two years, then as determined by HRM**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we542	Length (Miles)	0.39	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 5
Field Review Comments					
Surrounded by Pvt land					
Observed Use Type	**4WD**	Tread Width	**Over 50 Inches**	Corridor Width	**Over 50 Inches**
Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	**N/A**		

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Cultural resource is minimally impacted, no site visit necessary.** Mitigation Measures **Deferred survey to identify additional sites** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Route Number	we545	Length (Miles)	0.79	Map Location	T42N, R4W, Sec 8

Field Review Comments

Surrounded by Pvt land

Observed Use Type	4WD	Tread Width	Over 50 Inches	Corridor Width	Over 50 Inches

Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A	Citizens Inventoried Roadless Area	N/A

Alternative	Proposed Maintenance Level	Proposed Vehicle Class	Season of Use
2 - Proposed			
2 - Modified			
4			
5	**Trail**	**50" and less in width**	**Yearlong**

Watershed Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information — Key Watershed: **N/A** **Sensitive area or erosive soils** Mitigation Measures **Monitor during wet weather; consider closure if needed for resource protection.** Monitoring Requirements **BMP effectiveness - a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.**
Botany Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **No species of concern on route.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Wildlife Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **None** Mitigation Measures **None**
Cultural Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Light vehicle use. Survey is deferred.** Mitigation Measures **None require unless vehicle use increases.** Monitoring Requirements **Monitor motor vehicle use levels. If determined greater than light. Heritage surveys are required.**
Fisheries Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Risk and Information **Route is not within a Riparian Reserve.** Mitigation Measures **None**
Recreation Resource Information and Mitigation Measures	Resource Information: — ROS Class **Roaded Natural** **This route is part of a loop system for motorized vehicle use** Mitigation Measures **None**

Appendix B: Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions Relevant to Cumulative Effects

The following actions (described below) were considered in the cumulative effects analysis for each resource: fuels and vegetation treatment, timber management and vegetation treatment, grazing management, minerals and geology, special uses and lands management, recreation, fish/wildlife/rare plant management, and road/watershed management. Roads and forest access, including adjoining land management considerations, are also described. Reasonably foreseeable and present actions on National Forest System lands considered in the cumulative effects analysis are shown in Table B-5, which was developed by reviewing the January–March 2009 Schedule of Proposed Actions and the project website for the STNF. Many actions have some potential for increasing road density either temporarily or permanently; these are discussed below.

Fuels and Vegetation Treatment

Approximately 70,000 acres are proposed for fuels treatments as part of both current projects and reasonably foreseeable future projects across the forest. These projects propose vegetation treatments and prescribed burning for the primary purpose of reducing fuel hazards and the risk of loss from high intensity wildfire. Present and reasonably foreseeable fuel projects are listed in Table B-5. The fuels program does not build roads to carry out prescribed burn treatment, but cross-country travel may be required either by truck or OHV. Thinning projects for the purpose of fuels and wildfire hazard reduction sometimes require the creation of temporary roads.

Wildfire and associated suppression and rehabilitation measures sometimes require the creation of temporary roads and fuel breaks that in the past have been used by the public and turned into unauthorized routes on the forest.

Timber Harvest and Vegetation Treatments

Approximately 27,000 acres are proposed for timber management and vegetation treatments as part of both current projects and reasonably foreseeable future projects across the forest. These projects propose vegetation treatments and timber harvest for a variety of purposes including timber production, forest health, plantation maintenance, aspen management, and invasive species management. Present and reasonably foreseeable timber management and vegetation treatment projects are listed in Table B-5.

Reforestation will occur as needed after wildfires or timber management. Past activities associated with replanting trees included the use of herbicides and mechanical and physical site preparation to reduce the competition for soil nutrients and sunlight from grasses and shrubs (release). Existing roads are used for reforestation projects.

In the past, road construction was supported by timber harvest. The existing forest transportation system was developed, in part, through the need to provide timber to the public after World War II. This

trend continued until the late 1970s or early 1980s. Currently, forest planning efforts evaluate each project on a site-specific basis for existing roads that can be used, and for the possible decommissioning of roads that are no longer necessary. There may still be a need for temporary road construction and for the reconstruction of existing roads to allow for use of new equipment and for adjusting to specific logging systems required for steeper ground. Road closure or decommissioning is a component of some projects, as shown in Table B-6 and described in the Watershed Management/Roads section below.

Grazing Management

Presently there are 14 active allotments on 402,492 acres, and 8 vacant allotments on 223,008 acres. There are approximately 3,662 animal months of grazing permitted on the forest. Actual use differs annually from permitted use depending on such things as economics, weather conditions, and market conditions. Range permittees travel off roads to monitor and gather their livestock, place salt blocks, and conduct other livestock management activities. This permitted use is exempt from the Travel Management Rule.

Individual range-management projects include installing cattle guards, fencing, developing water sources, and thinning juniper. Projects such as fencing and juniper thinning, and administering permits (e.g., scheduling on- and off-dates) have restored riparian areas. Range management generally does not include the creation of new roads. Present and reasonably foreseeable range projects are included in Table B-5; one permit reauthorization is included for several allotments.

Minerals and Geology

Mining authorizations are a part of the minerals and geology program on the forest and several of these are currently in progress or are being planned. These authorizations do not typically result in new road construction or substantial ground disturbance, but this is dependent on the particular mining operation; in certain situations, ground disturbance can be extensive. It is estimated that 20 to 30 acres of new ground disturbance could result in the foreseeable future from mining operations on the forest, as shown in Table B-5.

Recreation

Current and future recreation projects are shown in Table B-5. No new road construction is anticipated for these projects.

Special Uses

The STNF has a caseload of about 1,740 special-use authorizations for activities and uses listed in Table B-1.

Table B-1. Shasta-Trinity National Forest special use authorizations

Type of Special Use	Number
Outfitter and Guide	85
Resort/Marinas	15
Communication Sites	45
Recreation Residences	160
Houseboats	730
Roads	370
Water Systems	140
Other [a]	195

a - Other category includes special uses such as but not limited to: organization camps, target range, research facility, maintenance facility, transfer station, and powerlines.

Special use permits authorize facilities and services necessary for public health, welfare, safety, and security, such as communications sites for local 911 radio repeaters to support local law enforcement and emergency response entities. Others provide basic needs such as power, telephone lines, and access to private landowners. Additionally, the STNF has a large recreation-based special use program with resorts, marinas, outfitters and guides, and recreation residence. There are currently approximately 1,740 special use permits on the forest.

Motorized access to private lands, communication sites, and other special-use-permitted sites are permitted uses exempt from Travel Management. Roads to private property, communication sites, and other special use permitted activities area not necessarily part of the National Forest Transportation System. Those with a valid special use permit will be allowed to continue to access the property and sites. However, the road may not be open to public access.

There are 19 special use projects currently being considered on the forest (Table B-5). These range from relatively small existing permit reauthorizations and vegetation maintenance along existing powerlines, to larger projects such as land exchanges and designation of energy corridors and geothermal leasing that span several forests. A detailed evaluation of expected ground disturbance and proposed vegetation removal or disturbance would be done prior to approval of special use projects.

Fish/Wildlife/Rare Plant Management

While many projects have the indirect benefit of improving habitat for fish, wildlife and/or rare plants, such as vegetation management for improving forest health or reducing high intensity wildfire risk, two projects are currently being considered for the specific purpose of benefiting fish habitat, as shown in Table B-5. These projects would occur in or adjacent to streams and would not result in measurable new ground disturbance.

Watershed Management/Roads

The forest is currently considering two site-specific projects that would improve watershed conditions through the closure of roads. The Scott Camp Ridge project on the Mount Shasta District and the Westside Watershed Restoration project on the Yolla Bolla District propose closures of up to 50 miles of roads or road segments. Other projects listed in the category include removing roadside hazards (Trinity Roadside Thin) and a right-of-way request where a small section of new road would be constructed to provide access to private land (Sierra Pacific Industries Right-of-Way). The overall forest program of road management is discussed in more detail in the next section.

Road-related Management

Road and Trail Maintenance

Road maintenance on the STNF averages 1,071 miles annually plus additional miles maintained by cooperators. Road maintenance includes activities such as grading, resurfacing, culvert cleaning, hazard tree removal, snow plowing, and slide removal.

Road and Right-of-Way Management

A system of Federal, State, and county highways provides access to the STNF. Forest system roads are extensions of these highways, and provide access to and mobility within the forest. Roads allow protection, management, use, and development of forest resources on which local communities depend. The forest road system contains approximately 6,961 miles of NFTS roads and 1,430 miles of NFTS trails. Of those routes classified as open, some segments are subject to seasonal closures.

Table B-2. Existing seasonal closures on NFTS routes

Route Number	Route Name	Ending Mile Post	Beginning Mile Post	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
41N08Y	Dry Creek Springs	0.0	3.7	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
41N12	Cramer Springs	0.0	9.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
41N16	Sugar Pine Butte	0.0	2.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
41N16A	Sugar Pine Butte	0.0	0.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
41N19X	Fa19 Sugar Pine/Military	17.3	28.9	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
41N31	McKenzie Butte (Fa31)	2.7	17.7	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
42N06	Asperin Butte	0.0	5.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
42N09	Trout Creek	0.0	0.8	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
42N13	Pilgrim Creek (Fa13)	2.5	15.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
42N43	Fons Butte	0.0	4.9	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
42N70	Surprise Lake	0.0	1.0	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N04	Lost Springs "Pigs Ear"	0.9	9.9	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N08	Red Cap	0.0	3.2	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N15	Harris Spring (Fa15)	42.7	44.0	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N19	Military Pass	12.0	16.4	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N26	Paint Pot	0.0	0.8	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N36	Garner	1.3	2.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N37	Table Top	4.2	5.3	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N44	Stephens Pass (Fa06)	6.0	11.1	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
43N70	Fisk	0.0	1.9	5/15-11/15	Converted to OSV trails
35N80	Clark Springs	0.0	0.5	4/1-10/31	Seasonal closure
33N78	Cooper Gulch	0.0	0.2	4/1-10/31	Seasonal closure
34N23Y	Ackerman	0.0	0.1	4/1-11/15	Seasonal closure
35N59	Ellery Creek	0.0	0.5	4/1-9/15	Seasonal closure
35N48B	Hirz Bay (#1)	0.0	0.1	4/1-9/30	Seasonal closure
35N48D	Hirz Bay (#2)	0.0	0.1	4/1-9/30	Seasonal closure
37N35Y	Sims Flat Crossing	0.0	0.5	4/20-11/16	Campground closed for winter season
37N35YB	Sims Cross Over	0.0	0.0	4/20-11/16	Campground closed for winter season
39N30	Fowlers Campground	0.0	0.0	4/20-11/16	Campground closed for winter season
39N30A	Fowlers A Loop	0.0	0.3	4/20-11/16	Campground closed for winter

Route Number	Route Name	Ending Mile Post	Beginning Mile Post	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
					season
39N30B	Fowlers B Loop	0.0	0.3	4/20-11/16	Campground closed for winter season
38N07Y	Trinity River	0.0	0.2	5/1-10/31	Facility closed for season
35N29	Fawn Group	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N29A	Fawn Group	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N29B	Fawn Group	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N29C	Fawn Group	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N81	Stoney Group	0.0	0.1	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N28	Stoney Point	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGBA	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.1	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGAA	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGC	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81A	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGD	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.2	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGA	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.3	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81CGB	Tannery Gulch	0.0	0.4	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
34N81	Tannery Gulch	0.0	1.3	5/1-9/30	Facility closed for season
38N71	Eagle Creek	0.0	0.4	5/15-10/31	Facility closed for season
36N98	Preacher Meadow	0.0	0.7	5/15-10/31	Facility closed for season
36N98A	Preacher Meadow	0.0	0.3	5/15-10/31	Facility closed for season
35N49	Hirz Bay	0.0	0.9	5/15-9/10	Facility closed for season
35N49A	Hirz Bay	0.0	0.0	5/15-9/10	Facility closed for season
35N26YB	Hayward Flat	0.0	0.3	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N26YC	Hayward Flat	0.0	0.3	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N26YD	Hayward Flat	0.0	0.3	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N26YE	Hayward Flat	0.0	0.4	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N26YA	Hayward Flat	0.0	1.3	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N26Y	Hayward Flat	0.0	2.2	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
33N79	Mary Smith	0.0	0.6	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
34N97	Rush Creek	0.0	1.0	5/15-9/15	Facility closed for season
35N85	Alpine View	0.0	1.1	5/15-9/30	Facility closed for season
35N07X	Bushytail	0.0	0.4	5/15-9/30	Facility closed for season
29N23	Basin Gulch Crossing	0.0	0.6	5/15-11/15	Vandalism
29N23A	Basin Gulch Crossing	0.0	0.2	5/15-11/15	Vandalism
1S22	Hells Gate	0.0	0.2	5/15-11/15	Vandalism
1S31	Forest Glen	0.0	0.2	5/15-11/15	Vandalism
41N30	McBride Springs	0.0	0.3	5/16-10/15	Campground closed for winter season
35N15A	Gregory Creek	0.0	0.2	6/15-9/30	Facility closed for season
30N32	Philpot Crossing	0.0	0.3	05/15-11/15	Per rec needs
29N06	Beegum Gorge	0.0	6.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion
28N06	Beegum Gorge Crossing	0.0	0.2	05/01-10/30	Erosion
27N25	Martin Cabin	0.0	2.0	05/01-10/30	Drainage
28N26	Prospect Creek	0.0	5.2	05/01-10/30	Erosion
28N32	Star	0.0	2.8	05/01-10/30	Erosion
28N32A	Star	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
28N32B	Star	0.0	0.9	05/01-10/30	Erosion
28N50	Lower Wilcox Ridge	0.0	8.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
28N50A	Lower Wilcox Ridge	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
28N50B	Lower Wilcox Ridge	0.0	0.5	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
28N50C	Lower Wilcox Ridge	0.0	0.5	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
28N52	Upper Wilcox Ridge	0.0	3.2	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
28N57	Wilcox Ridge Trailhead	0.0	0.7	05/01-10/30	Wildlife

Route Number	Route Name	Ending Mile Post	Beginning Mile Post	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
28N57A	Wilcox Ridge	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
29N20	Ranger	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion
29N22	Fir Gulch	0.0	5.9	05/01-10/30	Erosion
29N22B	Fir Gulch	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Erosion
29N63	Lower Saddle	0.0	1.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
29N89	Saddle Gulch	0.0	0.2	05/01-10/30	Erosion
29N89A	Saddle Gulch	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/03	Erosion
2N51	Rough	0.0	2.5	05/01-10/30	Erosion
2N51A	Rough	0.0	1.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion/wildlife
2N51B	Rough	0.0	0.2	05/01-10/30	Erosion
2N51C	Rough	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
30N22	Salt Creek Divide	0.0	8.3	05/01-10/30	Erosion
30N43	Gemmill Gulch	0.0	2.0	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
30N43A	Gemmill Gulch	0.0	0.2	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
31N17	Kelly Mine	0.0	1.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mining ops
31N33	Beegum Onion	0.0	2.6	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
31N33A	Beegum Onion	0.0	0.3	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
31N48	Long	0.0	4.2	05/01-10/30	Erosion
31N48A	Long	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion
31N48C	Long	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
32N23	Big Jim	0.0	3.5	05/01-10/30	Erosion
32N29	Sims Gap	0.0	2.5	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
33N34	Dirt	0.0	0.2	05/15-09/15	Erosion
33N42	Mc Kinzey	0.0	1.7	05/01-10/30	Erosion
34N05A	Trinity Mountain	0.0	1.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N05B	Trinity Mountain	0.0	0.8	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N05C	Trinity Mountain	0.0	1.0	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N33Y	Rush	0.0	0.5	05/01-10/30	Erosion
34N58	North Papoose	0.0	1.8	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N60	Upper North Papoose	0.0	1.2	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N61	North Fork Papoose	0.0	2.7	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
34N61A	North Fork Papoose	0.0	1.0	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
34N70	Smith Gulch	0.0	2.1	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N71	Haylock Ridge	0.0	1.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N71A	Haylock Ridge	0.0	0.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N82	Monument	0.0	0.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N96	La Grange	0.0	1.7	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N96A	La Grange	0.0	0.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
34N96B	La Grange	0.0	0.3	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N08Y	Horsebone Ridge	0.0	4.7	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N10XA	Saddle	0.0	0.8	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N12	Stacey Creek	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N12B	Stacey Creek	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N24Y	Greenhorn Gulch	0.0	2.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N24YA	Greenhorn Gulch	0.0	1.3	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N24YB	Greenhorn Gulch	0.0	0.7	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N24YC	Greenhorn Guclh	0.0	1.4	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N29YA	Onion	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N31	Feeny Ridge	0.0	2.5	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/eagle
35N42Y	Bragdon Gulch	0.0	3.9	05/01-10/30	Erosion
35N43B	West Van Ness	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
35N45Y	Onion Spur	0.0	1.3	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
35N77	Brush Creek	0.0	14.3	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
35N77G	Brush Creek	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
35N77Y	Big Mule	0.0	0.9	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N77YD	Big Mule	0.0	0.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed

Route Number	Route Name	Ending Mile Post	Beginning Mile Post	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
35N87	Diener Ditch	0.0	1.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
35N87	Diener Ditch	2.5	3.6	05/15-09/15	Watershed
36N11	South Hay	0.0	3.1	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
36N27	Jackass Spring	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
36N27C	Jackass Spring	0.0	0.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
36N32	Rackerby	0.0	1.2	05/15-09/15	Watershed
36N34	Swift	0.0	1.4	05/01-10/30	Watershed
36N81	Sawmill Gulch	0.0	0.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
36N81A	Sawmill Gulch	0.0	0.4	05/15-09/15	Watershed
36N82	Nelly	0.0	3.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
36N87	Rackerby Ridge	0.0	2.0	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
37N01Y	Halls	0.0	0.5	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N04Y	Onion Flat	0.0	1.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N08Y	Hall Gulch (Fa08)	0.0	8.7	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N08YA	Hall Gulch	0.0	3.7	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N08YC	Hall Gulch	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N16Y	Squirrel	0.0	2.4	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
37N22A	Cedar Creek	0.0	2.4	05/15-09/15	Watershed
37N29Y	Morrison	0.0	0.7	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/rdens
37N32Y	Morrison Gulch	0.0	2.7	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N32YA	Morrison Gulch	0.0	0.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N32YB	Morrison Gulch	0.0	1.8	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N32YC	Morrison Gulch	0.0	0.2	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N42	Crossover	0.0	1.8	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N47	Morrison Creek	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Wildlife
37N52	Buckeye Creek	0.0	3.1	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52	Buckeye Creek	3.1	9.4	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52A	Buckeye Creek	0.0	1.9	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52C	Buckeye Creek	0.0	0.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52D	Buckeye Creek	0.0	1.5	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52E	Buckeye Creek	0.0	0.7	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52J	Buckeye Creek	0.0	0.1	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N52K	Buckeye Creek	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N53	Up Little Boulder	0.0	7.0	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N53	Up Little Boulder	7.0	8.5	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N55	North Fork Swift Creek	0.0	10.1	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N55A	North Fork Swift Creek	0.0	1.0	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N55B	North Fork Swift Creek	0.0	0.9	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N55D	North Fork Swift Creek	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
37N55G	North Fork Swift Creek	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Watershed/rdens
38N01Y	Upper Eagle Creek	0.0	0.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
38N01Y	Upper Eagle Creek	0.5	1.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
38N14Y	Ripple Ridge	0.0	3.4	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N14YB	Ripple Ridge	0.0	1.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N14YC	Ripple Ridge	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N16Y	Minnehaha	0.0	1.1	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N22	Ripple Creek	0.0	4.4	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N22C	Ripple Creek	0.0	1.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N27	Eagle Creek	0.0	7.6	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N34	Chinquapin	0.0	4.5	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N34	Chinquapin	4.5	5.0	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N34B	Chinquapin	0.0	0.9	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N39	Knob Cone	0.0	2.5	05/15-09/15	Watershed
38N73	Alder Gulch	0.0	3.8	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N80	Graves Creek	1.0	5.4	05/15-09/15	Watershed
38N80B	Graves Creek	0.0	0.3	05/15-09/15	Watershed

Route Number	Route Name	Ending Mile Post	Beginning Mile Post	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
38N80C	Graves Creek	0.0	0.1	05/15-09/15	Watershed
38N85	Scorpion Creek	0.0	9.9	05/01-10/30	Watershed
38N85G	Scorpion Creek	0.0	1.3	05/01-10/30	Watershed
39N27	Meter Meadow	0.0	1.6	05/15-09/15	Watershed
39N27A	Meter Meadow	0.0	0.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
3N01	Steep	0.0	3.8	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
3N01B	Steep	0.0	0.1	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
3N01D	Steep	0.0	0.6	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
3N01E	Steep	0.0	0.3	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
3N07	Jud Creek	0.0	5.4	05/01-10/30	Erosion
3N07C	Jud Creek	0.0	1.5	05/01-10/30	Erosion
3N28	Duck Pond	0.0	1.8	05/01-10/30	Erosion
3N34	Midslope	0.0	1.5	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
3N34A	Midslope	0.0	0.3	05/01-10/30	Erosion/mntc$
4N03C	Rays Divide	0.0	0.9	05/15-09/15	Watershed
4N05A	Hayshed Creek	0.0	1.0	05/15-09/15	Watershed/rdens
4N05B	Hayshed Creek	0.6	1.7	05/15-09/15	Watershed/rdens
4N10	West Hayshed	0.0	2.4	05/15-09/15	Wildlife/soils
4N17	Bidden	0.0	1.1	05/15-09/15	Watershed/wild
4N22	Cedar Flat Creek	0.0	3.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
4N28	East Hayshed	0.0	2.6	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/watershed
4N28A	East Hayshed	0.0	1.2	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/watershed
4N29	Corral Creek	0.0	3.2	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/watershed
4N29	Corral Creek	3.2	6.0	05/01-10/30	Wildlife/watershed
5N11	Hidden Lake Loop	0.0	1.6	05/15-09/15	Watershed
5N15	Kaut	0.0	0.8	05/15-09/15	Watershed
5N19	Cedar Mill	0.0	1.0	05/15-09/15	Watershed

Table B-3. Existing seasonal closures on NFTS routes to protect bald eagles

Name	Area Acres	Closure Acres[a]	Season of Use	Reason for Closure
Shasta Lake	28,403	2,205	08/16 - 12/31	Bald Eagle Nesting
Trinity Lake	15,644	649	08/16 - 12/31	Bald Eagle Nesting
Iron Canyon Reservoir	429	0	08/16 - 12/31	Bald Eagle Nesting

a - Bald eagle closure areas may vary and shift by year as they buffer active nests identified on a yearly basis.

Roads under Other Jurisdictions

Table B-4 lists road mileages within the boundary of the forest that are managed by other agencies. The highway right-of-way is managed according to the terms of the specific easement. Vegetation management within the right-of-way is done according to the laws and regulations of counties and the State of California.

Table B-4. Roads within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest managed by other agencies

Jurisdiction	Miles
BLM - Bureau of Land Management	5.46
BOR - Bureau of Reclamation	3.24
C - County, Parish, Borough	794.23
L - Local	26.24
NPS - National Park Service	29.52
P - Private	186.42
SH - State Highway	1,242.47
SL - State Lands	6.91
Unknown	0.08
Grand Total	**2,294.59**

Table B-5. Present (current) and reasonably foreseeable projects, Shasta-Trinity National Forest

	Number	Project Name	District	Estimated Treatment Acres, if known	Roads
Fuels and Vegetation Management					
Current Projects	1	Middle Hayfork Precommercial thinning	Hayfork	6200	
	2	Powder Vegetation and Fuels Management	McCloud	3800	Road closures mentioned as part of project
	3	Mt Thin and Fuels Management	Mt Shasta	3200	
	4	North Shore/Rainbow Ridge Shaded Fuelbreak	Mt Shasta	60	
	5	Lakehead Fuels Hazard	Shasta Lake	unknown	
	6	Browns Fuels Project	Weaverville	1240	
	7	East Fork II Thinning	Yolla Bolla	1000	
Foreseeable Projects	8	Moosehead Vegetation and Road Management	McCloud	2400	21 miles road reconstruction; 11 miles road closure
	9	Loma thin and fire salvage	Big Bar	unknown	
	10	Down river community protection	Big Bar	unknown	
	11	Browns fuels and vegetation management	Weaverville	800	
	12	Gemmill thinning	Yolla Bolla	1620	
	13	Salt timber harvest and fuels reduction	Hayfork	1660	
	14	Mudflow vegetation management	McCloud	3000	
	15	Pilgrim vegetation management	McCloud	4000	
	16	Pettijohn Late Successional Reserve	Weaverville	3200	2.3 miles of road closure
	17	Porcupine vegetation and road management	McCloud	4400	
	18	Mt Shasta transportation corridor fuelbreak	Mt Shasta	unknown	
	19	Westside plantation thinning	Yolla Bolla, Big Bar, Mt Shasta, Hayfork, Weaverville	33,000	
	20	Bear hazardous fuels treatment	Shasta Lake	unknown	
	21	Jones thinning	Yolla Bolla	640	

	Number	Project Name	District	Estimated Treatment Acres, if known	Roads
Vegetation Management					
Current Projects	1	Baby Bear Plantation Thinning	Big Bar and Hayfork	20	
	2	Kinyon-Bear Plantation Thinning	McCloud	20	
	3	McCloud Aspen Release	McCloud	120	
	4	Mt Shasta Forest Timber Stand Improvement	McCloud	1000	
	5	Plantation Thin	McCloud	6500	
	6	South Flats Timber stand Improvement	McCloud	4600	
	7	Mt Shasta Plantation Maintenance	Mt Shasta	5000	
	8	Forestwide manual treatment of invasive plants	All	unknown	
Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects	9	White Rock Guard Station restoration	Yolla Bolla	unknown	
	10	Trinity Broom initiative	Big Bar, Hayfork, Weaverville	unknown	
	11	Canyon Creek Mine site restoration	Big Bar	unknown	
	12	Bolam timber stand improvement	Mt Shasta	2500	
	13	Deer Creek timber stand improvement	Mt Shasta	750	
	14	Algoma vegetation management	McCloud	5300	“some” new road construction
	15	Trout Creek meadow restoration	McCloud	90	
	16	Upper Dubakella vegetation management	Yolla Bolla	1000	Road construction and road closure
Grazing Management (no current projects, 1 foreseeable)					
	1	Bartle, Bear Creek and Toad Mountain Allotment Reauthorization	McCloud	0	
Minerals and Geology					
Current Projects	1	Hazel D Lode Mine Reauthorization	Big Bar	unknown	0 (maintenance of existing road only)
	2	Oso Butte and Panther Rock Cinder Pit Expansion	McCloud	3	
Foreseeable Projects	3	Gold Dollar Placer Mine authorization	Big Bar	unknown	
	4	Trinity 1-8 mining operation (high bench placer mining)	Big Bar	23	

	Number	Project Name	District	Estimated Treatment Acres, if known	Roads
Road / Watershed Management					
Current Projects	1	Scott Camp Ridge Road Closures	Mt Shasta		3 miles of road closure
Foreseeable Projects	2	Trinity Roadside Hazard	Yolla Bolla	3800	
	3	West side watershed restoration	Yolla Bolla		47 mi of road-related watershed improvements
	4	Roads right-of-way request from Sierra Pacific Industries	McCloud		Provide road access to private land: 2,000 ft and 300 feet
Special Uses / Lands (no current projects)					
Foreseeable Projects	1	Caltrans Sand House	McCloud	<1 ?	
	2	Elk Trail water system upgrade/reauthorization	Shasta Lake	unknown	
	3	Verizon wireless permit amendment	Weaverville	< 1 ?	
	4	Watershed Center planning permit for Indian Valley	Hayfork	unknown	
	5	Enterprise Lode Mine authorization	Big Bar	unknown	
	6	Calfire/CDC Sugarpine Conservation Camp permit reissuance and improvements	Shasta Lake	Improvements within existing permitted area	
	7	High voltage powerline right-of-way vegetation maintenance	Doublehead, McCloud	unknown	
	8	Caltrans Antlers Bridge staging area permit	Shasta Lake	Permit for access to 144 acres	
	9	Geothermal Leasing programmatic analysis	Several forests in 11 western states	unknown	
	10	Designation of energy corridors programmatic analysis	Several forests in 11 western states	unknown	
	11	Hyampom cellular site	Hayfork	< 1 ?	
	12	Big Bar cellular site	Big Bar	< 1 ?	
	13	McFarland ridge cellular site	Yolla Bolla	< 1 ?	
	14	Trinity county DOT special use permit authorization	Big Bar	unknown	
	15	Hagen French Ranch land exchange	Weaverville	unknown	
	16	Pacific Gas and Electric permit reissuance for transmission lines	All	unknown	
	17	Lakehead Response Center construction	Shasta Lake	unknown	
	18	Lehigh Southwest land exchange	Shasta Lake	unknown	
	19	Silverthorn recreation residence reconstruction	Shasta Lake	0 (using existing footprint)	

	Number	Project Name	District	Estimated Treatment Acres, if known	Roads
Recreation (no current projects, 2 foreseeable projects)					
	1	Recreation facility analysis/recreation site improvement	All	unknown	
	2	Greasy Loop trail relocation	Weaverville	unknown	
Fish/Wildlife/Rare Plants (2 current projects, no foreseeable projects)					
	1	Restoration of Fish Passage at Road Crossings	All	< 1?	0
	2	Shasta Lake Fish Habitat Improvement	Shasta Lake	< 1?	
	Total Projects	**Total Projects by Category**	**Total Projects by Ranger District/Unit**	**Total Acres by Project Type**	
	69	21–Fuels & Vegetation 16–Vegetation 1–Grazing 4–Minerals and Geology 4–Roads & Watershed 19–Special Uses & Lands 2–Recreation 2–Fish/Wildlife/Rare Plants	13–Hayfork 22–McCloud 13–Mt Shasta 13–Shasta Lake 14–Weaverville 15–Yolla Bolla 18–Big Bar 7–Doublehead * some projects are multi-district	70,220 ac–Fuels & Veg 26,900 ac–Vegetation 27 ac–minerals * this is a total of just those projects where treatment acres were available	

Roads Proposals and Decisions

Recent proposals and decisions regarding the existing National Forest Transportation System on the STNF are detailed below in Table B- 6. These actions have been or are currently undergoing environmental analysis in forest management projects in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Project-level analyses often study the transportation system in the project area and propose actions for individual routes such as adding to the transportation system, closing, decommissioning, or abandoning as necessary to meet management objectives.

Table B-6. Present and reasonably foreseeable road proposals and decisions on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
Algoma Vegetation Management Project				
39N06B	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
39N06C	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
39N10A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N11Y	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Close
39N11Y	NFTS	1.00	Proposed	Abandon
39N11YB	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
39N11YG	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
39N28YA	NFTS	0.80	Proposed	Close
39N28YB	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
39N28YD	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
39N28YE	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Abandon
39N28YF	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Abandon
39N35	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
39N35B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
39N35B	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
39N49	NFTS	1.90	Proposed	Close
39N49A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N49B	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N49C	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
39N49D	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N51A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
40N11A	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Close
40N11C	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N11D	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N13C	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N14A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
40N14E	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N14F	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
40N14YA	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
40N49YB	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N49YC	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N49YD	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
40N51	NFTS	2.10	Proposed	Close
40N63YA	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
40N92	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
40N92A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
MC034	Unauthorized Route	0.11	Proposed	Close
MC034	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC035	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close
MC036	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC03799999	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Proposed	Close
MC038	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
MC039	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC042	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC044	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC046	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close
MC047	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC048	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC048	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC049	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC050	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC051	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC052	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC053	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Close after Further Review
MC063	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Abandon
MC067	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
MC071	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC072	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC073	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC074	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC075	Unauthorized Route	0.91	Proposed	Close
MC075	Unauthorized Route	0.90	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC500	Unauthorized Route	0.50	Proposed	Add to NFTS
MC504	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Close
MC505	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC506	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC507	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC508	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC509	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC510	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC512	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
MC513	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC514	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close
MC515	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC516	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Close
MC517	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close
MC518	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Close
MC518	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Close
MC519	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
Browns Project/ Road Decommissioning Proposals				
33N38F	NFTS	0.69	Final	Decommission
33N42A	NFTS	0.54	Final	Decommission
34N52Y	NFTS	0.39	Final	Decommission
34N52Y-10	NFTS	0.05	Final	Decommission
34N52Y-14	NFTS	0.15	Final	Decommission
34N52YA-11	NFTS	0.04	Final	Decommission
34N52YA-13	NFTS	0.02	Final	Decommission
34N83A	NFTS	0.34	Final	Close
34N83B	NFTS	0.25	Final	Close
34N89	NFTS	0.80	Final	Decommission
34N89A	NFTS	0.48	Final	Decommission
34N95-1	NFTS	0.19	Final	Decommission
34N95-7	NFTS	0.19	Final	Decommission
34N95-9	NFTS	0.04	Final	Decommission
34N95A	NFTS	0.59	Final	Decommission
34N95A-1	NFTS	0.03	Final	Decommission
34N95B	NFTS	0.31	Final	Decommission
34N95C	NFTS	0.57	Final	Decommission
34N95C-1	NFTS	0.07	Final	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
34N95E	NFTS	0.60	Final	Close
34N95F	NFTS	0.27	Final	Decommission
34N95F-1	NFTS	0.04	Final	Decommission
34N95G-1	NFTS	0.02	Final	Decommission
34N95G-2	NFTS	0.14	Final	Decommission
34N96-1	NFTS	0.39	Final	Decommission
34N96-5	NFTS	0.35	Final	Decommission
34N96B	NFTS	0.31	Final	Decommission
34N96B1	NFTS	0.26	Final	Decommission
34N96B-2	NFTS	0.06	Final	Decommission
34N96B-3	NFTS	0.06	Final	Decommission
34N96C	NFTS	0.26	Final	Decommission
34N96C	NFTS	0.21	Final	Decommission
34N96C-1	NFTS	0.44	Final	Decommission
U09W95A	Unauthorized Route	0.09	Final	Decommission
U230A	Unauthorized Route	0.29	Final	Decommission
U232A	Unauthorized Route	0.43	Final	Decommission
U232B	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Final	Decommission
U33N01C	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Final	Decommission
U33N01K	Unauthorized Route	0.43	Final	Decommission
U33N38B	Unauthorized Route	0.43	Final	Decommission
U33N38D	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Decommission
U33N38G	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Decommission
U33N42C	Unauthorized Route	0.02	Final	Decommission
U33N42R	Unauthorized Route	1.94	Final	Decommission
U33N42RD	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N05YA	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Final	Decommission
U34N05YB	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Final	Decommission
U34N05YC	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U34N33YA	Unauthorized Route	0.49	Final	Decommission
U34N34B	Unauthorized Route	0.82	Final	Decommission
U34N52YB	Unauthorized Route	0.34	Final	Decommission
U34N52YC	Unauthorized Route	0.58	Final	Decommission
U34N52YD	Unauthorized Route	0.92	Final	Decommission
U34N77A	Unauthorized Route	0.38	Final	Decommission
U34N77A-1	Unauthorized Route	0.02	Final	Decommission
U34N77AAB	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Final	Decommission
U34N77B	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Final	Decommission
U34N77C	Unauthorized Route	0.17	Final	Decommission
U34N95A	Unauthorized Route	0.22	Final	Decommission
U34N95AA	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Final	Decommission
U34N95B	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Final	Decommission
U34N95H	Unauthorized Route	0.56	Final	Decommission
U34N95I	Unauthorized Route	0.25	Final	Decommission
U34N95I-1	Unauthorized Route	0.24	Final	Decommission
U34N95J	Unauthorized Route	0.33	Final	Decommission
U34N95J	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Final	Decommission
U34N95J-1	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U34N95J-2	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N95K	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U34N95L	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N96AB	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Final	Decommission
U34N96AC	Unauthorized Route	0.23	Final	Decommission
U34N96B-4	Unauthorized Route	0.02	Final	Decommission
U34N96BA	Unauthorized Route	0.02	Final	Decommission
U34N96D	Unauthorized Route	1.01	Final	Decommission
U34N96E	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
U34N96F	Unauthorized Route	0.70	Final	Decommission
U3TRI01	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U3TRI01A	Unauthorized Route	0.06	Final	Decommission
U3TRI02	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03	Unauthorized Route	0.18	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03A	Unauthorized Route	0.01	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03B	Unauthorized Route	0.11	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03F	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Final	Decommission
U3TRI04	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Final	Decommission
U3TRI04A	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05A	Unauthorized Route	0.06	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05A-1	Unauthorized Route	0.09	Final	Decommission
UC232-1	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Final	Decommission
UT34N95C-1	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Decommission
UT34N96BA	Unauthorized Route	0.12	Final	Decommission
34N42A	NFTS	0.20	Final	Decommission
34N95-10	NFTS	0.13	Final	Decommission
34N95-11	NFTS	0.08	Final	Decommission
34N95-12	NFTS	0.08	Final	Decommission
34N95-13	NFTS	0.04	Final	Decommission
34N95-14	NFTS	0.04	Final	Decommission
34N95-16	NFTS	0.05	Final	Decommission
34N95-17	NFTS	0.31	Final	Decommission
34N95-18	NFTS	0.25	Final	Decommission
34N95-19	NFTS	0.03	Final	Decommission
34N95-20	NFTS	0.03	Final	Decommission
34N95-21	NFTS	0.05	Final	Decommission
34N95-22	NFTS	0.20	Final	Decommission
34N95-23	NFTS	0.23	Final	Decommission
34N95-25	NFTS	0.08	Final	Decommission
34N96-2	NFTS	0.35	Final	Decommission
34N96-3	NFTS	0.06	Final	Decommission
34N96-4	NFTS	0.13	Final	Decommission
34N96-6	NFTS	0.29	Final	Decommission
34N96B-4	NFTS	0.15	Final	Decommission
34N96B-5	NFTS	0.34	Final	Decommission
U236AA	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Final	Decommission
U236AB	Unauthorized Route	0.17	Final	Decommission
U236AC	Unauthorized Route	0.17	Final	Decommission
U236AD	Unauthorized Route	0.42	Final	Decommission
U34N34B-1	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N34B-2	Unauthorized Route	0.11	Final	Decommission
U34N52YCA	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N52YCB	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N77AA	Unauthorized Route	0.56	Final	Decommission
U34N95M	Unauthorized Route	0.23	Final	Decommission
U34N95N	Unauthorized Route	0.29	Final	Decommission
U34N95O	Unauthorized Route	0.85	Final	Decommission
U34N95P	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Final	Decommission
U34N96AD	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N96AE	Unauthorized Route	0.05	Final	Decommission
U34N96G	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U34N96H	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03A	Unauthorized Route	0.19	Final	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
U3TRI03C	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03D	Unauthorized Route	0.05	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03E	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U3TRI03G	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05-2	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05-3	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Final	Decommission
U3TRI05-4	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Final	Decommission
East Fork II				
28N22A	NFTS	2.24	Proposed	Close
28N26F	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Decommission
28N26G	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
28N27B	NFTS	0.88	Proposed	Close
28N48	NFTS	3.50	proposed	Closure - Seasonal
28N51	NFTS	1.95	Proposed	Close
28N51A	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Close
28N65	NFTS	1.20	proposed	Close
28N65S	NFTS	0.00	Proposed	Close
29N30A	NFTS	0.92	Proposed	Close
29N30C	NFTS	1.25	Proposed	Close
Gemmill Thin Project				
U30N37B	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Proposed	Decommission
29N07A	NFTS	0.36	Proposed	Decommission
29N07D	NFTS	0.90	Proposed	Decommission
29N83	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
29N83A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
30N04A	NFTS	1.70	Proposed	Decommission
30N16B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N16C	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
30N16D	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
30N21A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
30N21E	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
30N65	NFTS	0.90	Proposed	Decommission
30N65A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07CA	Unauthorized Route	0.28	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07E	Unauthorized Route	0.18	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07H	Unauthorized Route	0.87	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07HA	Unauthorized Route	0.23	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07HB	Unauthorized Route	0.19	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07HBA	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07J	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07K	Unauthorized Route	1.66	Proposed	Decommission
U29N10D	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Proposed	Decommission
U30N04C	Unauthorized Route	0.43	Proposed	Decommission
U30N04D	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Proposed	Decommission
U30N16G	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
Moosehead Vegetation And Road Management Project				
39N05A	NFTS	0.64	Proposed	Close
39N05B	NFTS	0.29	Proposed	Close
39N52	NFTS	1.13	Proposed	Close
39N52A	NFTS	0.26	Proposed	Close
39N55	NFTS	0.39	Proposed	Close
39N56	NFTS	1.95	Proposed	Close
39N56A	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Close
39N90	NFTS	1.40	Proposed	Close
39N90A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
39N90B	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N90C	NFTS	0.53	Proposed	Close

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
39N91	NFTS	1.52	Proposed	Close
39N91A	NFTS	0.35	Proposed	Close
39N92A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
39N93A	NFTS	0.39	Proposed	Close
39N93B	NFTS	0.54	Proposed	Close
39N94	NFTS	1.08	Proposed	Close
39N95	NFTS	2.12	Proposed	Close
39N95A	NFTS	0.55	Proposed	Close
39N95B	NFTS	0.42	Proposed	Close
39N96	NFTS	1.76	Proposed	Close
39N96A	NFTS	0.78	Proposed	Close
39N96B	NFTS	0.28	Proposed	Close
40N02Y	NFTS	0.83	Proposed	Close
40N05	NFTS	0.36	Proposed	Close
40N05	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
40N10B	NFTS	0.18	Proposed	Close
40N10E	NFTS	0.42	Proposed	Close
40N10J	NFTS	1.01	Proposed	Close
40N20X	NFTS	1.12	Proposed	Close
40N48C	NFTS	0.13	Proposed	Close
40N48D	NFTS	0.34	Proposed	Close
40N53	NFTS	0.15	Proposed	Close
40N82YA	NFTS	0.44	Proposed	Close
40N82YB	NFTS	0.23	Proposed	Close
40N82YC	NFTS	0.03	Proposed	Close
40N82YE	NFTS	0.18	Proposed	Close
40N82YF	NFTS	0.25	Proposed	Close
40N83	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
40N83A	NFTS	0.29	Proposed	Close
Mudflow Vegetation Management				
40N14	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Close
40N14	NFTS	1.00	Proposed	Abandon
40N29	NFTS	0.80	Proposed	Close
40N29	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
40N29	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
40N29A	NFTS	0.23	Proposed	Close
40N34YB	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
40N56	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Abandon
40N71	NFTS	2.99	Proposed	Close
40N81YA	NFTS	0.03	Proposed	Close
40N87Y	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Close
40N87YA	NFTS	0.73	Proposed	Close
41N05X	NFTS	1.26	Proposed	Close
41N05XA	NFTS	0.23	Proposed	Close
41N29B	NFTS	0.56	Proposed	Close
MC634	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
MC636	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close
MC649	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Close
MC652	Unauthorized Route	0.80	Proposed	Close
MC653	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
MC654	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
MC655	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
MC663	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
MC731	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Close
SW ¼ OF NE ¼ OF SEC.35, T40N, R2W	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Close

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
40N81Y	NFTS	1.30	Proposed	Close
Pettijohn LSR Project				
34N34Y	NFTS	2.50	Proposed	Decommission
34N85	NFTS	2.20	Proposed	Decommission
Pilgrim				
40N12A	NFTS	0.50	Final	Close
40N47Y	NFTS	0.70	Final	Decommission
40N54Y	NFTS	0.80	Final	Close
40N54YA	NFTS	0.20	Final	Close
40N57Y	NFTS	0.30	Final	Close
40N57YA	NFTS	0.30	Final	Close
40N64YD	NFTS	0.20	Final	Close
40N78	NFTS	0.80	Final	Close
40N78A	NFTS	0.40	Final	Close
40N78Y	NFTS	0.60	Final	Abandon
41N02Y	NFTS	1.00	Final	Close
41N12A	NFTS	0.50	Final	Abandon
41N52	NFTS	0.10	Final	Decommission
41N77	NFTS	1.00	Final	Close
41N96	NFTS	0.70	Final	Close
42N13E	NFTS	0.30	Final	Close
43N19F	NFTS	0.30	Final	Close
U40N47YA (NEE 40N47Y)	Unauthorized Route	0.60	Final	Close
U40N50YA & P40N50YA	Unauthorized Route	0.60	Final	Close
U40N54YB	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Final	Close
U40N64YE	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Final	Decommission
U40N66YA	Unauthorized Route	0.50	Final	Decommission
U41N06YA	Unauthorized Route	0.01	Final	Decommission
U41N06YB	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Final	Close
U41N12AB	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Final	Close
U41N52A	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Final	Decommission
U41N75A	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Close
U41N75AA	Unauthorized Route	0.01	Final	Decommission
U42N13G	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Final	Close
U42N13P	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Final	Decommission
U43N19G	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Final	Close
Porcupine Vegetation Management				
40N12X	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
40N40YA	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
40N48YA	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
41N01A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
41N01B	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
41N19C	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
41N22B	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Close
41N23B	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Close
41N25	NFTS	1.10	Proposed	Decommission
41N36B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
41N36G	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
41N36H	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
41N80A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
41N80B	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
41N93A	NFTS	1.30	Proposed	Decommission
42N03A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
42N07YA	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
42N07YB	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
42N08YA	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
42N20A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
42N26E	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Close
42N26G	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
42N59A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
42N60A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Close
43N49M	NFTS	0.80	Proposed	Close
43N49N	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Close
43N49P	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Close
UV40N48YD	Unauthorized Route	0.50	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV41N01D	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV41N22	Unauthorized Route	1.20	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV41N23B	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV41N23BB	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV42N58H	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Add to NFTS
UV42N60C	Unauthorized Route	0.60	Proposed	Add to NFTS
Powder				
42N01A	NFTS	0.12	Final	Close
42N02X	NFTS	2.37	Final	Close
42N03D	NFTS	0.23	Final	Close
42N03Y	NFTS	1.86	Final	Close
42N11B	NFTS	0.11	Final	Close
42N11C	NFTS	0.09	Final	Close
42N11E	NFTS	0.21	Final	Abandon
42N25	NFTS	1.31	Final	Close
42N28	NFTS	1.77	Final	Close
42N28	NFTS	0.17	Final	Decommission
42N30A	NFTS	0.65	Final	Close
42N30C	NFTS	0.24	Final	Abandon
42N30D	NFTS	0.05	Final	Decommission
42N36A	NFTS	0.32	Final	Close
42N37	NFTS	0.60	Final	Close
42N47	NFTS	1.91	Final	Close
42N47	NFTS	0.72	Final	Close
42N49C	NFTS	0.18	Final	Close
42N54	NFTS	0.32	Final	Close
42N55	NFTS	1.91	Final	Close
42N56	NFTS	1.43	Final	Close
42N77	NFTS	0.00	Final	Decommission
42N77	NFTS	0.00	Final	Abandon
42N77A	NFTS	0.17	Final	Decommission
42N77B	NFTS	1.08	Final	Close
42N81	NFTS	0.30	Final	Decommission
42N85	NFTS	3.19	Final	Close
42N87	NFTS	0.41	Final	Close
42N88	NFTS	1.12	Final	Close
42N89	NFTS	0.47	Final	Close
43N35	NFTS	0.90	Final	Decommission
43N35A	NFTS	0.61	Final	Close
43N35B	NFTS	0.24	Final	Close
43N49C	NFTS	0.77	Final	Close
43N49E	NFTS	0.56	Final	Close
43N49F	NFTS	0.15	Final	Close
43N49H	NFTS	0.38	Final	Close
43N49I	NFTS	0.91	Final	Close
43N52	NFTS	0.38	Final	Close
43N52A	NFTS	0.07	Final	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
U42N02XA	Unauthorized Route	0.94	Final	Decommission
U42N02XA	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Abandon
U42N02XB	Unauthorized Route	0.33	Final	Abandon
U42N02XY	Unauthorized Route	0.91	Final	Close
U42N02Y	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Abandon
U42N11F	Unauthorized Route	0.24	Final	Close
U42N25D	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Decommission
U42N47Y	Unauthorized Route	0.26	Final	Abandon
U42N77B	Unauthorized Route	0.06	Final	Close
U42N88A	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Abandon
U43N15M	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Final	Close
U43N15XT	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Close
U43N15XT	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Abandon
U43N15XY	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Close
U43N35B	Unauthorized Route	0.36	Final	Decommission
U43N49C	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Abandon
U43N49L	Unauthorized Route	0.42	Final	Close
U43N49Y	Unauthorized Route	0.00	Final	Close
42N01A	NFTS	0.12	Final	Close
Road Rights-Of-Way Requests From Sierra Pacific Industries				
TBD	New Construction	0.46	Proposed	Add to NFTS
Salt Timber Harvest And Fuels Hazard Reduction				
30N16Y	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
30N18C	NFTS	1.00	Proposed	Decommission
U30N16YA	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N18E	Unauthorized Route	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27AA	Unauthorized Route	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
U30N28F	Unauthorized Route	1.90	Proposed	Decommission
U30N28H	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U36TRI03B	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
29N55A	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
30N07	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
30N07A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N45A	NFTS	0.90	Proposed	Decommission
U29N31E	Unauthorized Route	2.80	Proposed	Decommission
U29N55B	Unauthorized Route	0.80	Proposed	Decommission
U29N55BA	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N07A	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Proposed	Decommission
U30N07AA	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N07AB	Unauthorized Route	0.05	Proposed	Decommission
U30N07AC	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N07AD	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27H	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27I	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27J	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27O	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27Q	Unauthorized Route	0.80	Proposed	Decommission
Upper Dubakella				
29N12	NFTS	0.81	Proposed	Decommission
29N17	NFTS	0.38	Proposed	Decommission
29N31A	NFTS	1.13	Proposed	Decommission
29N31B	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
29N32A	NFTS	0.87	Proposed	Decommission
29N33C	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
29N71	NFTS	3.44	Proposed	Decommission
29N72	NFTS	3.26	Proposed	Close
29N72A	NFTS	0.87	Proposed	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
29N89	NFTS	0.19	Proposed	Decommission
U29N17C	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Proposed	Decommission
U29N31G	Unauthorized Route	0.11	Proposed	Decommission
U29N31H	Unauthorized Route	0.26	Proposed	Decommission
U29N71B	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Proposed	Decommission
Westside Watershed Restoration				
1S28C	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
1S37	NFTS	0.90	Proposed	Decommission
1S39A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
28N06	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
28N31A	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
28N71A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
29N12A	NFTS	0.53	Proposed	Decommission
29N17B	NFTS	0.24	Proposed	Decommission
29N22A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
29N30P	NFTS	0.13	Proposed	Decommission
29N31C	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
29N31D	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
29N42A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
29N46A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
29N46B	NFTS	0.18	Proposed	Decommission
29N46C	NFTS	0.52	Proposed	Decommission
29N48A	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
29N50	NFTS	0.70	Proposed	Decommission
29N54	NFTS	1.39	Proposed	Decommission
29N54A	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
29N54B	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
29N56	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
29N56A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
29N58E	NFTS	0.01	Proposed	Decommission
29N58E	NFTS	0.19	Proposed	Decommission
29N58H	NFTS	0.57	Proposed	Decommission
29N58H	NFTS	0.03	Proposed	Decommission
29N58K	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
29N62D	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
29N63	NFTS	1.38	Proposed	Decommission
29N64	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
29N68A	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
29N68B	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
29N71A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
29N73D	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
29N81	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
29N81A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
29N86	NFTS	1.23	Proposed	Decommission
29N89A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N03A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N13C	NFTS	0.80	Proposed	Decommission
30N14A	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N14Y	NFTS	0.43	Proposed	Decommission
30N18A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
30N18B	NFTS	0.80	Proposed	Decommission
30N27A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
30N28A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
30N28B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
30N50A	NFTS	1.50	Proposed	Decommission
30N53A	NFTS	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
30N53B	NFTS	0.50	Proposed	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
30N57A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
33N04YA	NFTS	0.42	Proposed	Decommission
33N31	NFTS	1.80	Proposed	Decommission
33N47A	NFTS	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
33N51C	NFTS	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
34N17YA	NFTS	0.18	Proposed	Decommission
34N34YA	NFTS	0.60	Proposed	Decommission
34N36	NFTS	2.10	Proposed	Decommission
34N80B	NFTS	0.87	Proposed	Decommission
4N16B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Close
4N16B	NFTS	0.40	Proposed	Decommission
U1S29	Unauthorized Route	1.24	Proposed	Decommission
U28N10A	Unauthorized Route	0.32	Proposed	Decommission
U29N02C	Unauthorized Route	0.19	Proposed	Decommission
U29N05AB	Unauthorized Route	1.25	Proposed	Decommission
U29N05D	Unauthorized Route	0.21	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07C	Unauthorized Route	0.28	Proposed	Decommission
U29N07G	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Proposed	Decommission
U29N21X	Unauthorized Route	0.39	Proposed	Decommission
U29N22A	Unauthorized Route	1.02	Proposed	Decommission
U29N22E	Unauthorized Route	0.44	Proposed	Decommission
U29N22I	Unauthorized Route	0.18	Proposed	Decommission
U29N25C	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Proposed	Decommission
U29N31EAA	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
U29N31EB	Unauthorized Route	0.30	Proposed	Decommission
U29N32B	Unauthorized Route	1.77	Proposed	Decommission
U29N33B	Unauthorized Route	0.92	Proposed	Decommission
U29N41W	Unauthorized Route	0.65	Proposed	Decommission
U29N41X	Unauthorized Route	0.39	Proposed	Decommission
U29N46D	Unauthorized Route	0.38	Proposed	Decommission
U29N51A	Unauthorized Route	0.32	Proposed	Decommission
U29N58HA	Unauthorized Route	0.17	Proposed	Decommission
U29N71B	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Proposed	Decommission
U29N73E	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U29N83C	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Proposed	Decommission
U29N86B	Unauthorized Route	0.58	Proposed	Decommission
U29N86BA	Unauthorized Route	0.44	Proposed	Decommission
U29N86BB	Unauthorized Route	0.14	Proposed	Decommission
U30N14A	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N14AA	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N14B	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27A	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27AB	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27B	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27D	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27F	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27G	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27K	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27S	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27W	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27X	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N27Z	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Proposed	Decommission
U30N28C	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N28D	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N28FA	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission
U30N45A	Unauthorized Route	0.05	Proposed	Decommission
U30N45B	Unauthorized Route	0.20	Proposed	Decommission

Route Number	Road NFTS Status	Miles	Decision Status	Proposed Action / Decision
U32N25B	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Proposed	Decommission
U33N22BA	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Proposed	Decommission
U33N22C	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U33N22D	Unauthorized Route	0.27	Proposed	Decommission
U33N30	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Proposed	Decommission
U33N30A	Unauthorized Route	0.12	Proposed	Decommission
U33N30D	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Proposed	Decommission
U33N41AA	Unauthorized Route	0.02	Proposed	Decommission
U33N41AC	Unauthorized Route	0.07	Proposed	Decommission
U33N41EA	Unauthorized Route	0.03	Proposed	Decommission
U33N41FA	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Proposed	Decommission
U33N41M	Unauthorized Route	0.23	Proposed	Decommission
U33N48AA	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U33N48B	Unauthorized Route	0.08	Proposed	Decommission
U33N48C	Unauthorized Route	0.18	Proposed	Decommission
U33N48D	Unauthorized Route	0.04	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51BA	Unauthorized Route	0.16	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51E	Unauthorized Route	0.09	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51F	Unauthorized Route	0.32	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51G	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51H	Unauthorized Route	0.13	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51I	Unauthorized Route	0.05	Proposed	Decommission
U33N51J	Unauthorized Route	0.22	Proposed	Decommission
U36TRI03	Unauthorized Route	0.50	Proposed	Decommission
U36TRI05	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U414B	Unauthorized Route	0.10	Proposed	Decommission
U30N37A	Unauthorized Route	0.15	Proposed	Decommission
Total		**261.61**		

Private Lands

Because private landowners have no requirement to share their long-term management plans, actions on private land are difficult to analyze. Some new roads could be built on private lands to support restoration projects; however, new roads on private lands would likely not be open to the public. Cross-country travel will most likely continue across private land by ranchers and others in their day-to-day business and for recreation. Timber production will continue on private land and road construction associated with that will likely occur. These roads will probably be temporary and will support timber operations. Firewood gathering will continue to occur on private land, but most likely will use existing roads, and travel cross-country will be for short distances only.

The forest contacted several private landowners with holdings within the boundary of the forest to determine trends in present and future management. Since the public comments received during the comment period revealed some concern with the policies of private landowners regarding OHV use on their land, the forest contacted five large landowners to determine what those policies are.

Primary land activities occurring on these private lands are timber management, public recreation with picnic and boating facilities on lands associated with hydroelectric facilities, and undeveloped property. All landowners anticipate continuing with similar management activities over the next 20 years.

Public Use on Private Lands

Sierra Pacific Industries: They do not discourage public use as long as it is by foot or non-motorized means. Motorized vehicles are allowed where the road is not gated; if there is a gate, there should be no public motor vehicle use. They do not allow cross-country travel on their lands, and approximately one-third of the roads on the local district are gated, with up to two gates added per year. There have been no changes in their policy over the last 10 years, except that they used to allow non-street-legal vehicles (ATVs) behind locked gates.

Roseburg Resources: Foot traffic, bicycle, or horseback riding is allowed on their lands. Their general policy is to gate all roads to motorized use to help protect the roads and reduce watershed impacts. There is a chronic problem with off-highway vehicle use on their lands. The gates are intended to eliminate motorized use, but they are ineffective for motorcycles or all-terrain vehicles. They are concerned with the impacts to water quality with this use, and with areas where motorized access on National Forest land crosses onto private property. Illegal access on private lands may result in wildfire, illegal dumping of waste, and poaching of firewood.

Pacific Gas and Electric (PGE) Company: Generally, unless an area is gated and posted, PGE does not actively allow or restrict public access. If an area is not gated or posted, PGE properties are open to the public, including hunting and fishing, motorized and non-motorized use.

Fruit Growers Supply Co.: They sign their property and require permission to pass through, and generally allow hunting and fishing on their properties. They have some gated areas that allow foot, horse, and bike travel, but not motorized. They have had problems with permit holders (i.e., Christmas trees, firewood, and, particularly, mushrooms) for special uses on National Forest land accessing their private land. Also, Fruit Growers Supply would like to gate or close some access to reduce unauthorized access and camping.

Hancock Natural Resource Group: The majority of the property is open to the public with no restrictions. About 30 percent of their land is gated; foot traffic, horseback riding and mountain biking are allowed behind gated roads (with the exception of the hunting club area described below). Motorized use is not allowed behind the gates. Hunting and fishing are allowed on their property; hunter success has been increasing in the walk-in only areas.

Approximately 5,000 to 6,000 acres southwest of the town of McCloud is gated for the exclusive use of the Wilderness Unlimited Hunting Club. Access to the general public is restricted there. There has been a noticeable increase in the number and use of all-terrain vehicles in the area. Dune buggies are damaging the soils.

Appendix C: Process for Designation of Motorized Mixed Use on Shasta-Trinity National Forest Roads

In accordance with Forest Service and regional policy, a qualified engineer conducted a mixed-use analysis to determine if the NFTS maintenance level 3 road segments proposed are appropriate for motorized mixed-use. The forester supervisor, regional engineer, and regional forester have reviewed the completed analysis. Table C-2 below displays the list of roads submitted for concurrence with the California Highway Patrol (See 36 CFR 212.5(a)(1) and 36 CFR 212.53). If the California Highway Patrol concurs with the analysis, motorized mixed-use may be allowed on the approved road segments.

Background

National Forest System roads maintained for passenger car use (operational maintenance levels 3-5) are considered highways on the STNF. Because these roads generally would not be open to motorized mixed use (MMU) under the California Vehicle Code (CVC), Forest Service policy requires that decisions regarding designation of MMU on these NFS roads be informed by an engineering analysis conducted by a qualified engineer. In addition, Forest Service Region 5 requires that designation decisions regarding motorized mixed use on high-clearance vehicle roads (operational maintenance level 2) also be informed by an engineering analysis, with documentation required in the form of an engineering judgment.

The CVC requires that prior to an agency of the Federal government designating a highway, or portion thereof, as a combined use highway, the commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) be notified. The CVC further states that the agency shall not designate any segment which, in the opinion of the commissioner, would create a potential traffic hazard.

The proposals for motorized mixed use studied in this analysis are listed below in Tables C-1 and C-3. They include both passenger car roads (Table C-1) and high-clearance vehicle roads (Table C-3). All proposals involving highway segments are consistent with the CVC combined use highway laws. To properly inform the responsible official regarding the designation of these roads and road segments for motor vehicle use, engineering analyses have been conducted and are documented in the appropriate format—engineering report or engineering judgment. In accordance with State law, the engineering reports for highway segments the responsible official chooses to designate will then be sent to the commissioner of the CHP for review, prior to designation.

The engineering analyses conducted by the Forest Service assess crash risk in terms of both crash probability and crash severity on a scale of low, moderate, and high. The engineering analyses also provide potential mitigation measures and an estimate of the associated change in risk due to implementing these alternatives. Last of all, estimated costs for the mitigation alternatives are presented to give the interdisciplinary team and responsible official a better understanding of the economic impacts associated with these alternatives.

After considering the results of the engineering analysis, the responsible official will decide whether or not to designate these segments for MMU. If the CHP concurs with the proposals, the responsible official may move forward with the decision. If the responsible official wishes to move forward with proposals not concurred with by the CHP, then the regional forester team will determine whether or not to allow motorized mixed use on the applicable segment(s). The final decision must be reflected in designations on a motor vehicle use map and documented in road management objectives.

Motorized Mixed-Use –Maintenance Level 3 Roads

Assessed risks for maintenance level 3 roads that were considered are documented in Table C-1. These risks represent the expected crash risk after mitigation, if motorized mixed use were to be designated. Reports for individual segments are in the project record.

Table C-1. Existing NFTS level 3 roads proposed for motorized mixed-use in alternatives 4 and 5

Route	Name	Surface	Beginning Milepost	Ending Milepost	Miles	Crash Probability/ Crash Severity
40N64	Toad Lake	Native material	4.15	5.97	1.82	L / H
34N17	Fenders Ferry	Native material	27.43	28.42	0.99	M / H
1N12	Copper Mine	Crushed aggregate or gravel	4.98	5.83	0.85	L / H
4N08	Miners Creek	Improved native material	1.32	4.23	2.91	L / M
4N08	Miners Creek	Improved native material	8.83	8.99	0.16	L / M
33N52	Hayfork Bally	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.27	4.40	1.13	L / M
33N47	Soldier Creek	Crushed aggregate or gravel	7.72	7.97	0.24	L / M
33N47	Soldier Creek	Crushed aggregate or gravel	1.37	2.84	1.47	M / M
5N04	Big Mountain	Crushed aggregate or gravel	6.97	8.35	1.38	L / M
2N10	Indian Valley	Bituminous surface treatment	8.68	10.56	1.88	M / H
2N07	Post Mountain	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.76	4.86	1.09	L / M
1N12	Copper Mine	Crushed aggregate or gravel	0.00	0.99	0.99	L / M
1S14	Bear Wallow	Crushed aggregate or gravel	8.04	8.44	0.40	M / H
29N28	String Bean Creek	Native material	6.49	6.81	0.31	L / M
27N06	Tomhead Mountain	Native material	1.73	3.70	1.97	L / M
30N29	Bramlet	Crushed aggregate or gravel	0.00	1.91	1.91	M / H
40N45	Bear Creek	Native material	2.17	4.76	2.59	L / M
28N10	Stuart Gap	Crushed aggregate or gravel	8.90	9.73	0.83	L / M
30N29	Bramlet	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.60	5.52	1.93	L / M
29N75	Upper Smokey	Crushed aggregate or gravel	0.00	1.39	1.39	L / M
41N36	Lava Spur aka Porcupine Butte	Crushed aggregate or gravel	1.70	3.05	1.35	L / M
40N45	Bear Creek	Crushed aggregate or gravel	8.59	9.84	1.25	M / H
34N17	Fenders Ferry	Native material	20.46	22.03	1.57	L / M
Total					**30.41**	

L= low; M=Moderate; H=High

The forest supervisor considered the results of the mixed use analysis to determine which road segments would be appropriate to designate on the MVUM. Some segments were eliminated from further consideration because there are no practical mitigations for lowering the high crash probability and severity. The final list of road segments proposed for motorized mixed use in modified alternative 2 is in Table C-2. These roads facilitate extended rides and loops to enhance motorized recreation experiences and access while providing for public safety. They intersect approximately 35 maintenance level 2 roads and extend OHV riding opportunities a minimum of 128 miles.

The regional forester has concurred with these road recommendations (Regional Forester's Memo, January 20, 2010) and the STNF is currently coordinating with the California Highway Patrol. Final approval for allowing mixed use on these road segments is contingent upon concurrence from the CHP and the development of a signing safety plan using the Forest Service guidelines for approved warning signs.

Table C-2. Existing NFTS level 3 roads proposed for motorized mixed-use in modified alternative 2

Route	Name	Surface	Beginning Milepost	Ending Milepost	Miles	Crash Probability/ Crash Severity
4N08	Miners Creek	Improved native material	1.32	4.23	2.91	L / M
4N08	Miners Creek	Improved native material	8.83	8.99	0.16	L / M
33N52	Hayfork Bally	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.27	4.40	1.13	L / M
33N47	Soldier Creek	Crushed aggregate or gravel	7.72	7.97	0.24	L / M
33N47	Soldier Creek	Crushed aggregate or gravel	1.37	2.84	1.47	M / M
5N04	Big Mountain	Crushed aggregate or gravel	6.97	8.35	1.38	L / M
2N07	Post Mountain	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.76	4.86	1.09	L / M
1N12	Copper Mine	Crushed aggregate or gravel	0.00	0.99	0.99	L / M
29N28	String Bean Creek	Native material	6.49	6.81	0.31	L / M
27N06	Tomhead Mountain	Native material	1.73	3.70	1.97	L / M
40N45	Bear Creek	Native material	2.17	4.76	2.59	L / M
28N10	Stuart Gap	Crushed aggregate or gravel	8.90	9.73	0.83	L / M
30N29	Bramlet	Crushed aggregate or gravel	3.60	5.52	1.93	L / M
29N75	Upper Smokey	Crushed aggregate or gravel	0.00	1.39	1.39	L / M
41N36	Lava Spur aka Porcupine Butte	Crushed aggregate or gravel	1.70	3.05	1.35	L / M
34N17	Fenders Ferry	Native material	20.46	22.03	1.57	L / M
Total					**21.31**	

Costs for implementing motorized mixed use designations on these 16 segments are estimated at approximately $3,000 per segment, or $48,000 total. This would cover work including: brushing for additional sight distance, warning and other traffic control signing, route identification signing, and implementing traffic management strategies on adjacent routes.

Proposed Roads Open to All Vehicles

The routes proposed to allow all vehicle classes are listed below in Tables C-3 and C-4. A qualified engineer conducted the required engineering analysis which is documented in the engineering judgment in the project file. The analysis determines that the proposed designations are consistent with state and local laws, and that the routes currently have motorized mixed-use.

Table C-3. Unauthorized routes proposed for all vehicle classes in alternatives 2, 4, and 5

Route	Miles	Alternatives
JG30	0.18	2, 5
JG31	0.21	2, 5
JM244	0.96	2, 5
JM25	0.19	2, 5
JM44	0.15	2, 5
JM72	0.06	2, 5
NRA1	0.60	2, 5
NRA2	0.30	2, 5
NRA3	0.22	2, 5
PM2004	0.32	2, 5
PM304	0.03	2, 5
RM1036	2.16	2, 5
RM706	0.07	2, 5
SE194	0.04	2, 5
SE314	0.07	2, 5
SE416	2.04	2, 5
SE476	0.16	2, 5
SE477	0.15	2, 5
SE508	0.12	2, 5
SFMU13	0.26	2, 5
SFMU17	0.04	2, 5
SFMU18	0.03	2, 5
SFMU4	0.02	2, 5
SFMU5	0.06	2, 5
SFMU6	0.02	2, 5
SFMU7	0.01	2, 5
SW234	0.14	2, 5
TC1004	0.12	2, 5
TC1098	0.05	2, 5
TC1238	0.04	2, 5
TC349	0.22	2, 5
TC828	0.08	2, 5
TC838	0.14	2, 5
TC899	0.06	2, 5
TRMU2	0.54	2, 5
TRMU3	0.15	2, 5
TRMU5	0.22	2, 5
TRMU6	0.15	2, 5
U1B005A	0.09	2, 5
U1S39B	0.23	2, 5
U27N02G	0.09	2, 5

Route	Miles	Alternatives
U29N28D	1.55	2, 5
U30N27S	0.05	2, 5
U30N29E	0.74	2, 5
U34N26DA	0.26	2, 5
U34N26DAA	0.09	2, 5
U35N05A	1.74	2, 5
U35N85A	0.19	2, 5
U36N35AA	0.71	2, 5
U36N35AB	0.10	2, 5
U40N13D	0.71	2, 5
U40N35A	0.65	2, 5
U40N84AA	1.59	2, 5
U40N88XCB	0.49	2, 5
U40N88XE	0.25	2, 5
U40N91YA	0.63	2, 5
U414A	0.59	2, 5
U414C	0.19	2, 5
U414CA	0.12	2, 5
U414D	0.15	2, 5
U414F	0.18	2, 5
U414FA	0.04	2, 5
U41N18A	2.52	2, 5
U41N18AA	2.08	2, 5
U41N18AAD	0.82	2, 5
U41N55D	1.21	2, 5
U41N55E	1.60	2, 5
U42N18A	3.89	2, 5
U42N18AA	2.43	2, 5
U4N12L	0.06	2, 5
U4N12LA	0.06	2, 5
IV001	0.02	5
IV002	0.01	5
IV007	0.06	5
IV008	0.01	5
IV009	0.07	5
IV010	0.07	5
IV011	0.03	5
IV012	0.02	5
IV013	0.04	5
IV014	0.06	5
IV015	0.07	5

Route	Miles	Alternatives
IV016	0.04	5
IV017	0.02	5
IV018	0.05	5
IV020	0.06	5
IV021	0.04	5
MC090	0.88	4, 5
MC091	0.20	5
TC1451	0.03	5

Route	Miles	Alternatives
TC1451	0.10	5
TC1451A	0.17	5
TC1462A	1.69	5
TC1489	1.78	5
TC857	0.49	5
U29N73G	0.98	5
Total	43.47	

Table C-4. Unauthorized routes proposed for all vehicle classes in modified alternative 2

Route	Miles
IV001	0.02
IV002	0.01
IV007	0.06
JM244	0.96
JM25	0.19
JM72	0.06
NRA1	0.60
NRA2	0.30
NRA3	0.22
PM2004	0.32
PM304	0.03
RM1036	2.16
SE416	2.04
SE508	0.12
SFMU17	0.04
SFMU18	0.03
SFMU4	0.02

SFMU5	0.06
SFMU6	0.02
SFMU7	0.01
SW234	0.14
TC1098	0.05
TC349	0.22
TC838	0.14
TC899	0.06
TRMU2	0.54
U1B005A	0.09
U1S39B	0.23
U29N28D	1.55
U30N27S	0.05
U30N29E	0.74
U34N26DA	0.26
U34N26DAA	0.09
U35N85A	0.19
U36N35AA	0.71

U36N35AB	0.10
U40N13D	0.71
U40N35A	0.65
U40N84AA	1.59
U40N88XCB	0.49
U40N91YA	0.63
U414A	0.59
U414C	0.19
U414CA	0.12
U414D	0.15
U414F	0.18
U414FA	0.04
U41N18A	2.52
U41N18AA	2.08
U42N18AA	2.43
U4N12L	0.06
U4N12LA	0.06
Total	24.92

References:

FSH 7709.55, available @ http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/

CVC Division 16.5, available @ http://www.dmv.ca.gov/pubs/vctop/vc/vc.htm

R5 Regional Forester letter dated January 20, 2010

R5 Regional Forester letter dated January 13, 2009

R5 Regional Forester letter dated August 21, 2006

Appendix D: Mitigation and Monitoring

Changes between DEIS and FEIS

- All monitoring and mitigation information related to cultural resources has been moved to Appendix L: Cultural Resources Management.
- Mitigation tables now include modified alternative 2 where applicable.
- Seasonal restrictions for northern spotted owls have been removed from routes and reservoir open areas.
- Botany and non-native invasive species data has been updated.
- Best Management Practice 2-26 (Obliteration or Decommissioning of Roads) has been removed as it does not apply to this analysis.
- Air quality mitigations have changed to require capping of particular routes with inclusions of naturally occurring asbestos prior to designation on the motor vehicle use map.

Wildlife

Mitigation

Seasonal restrictions are assigned to proposed road and trail additions in this analysis to protect nesting and young TES species[1]. Table D-1 lists the closures by route and the reason for the closure. The season of use for each route applies to all alternatives in which the route is proposed.

Table D-1. Closures by route; the season of use for each route applies to all alternatives in which the route is proposed

Route No.	Miles	Alts	Season of Use	Closure Reason
JM72	0.06	2, 5, Mod. Alt. 2	August 16 - December 31	Bald eagle
EA284	0.68	5	August 16 - January 31	Northern goshawk
MC090	0.88	4, 5	August 16 - January 31	Northern goshawk
SFMU18	0.03	2, 5, Mod. Alt. 2	August 16 - January 31	Northern goshawk
TC1249	0.06	2, 5	August 16 - January 31	Northern goshawk
U40N50A	0.51	5	August 16 - January 31	Northern goshawk

Season of use restrictions on particular proposed routes and below the high water marks on Trinity Lake and Iron Canyon Reservoir to protect nesting and young northern spotted owls in habitat adjacent to the reservoirs were studied in the DEIS. Further analysis by the STNF wildlife biologist indicates that

[1] The STNF has no current Forest Orders for seasonal restrictions. The Forest Plan allows for seasonal road closures to protect wildlife (Forest Plan p. 4-17).

such closures would not be effective or necessary (see the wildlife section in chapter 3) and the closures have been removed in the FEIS. Table D-2 reflects that change. Existing bald eagle closures remain.

Table D-2. Existing seasonal restrictions for wildlife below the high water mark

Proposed Open Area Below the High Water Mark	Total Open Area Acres	Bald Eagle Seasonal Restriction EXISTING Season of Use (acres) Aug 16–Dec 31	Acres of Open Area with no Seasonal Restrictions
Iron Canyon Reservoir Area	429	0	429
Shasta Lake Area	28,403	2,205	26,198
Trinity Lake Area	15,644	649	14,995
Total Open Areas	**44,476**		

Hazard trees that are felled along routes proposed in late successional reserves (LSRs) would be left to provide habitat for TES wildlife species and their prey. This mitigation measure could affect motorists' ability to pull off and park/camp within one vehicle length of the proposed routes.

Table D-3. Routes in LSRs potentially affected by leaving felled hazard trees

Route	Alternative	Type	Miles
JG30	2, 5	Road	0.18
JG31	2, 5	Road	0.21
JM244	2, 5	Road	0.10
NRA1	2, 5, Mod Alt 2	Road/Trail	0.26
PM2004	2, 5	Road	0.32
RM1036	2, 5, Mod Alt 2	Road	0.52
SFMU4	2, 5	Road	0.02
SFMU6	2, 5	Road	0.02
SFMU7	2, 5, Mod Alt 2	Road	0.01
TC1098	2, 5	Road	0.05
TC1238	2, 5	Road	0.04
TC828	2, 5	Road	0.08
TRMU2	2, 5	Road	0.54
TRMU3	2, 5	Road	0.15
TRMU5	2, 5	Road	0.19
TRMU6	2, 5	Road	0.14
U35N85A	2, 5	Road	0.02
U40N13D	2, 5, Mod Alt 2	Road	0.10
JM44	2, 5	Road	0.15
PM702	2, 5	Trail	0.04
TC1249	2, 5	Trail	0.06
TC319	2, 5, Mod Alt 2	Trail	0.12
U29N28C	2, 5	Trail	0.51
U31N02Q	2, 5	Trail	0.28
U4N12D	2, 5	Trail	3.29
UT29N30HA	2, 5	Trail	0.23
Total			**7.63**

Botany

Monitoring

Known botanical resources on proposed trail routes will be monitored for impacts (Table D-4). Mitigation measures such as barriers or treatment of noxious weeds will be implemented as necessary.

Table D-4. Specific proposed routes that will be monitored for impacts to known botanical resources by alternative

Trail #	Botanical Resources (site locations)	Alternatives
TC1829	*Harmonia doris- nilesiae* (HADO2STTM002)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
RM1036	*Ericameria ophitidis* (EROP205140049)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
RM720	*Ericameria ophitidis* (EROP205140005)	5, Mod. Alt. 2
RM737	*Ericameria ophitidis* (EROP205140054)	5
RM793	*Harmonia doris-nilesiae* (HADO2STTM001)	5
SE512	*Arnica venosa* (ARVE05140032C)	5
TC1489	*Eriastrum tracyi* (ERBR3STTM001)	5, Mod. Alt. 2
U42N18B	*Phacelia cookei* (PHCO202005140001)	5
U29N73G	*Eriogonum libertini* (ERLI405140010)	5, Mod. Alt. 2
WE039	*Phacelia cookei* (PHCO202005140002)	5
Shasta Lake Area	*Clarkia borealis* var. *borealis* (CLBOBSTTM004)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Clarkia borealis* var. *borealis* (CLBOBSTTM005)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Neviusia cliftonii* (NECLSTTM001)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Neviusia cliftonii* (NECLSTTM002)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Neviusia cliftonii* (NECLSTTM003)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Neviusia cliftonii* (NECLSTTM004)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Shasta Lake Area	*Neviusia cliftonii* (NECLSTTM005)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2
Trinity Lake Area	*Penstemon filiformis* (PEFI2051140001)	2,4,5,Mod.Alt 2

Non-native Invasive Plants

Mitigation

Known weed sites on proposed trail routes will be treated by hand-pulling (Table D-5).

Table D-5. Noxious weed sites on proposed trail routes that will be treated by hand by alternative

Trail #	Noxious Weeds (site locations) that will be Treated by Hand	Alternative(s)
SFMU6	*Centaurea diffusa* (05145201PFB234)	2 & 5
U4N12D	*Centaurea diffusa* (05145201PFB234)	2 & 5
U4N12D	*Centaurea diffusa* (05145201SAE011)	2 & 5
NRA3	*Isatis tinctoria* (05145202PFB211[38])	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
NRA3	*Isatis tinctoria* (05145601PFB218[39])	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
NRA3	*Isatis tinctoria* (05145603SAE014)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
U34N26DA	*Spartium junceum* (051456SPJU11206G)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
U42N15J	*Carduus nutans* (05145902PFB102A)	5
U42N15KA	*Carduus nutans* (05145902PFB102A)	5
U40N88XE	*Cirsium vulgare* (51459CIVU150A)	2 & 5
U40N88XCB	*Cirsium vulgare* (51459CIVU150B)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
UOHV18	*Cytisus scoparius* (58CYSC19103N)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
U40N35A	*Carduus nutans* (59CANU20502B)	2, 5, Mod. Alt 2
U40N91YA	*Carduus nutans* (59CANU20502B)	5, Mod. Alt. 2

Watershed

Mitigation

Table D-6. Seasonal restrictions by route number to mitigate erosion hazards

Route Number	Proposed Type	Miles	Season of Use	Reason for the Restriction	Alts
RM1216	Trail	0.39	05/01 - 10/30	Erosion	5, Mod. Alt. 2
RM1210	Trail	0.07	05/01 - 10/30	Erosion	5
RM1211	Trail	0.12	05/01 - 10/30	Erosion	5
RM1212	Trail	0.15	05/01 - 10/30	Erosion	4, 5
RM1213	Trail	0.08	05/01 - 10/30	Erosion	5

In addition to the seasonal restrictions assigned in Table D-6, any routes selected for designation which are located in areas with high and very high erosion potential and hydrologically sensitive areas would be closed as needed to protect resources. Routes listed in Tables 3.02-7, 3.02-9, 3.02-20, and 3.02-21 in the watershed section of chapter 3 will be monitored and closed if necessary.

Best Management Practices[2]

Non-point source pollution on national forests is managed through the Regional Water Quality Management Plan (USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region, 2000), which relies on implementation of prescribed best management practices (BMPs). The plan includes one BMP for OHV use (4-7) and 28 BMPs related to road construction and maintenance (2-1 to 2-28). All NFS roads and trails open to OHV use are required to comply with these BMPs.

Monitoring BMP effectiveness will occur with a random sample of 2-3 routes per year.

Practice 4-7 - Water Quality Monitoring Off-highway Vehicle Use According to a Developed Plan

Monitoring results are evaluated against the OHV plan objectives for water quality and the LRMP objectives for the area. These results are documented, along with the actions necessary to correct identified problems. If considerable adverse effects are occurring, or are likely to occur, immediate corrective action will be taken. Corrective actions may include, but are not limited to, reduction in the amount of ORV use, signing, or barriers to redistribute use, partial closure of areas, rotation of use on area, closure to causative vehicle type(s), or total closure, and structural solutions, such as culverts and bridges. Closure is accomplished through authority of the Forest supervisor.

Practice 2-1 - General Guidelines for the Location and Design of Roads

Forest engineers will be responsible for developing and meeting design specifications. The COR, ER or FSR ensures compliance with project plan requirements and the operating plan.

Practice 2-2 - Erosion Control Plan

Design engineers develop detailed mitigation using an ID team. The detailed mitigations are reflected in the contract specifications and provisions. The intent of mitigation is to prevent construction-generated erosion, as well as that generated from the completed road, from entering watercourses. Contracted projects are implemented by the contractor or operator. Compliance with contract specifications and operating plans is ensured by the COR, ER, or FSR through inspection. This practice is commonly applied to all road construction through contract clauses and specifications and will apply to road construction for timber sales, mining, recreation, special uses and other roadwork on NFS lands.

Practice 2-4 - Road Slope Stabilization (Preventative Practice)

Depending on site factors such as slope angle, soil type, climate, and proximity to waterways, many fill slopes, some cut slopes, and some spoil disposal areas will require vegetative and/or mechanical measures

[2] USDA Forest Service 2000. Water Quality Management for Forest System Lands in California Best Management Practices. Please see this publication for complete information about each Practice, the information here partial extractions.

to provide surface soil stability. The level of stabilization effort needed is determined on a case-by-case basis by trained and qualified employees.

Revegetation includes the seeding of plant species grass, legumes, or browse species; or the planting of brush, or trees. Revegetation may also include fertilizer, soil amendments, and mulching, or even watering to ensure success.

Mechanical and vegetative surface stabilization measures will be periodically inspected to determine effectiveness. In some cases, additional work will be needed to ensure that the vegetative and/or mechanical surface stabilization measures continue to function as intended

Practice 2-5 - Road Slope Stabilization (Administrative Practice)

A prerequisite for stabilization is to provide basic mechanical stability of the soils, using data from soils and geologic investigations to develop requirements for proper slope angles, compaction, and adequate drainage.

Application is commonly in conjunction with practice 2-4. Complete most, if not all, of the stabilization measures prior to the first winter rains. At especially critical locations, with a high erosion and/or sedimentation potential, extensive and reliable remedies will be necessary.

Practice 2-6 - Dispersion of Subsurface Drainage from Cut

Where ground water dispersion is necessary because of slopes, soil, aspect, precipitation amounts, inherent instability, or other related characteristics, dispersion methods would include: (1) underdrains or subdrains (e.g., pipes, geotextiles) and (2) horizontal drains or chimney drains.

Dispersal of collected water will be accomplished in an area capable of withstanding increased flows.

Practice 2-7 - Control of Road Drainage

Methods used to reduce erosion include, but are not limited to, such controls as construction of properly spaced cross drains, water bars or rolling dips; installing energy dissipaters, apron, downspouts, gabions, flumes, override drains and debris racks; armoring of ditches, drain inlets, and outlets and removing or adding berms to control runoff.

Reduce sediment loads from road surfaces by adding aggregate or paving surfaces or by installing such controls as sediment filters, settling ponds, and contour trenches.

Practice 2-8 - Constraints Related to Pioneer Road Construction

(1) Confine construction of pioneer roads to the planned roadway construction limits unless otherwise specified or approved by the ER or COR. (2) Locate and construct pioneering roads to prevent undercutting of the designated final cut slope, avoid deposition of materials outside the designated

roadway limits, and accommodate drainage with temporary culverts or log crossings. (3) Complete erosion control work prior to the rainy season and in accordance with contract, or project plan requirements. (4) Dewater sites on live streams crossed by pioneer roads with diversion devices (see practice 2-15).

Practice 2-9 - Timely Erosion Control Measures on Incomplete Road and Stream crossing Projects

Apply protective measures to all area of disturbed, erosion-prone, unprotected ground that is not to be further disturbed in the present year. When conditions permit operations outside of the normal operating season, update the operating plan as necessary and keep erosion control measures sufficiently current with ground disturbance to allow rapid closure when weather conditions deteriorate. Do not leave project areas for the winter with remedial measures incomplete.

Practice 2-10 – Construction of Stable Embankments

To minimize fill failures, design and construct the roadway as a stable and durable earthwork structure with adequate strength to support the treadway, shoulders, subgrade and the road's traffic loads. Proper slope ratio design will promote stable embankments.

Practice 2-11 - Minimization of Sidecast Material

Sidecasting is an unacceptable construction alternative in areas where it can adversely impact water quality.

Practice 2-12 – Servicing and Refueling Equipment

The COR, ER, CI, or TSA are authorized to designate the location, size, and allowable uses of service and refueling areas. Operators are required to remove service residues, waste oil, and other materials from National Forest land. They must also be prepared to take responsive actions in case of a hazardous substance spill, according to the Forest spill prevention, containment and counter measures plan.

Practice 2-13 - Control of Construction in Riparian Management Zones

Construction and maintenance fills, sidecast, and end-hauled materials are kept out of SMZs except at designated sites to minimize effects on the aquatic environment.

Practice 2-14 - Controlling In-channel Excavation

The engineering representative is authorized to designate the location of crossings or work sites and coordinate with the contractor to mange heavy equipment. Excavation during the installation of instream structures must follow minimum water quality protection requirements.

Practice 2-15 - Diversion of Flows around Construction Sites

Streamflow must be diverted around construction sites such as bridges, culverts and dams. The streamflow will be diverted for all live streams according to the instructions of the ER. The diverted flows are returning to their natural stream course as soon as possible after construction or at least prior to the rainy season. All disturbed areas are stabilized prior to the rainy season or as needed.

Practice 2-17 - Bridge and Culvert Installation

Spoil material generated during construction should neither obstruct the stream course (including natural floodplains) nor impair the efficiency of the associated structures.

Practice 2-18 – Regulation of Riparian Gravel Borrow Areas

Borrowing will be limited to material deposited above the bankful line. Borrow area shaping or other special drainage re-configuration actions are taken to maintain channel function.

Practice 2-19 - Disposal of Right-of-way and Roadside Debris

Construction debris and other newly generated roadside slash developed along roads in the streamside management zone is disposed of by the following means as applicable (see practice 2-11): (1) on site; (2) removal to agreed upon locations; (3) a combination of 1, and 2; (4) large limbs and cull logs are removed to designated sites outside the SMZ or relocated within the zone to meet aquatic resource management objectives.

Practice 2-20 – Specifying Riprap Composition

Riprap must be sized and installed in such a way that is effectively resists erosive water velocities.

Practice 2-21 - Water Source Development Consistent with Water Quality Protection

Engineering representatives and the TSA working with hydrologists and fishery biologists should evaluate streams in which water developments are proposed. Water holes and other improvements will be restored to a stable condition, prior to the end of the normal operating season.

Practice 2-22 - Maintenance of Roads

All roads are maintained to at least the following level: (1) provide the basic maintenance required to protect the road investment and to ensure that damage to adjacent land and resources is prevented; (2) as a minimum measure, maintenance must protect drainage facilities and runoff patterns; and (3) additional maintenance measures include surfacing an resurfacing, outsloping, clearing debris from dips and cross drains, armoring of ditches, spot rocking, culvert replacement and installing new drainage features.

Practice 2-23 - Road Surface Treatment to Prevent Loss of Materials

Road surface treatments include watering, dust oiling, penetration oiling, sealing, aggregate surfacing, chip-sealing, or paving, depending on traffic, soils, geology, and road design specifications.

Practice 2-24 - Traffic Control During Wet Periods

Roads that must be used during wet periods should have a stable surface and sufficient drainage provided to allow such use while at the same time maintaining water quality.

Practice 2-25 - Snow Removal Controls to Avoid Resource Damage

Practice 2-27 - Restoration of Borrow Pits and Quarries

Once excavation has been completed on all or part of the area, the sides will be sloped and graded to ensure proper drainage, and the general pit area smoothed and stabilized. Finer material will be spread over the bottom of the pit prior to spreading stockpiled or imported topsoil. Seeding, soil amendment, and mulching may be required and will be carried on as reference in Standard Specification Section 625.

Practice 2.28 - Surface Erosion Control at Facility Sites

To control the amount of soil entering streams, the natural drainage pattern of the area should not be changed; sediment basins and sediment filters will be established to filter surface runoff; and diversion ditches and berms will be built to divert surface runoff around bare areas. Construction activities will be scheduled to avoid periods of the year when heavy runoff is likely to occur.

Transportation

Monitoring

The Travel Management Rule recognizes that designations of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use are not permanent. Unforeseen environmental impacts, changes in public demand, route construction, and monitoring conducted under §212.57 of the final rule may lead responsible officials to consider revising designations under §212.54.

Monitoring will be used to check for trends of environmental condition and progress toward meeting Forest objectives for the NFTS. Information will be reviewed and updated to ensure that maintenance criteria remain consistent with management area direction, resource program needs, road management objectives, and available resources.

All newly designated roads will be monitored as directed in the Travel Management Rule and the Forest Service Handbook.

Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212.57)

Monitoring of effects of motor vehicle use on designated roads and trails and in designated areas.

For each administrative unit of the National Forest System, the responsible official shall monitor the effects of motor vehicle use on designated roads and trails and in designated areas under the jurisdiction of that responsible official, consistent with the applicable land management plan, as appropriate and feasible.

Forest Service Handbook (FSH 7709.59 Chapter 60)

- 62.4 - Maintenance Activities and Maintenance Standards
- 62.5 - Condition Surveys

Perform condition surveys as needed to provide up-to-date knowledge of the road condition. Itemize and rank deficiencies needing correction, make recommendations for developing or updating the maintenance prescription, and provide information for traffic management decisions. Frequency and intensity of condition surveys will vary with the road maintenance level and the risk involved.

Air Quality

Mitigation

Motorized use on unsurfaced routes underlain with serpentine bedrock may pose a human health hazard caused by naturally occurring asbestos in the soil. Several proposed routes occur near possible serpentine soils as mapped in the Forest 3rd Order Soil Survey or the Trinity serpentine soil survey of Earl Alexander, but not on the Forest serpentine bedrock map which is a subset of the STNF geomorphology database. As a result, there is uncertainty about whether the routes cross areas with potential naturally occurring asbestos. Any routes with inclusions of naturally occurring asbestos (as indicated by testing), will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the motor vehicle use map (MVUM.).

Table D-7. Routes tested for naturally occurring asbestos prior to designation on the motor vehicle use map

Route Number	Alternative	Statement	Mitigation
PM047	5	Possible serpentine soils	Inclusions of NOA will be capped with crushed rock prior to designation on the MVUM.
PM048	5		
PM211	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
PM216	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
RM1101	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
RM145	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
RM146	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
RM1603	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
RM737	5		
U29N33B	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
U29N73G	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
U30N36B	5, Mod. Alt. 2		
U33N51F	4, 5		

Appendix E: Law Enforcement

Introduction

U.S. Forest Service law enforcement and investigations (LEI) personnel are responsible for protecting the public, employees, natural resources, and other property under the Agency's jurisdiction. Additionally, LEI investigates and enforces applicable laws and regulations that affect National Forest System lands, and prevents criminal violations. The new Travel Management Rule is one such regulation.

The Travel Management Rule requires designation of roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle use, and the prohibition of cross-country wheeled motorized vehicle travel by the public. This is a considerable change in public motorized access management from previous conditions where most forests were managed as "open to cross-country travel." The implementation of designated routes and areas for motorized vehicles will be the responsibility of all Agency employees, especially in the area of education and enforcement. The law enforcement program is primarily responsible for issuing violations to the Travel Management Rule.

The national LEI budget is funded by appropriated dollars from Congress to provide law enforcement services on the NFS lands. The travel management program is one of many forest programs to benefit from Federal law enforcement funding. For the past few years, law enforcement funding has increased and that has translated into an increase in field law enforcement personnel[3].

To enhance enforcement of the Travel Management Rule, Region 5 forest recreation programs have applied for and received grant dollars (green sticker funding) from the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division Grants Program. These State funds are earmarked specifically for enforcement of off-highway vehicle laws and regulations on the various forests, and are performed primarily by forest protection officers (FPOs). In addition, LEOs support the FPOs as needed, especially if serious violations have occurred. In recent years, State law enforcement grants have ranged from 3 to 4 million dollars annually with similar funding anticipated for the 2008–2009 grant cycle.

Authority and Jurisdiction

The Forest Service exercises its law enforcement authority when violation of laws or regulations occurs on NFS lands or when incidents affect the NFS. The existing authorities for enforcement are completely adequate and no new laws will be needed to implement the Travel Management Rule.

Every national forest has a law enforcement plan, updated annually. All Forest Service employees have a duty to know and understand their authorities and responsibilities, and to properly enforce laws and regulations relating to the forest within their authority and capability. LEI and agency personnel provide a regular and recurring presence on vast amounts of public land, roads, trails, and areas, and take

[3] Region 5 Law Enforcement budget figures for the past 4 years have increased and the number of law enforcement officers has increased by 65.

appropriate action if illegal activity is discovered. Violations involving motorized vehicles are primarily enforced by FPOs, who patrol off-highway-use roads, trails, and areas. These include violations such as operating a motor vehicle in violation of Federal regulations and California vehicle code, parking improperly, resource damage to soils, vegetation or wildlife, and disorderly or unruly behavior. LEOs have discretion when deciding what type of action to initiate when handling violations to the following Federal laws that pertain specifically to motor vehicle use.

- The Act of June 4, 1897 (Title 16 United States Code 551), is the authority for issuing regulations at Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 261 (36 CFR 261). Specific OHV travel management regulations are in sections 261.9 – Property, 261.13 –Motor Vehicle Use, and 261.15 –Use of Vehicles Off-Road. These CFRs cover a wide array of misdemeanor infractions.

- The Act of March 3, 1905 (Title 16 United States Code 559), authorizes all employees of the Forest Service to make arrests for violation of the laws and regulations pertaining to national forests. Normally, arrest authority is limited to trained law enforcement personnel. (Any employee may take immediate action when necessary to protect life and prevent serious damage to or destruction of property, escape of a suspect, or loss of material evidence when such action can be done with reasonable safety).

Cooperation

The Forest Service shares responsibility and cooperates with local, State, and other Federal agencies in the execution of its law enforcement program. The authority for cooperation among agencies, especially as it pertains to travel management, is within the following laws:

- The act of August 10, 1971 (Title 16 United States Code 551a), authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with, and provide reimbursement to, any State or political subdivision thereof, for the enforcement of their laws within the NFS. This law does not deprive any State or local law enforcement agency from exercising its criminal and civil jurisdiction on lands that are part of the NFS.

- The California Penal Code, Section 830.8, provides that Forest Service law enforcement personnel may exercise State peace officer authority where the sheriff of the county wherein the officer works has provided specific written permission for the officer.

- The State vehicle code section 38301 allows State law enforcement officer to enforce any of the Federal CFRs related to motor vehicles on NFS lands[4].

[4] State Vehicle code section 38301. (a) It is unlawful to operate a vehicle in violation of special regulations which have been promulgated by the governmental agency having jurisdiction over public lands, including, but not limited to, regulations governing access, routes of travel, plants, wildlife habitat, water resources and historical sites.

Each forest maintains close working relationships with many State and local law enforcement agencies that have law enforcement responsibilities within/and or adjacent to the forest boundary. Significant cooperating agencies relative to the Travel Management Rule include the local county sheriff departments, the California Department of Fish and Game, California Highway Patrol, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and occasionally one or more Federal agencies depending on the violation. Forest Service law enforcement personnel cooperate fully with these agencies in carrying out their law enforcement responsibilities by providing assistance; liaison, advice, and information.

Forests maintain cooperative law enforcement agreements with their respective county sheriff's office. In Region 5, the total cost for the 2008 Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreements is $891,397[5]. These dollars are for performance of duties in addition to the normal activities in which the sheriff's deputies handle crimes against persons and their property that may occur within the NFS boundary. In these agreements, both parties recognize that public use of NFS lands is usually located in areas that are remote or sparsely populated and the enforcement of State and local law is related to the administration and regulation of NFS lands. Within the cooperative law enforcement agreements, an operating plan is developed outlining the supplemental work to be performed by the cooperating agency. Relative to the Travel Management Rule, operating plans may provide:

- Supplemental patrols in areas of high use.
- Supplemental patrols on weekends or during particular months of high use.
- Additional officers for large group gatherings or events (such as enduro events).
- Vehicle checkpoints for vehicle registration spark arrestors, and other miscellaneous items.

Implementation and Tracking

Implementation of the Forest Service law enforcement program is continually adapting as law enforcement personnel assess the changing patterns of visitor use and attitudes, and the trends in violations, especially for property and resource damage. One method of assessment is the analysis of Law Enforcement and Investigations Management Attainment Reporting System (LEIMARS) data. LEIMARS tracks all known violations of criminal law or regulation on NFS lands (FSH 5309.11, chapter 40 and FSM 5340). Additionally, embedded in LEIMARS is the Case Tracking System, which tracks all felony and serious misdemeanor cases. These tracking systems:

- Capture and record information on location, volume, damages, and type of violations occurring on NFS lands.
- Provide a retrieval system of data on incidents and violations that is responsive to the needs of all organizational levels.

[5] Region 5 Law Enforcement Cooperative Agreement 2008 spreadsheet.

- Provide agency managers with a means to identify and monitor law enforcement activities.
- Specifically identify problem areas and periods of activity.
- Provide a method to record and analyze incidents involving violations or suspected violations on NFS lands.

Trends in violations related to the Travel Management Rule can be analyzed and appropriate action(s) taken, if needed. Appropriate action(s) may involve one or more techniques or adaptive strategies. In the law enforcement community, this is often referred to as the "three E strategy" of engineering, education, and enforcement. With the change in the Travel Management Rule, it is anticipated that the law enforcement program will use a combination of strategies, especially during the first 5 years of the rule implementation.

Implementation Strategy

Engineering – Education – Enforcement

The engineering strategy is designed to prevent or reduce inadvertent violations, resource damage, and crime vulnerability. The strategy's goal is to remove the opportunity to commit a violation. LEI personnel work with each forest, particularly the recreation and engineering programs, to implement some or all of the following specific tactics:

- Proper design of improvements and facilities.
- Facility security measures such as installation of barricades, gates, and other natural obstacles.
- Forest signing, both directional and informational, to assist the public to ensure they stay on designated trails, and out of the wilderness and other sensitive areas.
- Physically close and rehabilitate decommissioned roads and trails.

The educational strategy focuses on specific user groups, school groups, recreation users, and the public. The goal is to develop responsible and concerned public land use attitudes in forest users; thereby preventing violations. Forest LEOs and FPOs make regular contacts in the field informing the users of the regulations and need for the prohibition. The LEI personnel work with each forest, particularly the recreation and public information programs, to identify and implement some or all of the following specific tactics.

- Have motor vehicle use maps easily available to public.
- Have route numbers visually marked on the ground.
- Distribute maps and brochures promoting responsible use.

- Conduct environmental interpretation activities in local communities, at schools, and with special interest groups.
- Use of all forms of the media (television, radio, and newspapers), especially prior to, and during, the high use periods.
- Ensure all employees understand the Travel Management Rule.
- Utilize high visibility prevention patrols and public information checkpoints, especially during the peak use periods.
- Encourage cooperating law enforcement agencies to make visitor contacts and provide violator information to forest officers.
- Ride with other agency officers to demonstrate solidarity to the public.
- Issue news releases of arrests and successful prosecutions, including offender names, criminal penalties, and court ordered restitution.

The law enforcement strategy is to affect crime prevention measures designed to reduce specific criminal activity, deter potential and repeat offenders, maximize enforcement actions and visibility, and increase prosecutorial successes. All enforcement actions should result in a better understanding of regulations pertaining to the management of NFS lands. LEI personnel work with each Forest to identify and implement some or all of the following specific tactics:

- Schedule officers to work during the identified problem periods, including holidays and weekends.
- Use high profile “saturation patrols” and stationary surveillance posts in the identified problem areas.
- Use the most effective and efficient means of patrol, including foot, horseback, all-terrain vehicle, snowmobile, watercraft, and aircraft.
- Use aerial over-flights to enforce restriction under Travel Management Rule.
- Enlist the aid of volunteers.
- Initiate an awards program.
- Supplement patrols with cooperating law enforcement agencies in areas of concern.
- Use technical investigative equipment (cameras, monitors, sensors) to assist officers with detecting and monitoring violations at known or suspected violation sites.
- Conduct planned and approved compliance checkpoints.

- Follow-up on complaints to document violations, damages, and identify suspect vehicles or persons.
- Require cooperating law enforcement agencies to assist with reporting and/or enforcing violations within their authority.
- Patrol with other cooperating law enforcement agency officers.
- Conduct unpredictable patrol schedules.
- Conduct special enforcement actions (unmarked vehicle deployment, surveillance, traffic check-points).
- Utilize LEIMARS and Central Violations Bureau databases along with the State motor vehicle data, to identify repeat offenders for enhanced prosecution.
- Pursue court ordered restitution or civil collections for resource and property damages.
- Encourage prosecutorial and judicial support.
- Execute bench warrants related of off-highway vehicle violations.

Assumptions

Based on many years of enforcing off-highway vehicles, implementation of the Travel Management Rule from a law enforcement perspective assumes the following to be true. Additionally, these assumptions are based on several case studies in R5. These assumptions may change in time with analysis of the LEIMARS database.

Enforcement Assumptions:

- Enforcement of the laws and regulations related to travel management will be enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal laws and regulations.
- As with any change in a regulation on NFS lands, there is usually a transitional period for the public to understand the changes. It is anticipated there will be a higher number of violations to the Travel Management Rule the first few years and the number of violations will decline as the users understand and comply with the rules. It is assumed :
    - Users in communities adjacent to the forest will comply within 1 to 2 years.
    - Frequent users, but further in distance from the forest, will comply within 2 to 3 years.
    - Infrequent users regardless of distant may take up to 5 years to comply.
- Law enforcement officer and Agency personnel presence and enforcement actions will positively affect OHV users' behaviors and attitudes.

- The Travel Management Rule and associated motor vehicle use map clearly define the designated routes; therefore, making violations to the rule unequivocal.
- Once the motor vehicle use map is published, the implementation of the established dedicated network of roads, trails, and areas with signs, and user education programs, will reduce the number of violations.
- FPOs spend a large percentage of their time on travel management issues, and depending on the forest, the estimate range from 30 to 50 percent. LEOs spend approximately 10 to 20 percent of their time on enforcement of off-highway vehicle issues[6].

Agency Funding Assumptions:

- Appropriated program funding levels and number of law enforcement personnel does not affect enforcement of the Travel Management Rule. All laws and regulations are enforced equally.
- Appropriated funds will remain level or increase slightly in the next 5 years.
- The State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division Grants Program (green sticker funding) enhances and provides additional law enforcement presence in the field at the forest level.

Public Attitude and Compliance Assumptions:

- Forest users want to do the right thing and will obey the rule[7], once they understand the rule and motor vehicle use map.
- User compliance[8] based on the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division data is anticipated to be:
    - 95 percent of users are fully compliant.
    - 2 to 3 percent of users think about and may violate a law.
    - 1 to 2 percent of users will violate the law.

Measure of Success

Measuring the success of the Travel Management Rule from a law enforcement perspective will be done using the LEIMARS database. An analysis of the data may alert a forest to a particular problem area for

[6] Barnett, G. 2004-2005 Law Enforcement Workload Analysis.
[7] Tyler, Tom R. Why People Obey the Law, Princeton University Press, 2006, p. 320
[8] User compliance was computed by using the State Vehicular Recreation Area Fiscal year 2006/2007 data: 4.2M SVRA visitors divided by the 210,000 citations written, is approximately 5 percent non-compliant, and 95 percent compliant.

violations such as a group campsite area that may be surrounded by flat meadow areas inviting riders to potentially violate the regulation. A successful program will see a positive change in the following measures:

- **Measure 1**: A reduction in the number of off-route travel violations.
- **Measure 2**: A reduction in the number of resource damage violations.

Appendix F: Annual Maintenance Cost by Alternative

Table F-1. Miles of NFTS roads combined with proposed additions

Operational Maintenance Level	Annual Maintenance Cost $/Mile	Alt 1 Miles	Alt 1 Annual Cost	Alt 2 Miles	Alt 2 Annual Cost	Alt 2 Mod Miles	Alt 2 Mod Annual Cost	Alt 3 Miles	Alt 3 Annual Cost	Alt 4 Miles	Alt 4 Annual Cost	Alt 5 Miles	Alt 5 Annual Cost
1	$225.00	1458	$328,005	1458	$328,005	1458	$328,005	1458	$328,005	1458	$328,005	1458	$328,005
2	$543.33	4217	$2,291,005	4253	$2,310,843	4238	$2,302,601	4217	$2,291,005	4217	$2,291,481	4260	$2,314,643
3	$10,870.00	785	$8,536,211	785	$8,536,211	785	$8,536,211	785	$8,536,211	785	$8,536,211	785	$8,536,211
4	$14,106.67	328	$4,621,345	328	$4,621,345	328	$4,621,345	328	$4,621,345	328	$4,621,345	328	$4,621,345
5	$14,106.67	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -	0	$ -
Totals		**6788**	**$15,776,566**	**6824**	**$15,796,404**	**6809**	**$15,788,162**	**6788**	**$15,776,566**	**6788**	**$15,777,042**	**6831**	**$15,800,205**

Appendix G: Route Disposition

Changes between DEIS and FEIS

- The list of routes requested during the scoping period for the proposed action and the screening results for specific routes have been removed. Routes incorporated in alternative designs are listed in appendix A.
- Additional detail regarding screening criteria and methodology has been added.
- Ranking criteria for cultural resources has been updated.
- A general discussion of data sources has been added.

Introduction

This appendix describes the process used to select the routes for study in alternatives 4 and 5. This process is based on the results of public scoping on the proposed action (alternative 2). The proposed action was developed using a different methodology which is described in Chapter 1.

All routes included in the Notice of Intent for the Proposed Action (August 8, 2009) were retained as Alternative 2, incorporated into Alternative 5, and analyzed in the FEIS.

The development of modified alternative 2 in response to public comments on the DEIS and further study by the interdisciplinary team is described in chapters 2 and 3.

During the public scoping period for the proposed action, many respondents requested that particular routes be added to or excluded from the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS). The routes requested for addition were those that individuals personally used or identified as valuable contributions to the motorized recreation experience or access. The routes requested to be excluded from consideration were noted to have resource concerns or conflicts with non-motorized activities and values. In some cases, the same routes were requested for retaining or expanding motorized use by some commenters, and requested for closure by others. The requests are generally categorized as follows:

- Retain motorized use on existing NFTS roads and trails already open to motorized use, and/or expand mixed-use opportunities.
- Allow motorized use on closed existing NFTS roads and non-motorized trails.
- Close existing NFTS roads and trails for resource protection.
- Add unauthorized route to NFTS.
- Do not add unauthorized route to NFTS.

After the scoping period concluded, the Forest Service reviewed and gave due consideration to all proposals submitted by the public. In some cases, routes were submitted without enough identifying information for consideration. Identification was attempted through follow-up with the public and examination of all available data sources and information supplied by the commenters.

The interdisciplinary team compiled all route requests and conducted a comprehensive and integrated screening process to identify which routes could be brought forward for further study in an alternative. The screening criteria included the degree to which proposals would address the purpose and need for travel management and the significant issues identified for this analysis; laws, regulation, and policy related to motorized recreation, including the Travel Management Rule and Forest Plan direction; resource concerns; public health and safety, and jurisdiction. The screening criteria and methodology is documented here. Datasets, screening results, and further details are in the project record.

Data Sources used in Route Screening Process

The interdisciplinary team used the most current data available. The Forest Service and a variety of state and federal natural resource agencies supplied GIS coverages for the screening process. An advocacy group supplied data for citizen-inventoried roadless areas which was used to address a significant issue, although the data is not endorsed by the agency. In addition, results of field surveys on the unauthorized routes and the on-the-ground knowledge of STNF managers and the public contributed to the process of selecting routes for further study.

Screening Criteria and Methodology

Alternative 5 - Improved Access and Motorized Recreation Opportunities

The first step was to identify and eliminate requested routes which were outside the scope of the analysis:

A. Roads and trails currently part of the existing National Forest Transportation System (NFTS), except for evaluation of motorized mixed-use proposals. The purpose of this analysis is to implement the Travel Management Rule, 36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B, which prohibits motorized travel off designated roads, trails, and areas, while allowing consideration of additions to the NFTS to maintain access and to provide a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities. Closing or otherwise examining existing NFTS roads, except for limited changes to assigned vehicle classes for motorized mixed use, was outside the scope of this analysis.

B. Routes excluded by law, regulation, and policy, or in areas with specific resource or public safety concerns:

   - Wilderness
   - Research Natural Areas

- Special Interest Areas (Botanical, Geologic, and Scenic)
- Wild sections of Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Non-motorized recreation areas identified by the Forest Plan
- Serpentine soils
- Unstable lands
- Close proximity to mines

C. Routes that access private land or cross the STNF boundary.

D. Routes not suitable for public vehicles and/or would require more than the equivalent of basic maintenance to meet standards for public travel. These routes may be considered in future project-level analyses.

E. Routes with decisions for closure resulting from other project-level planning on the STNF.

F. Spurs of existing NFTS routes with signed decisions for physical closure, decommissioning, or abandonment.

The interdisciplinary team then looked at resource concerns and recreation benefits associated with the remaining routes:

G. Routes in the following concern areas were eliminated if they do not address the significant issues of recreation access and quality of the experience (providing access to water or documented dispersed recreation sites, or contribute to a loop ride):

- Late-successional reserves
- Riparian reserves
- Key watersheds
- Impacted watersheds (over the threshold of concern or condition class 3)
- Suitable, critical, or occupied habitat for TES terrestrial and aquatic species
- Proximity to cultural resources with high risk of effects

H. Routes were then restored or excluded based on field survey results regarding stability, water, soils, and other resources as well as suitability for public travel.

I. Routes were eliminated if the above screening resulted in broken connections to the NFTS or another proposed route.

The remaining routes were evaluated by the interdisciplinary team (IDT) using a travel analysis process to determine the composite resource risk and recreation benefit of individual routes. Risk factors are described in Table G-1. Each resource specialist evaluated each route based on the criteria for their resource. The rankings were incorporated into a combined risk ranking for each route and considered by the IDT in conjunction with the recreation opportunities provided by the routes.

Table G-1. Resource Ranking Criteria

Benefit: Public Access and Recreation	
Access for public recreation. All routes are considered high benefit until data shows no apparent benefit.	**HIGH** – A route which is part of a loop system for motorized use, accesses water recreational opportunities, or documented dispersed recreation sites.
Risk: Botany	
Motorized use of routes can spread undesirable plant species, or damage the habitat for TES plants.	**HIGH** – Presence of TES plants and weeds on the same route.
	MEDIUM – Presence of TES plants or weeds on the same route.
	LOW – No TES plants or weeds on route.
Risk: Wildlife	
Motorized use of routes damage the habitat for TES and other sensitive wildlife species.	**HIGH** – Route goes through habitat for TES (northern spotted owl) using late successional reserve (LSR) layer to define habitat.
	MEDIUM – Route goes through habitat for sensitive species. fisher, cascade frog, Shasta salamander, western pond turtle, northern goshawk, bald eagle.
	LOW – Route does not enter LSR or known habitat for sensitive species.
Risk: Cultural Resources	
Motorized use of routes can damage or provide access to cultural resources.	**HIGH** – Route impacts known sites which cannot be mitigated, or additional research is needed to make this determination. Or, has the same conditions as Medium risk, but portions of route have not been surveyed.
	MEDIUM – Route impacts known site, but impacts can be mitigated. Or, has the same conditions as LOW risk, but portions of route have not been surveyed.
	LOW – Route does not impact known sites, or sites are not eligible for listing on the national register for Historic Places. Routes have been surveyed.
Risk: Watershed/Soils	
Motorized use of routes can increase sedimentation into streams, rivers, and lakes.	**HIGH** – Route located within 150' of 303D streams, or located within CC3 watershed.
	MEDIUM – Route located between 150' and 300 feet of 303D stream.
	LOW – All other routes.
Risk: Fisheries	
Motorized use of routes can impact habitat of aquatic species.	**HIGH** – Routes that access TES aquatic species habitat.
	MEDIUM – Routes that are within Riparian Reserves on fish-bearing streams.
	LOW – All other routes.

The IDT evaluated each route and proposed a recommendation based on the recreation benefit and the resource risk. The recreation benefit for the route was determined by examining GIS and field data with input by local managers. A route was determined to provide a recreation benefit if the data showed that the route met one of the following three criteria:

1. Is part of a loop system of unauthorized routes or Level 2 NFTS roads.

2. The route provides recreational access to streams, rivers, or lakes.

3. The route has documented dispersed recreation.

If the route did not meet one of the three listed recreation benefits, the recommendation was to eliminate the route from further study. If the route did meet the criteria, the composite resource risk ranking was used to guide the team to a recommendation for that route. Recommended disposition as a result of the travel analysis process included:

- Do Not Add to System - No Data Supporting Recreation Usage
- Do Not Add to System - Medium Risk Route within an LSR with Recreation Usage
- Do Not Add to System – High Resource Risk (no mitigation possible)
- Add to System
- Add to System with Mitigation

The routes remaining after the above screening process were added to the routes comprising alternative 2 (the proposed action) to become alternative 5. This was considered the maximum number of routes that could be proposed for addition to the NFTS at this time.

Alternative 4 - Minimize Impacts to Natural Resources and Roadless Areas

Alternative 4 is a subset of alternative 5. Routes from alternative 5 were excluded from alternative 4 to address the issues of motorized use impacts on nonmotorized recreation and natural and cultural resources. Routes were eliminated as follows:

A. Routes which were spurs of roads proposed to be closed in other project-level environmental analysis across the STNF.

B. Routes in resource concern areas including habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, inventoried roadless areas, citizen-inventoried roadless areas, high risk for non-native invasive species, key watersheds and those over the threshold of concern or condition class 3, and proximity to cultural resources with high risk of effects.

C. Routes with broken connections to the NFTS or another proposed route as a result of the above screening.

Appendix H: Civil Rights Impact Analysis

USDA civil rights policy requires each agency to analyze the civil rights impact(s) of policies, actions, or decisions that will affect federally conducted and federally assisted programs and activities. A civil rights impact analysis (CRIA) facilitates the identification of the effects of eligibility criteria, methods of administration, or other agency-imposed requirements that may adversely and disproportionately impact employees or program beneficiaries based on their membership in a protected group. Protected groups include multiples of similarly situated persons who may be distinguished by their common race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetics, political beliefs, or receipt of income from any public assistance program.

Restrictions on motor vehicle use that are applied consistently to everyone are not discriminatory. However, some groups could be impacted more than others. This assessment addresses such concerns.

Public Involvement and Scoping

Public involvement concerning this proposal began with travel analysis to identify unauthorized routes and assess the effects of prohibiting cross-country motorized travel on forest users. This initial phase of public involvement began in February 2005 with information posted on the forest's website, public meetings and open houses and attending interest group meetings at their invitation (listed below). Public meetings and open houses were announced to the local media with articles appearing the local papers. Postcards were sent to those who expressed an interest in travel management on the STNF to announce public inventory workshops and the final inventory maps.

- **February 2005**: Introductory OHV route designation public meetings, providing an overview of the five-step process.
- **June and October 2005**: Open houses in Redding and Weaverville, CA, providing an opportunity for public input on route locations and appropriate vehicle types for specific routes in the Forest's inventory.
- **August 2005**: Joint public meeting with the Lassen National Forest providing an overview of the five-step process for OHV route designation, an opportunity to view the Lassen NF's draft inventory maps, and a forum for public comment.
- **April and September 2006**: Joint public meetings with Lassen National Forest, announcing the Lassen NF's completion of Step 2, the issuance of a Temporary Forest Order restricting motorized wheeled vehicle travel off existing roads, trails and areas and providing feedback on the Lassen NF's unauthorized routes.

- **August and November 2006**: Mixed Use discussion group meetings with Redding Dirt Riders and Cal 4-Wheel Drive representatives, providing information on the travel management process, and discussing mixed use.
- **June 2006**: Attendance at Sierra Club Wilderness Committee meeting, providing an update on the Travel Management process and the implementation timeline.
- **March 2007**: Environmental discussion group meeting, providing an update on the Travel Management process and the implementation timeline.
- **April 2007**: Attendance at Red Bluff Rotary meeting, providing an overview of the Travel Management process and the timeline.
- **August 2007**: Public meetings, providing draft inventory maps and explaining the process for providing public comments.

Public scoping for this environmental impact statement began with a Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register on August 8, 2008. Scoping for the proposal continued through September 6, 2008. Scoping efforts included mailing a postcard to 590 groups and individuals that indicated an interest in Travel Management on the STNF and posting the Notice of Intent (including the proposed action) and maps of the proposed action on the Forest's website. Maps were also available at forest offices for viewing. Approximately 210 individuals and organizations responded. In addition, the following meetings were held with interest groups:

- **August 2008**: Meeting with motorized user group representatives, providing proposed action information and suggesting a process for providing comments to share with their groups
- **September 2008**: Meeting with environmental community to discuss the proposed action and public comment period
- **November 2008**: Meeting with OHV community to clarify scoping comments
- **December 2008**: Meeting with environmental community to describe alternatives.

Throughout the travel management process numerous articles, editorials and letters to the editor have been published in the local papers; including the Record Searchlight (Redding, CA), Mount Shasta Herald (Mount Shasta, CA), and the Trinity Journal (Weaverville, CA). The letters to the editor express a variety of interests, including civil rights. These interests are described in concerns section of this report.

Concerns and Mitigations Related to Potential Civil Rights Impacts

Through these public involvement efforts and interdisciplinary discussions, several concerns were raised and are addressed below:

A. **Gathering Special Forest Products**. It is known that many people; including members of protected groups; use motor vehicles to gather special forest products including mushrooms, greenery, firewood, posts, poles, etc. Such products are gathered for both personal and commercial use. Some protected groups are very active in gathering certain special forest products. There are concerns that prohibiting cross-country travel would restrict such activities to designated roads or trails, limiting people's ability to gather such products and disproportionately impacting protected groups.

   Currently, under 36 CFR 261.6, removing any timber, tree or other forest product, except as authorized by a special-use authorization, timber sale contract, or Federal law or regulation is prohibited.

   Gathering special forest products requires written authorization by the Forest Service. Such permitted activities are exempt from the prohibition on cross-country travel in accordance with provisions of the permit (36 CFR 212.51 (8)). Such activities have been, and will continue to be, subject to separate, site-specific National Environmental Policy Act analysis, before permits are issued. This proposal does not change that policy. Permits will continue to be issued in accordance with law, regulation and policy regardless of this proposal. Therefore, it is not expected that gathering special forest products will be affected by this proposal or that any protected groups will be disproportionately affected.

B. **Impacts on People with Disabilities and the Elderly**. There are concerns regarding the impact of this travel management proposal on people with disabilities and the elderly. Commenters assert that the proposal unfairly discriminates against these groups because they are more dependent on motor vehicles to access and enjoy our national forests.

   Comments from people with disabilities and the elderly, including references to specific sites or locations, have been considered in the development of alternatives. Recreation opportunities and access needs for all users are some of the criteria used in the process of developing the selected alternative.

   Implementation of the Travel Management Rule, Subpart B, including the prohibition of cross-country travel, is forestwide and applies to all forest users equally. Changes to the National Forest Transportation System are largely limited to changes in vehicle class and season of use. Adding unauthorized routes and motorized vehicle classes on routes where such use has been prohibited is expected to enhance motorized access on NFTS routes.

   There is no legal requirement to allow people with disabilities to use motor vehicles on roads, on trails, and in areas that are closed to motor vehicle use. Restrictions on motor vehicle use that are applied consistently to everyone are not discriminatory. Generally, granting an exemption from designations for people with disabilities would not be consistent with the resource protection and

other management objectives of travel management and would fundamentally alter the nature of the Forest Service's travel management program (29 U.S.C. 794; 7 CFR 15e.103).

Under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, no person with a disability can be denied participation in a Federal program that is available to all other people solely because of his or her disability. Consistent with 36 CFR 212.1, FSM 2353.05, and Title V, Section 507(c), of the Americans With Disabilities Act, wheelchairs and mobility devices, including those that are battery-powered, that are designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion and that are suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area are allowed on all NFS lands that are open to foot travel.

Several comments were received during scoping expressing concerns that route designation will adversely affect persons with disabilities and the elderly by limiting the areas on the national forest that they can access with motor vehicles. The author of one letter to the editor of the Record Searchlight felt that “closures in effect are discriminating against the aged as their access is being greatly reduced.”

Several people expressed particular concerns about elderly and people with disabilities having access to areas on Shasta Lake and Trinity Lake, particularly access to boat docks. The lakes are actually reservoirs that are drawn down annually with boat docks moved as the lakes recede. The proposed action included highway-legal vehicles only for use below the high water mark on Shasta Lake and Trinity Lake. People with recreation residence permits commented that they will be unable to access boat docks without using a nonhighway-legal vehicle because the road to the boat dock is unsuited for highway-legal vehicles. In response to these and other comments regarding motor vehicle use below the high water mark on these lakes, alternative 5 includes the areas as open to both highway-legal and nonhighway-legal vehicles.

C. Access by American Indians. American Indians and tribal representatives are concerned that this proposal would unduly restrict access to sacred sites or traditional gathering areas accessed via motorized cross-country travel, including unauthorized routes. Without motorized access, elderly or infirm tribal members may be prevented from participating in tribal. Such access has been traditionally granted as long as resource damage can be prevented.

Motor vehicle use that is specifically authorized in writing and issued under Federal law or regulations is exempt from route designations (36 CFR 212.51 (8)). Therefore, motor vehicle access to sacred sites or gathering areas may be authorized by the Forest Service and will not be affected by this proposal.

Comments from and consultations with federally recognized and other local tribes associated with the Shasta-Trinity National Forest have been sought during travel management planning. The STNF has memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with the Pit River Tribe and Hoopa Valley Tribe

to establish government-to-government consultation. The Forest also has an MOU with the Winnemem Wintu Tribe to establish "a framework for cooperation, communication, and consultation between the Forest Service and the Tribe…."

Early in the process a meeting was held with the Pit River Tribe to provide an overview of travel management and to discuss any concerns. In addition, the following nine tribal organizations received information and the opportunity to comment on the proposed action:

- Pit River Tribe
- Quartz Valley Indian Reservation
- Hoopa Tribe
- Redding Rancheria
- Colusa Indian Community Council
- Winnemen Wintu Tribe
- Shasta Indian Nation
- The Shasta Tribe, Inc.
- Nor-Rel-Muk Nation

Following the public comment period, meetings were held with the Pit River Tribe and the Winnemem Wintu Tribe to discuss travel management planning and provide preliminary information on the alternatives being considered. Further consultation with tribal governments is planned as this analysis continues.

Concerns noted by the tribes include:

- Losing access to traditional territory and culture
- Limiting access to sacred sites and traditional gathering areas
- Limiting access for gathering firewood and other forest products
- Facilitating damage to cultural resources from motor vehicle use on Shasta Lake
- Providing easy access for artifact looters on Shasta Lake

Maps of the alternatives have been provided to the Winnemen Wintu Tribe. They have also requested maps of the inventory which will be provided to them. Pit River tribal members mentioned that many of them do not have internet access and would like hard copies of the

documents and maps prior to them being released for public review. A hard copy of maps will be provided to them.

D. **Impacts on People with Limited English Proficiency**. In California, people of Hispanic origin comprise a large part of the population and enjoy access to the national forests for a variety of recreation and business pursuits. Some of these users speak English as a second language and therefore may have limited ability to read maps or other publications pertaining to travel management. In particular, the Forest motor vehicle use map (MVUM) is a concern since the MVUM will be the basis for enforcing vehicle restrictions. NFTS routes that are open for public use will be designated on the MVUM, and users that leave designated routes will be subject to fines. There is a concern that people with limited English proficiency will be more vulnerable to citation if they are unable to read or understand the MVUM.

The MVUM shows roads and motorized trails that are open to public motor vehicle travel along with the vehicle class and season of use. The map is a graphical document that is easy to interpret; however, vehicle class and season of use could be more difficult concepts to communicate to people for whom English is a second language.

There are two main populations potentially affected by limited English proficiency; Hispanics and Southeast Asians. The National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) survey of the STNF in fiscal year 2002 estimates that 3.9 percent of visitors considered themselves “Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino.” This equates to approximately 86,000 visits by Hispanic people. Asians make up four percent of visitors or approximately 88,000 visitors.

Hispanic visitors take advantage of all the recreation opportunities on the STNF, including camping, sight-seeing, fishing, boating and camping. Southeast Asians are frequent forest visitors to the STNF primarily for mushroom picking and fishing. Many of these people have limited English proficiency. Typically there is an English-speaking person with every group who communicates with forest employees to obtain permits and other necessary authorization.

The forest will evaluate periodically whether any actions need to be taken to provide information about travel management and the MVUM to Hispanics and Southeast Asians with limited English proficiency.

Appendix I: Analysis of Public Comment

Introduction

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest (STNF) Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was released on June 26, 2009 for a 60-day public review and comment period, which closed on August 25, 2009. The Forest Service received a total of 175 responses from individuals, organizations, agencies, business owners, and elected officials. Responses came as letters, emails, written comments at public meetings, and verbal comments from phone and in-person conversations. Six of the comment letters were form letters, meaning that identical copies of the same letter were sent by many individuals, with just a small percentage of the form letters including additional unique comments. In total, the 175 responses generated approximately 1,200 comments from which 251 public concern statements (PCs) and responses to comments (RTCs) were developed.

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest documented, analyzed, and responded to the public comments received in response to the DEIS. This appendix contains the agency's response to all of the public concerns received on the DEIS.

Content Analysis Process

The Forest Service followed a systematic process of carefully logging-in, numbering, reading, coding and summarizing all viewpoints and concerns that were submitted. The comments that were most helpful were those that were unique, substantially different, and were specifically related to the analysis disclosed in the DEIS. In addition to capturing unique and substantially different comments, this report attempts to reflect the emotion and strength of public sentiment in order to represent the public's values and concerns as fairly as possible. When an individual raised multiple concerns within the same letter, each unique comment was numbered and tracked separately. Each comment was assigned a unique tracking number and coded by subject or topic (see project record for coding structure and other details).

Once the unique and substantially different comments were coded, concerns raised by different commenters on the same subject and with the same intent and issue were grouped and summarized into public concern statements that capture the essence of those like-concerns. In this way, multiple comments may be addressed by one response. In some cases, more nuanced or complex concerns may be answered through multiple responses to multiple concern statements, or they may have a single response dedicated to just that specific commenter. It is important to keep in mind that even though the public concern statements attempt to capture the full range of public issues and concerns, they should be reviewed with the understanding that there is no limitation on who submits comments. Therefore, the comments received do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the public as a whole. This report attempts to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. Every comment has the same value, whether expressed by many, or by one respondent. Analyzing comments is not a vote-counting process. The Forest Service response to the public comments, which in some cases resulted in changes to the DEIS, was not

determined by majority opinion but rather by the substance of the comments. The content analysis process we used ensured that every comment was read, analyzed, and considered.

Following is the systematic process used to analyze the comments:

Step 1: All comment letters were assigned a communication number to allow for tracking the unique comments within the letter to the public concern statements. Name and address information were entered into a database and these commenters were added to the project mailing list.

Step 2: Forest managers and the interdisciplinary team (IDT) read each letter and worked with a third-party collaboration specialist to ensure all unique and substantially different comments in the letters were coded, entered into a database, incorporated into public concern statements, and addressed in this appendix.

Each unique and substantially different comment within a letter was assigned a comment number, subject code, and category code to enable grouping of similar comments for the report described in step 5. The coding structure and coding of each comment letter can be found in the project record. For example, a comment desiring more motorized loop trails to provide for a better recreational experience would be coded as:

- Comment Number: 1 (1st comment coded in the letter)
- Subject Code: REC (Recreation)
- Category Code: 29200 (Motorized Recreation Opportunities (loops etc.)

Step 3: Form letters were identified and filed in the project record. Regardless of the number of copies received or the number of signatures, one copy of each form letter (identified as the master form letter) was analyzed for unique and substantially different comments and that one letter followed step 2 of this process. The other letters were identified as being associated with this master form letter.

Step 4: Each of the more than 1,200 unique and substantive comments that were coded were entered into a database, verbatim.

Step 5: Reports were produced from the database that contained the coded comments and a report was generated that grouped similar comments. The interdisciplinary team, along with the third-party collaboration specialist, then drafted public concern statements that summarized each group of like-comments. These public concern statements were reviewed and revised by the planning team and approximately 251 of these public concern statements are contained in this report, along with the responses to those comments developed by the planning team and Forest.

Step 6: The Forest Leadership Team (forest supervisors, district rangers, and staff officers) and planning team were provided a report of the public concern statements to assist them in discussing changes to the DEIS. In addition, both teams received a report of all 1,200 unique and substantially different comments, as well as the original comment letters.

Step 7: After reviewing the public concern statements and comments, the Forest leadership met with the planning team to clarify questions, discuss comments, and direct changes to be made for the Final EIS. In addition, the planning team responded to all the public concern statements, with a review by the Forest Leadership Team. The responses are included with the associated public concern statements at the end of this appendix.

Response to Comments (RTCs)

The Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1503.4) list five ways to respond to comments:

- Modify alternatives including the proposed action;
- Develop and evaluate alternatives not given serious consideration;
- Supplement, improve, or modify the analysis;
- Make factual corrections;
- Explain why the comments do not warrant further response.

The Forest Service responses to the comments may describe modifications made to certain actions in the alternatives or in the FEIS; or show that changes were made in the analysis of the alternatives or in factual corrections made in response to concerns raised in the comments. Other responses were intended to clarify information or analysis contained in the FEIS or resolve some misunderstandings of the purpose and need and other elements of the travel management planning process.

How to Find a Response to Your Concern in this Appendix

The public concerns (PCs) and response to comments (RTCs) are organized by subject following the coding structure developed for the content analysis process (see the project record). In order to find the public concern statements and responses to comments that address your comments:

1. Find your name or organization in Table I- 1 below, which lists the organizations and then individuals alphabetically. A list of public concern numbers associated with your comment letter are listed.
2. Find the public concerns associated with your letter in the response to comments section in this appendix.

In Table I- 2, the public concern statements are organized by subject so if you look for the subject that most closely aligns with your comments, it might be easier for you to find the public concern number (PC#) associated with your letter. In some cases, your concerns may be addressed as part of several different, but related public concern statements.

Table I- 1. Public concern statements by commenter's name and organization

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Blue Ribbon Coalition	Amador	Don	154	40, 42, 105, 214, 237, 335, 368, 506, 530, 540, See Site-Specific and Attachment Tables in this Appendix
California Rifle and Pistol Assoc, Inc.	Fields	John	37	364, 365
California Wilderness Coalition	Henson	Ryan	140	237, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
California Wilderness Project	Johnson	Gordon	165	237, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Conservation Congress	Boggs	Denise	91	14, 21, 41, 70, 71, 81, 82, 84, 89, 99, 102, 205, 206, 225, 234, 317, 352, 468, 515, 537, 545, 1015, 1016, 1017
County of Shasta	Hawes	Glenn	145	38, 42, 226, 366, 495, 506, 550, 558
County of Siskiyou	Costales	Ric	132	223, 226, 238, 366, 495, See Attachment Table in this Appendix
Disabled Charters, Inc.	Hoopes	Jess	146	228. 362
Environmental Protection Agency	Goforth	Kathleen	164	24, 70, 71, 79, 89, 95, 237, 238, 533, 1003
Four Runners of Klamath Falls	East	Larry Jr.	64	378
McCloud-Pit Relicensing Coordinator, Shasta-Trinity National Forest	Smith	Stacy	170	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Motorcycle Sports Committee, AMA District 36	Pickett	David	1	232
Mt. Shasta Trail Association	Wirth	Joe	144	10, 37
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	Sanderson Port	Patricia	66	467
Pacific Crest Trail Association	Nelson	Ian	156	88, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Rat Pack 4WD Club	Cole	Bob	2	Request for information
Recreation Outdoors Coalition	Milligan	Sylvia	7	232
Recreation Outdoors Coalition	Milligan	Sylvia	152	34, 42, 71, 211, 216, 227, 232, 242, 332, 336, 358, 359, 353, 364, 366, 368, 370, 495, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 515, 518, 527, 528, 529, 541, 551
Redding Dirt Riders	Stangenberg	Reid	158	32, 510

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Sierra Club, Shasta Group; California Trout, and Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC)	Musgrove; Knight; Baker	Bob; Curtis; and Kimberly	9	51, 70, 81, 86, 98, 206, 334, 1003, See Attachment and Site-Specific Tables in this Appendix
South Fork Trinity Up-River Friends This is like F5, however it was coded because it was sent in separately from TWS	Wilson	Karen	153	19, 22, 237, 531, 556, 1005, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
State Water Board Staff	Leong	Tristan	150	39, 560
Stewards of the Sierra National Forest	Wubbels	Mike	139	1, 3, 33, 34, 35, 36, 47, 48, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 83, 103, 104, 201, 202, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 226, 228, 237, 242, 243, 244, 310, 312, 317, 318, 327, 328, 338, 339, 350, 354, 355, 366, 367, 385, 495, 506, 521, 522, 532, 539, 540, 547, 548, 1001, 1004, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1019, 1021, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
The Wilderness Society	Boggs	Jennifer	84	467
The Wilderness Society	Van Velsor	Stan	20	467
The Wilderness Society	Van Velsor	Stan	151	11, 12, 20, 22, 41, 42, 70, 71, 73, 81, 94, 99, 177, 210, 214, 218, 221, 235, 237, 238, 310, 325, 329, 330, 333, 337, 360, 492, 515, 519, 554, 556, 1003, 1006, 1014, See Site-Specific and Attachment Tables in this Appendix
The Wilderness Society (TWS)	Tucker	Tashia	143	19, 20, 22, 70, 85, 89, 237, 331, 360, 32, 385, 384, 513, 515, 531, 545, 1000
Trinity County	Reiss	Wendy	79	504, 558
Trinity County Resource Conservation District	Frost	Patrick	80	28, 204, 228
Trinity River Lumber Company	Sanders	Dee	56	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Trinity River Lumber Company	Sanders	Dee	141	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Trout Unlimited	Davidson	Sam	161	16, 24, 41, 50, 52, 81, 1020, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
Individuals	Abbay	William	155	467
	Adams	Leslie	117	81, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Aguilera	Andrew	48	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Allen	Barbara	17	468, 545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Allen	Tony	116	90, 510
	Allin	Virginia	70	558

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Individuals	Anderson	Dan	13	384
	Anderson	Donna	166	Request for information
	Baird	Dewey	53	362, 379, 542
	Baldini	Randall	88	26
	Barnes	M. Robert and Nancy	27	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Beilla	Darrell	122	7
	Bingham	Robert	60	362
	Bowser	Rickey	163	218, 381, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Bray	Raymond	51	4
	Brooks	Duane	30	5, 97
	Brosnan-Torisse	Melissa	5	Request for information
	Brown	Danny A	6	Request for information
	Brown	Owen	22	362
	Brown	Owen	40	362, 384
	Brown	Vick	121	364
	Burns	James	89	568, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Cameron	Robert	12	387, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Carr	Gaile	16	468, 545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Carstensen	Bev	68	536
	Cassidy	Mike	171	510
	Chandon	Joe	87	4, 26, 232, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Collard	Jean	74	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Collard	Kent	77	See Site-Specific and Attachment Tables in this Appendix
	Collard	Kent	90	505, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Coots	Richard	35	90, 362, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Coppe	Dino	58	558
	Cotton	Ken	38	90, 362, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Crandall	Casey	85	4, 80, 90, 228, 350, 351, 362, 493, 495, 511, 540, 546, See Attachment Table in this Appendix
	Cristobal	Ken and Kris	44	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Crivello	Robert and Beatrice	78	558, 559
	Cyphers	Jeff	133	235, 510, 557, 558

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Individuals	Damaso	Michael	160	38, 105, 213, 214, 218, 382, 388, 501, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Downs	Ken	45	493
	Dubree	Russell	49	13
	Duncan	John	92	90, 211, 335, 362, 461
	East	Larry	75	Duplicate of 64
	Eilers	Curt	26	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Facchin	Phillip	93	26, 335, 468, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Fluegor	P	76	558
	George	Heidi	29	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Gibbs	Patricia	94	207, 208, 209, 366, See Attachment Table in this Appendix
	Goetz	Karen	95	558
	Goetz	Roger	96	558
	Gray	Darcy	61	558
	Gray	Jim	65	468, 558
	Gray	Ruth	97	558
	Grippi	Chris	114	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Grossen	Allen	72	388
	Grossen	William	81	See Attachment Table in this Appendix
	Grossen	William	82	491, 501, 515, See Attachment Table in this Appendix
	Guglielmetti	David	157	510
	Hadley	Ryan	50	377, 379, 468, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Hamilton	Mary	98	335, 558
	Han	Michael	10	17, 26, 89
	Hancock	Eric	99	232, 335, 468, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Hankins	Karl	136	32, 211
	Haynes	Bruce	134	7, 32, 510, 558
	Hipkiss	Ron	138	89, 230, 366, 379, 380, 510, 529, 538, 1007, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Hoover	Robert	167	9, 90, 218, 388, 510
	Interested party		42	468, 545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Johnston	Pamela and Andrew	59	384
	Keesee	Marianne	106	558

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Individuals	Kelly	Gerald	100	6, 31, 353, 515, 558, 1015, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Kessler	Sam	123	7
	Kinsman	Cindy	57	558
	Knox	Deadra	31	20
	Kristoffersen	Kris	172	510, 544
	Lacy	Jason	86	4, 80, 90, 228, 350, 351, 362, 493, 495, 511, 540, 546, See Attachment Table in this Appendix
	Lee	Don	67	89, 93, 335, 362, 366, 373, 376, 380, 490, 493, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Lennard	Spencer	110	81, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Linden	Scott	148	383, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Lininger	Jay	111	81, 326, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Littlefield	Chris	108	335, 510, 558
	Long	David	135	461
	Long	Loren and Margie	101	558
	Lower	Don	83	90, 518
	Lucido	Brett	34	90, 362, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Luckin	George	41	493, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Lucky	George	102	558
	Mackey	Don	23	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Magni	Linda	103	558
	Mangels	Francis	3	Request for information
	Mangels	Francis	46	87, 89, 387, 460, 509, 515, 543, 545, 552
	Marrone	Chris	8	Request for information
	Marrone	Chris	71	468, 545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Marshall	Chuck	129	7
	Martin	Pat	173	381
	McDonald	Kelly	124	7
	McFall	Dennis	63	89, 93
	Medford	Roger	14	468
	Milligan	Sylvia	24	See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Mitchell	Michael	142	510, 549
	Moniot	Chris	107	558
	Mountjoy	Bob and Jan	32	18, 1002, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Individuals	Norton	Elizabeth	25	232
	Norton	Elizabeth	149	Request for information
	Norton	Phil and Cheryl	33	545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Oberst	Greg and Penelope	11	467
	Olson	Gabe	36	90, 362, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Palmer	Ken	125	7
	Paul	Kathy	126	7
	Peterson	Doug	4	Request for information
	Peterson	Howard	54	4
	Pettis	Ralph	168	228, 362
	Plumb	Bob	104	558
	Price	Dean	73	357, 380, 501
	Purcell	Ken	43	493
	Rauh	Troy	169	461, 493, 510
	Razzeto	Jack	62	558
	Regnani	Richard	18	89, 362
	Reisinger	Joe	162	176, 510, 514
	Richards	James	159	467
	Roether	Evelyn	113	81, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Rourke	Dennis	21	27, 89, 493
	Rutter	Dustin	127	7
	Sampson	Harry	28	558
	Sexton	George	118	89, 91, 105, 237, 240, 241, 317, 354, 515, 519, 520, 534, 545, 1018, See Attachment and Site-Specific Tables in this Appendix
	Sim	Perry	52	89, 384, 545
	Smith	Jerry	128	7
	Sutherlin	Laurel	115	545
	Tidwell	Stephanie	119	81, 520, 531, 545, 1000
	Uhles	Steve	147	203, 218, 236, 524
	Vaile	Joseph	109	81, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Veazey	Christine	131	558
	Volkart	Derek	112	81, 515, 531, 545, 1000
	Wade	Joy and Russell Scott	19	545, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Walsh	Kelly	105	235, 510, 557, 558
	Watson	Tom	130	7
	White	David	137	4, 558, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix
	Wiedenhoeft	James	15	468

Organization	Last Name	First Name	Ltr #	PC #'s
Individuals	Wilson	Karen	120	22, 531, 535
	Wilson	Rex	47	362, 468
	Wolfe	David	55	361, 362, 366, 373, 374, 504, 516
	Zanger	Michael	39	545
		Paul	69	26
		Richard	174	513, See Site-Specific Table in this Appendix

Table I- 2. Public concern statements organized by subject

Subject	Public Concern Numbers Associated With This Subject
Response to Public Concerns by Subject Alternatives	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42,
Aquatic Resources	47, 48, 50, 51, 52
Best Available Science	70
Botanical Resources	326, 327
Cultural Resources	71, 72, 73
Geology	74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79
Inventoried Roadless Areas	80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86
Lands	87
Law Enforcement, Education, and Signage	88, 89, 90, 91, 93
Law, Regulation, and Policy	94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103, 104, 105
Miscellaneous	176, 177, 180
NEPA – Process, Consultation, Scope, and Monitoring	201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 221, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244
NEPA – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Cumulated Effects	310, 312, 314, 317, 318
Non-native Invasive Plants	328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333
Out of Scope	325
Public Involvement	334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339
Recreation Resources	350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 351, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 370, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388
Socio-economic Resources	460, 461, 464
Transportation Management (Roads and Trails)	490, 491, 492, 493, 495, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 504, 505, 506, 509, 510, 511, 513, 514, 515, 516, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 524, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 554, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560
Visual Resources	1001
Watersheds	1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1021
Wildlife	1000, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020
Thank you for your comment and voting issue	467, 468

The following are the acronyms used in the public concern statements and response to comments:

ATV	all terrain vehicles
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BA	biological assessment
BE	biological evaluation
CEQ	Council of Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIRA	Citizen Inventoried Roadless Area
CVC	California Vehicle Code
EIS	environmental impact statement
EO	Executive Order (Regulations)
FS	Forest Service
FSM	Forest Service Manual
IDT	Interdisciplinary Team
IRA	Inventoried Roadless Area
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan (also known as Forest Plan)
MIS	management indicator species
ML	maintenance level
MVUM	motor vehicle use map
NEPA	National Environmental Protection Act
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NFS	National Forest System
NFTS	National Forest Transportation System
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NVUM	national visitor use monitoring
OHV	off-highway vehicles
RAPs	roads analysis process
ROD	Record of Decision
STNF	Shasta-Trinity National Forest
TES	threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
TMR	Travel Management Rule
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Complete letters from Federal, State, and local agencies are attached to this appendix (starting on page I-191) as required (FSH1909.15, 24.1 (3)). The remaining letters are available for review in the project record.

The following public concern statements (PCs) and the response to comments (RTCs) are organized by subject. A sample public comment follows the response to comment and the number in the parentheses at the end of the public comment is the comment letter number (i.e., Comment Letter #31 = #31).

A sixth alternative, titled Modified Alternative 2, was developed and analyzed to address some of the concerns raised by the public after publication of the DEIS. The new alternative presents a revised grouping of routes and actions to better respond to public requests for enhanced motorized recreation opportunities and protection of our natural and cultural resources. There are no references to Modified Alternative 2 in the responses below because the alternative was developed and analyzed after the responses were completed. However, as described in chapters 2 and 3 of the FEIS, Modified Alternative 2 clearly addresses many of the themes reflected in the public concerns below.

Response to Public Concerns by Subject

Alternatives

Public Concern # 1. The Forest Service should develop an alternative that conforms to FSM 2353.03(2) policy direction (which states the FS needs to provide diverse road and trail opportunities and a balanced motorized access transportation system) because:

A) the alternatives in the DEIS reduces mileage available to the public by more than 96%, thus doesn't support FSM policy direction;
B) the seasonal closures on roads don't support FSM policy direction;
C) the Purpose and Need does not address local trends and future desired conditions specific to the STNF.

Response: The purpose of this analysis is to implement the TMR, 36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B, which prohibits motorized travel off designated roads, trails, and areas. Eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel will reduce some motorized recreation opportunities by eliminating travel on many unauthorized routes as the commenter notes, yet at the same time the TMR allows for consideration of additions to the NFTS to maintain access for dispersed recreation activities and to provide a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities. All action alternatives propose a mix of roads, trails, and areas with a variety of vehicle types assigned. The alternatives adhere to FSM direction 2353.03(2) which states "Provide a variety of trail opportunities, settings, and modes of travel consistent with the applicable land management plan."

Routes studied for possible addition to the NFTS were screened by the IDT to determine the risks and benefits of each route. Routes with unacceptable resource risks were excluded from further consideration. In some cases, effects could be mitigated to allow a route to remain in the mix for further study. Seasonal closures are a common mitigation measure and part of the alternative designs which would allow further consideration of routes for addition to the NFTS. In some cases, a route was retained because a seasonal closure is assigned. Please see the alternative descriptions in Chapter 2 and Appendix D for further details on seasonal closures applied to the proposed routes and areas.

Some of the stated Purpose and Need for this analysis (FEIS, page 7) is likely similar to other Travel Management analyses around the region and nation because the TMR is effective nationwide and all national forests must implement it. However, the STNF Forest Supervisor established the Purpose and Need for this project to reflect the local conditions and trends, such as use and management below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs, and the proposed non-significant amendment to the STNF LRMP. See Chapter 1 for a full description of the Purpose and Need, including components specific to the STNF.

Sample Public Comment(s):

All action alternatives fail to conform to Forest Service Policy as stated below: It is Forest Service policy to provide a diversity of road and trail opportunities for experiencing a variety of environments and modes of travel consistent with the National Forest recreation role and land capability (FSM 2353.03(2)). Alternatives 2 through 5 would carry forward 7.6 miles of trail to 43.4 miles of trail respectively out of a total of approximately 1,252 miles of inventoried routes currently used by the public. This is a reduction of over 96% of the total miles of inventoried routes used by the public. In addition, adversely reducing seasonal use on nearly 100% of the existing Shasta Trinity National Forest transportation system does not conform, nor foster Forest Service policy as sited in (FSM 2353.03(2) and (FSM 2353.03(2) "providing a diversity of road and trail opportunities". The Forest has not provided the science, analysis and field review to validate and rationally justify the need for such drastic road and trail closures as is displayed in this DEIS. Again, the Forest Service has chosen to utilize a fundamentally flawed Travel Analysis to develop the action alternatives. The Forest Service has failed to develop the Purpose and Need that addresses local trends, and future desired conditions specific to the Shasta Trinity National Forest. We want the agency to develop an alternative that supports this policy and provides for a balanced motorized access transportation system. (#139)

Public Concern # 3. The Forest Service should insure that all action alternative comparisons were done correctly using Alternative 1 as the baseline and Alternative 3 should not be used (as stated in the Summary) because it does not reflect existing condition and uses, including the use and effects of the 1,252 miles of unauthorized routes as well as the existing system. Alternative 1 more accurately reflects the baseline.

Response: To effectively display the environmental effects of the alternatives, the FS considered two 'baseline' alternatives in the EIS:

1. Alternative 1, the 'No Action' Alternative. This alternative represents a continuation of current management or direction, in that there would be no changes to the current NFTS of roads, trails, and areas, and no permanent prohibition on cross-country motor vehicle travel. Use of unauthorized routes would continue, but these routes would not be added to the transportation system or designated for motor vehicle travel. This alternative establishes an important baseline for the assessment of impacts resulting from the existing condition. It provides a point of reference for contrasting existing resource impacts and recreational uses with the action alternatives.

2. Alternative 3. This alternative proposes a prohibition on cross-country motor vehicle travel with no change to the current NFTS of roads, trails, and areas. This alternative is similar to the No Action Alternative in that there would be no changes to the current NFTS. However, because use of all unauthorized routes would be prohibited, as well as all unauthorized motor vehicle travel below the high-water marks, this alternative establishes a key baseline for contrasting the other alternatives as they relate to the significant issues.

These alternatives provide two different scenarios for making no changes to the existing NFTS at this time. Together, they provide important points of reference for the comparison of the effects of the other alternatives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under Summary of the DEIS, Alternative 3 has been identified as the baseline for comparison of the action alternatives. We submit that using Alternative 3 as the baseline for comparison is fundamentally flawed because it does not represent existing conditions including the use and effects of the 1,252 miles of inventoried routes and the existing transportation system. We want the agency to use Alternative 1 as the baseline because it more accurately reflects existing conditions. (#139)

Chapter 2, Alternative 3 - Again, this alternative is referenced as the baseline alternative. This is in conflict with Specific Finding #14. We believe that Alternative 1 is the correct alternative for comparison. We want the agency to correct this conflict and insure that all action alternative comparisons were correctly using Alternative 1 as the baseline. (#139)

Public Concern # 4. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 1 because it provides the best access for motorized recreation and because:

- **A) it allows access for camping beyond one vehicle length off designated roads;**
- **B) it allows motorized use on all unauthorized routes and doesn't restrict access like the other alternatives do;**
- **C) the other alternatives do not respond to the public's assistance in identifying desired routes, which the STNF requested;**
- **D) the other alternatives restrict access to certain classes of individuals, is not a good use of public lands, and does not provide enough places for future generations to recreate;**
- **E) the roads should be left open for ATV use.**

Response: Alternative 1 cannot be legally selected and implemented because it does not meet the requirements of the TMR to prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel and protect natural and cultural resources. One of the requirements in completing an EIS is to describe and analyze the effects of the No Action Alternative (40 CFR 1502.14(d)). This provides a baseline from which to compare the effects of other alternatives. To implement the TMR, the effects of prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel must be analyzed and described, and a site-specific decision made to prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel. Cross-country motor vehicle travel is included in Alternative 1 because at this time cross-country motor vehicle travel is not prohibited in most areas on the STNF. As such it provides a 'baseline' from which to compare the effects of the other alternatives. The No Action Alternative is not required to be selectable (i.e. does not have to meet law, regulation, and policy).

The FS designed the Proposed Action and the alternatives in accordance with the Purpose and Need, including the need to consider access for dispersed recreation and the need for a diversity of motorized recreation experiences. The Proposed Action was developed using the inventory of routes, which the public assisted in building for this analysis. In the course of designing the alternatives, the FS considered all of the routes requested by the public during the scoping period. All routes were screened using criteria intended to identify the routes that would pose the least risk to natural and cultural resources, while providing a benefit for motorized access or recreation. The alternatives also were designed using a variety of vehicle classes to provide diversity for motorized recreationists. Vehicle classes were assigned based on existing tread width, location of the route, or opportunity for access to dispersed recreation sites. All action alternatives expand the existing NFTS. The process used to develop the alternatives is described in detail in Appendix G. An alternative allowing for dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of designated roads and trails was considered but eliminated from further study due to the extensive acreage that would then be open for cross-country motor vehicle travel and the potential impacts to natural and cultural resources (see page 55 in the FEIS in the section "Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis").

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A B
I think option 1 is the best for the public because: 1) you will still be able to camp in your favorite spot not one car length from the main road; 2) we can still ride on old unused road and trails; and 3) the old map is better than the new map with all the roads closed. (#51)

Subconcern # C
I request you go with Alternative 1: No-action Alternative. I fell that what the USFS is doing is illegal. You asked for the public help. We participated by telling you where our favorite trails were located, and now you want to make them off limits to us. (#54)

Subconcern # D
After reviewing all of the alternatives proposed in the DIES, I prefer the no change alternative. I enjoy camping, hiking, OHV use, mountain biking and hunting on National forest lands, and I wish to continue to do so. Limiting access to certain classes of individuals is not a good use of public lands. The changes proposed in the other alternatives are not acceptable for our future. My kids need a place to recreate, I don't want the USA turning into a place where everyone is crammed into small areas, or you must own the land in order to use it. (#85)

Subconcern # E
I would like to see proposal I no Action. I want these roads left open for ATV use. (#87)

Public Concern # 5. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 1 because the other alternatives are illegal and they violate Section RS 2477, which authorizes rights-of-way over public lands.

Response: The FS considers all of the action alternatives presented to be consistent with the direction of Subpart B of the TMR, which directs the STNF to end cross-country motorized travel and identify the NFTS road system on a MVUM. This Travel Management project will have no effect on RS2477 rights and has not proposed to provide direction on roads or trails that are under the jurisdiction of the State or County. Under RS2477, only Counties or other public agencies can hold the right-of-way and not individual members of the public. Since RS2477 involves the County claiming jurisdiction over any public highway that predates the reservation of the national forest, designating public use on NFS roads and trails by vehicle class and season of use would not be a RS2477 violation. Additionally, exercising RS2477 would be a County-level decision. The STNF encourages the appropriate public road agencies to apply for a Department of Transportation or a Forest Road and Trail Act easement to document rights-of-way secured under 43 U.S.C. 932.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The only proposal that does not come into conflict with pre-existing laws would be item # I No Action Taken to close roads. Section RS 2477, which authorizes rights of way for roads over public lands, would be violated in the other proposals. (#30)

Public Concern # 6. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 1 because the study is too broad to accurately make proposals in specific areas and:

A) the study does not address differences in ecology, recreational uses, and spotted owl habitat in different locations, especially in the Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir areas;

B) field studies to identify habitat should have been made and determined by specific area before the development of any alternatives to the existing situation.

Response: Alternative 1 cannot be legally selected and implemented because it does not meet the requirements of the TMR to prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel and protect natural and cultural resources. The environmental analysis, although broad in scale because it covers the entire STNF, is a site-specific analysis using data associated with each requested route to determine the potential environmental effects of each alternative. The resource sections in Chapter 3 describe the data and methodology used in determining effects of the proposed routes. Resource data used includes GIS layers and field survey data as described in Chapter 3. This spatial and field survey data allowed the IDT to identify benefits and risks associated with each route.

The FEIS has been updated as a result of further study and field visits. The seasonal closures for northern spotted owls have been removed from Trinity Lake and Iron Canyon Reservoir, as well as the routes. The cultural resource protection measures assigned to sites below the high-water marks in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir have been revised. These changes are described in detail in Chapters 1, 2, 3, and in Appendices D and L. In addition, the route cards in Appendix A have been updated to reflect new field information gathered after the publication of the DEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Based upon my evaluation of this study, Alternative I should be adopted at this time. My reasons for this conclusion are based upon the following facts:

I) The study is too broad in proposing changes to several different geographical areas without properly identifying specific areas. It is too generic and fails to address the distinct differences between the main reservoirs: Shasta, Trinity and Iron Canyon.

2) Even when addressing the Trinity Lake area, again the proposals are too broad in that the shoreline of Trinity Lake has very different ecological, recreational use, and habitat areas.

3) The proposals set forth in Alternatives 2 through 5 do not properly identify specific areas that may or may not impact any nesting of the dreaded Spotted Owl. Specifically, the west shoreline of Trinity Lake from Trinity Center to the north end of the lake has no habitat that would involve any nesting of the Spotted Owl below the high water line. Instead the other alternatives rely on an undefined future determination by a field biologist if such habitat exists. This study should have been made and determined by specific area before the development of any alternatives to the existing situation. (#100)

Public Concern # 7. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 1 because:

A) taxpayers should have the right to use all of the roads;

B) it doesn't prohibit motorized cross-country travel.

Response: Congress established the FS to provide opportunities for the public to use the national forest in a way that protects natural resources so that future generations can continue to enjoy them. Chapter 1 of the FEIS describes why there is a need for this Proposed Action. Alternative 1 is analyzed in the range of alternatives to provide a baseline for comparing effects of the Proposed Action and the action alternatives. In the case of this analysis and the Purpose and Need to implement the TMR, it would not be legal to choose and implement alternative 1 because the current unmanaged cross-country motor vehicle travel is prohibited under the TMR. The TMR requires a thorough environmental analysis before designating routes for public use. The analyses of prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel and changes to the NFTS are described in detail in Chapter 3. The FS also recognizes our mandate to provide motorized access for recreation and other pursuits, as it is described in the Purpose and Need and identified as a significant issue. The STNF provides 5,329 miles of roads open to the public and proposed additional mileage and areas in the alternatives studied. Existing roads not open to public travel have been closed to protect resources or are needed only intermittently. See the discussions in Chapter 1 for details regarding the Purpose and Need for this motorized Travel Management analysis, as well as the description of the issues identified for this analysis.

36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261, and 295 Final Rule: Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use (November 9, 2005) requires designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle travel. Designations will be made by class of vehicle and, if appropriate, by time of year. National Forests are also managed by law for multiple use. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA), defines ‘‘multiple use’’ in part as ‘‘management of all the various resources of the National Forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people.’’ The Act specifically provides ‘‘that some land will be used for less than all of the resources’’ (16 U.S.C. 531(a)). The applicable laws do not require that all NFS lands be open to all uses and do not prohibit the use of motor vehicles. Unauthorized routes that are not added to the NFTS are not precluded from consideration in future actions, but they would be closed to motor vehicle travel as part of the cross-country motor vehicle travel prohibition in the Proposed Action and the other action alternatives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
I would like Alternative #1 because it leaves most if not all of the roads open. It is our tax money that keeps everything going, so we should have the rights to use all of the roads. (#122)

Subconcern # B
I am in support of Alternative #1, No Action. The other four alternatives prohibit cross country travel. (#134)

Public Concern # 9. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 1 until a better range of action alternatives is developed.

Response: The STNF Forest Supervisor could select Alternative1 if she finds the environmental effects of the action alternatives unacceptable, or the analysis inadequate. However, the alternatives were developed and studied in accordance with law, regulation, and policy, and were developed using extensive public involvement. The range of alternatives respond to the significant issues and meet the Purpose and Need as described in Chapter 1. The agency considered a range of alternatives which address the diversity of motorized opportunities. Under Alternatives 2, 4, and 5, the NFTS is expanded by adding roads, trails and areas, as well as the expansion of vehicle classes providing opportunities for motorized recreation.

The STNF is committed to implementing the TMR and publishing a MVUM within the required national deadline and so it is important to move forward with this effort. The STNF Forest Supervisor will select an alternative that represents the Forest’s initial step of implementing the TMR. Identifying the minimum road system while building a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists will occur over time through further collaboration, project-level decisions, and annual updates to the MVUM. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

As a member of the public and frequent (responsible) visitor to the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, I disagree with all 4 of the action alternatives and can only support Alternative I until a better range of alternatives are presented. (#167)

Public Concern # 10. The Forest Service should not adopt Alternative 1; however they should develop a plan that allows for compatible use between users and the environment, and a budget strategy should be built to ensure successful implementation, compliance, and enforcement.

Response: The alternative ultimately selected represents the STNF Forest Supervisor's determination of the best course of action in providing motor vehicle travel in the STNF with minimal impact to natural and cultural resources. The alternatives propose a variety of road, trail, and area opportunities intended to respond to the significant issues raised by the public during the scoping period, while meeting the Purpose and Need as described in Chapter 1. These alternatives were studied thoroughly for the predicted effects on the array of resources as described in Chapter 3.

The availability of management resources should be a consideration in designating routes for motor vehicle travel. Section 212.55(a) of the TMR includes as a criterion for designation "the need for maintenance and administration

of roads, trails, and areas that would arise if the uses under consideration are designated; and the availability of resources for that maintenance and administration." The FS is committed to using whatever funds it has available to accomplish the purposes of this final rule in a targeted, efficient manner. The issues of affordability and other facility considerations are provided in detail in the Transportation section in Chapter 3, as well as in Appendices E, F, and J.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest needs to develop a plan that allows for compatible (other users and the environment) use. This plan needs to place appropriate restrictions on off road vehicles, while developing a budget strategy designed to ensure successful implementation and compliance. We believe this is key to success; plans without enforcement do not work. (#144)

Public Concern # 11. The Forest Service should perform a comprehensive inventory of its past transportation decisions as part of the travel analysis because:

A) the so-called "system" roads may not have appropriate NEPA documentation and, therefore, should be considered unauthorized routes because there is no record of administrative decisions or analysis addressing the environmental impacts of motor vehicle use on these routes;

B) the FS needs to include the NEPA analysis and decision documents, approval of Road Management Objectives (RMOs) or Trail Management Objectives (TMOs), or records establishing the expenditure of normally-appropriated maintenance funds on a specific route.

Response: The NFTS has been developed through active management and decisionmaking over time, both pre- and post-NEPA. The baseline system (classified roads and trails), as documented in the Forest's INFRA database, represents a compilation of those roads and trails included in the forest transportation atlas, have documented decisions for use, are marked with FS signing and numbering, or have at some time had documentation of maintenance and other management activities. The NFTS was reviewed prior to the start of this project and was established as the baseline. The NFTS changes over time as project-level analyses add or delete roads and trails based on site-specific conditions and needs. In addition, as with any databases, the INFRA database, which tracks maintenance levels and other road and trail data, reflects ongoing administrative updates.

Retention of NEPA documentation and other agency documentation such as funding levels is required for only six years (Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980). Therefore, many older records related to early development of the NFTS and maintenance records are not available, nor are they required or necessary in this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
We are concerned that a significant discrepancy may exist between what the Forest Service is calling its "system" and the routes which are supported by appropriate documentation. We would expect the Forest Service to perform a comprehensive inventory of its past transportation decisions as part of Travel Analysis. In our September 8, 2008, "scoping" comments we requested, but did not receive, this documentation. (#151)

Subconcern # B
As part of its description of the legal baseline, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest should include a table identifying the specific documentation or evidence which supports the inclusion of all existing routes in the transportation system. Such documentation would include NEPA analysis and decision documents, approval of Road Management Objectives (RMOs) or Trail Management Objectives (TMOs), or records establishing the expenditure of normally-appropriated maintenance funds on a specific route. Routes lacking such documentation should be marked accordingly. In scoping comments we included a sample spreadsheet to serve as an example. (#151)

Public Concern # 12. The Forest Service should compare the action alternatives, and then also compare to an alternative which designates only those routes that are currently in the NFTS, in this case, Alternative 3.

Response: The IDT evaluated all alternatives for their predicted environmental effects and this comparison of alternatives can be found in Chapter 2. Alternative 3, which prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel but proposes no addition to the NFTS, serves as a baseline for comparison among the other action alternatives that do propose additions to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Widespread cross-country travel is prohibited by the Travel Management regulations. While we understand that NEPA allows consideration of a No Action Alternative which is contrary to current law, we do not believe that such an alternative should serve as the sole baseline for comparison of the Action Alternatives. We believe, as does the Shasta-Trinity NF, that the Action Alternatives must be compared among each other and to an alternative which designates only those routes that are currently in the NFTS, in this case, Alternative 3. The threshold for determining whether a route is currently in the transportation system should be consistent and rigorous. In our view, the baseline transportation system should be limited to those current motorized system routes that are supported by prior NEPA analyses or decision documents that justify their inclusion on maps and in spatial databases. We believe that any routes lacking documentation (including routes which were constructed or came into being before NEPA was enacted) should be analyzed as new unauthorized routes, in recognition of the fact that there is no record of administrative decision or analysis addressing the environmental impacts of motor vehicle use on these routes. (#151)

Public Concern # 13. The Forest Service should not adopt Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), because it disregards the OHV community's desire for creating loop trails, and increases the necessity of mixed use roads to provide access to designated OHV routes. In addition, the EIS should include discussion on the conflict of the Shasta Board of Supervisor's designations for mixed use on NFS roads versus the STNF's proposal for licensed vehicles only on NFS roads.

Response: The STNF manages thousands of miles of roads for high-clearance vehicles (operational ML 2) that are open and available for non-highway-legal use. In addition to this opportunity, a feasible subset of passenger car road segments was proposed to be designated for motorized mixed use. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users. If adjacent public road authorities choose to implement and provide combined use highways and other motorized mixed use roadways in accordance with the CVC, the STNF has the opportunity to make future Travel Management decisions to better provide for user access.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I have taken the time to visit the FS office and viewed the proposal maps. Alternative #2, STNF's proposed action, seems to disregard the bulk of comments submitted by the OHV community for connecting roads and loops throughout the Forest. The use of the approved OHV trails is also hindered by the designation of the "licensed vehicles only" roads. Without connecting trails and loops, the necessity for mixed use roads increases for access. I was under the impression the Shasta Board of Supervisors had designated roads for mixed use that the FS proposal now designates "licensed vehicles only". If this is the case, how is this conflict resolved. The Recreation Outdoors Coalition has supporting documents for this mixed used position as well as addressing safety issues. It is my opinion that for Alternative #2, to be a viable proposal, would need the inclusion throughout the Forest of mixed use roads providing access to designated OHV routes. (#49)

Public Concern # 14. The Forest Service should not adopt Alternative 2, the Proposed Action, because it appears to violate NEPA, is arbitrary and capricious, and:

- **A) it increases road densities without funding available to maintain these new roads;**
- **B) it would exacerbate increasing forestwide watershed impacts and soil erosion, and decreasing wildlife populations and habitat;**
- **C) all TES and MIS species should be analyzed for potential impacts from the Proposed Action.**

Response: Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) was developed in accordance with law, regulation, and policy, including the NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF's LRMP. Alternative 2 was thoroughly

studied to identify predicted environmental effects as is disclosed in Chapter 3. Road densities are examined in several resource areas and the addition of roads, trails, and areas is evaluated for each resource by alternative. Impacts to watersheds, wildlife, TES, and MIS species are predicted and disclosed. Costs of adding roads and trails are estimated in the Transportation section of Chapter 3, as well as Appendices A and F.

Sample Public Comment(s):

As currently described, the proposed action appears to be in violation of NEPA and is arbitrary and capricious. It also appears to be biased decision-making in that the proposal concedes it is only looking at making some illegal motorized routes legal, thereby increasing road densities even further without the funds to maintain them. Currently, the STNF is experiencing forest-wide watershed impacts and soil erosion, as well as decreasing wildlife populations and habitat. The proposed action will only exacerbate all of these problems. All TES and MIS should be analyzed for potential impacts from the proposed action. These issues need to be thoroughly analyzed in the EIS. (#91)

Public Concern # 16. The Forest Service should amend Alternative 2 by reducing the proposed number and mileage of new motorized roads and trails that will be added to the STNF travel system because:

A) it reduces the potential for adverse impacts to fish and fish habitat, especially in the South Fork Trinity River watershed;
B) it ensures that no new motorized routes are designated in IRAs;
C) it would benefit relatively few STNF visitors because of the additional motorized routes;
D) the economic benefits from OHV use is relatively small when compared to other uses.

Response: Alternative 4 was developed to respond to the significant issue of resource impacts caused by motor vehicles, while providing for a small increase in additional routes to the NFTS, which addresses the commenters request for Alternative 2 to be amended. In addition, Alternative 4 mileage proposed for addition to the NFTS is the lowest of all action alternatives. As with all proposed additions in all action alternatives, the routes were chosen because they serve a motorized recreation benefit by offering a loop or extended ride, or access to water, or a documented dispersed recreation site. See Chapter 2 for a complete description and comparison of the alternatives. Routes proposed in Alternative 4 avoid the most sensitive riparian areas in order to protect watersheds, fish and fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms or riparian-related species. No routes are proposed in IRAs. See Chapter 3 for the environmental impacts predicted for all alternatives. In addition, the socio-economic and recreation analyses in Chapter 3 include the visitor numbers for a wide array of uses in the STNF, including motorized recreation. National forests are managed for a range of uses and experiences, some of which may include lower numbers of users.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This commitment of agency resources, and sacrifice of land and water resources that could remain in or be restored to a natural condition, benefits relatively few Forest visitors. Moreover, the economic contribution of OHV use on the STNF to local economies is small relative to other uses. For these reasons, and because we strongly support greater protection of aquatic and game animal habitat, we recommend that Alternative 2 of the DEIS be amended to reduce the proposed number and mileage of new motorized roads and trails that will be added to the STNF travel system: to reduce the potential for adverse impacts to fish and fish habitat, especially in the South Fork Trinity River watershed; and to ensure that no new motorized routes are designated in Inventoried Roadless Areas. (#161)

Public Concern # 17. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 2 or 4 because the speed limit restriction on the lake beds addresses safety concerns with OHV use.

Response: The speed limit restrictions proposed for areas below the high-water mark are intended to protect resources by effectively preventing hill climbing, jumping, fast turns, and mud bogging. Any enhanced public safety realized as a result of the speed limit restrictions would be a coincidental and appreciated indirect effect. See Chapter 2 for a discussion of speed limits and other protection measures proposed for the lake beds.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Alternatives 2 and 4 would be my first preference, as it removes OHVs from the lake bed. But with a speed restriction inserted into the alternative, it addresses the safety element which is my highest concern with the OHVs on the lake beds. (#10)

Public Concern # 18. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 2 because it prohibits motorized cross-country travel, while allowing some additional motorized road and trail access.

Response: Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 propose additional roads, trails, and areas while prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel. See the description of the alternatives in Chapter 2 for details. The alternative ultimately selected will represent the STNF Forest Supervisor's determination of the best course of action in providing motor vehicle travel in the STNF with minimal impact to natural and cultural resources.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The proposed Alternative #2 appears to be a reasonable compromise in providing some additional motorized road and trail access, and has our support. The most important provision is the prohibition of cross-country travel. (#32)

Public Concern # 19. The Forest Service should not adopt Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) because the STNF is unable to properly maintain the 5,000 miles of roads and motorized trails currently existing on the STNF and before adding 44 miles of routes to the system, at least 44 miles of unauthorized routes should be decommissioned.

Response: Title 36 CFR 212.55 provides criteria for the designation of roads, trails, and areas that will comprise the NFTS. Availability of resources for maintenance and administration of the NFTS is only one of the criteria for designation. The STNF Forest Supervisor will select the alternative that she believes best meets the requirements of the Travel Management regulation (36 CFR 312) and the STNF LRMP, as amended. The STNF did consider and analyze estimated costs for the administration and maintenance of the routes added to the NFTS in various alternatives (see Chapter 3.12, Table 3.12-8). However, it is impractical to use funding levels as the primary rationale for adding or not adding routes to the NFTS. This is true for a variety of reasons. First, funding comes from a variety of sources that can vary dramatically from year to year. Annual recurring maintenance funds alone are not the only (or even the primary) funding available for maintenance of ML 2 roads, such as those being added in this process. As described in the affected environment section of the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3.12 of the FEIS, many other funding sources are used. Additionally, careful prioritization of the roads that get maintained on various schedules allows the Forest to maintain roads at or above minimum standards without dramatically increasing deferred maintenance costs. Deferred maintenance activities are often funded through cyclical project-specific funding sources. Title 36 CFR 212 Subpart A requires development of an annual program of work for the NFTS that includes road maintenance.

Decommissioning is a specific term which includes activities that result in the stabilization and restoration of unneeded roads to a more natural state (36 CFR 212.1, FSM 7703). These activities can include removal of all drainage structures, outsloping the roadbed for drainage, revegetating the roadbed, and blocking it to vehicular travel. In Appendix B, Table B-6 identified 261.61 miles of roads to be closed, decommissioned, or abandoned on the STNF in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I am writing to oppose your proposed action in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Motorized Travel Management on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest to add approximately 44 miles of unauthorized roads and motorized trails to your current transportation system and 44,000 acres of open area below the high-water mark on Shasta and Trinity Lakes. This action is misguided considering that the Forest is unable to properly maintain the 5,000 miles of roads and motorized trails currently existing on the forest. (#143)

Public Concern # 20. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 3 because it best protects the resources, IRAs, and recreation and scenic values, and:

- **A) water quality would be improved due to reduction in use of unauthorized routes and stream crossings, as well as restoration of routes, especially in hydrologically sensitive areas such as the South Fork Trinity River and Hayfork Creek watersheds;**
- **B) prohibition of motorized cross-country travel will improve key wildlife species due to less disturbance;**
- **C) no use below the high-water mark in the three reservoirs will reduce disruption to nonmotorized recreationists and cultural resources;**

D) because it complies with the laws and regulations and if Alternative 3 is not adopted, the DEIS should be revised.

Response: The predicted environmental effects, including effects to biological, cultural, social, economic, scenic, and recreation resources of all alternatives, were evaluated and are disclosed in Chapter 3. The alternative ultimately selected will represent the STNF Forest Supervisor's determination of the best course of action in providing motor vehicle travel in the STNF with minimal impact to the resources evaluated in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Please choose Alternative 3, the only alternative which would protect the STNF from the increased damage that new roads cause, and the only one that conforms to the USFS motto of "caring for the land and serving the people". (#143)

Subconcern # A-C
I am requesting that Alternative 3 (Cross-County Travel and Parking Prohibition Only No Additions to the Existing NFTS) be adopted and implemented for the following reasons: The water resources would be protected due to a 98% decrease of route miles, and no additional miles in, hydrologically sensitive areas (especially the South Fork Trinity River and Hayfork Creek Watersheds), in addition to decreasing motorized stream crossings by 13% - both aspects leading to improved water quality. It will be important to enforce use of unauthorized routes to allow passive restoration of these inappropriately used routes (if de-compaction and re-vegetation cannot be afforded). ? Motorized use of lakes and reservoirs up to the high-water mark should not be allowed due to the disruption is would cause non-motorized users and cultural resources. The key wildlife species would not be affected by increased disturbance or aspects to their food or prey and populations could improve due to enforcement prohibiting cross-country travel and use of unauthorized routes. It is crucial to protect Inventoried Roadless Areas for wildlife, recreation and scenic values. Alternative 3 would decrease noise, dust and disruption caused by motor vehicles. (#31)

Subconcern # D
Unmanaged OHV use has resulted in unauthorized roads and trails, increased soil compaction and erosion, increased sedimentation, water quality degradation, the spread of noxious weeds, increased fire risk, damage to cultural resources, habitat destruction and fragmentation, increased disturbance to sensitive wildlife, and conflict among users. Consequently, we strongly support the goals of the agency through this public process to prohibit widespread cross-country travel and to designate roads, trails, and areas for OHV use. However, we find the DEIS to be inadequate in following all of the regulations established for travel management and in addressing the environmental impacts associated with the current and proposed transportation systems. We request that these deficiencies be addressed and resolved in a revised DEIS or that route designations be strictly limited, by choosing Alternative 3 as described in the "Remedy" section below. (#151)

Public Concern # 21. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 3 because it is the only legal alternative which eliminates motorized cross-country travel without designating any new roads or trails.

Response: All alternatives were developed in accordance with law, regulation, and policy, including the NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF's LRMP. The STNF Forest Supervisor will consider the environmental consequences disclosed in Chapter 3 before selecting an alternative to implement. The alternative ultimately selected will represent the STNF Forest Supervisor's determination of the best course of action in providing motor vehicle travel in the STNF with minimal impact to the resources evaluated in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The only legal alternative is #3 that eliminates cross-country travel and does not designate any new roads or trails. If the STNF is not going to conduct a legal analysis, which this DEIS is not, then it should simply implement Alternative 3 and wait for another time to add, close, and/or decommission roads/trails. (#91)

Public Concern # 22. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 3 because there is no funding to maintain any additional roads, trails, or open areas and:

A) identify the minimum road system (Subpart A), which will reflect long-term term funding expectations and minimize adverse environmental impact;

B) depict only the existing system roads on the MVUM, which can be justified through appropriate documentation showing that they were designed to be used by the public for long-term motorized recreation.

Response: The STNF Forest Supervisor will consider the significant issues, the mandate of the Subpart B of the TMR, the environmental consequences, and funding implications disclosed in Chapter 3 and Appendices A and F before selecting an alternative to implement. The alternative ultimately selected will represent the STNF Forest Supervisor's determination of the best course of action in providing motor vehicle travel in the STNF with minimal impact to the resources evaluated in Chapter 3.

The TMR is comprised of three parts: Subpart A, Administration of the Forest Transportation System; Subpart B, Designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle travel; and Subpart C, Use by over-snow vehicles. The scope of this action is focused on the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel to allow implementation of Subpart B and the production of a MVUM as required by the TMR. The Chief of the Forest Service has directed all national forests to complete the analyses necessary to publish the MVUM by the end of 2009. The identification of the minimum road system needed for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands is contained in Subpart A. There is no legal requirement in the regulations to implement Subpart A as a pre-condition to, or part of, the current Proposed Action. The STNF recognizes the value of implementing Subpart A. Identifying the minimum road system while building a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists will occur over time through further collaboration, project-level decisions, and annual updates to the MVUM. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Roads that make up the current transportation system were intended to be managed for the long-term use, administration, and protection of the national forest. However, it is important to note that management and administration of the 'baseline' road system on the STNF has evolved over time. Any additions to the NFTS made through this action or any other analyses represent a commitment by the FS to ensure the routes are suitable for public travel prior to inclusion on the published MVUM. Routes that were known to require work beyond the equivalent of basic maintenance to ensure suitability were excluded from the alternatives. Documentation of design or decisions regarding long-term use for the NFTS or the proposed additions is not required or necessary in this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

At this time, being realistic is important as to the long-term funds available for maintenance. I encourage you to select Alternative 3, which prohibits cross-country travel but does not add new roads or motorized trails to the current unsustainable National Forest Transportation System. Adding 44,000 acres of open area below the high-water mark on Shasta and Trinity Lakes does not consider the maintenance costs. (#120)

Subconcern # A
Because you have not completed a science-based travel analysis and identified the minimum road system that reflects long-term funding expectations and minimizes adverse environmental impacts associated with the existing transportation system, I encourage you to select Alternative 3, which prohibits cross-country travel but does not add new roads or motorized trails to the current unsustainable National Forest Transportation System (NFTS). (#143)

Subconcern # B
Alternatively, in the event the Forest insists on designating routes under Subpart B before performing the required analysis under Subpart A, the only option that preserves a semblance of the required process and protections of the applicable regulations is to adopt Alternative 3. Furthermore, the route designations and their depiction on a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) under this alternative should be limited to those motorized routes which can be justified through appropriate documentation showing that they were designed to be used by the public for long-term motorized recreation. (#151)

Public Concern # 24. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 4 because it better protects water quality, aquatic biota, nonmotorized recreation, avoids routes in environmentally sensitive areas, and:

A) it allows motorized mixed use of existing roads for OHV use rather than authorizing new motorized routes prior to completing Subpart A of the TMR;
B) it provides access for dispersed recreation and loop trails;
C) the speed limit below the high-water mark protects water quality.

Response: Alternative 4 was developed to respond to the significant issue of resource impacts caused by motor vehicles while still providing for a small increase in additions to the NFTS. The mileage proposed for addition to the NFTS is the lowest of all action alternatives. As with all proposed additions in all action alternatives, the routes were chosen because they serve a motorized recreation benefit by offering a loop or extended ride; or access to water or a documented dispersed recreation site. See Chapter 2 for a complete description and comparison of the alternatives. Routes proposed in Alternative 4 avoid the most sensitive riparian areas in order to protect watersheds, fish and fish habitat, and other aquatic organisms or riparian-related species. No routes are proposed in IRAs. Speed limits below the high-water mark are intended to preclude motor vehicle activities that could damage cultural resources. Speed limits are not predicted to directly protect water quality in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs.. See Chapter 3 for the environmental impacts predicted for all alternatives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
We especially appreciate that the STNF will prohibit motorized travel cross-country, and has provided route-by-route documentation of user-created routes and their potential impacts. We very much endorse the intention to close 102 miles of user-created routes that presently pass into or through riparian reserves. Over all, we prefer the outcomes proposed under Alternative 4 to those of Alternative 2 (the Proposed Action), because Alternative 4 would better protect water quality and aquatic biota, and because we support changing the designation of existing motorized routes (to mixed motorized use) to allow use by OHVs rather than authorizing new motorized routes prior to completing Sub-Part A of the Travel Management Rule. (#161)

Subconcern # B C
Implement Alternative 4 or a modified Alternative 2 to minimize impacts to natural resources and roadless areas, The DEIS states that Alternative 4 would provide access for dispersed recreation and connections for loop rides, while also protecting natural resources and minimizing impacts to the nonmotorized recreation experience, While we recognize that Alternative 2 would add a small portion of the current unauthorized routes to the NFTS, EPA believes that Alternative 4 would better balance the interests of resource protection and recreation opportunities than the proposed action, Alternative 2.

Recommendation: EPA recommends implementation of Alternative 4 or a modified Alternative 2, including avoidance of routes in late-successional reserves, riparian reserves, inventoried roadless areas, citizen-inventoried areas, key watersheds, habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, and other environmentally sensitive areas. We also support the proposed speed limit of 10 miles per hour for vehicles traveling in the areas below the high-water mark in Shasta and Trinity Lakes, include in Alternative 4, to minimize disturbance of lake bottom sediments and subsequent water quality impacts. (#164)

Public Concern # 26. The Forest Service should adopt Alternative 5 because it leaves roads open, taxpayers should have the right to use all of the roads, and it is the most balanced approach with the exception:

A) that roads that are open should not allow ATV use;
B) of road 38N82, the Squaw Creek Road.

Response: Alternative 5 responds to the significant issue regarding motor vehicle access and recreation opportunity. It proposes the highest mileage of route additions of the action alternatives, and offers opportunities for a variety of vehicle types including ATVs. Road 38N82 is an existing NFTS road and as such, any actions on this road other than consideration of motorized mixed-use is outside the scope of this analysis. Road 38N82 is not included in any alternative considered and will remain part of the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I would like Alternative #5 because it leaves most if not all of the roads open. It is our tax money that keeps everything going, so we should have the rights to use all of the roads. (#69)

Subconcern # A
My second choice is #5 with these roads added, for use with out ATV's. (#93)

Subconcern # B
If any alternative meets my criteria for the use of the National Forest it is Alternative 5. The exception is Road 38N82, known locally as the Squaw Creek Road. (#34)

Public Concern # 27. The Forest Service should adopt the green dot trail system used in Oregon to protect soils and wildlife habitat, minimize harassment of wildlife, maintain adequate bull escapement, and promote quality hunting.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. All of the action alternatives would benefit wildlife by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel with OHVs and ATVs. Appendix A identifies currently unauthorized routes that will be added to the NFTS and indicates any seasonal restrictions that may be in place. Subpart A of the TMR provides for future ongoing review of the NFTS. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users and provide for additional resource concerns based on agency and public input, such as in your comment.

Sample Public Comment(s):

They had seen use of a green dot trail system in Oregon and thought it worked well. The objectives of the Green Dot restrictions are to: 1) Protect soils and wildlife habitat, 2) Minimize harassment of wildlife, 3) Maintain adequate bull escapement, and 4) Promote quality hunting. (#21)

Public Concern # 28. The Forest Service should use management units as the basis for study in order to better focus on affected communities, user groups, those who fund projects, partners, and:

A) models of the management units exist in the McCloud Flats and McArthur areas;
B) the Weaverville Community Forest could be a collaborative model;
C) a collaborative effort could help fulfill the STNF's niche regarding water and recreation.

Response: The TMR is directed at the national forest level of decisionmaking and authority. However, District Rangers and their staff have participated throughout this process, and multiple public meetings have been held on the various management units to solicit input for implementation of the TMR.

A) The TMR ends cross-country motor vehicle travel off of designated routes or out of designated areas. The McCloud Flat was not one of the Designated Areas considered in alternative development.

B/C) The Weaverville Community Forest is one of many possible models of collaboration. As stated in the preamble to the TMR, the STNF Forest Supervisor should consider the contributions from volunteers and other cooperators in deciding on which routes to allow motor vehicle travel. Appendix E of the FEIS (Law Enforcement) contains an implementation strategy which among other tasks, identifies how the public can help with implementation and maintenance of the designated system, enforcement of the rules, and education of other Forest users. A number of other criteria also need to be taken into account when considering entering into volunteer agreements, including the consideration of the effects of route designation on national forest natural and cultural resources, public safety, provision of recreational opportunities, access needs, and conflicts among uses of NFS lands. It is also important to remember that this is the first year of an ongoing process. Once a NFTS has been established, we believe the TMR provides the flexibility to develop future volunteer relationships and we look forward to that opportunity where it aligns with the objectives of the STNF LRMP. We believe collaboration with users is an integral part of defining the Forest’s recreation niche and the success of a Travel Management Plan.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We'd like to suggest a possible solution to these deficiencies and what appears to be a lack attention to Forest uses in all of the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. Our experience has been that developing a comprehensive plan on a manageable scale, such as your Management Units, would help focus affected communities, user groups and potential project funders and partners on the issues and resource needs. We have heard that a model for this exists in the McCloud Flats or McArthur area and would like to explore this further with you, possibly beginning with the Weaverville Community Forest as a collaborative model on the west side of the Forest. This planning approach would facilitate adequate overlays of all of resource and user issues that affect, and are affected by, the transportation system to be evaluated in synergy not separately. It could take into account our role as the stewardship link between the National Forest and the local communities and help all of us help you to meet the Shasta Trinity National Forest's niche, which we understand is water and recreation. (#80)

Public Concern # 31. The Forest Service should address the impacts of low lake levels and the ability of taxpayers to use the lakeshore for recreational activities (day camping, fishing, swimming, etc.) when the actual waterline of the lake is often one-quarter to one-half mile below the high-water mark.

Response: Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 propose to add areas below the high-water marks to provide access to the lake shore and opportunities for motor vehicle recreation when the lake levels are low. The alternatives vary somewhat in the areas, vehicle types, and speed limit restriction. See the full description of the alternatives in Chapter 2 and the effects of these area proposals, including those on recreationists in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

None of the other alternatives properly address the lake levels of Trinity Lake. Due to climate changes, fishery management and water resource allocations, for 90% to 95% of the year, Trinity Lake is well below its capacity and the recreational use of the lake is dramatically impacted by overall lower lake levels. None of the other alternatives have properly addressed the overall reduced lake levels and the ability to taxpayers to use the lakeshore for recreational activities (day camping, fishing swimming, etc) when the actual waterline of the lake is often 114 to 112 mile below the high water line. (#100)

Public Concern # 32. The Forest Service should develop alternatives that will allow public use and enjoyment of the STNF without FS intervention and there is no alternative that maintains 100 percent of the existing routes, including unauthorized routes.

Response: Congress established the FS to provide opportunities for the public to use the national forest in a way that protects natural resources so that future generations can continue to enjoy them. Chapter 1 of the FEIS explains why the FS needs to take this action. The FS manages NFS lands for many uses, and sometimes, those uses seem to be in conflict. It is the Forest Service's responsibility to work with the public and within law, regulation, and policy to provide recreational opportunities, including motorized recreation, while protecting natural resources. It would not be legal or environmentally responsible for the FS to allow unmanaged public use of the STNF. The alternatives considered in this analysis represent a range of actions which respond to public input, while remaining in accordance with the Purpose and Need for the analysis as described in Chapter 1.

Closing existing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis; therefore the NFTS remains intact in all alternatives. An alternative which designates the entire inventory of unauthorized routes that receive motor vehicle travel was considered but eliminated from further study due to the potential for environmental impacts, the requirements of the TMR, and the costs associated with maintaining such an expanded road system. See Chapter 2, page 55 of the FEIS for details regarding this proposed alternative.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This document has only two alternatives, leave the forest open or close it. You need to develop alternatives that will let the public use and enjoy the forest without USFS intervention. (#134)

Why is there no alternative to keep 100% of the existing routes, including those you have negatively designated as "unauthorized"? (#136)

Public Concern # 33. The Forest Service should develop an alternative that addresses resource issues and concerns raised in the DEIS, prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel, fully meets public motorized access needs, and:

A) develop an alternative that fully addresses the stated goals in the Purpose and Need;
B) should not state that "unauthorized tracks" are unauthorized because they are actually legal and allowed under the current LRMP;
C) add the list of routes in Appendix A to this alternative.

Response: The range of action alternatives in the FEIS was developed to meet the Purpose and Need for the action as described in Chapter 1, which includes the need to protect natural and cultural resources. The environmental impacts of the alternatives were thoroughly studied and are disclosed in Chapter 3. Proposed routes that raised concerns were assigned mitigation measures, or if the effects cannot be mitigated, the STNF Forest Supervisor will take that into account when making a final decision on which routes to add to the NFTS. Alternatives 2 through 5 prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel and vary in the amount of proposed additional motorized access. Motorized access is a significant issue in this analysis, and the FS responded to the need for access with Alternative 5, which proposes the most additions to the NFTS than the other alternatives (see Chapter 2 in the FEIS). The routes proposed for addition to the NFTS are listed in Appendix A. The term "unauthorized road or trail" is defined in the TMR as "A road or trail that is not a forest road or trail or a temporary road or trail and that is not included in a forest transportation atlas (36 CFR Part 212.1)" and is used in this analysis to be consistent with the TMR. It is helpful in differentiating the undesignated routes from the existing NFTS roads. The commenter is correct in that the STNF LRMP allows cross-country motor vehicle travel in some areas of the STNF. The LRMP also prohibits it in other areas, most notably designated Wilderness as required by the Wilderness Act.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We feel that none of the action alternatives fully address adequate motorized access on the Shasta Trinity National Forest. We want the STNF to develop an alternative to be considered in the final EIS that addresses resource issues and concerns raised in the document, prohibits cross-country use, and fully meets public motorized access needs. (#139)

Public Concern # 34. The Forest Service should develop an alternative that meets the existing and future use for motorized access, provides a better balance between motor vehicle access, affordability, and environmental stewardship, and:

A) none of the DEIS alternatives address Significant Issue #1 as required by NEPA;
B) the DEIS alternatives, including seasonal closures proposed for designated routes, drastically reduce motorized access on inventoried routes and the DEIS does not adequately disclose the effects;
C) concentrating use on the designated routes proposed in the DEIS should be addressed in the cumulative effects section of the DEIS;
D) the alternatives represent major changes, not "limited changes" as stated in the TMR, and are beyond the scope of the TMR;
E) the FS needs to reevaluate the alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study, which adds all of the inventoried routes to the NFTS;
F) data in the Recreation and Scenic sections show that two-thirds of STNF visitors are at least partly tied to motorized recreation;
G) there is not an adequate range of alternatives as required by NEPA regulations;
H) affordability of the NFTS should be a significant issue addressed in a new alternative;
I) based on valid traffic data, reclassify most of the STNF's unpaved ML 3 roads to ML 2, and convert many of the ML 2 roads to motorized trails (open to all vehicle classes) to better align the STNF's road system with projected annual road maintenance costs and current vehicle use;
J) the FS should designate all ML 2 and unpaved ML 3 roads for motorized mixed use (all vehicles) unless a rare exception exists that cannot be mitigated;
K) allow side-by-side vehicles (54 inches wide) on all "ATV trails", which are formally defined as 50 inches or less in width. It would be imprudent to prohibit "Rhinotype" vehicles on these trails because they exceed the width definition by a mere four inches;

L) include all combined use/mixed use assessments (engineering reports) in an Appendix to the FEIS so the public understands why some routes may not be recommended for mixed use;
M) provide access to all historically used recreation sites unless there is no evidence of recent use;
N) allow parking 30 feet from a designated route and allow vehicle access for dispersed camping within 100 feet from a designated route consistent with FSM 7715.74, FSM 7716.1, and FSM 7716.13;
O) allow cross-country motor vehicle travel by ATVs only for the sole purpose of big game retrieval during the hunting season if desired by the public for certain zones or all zones. Prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel at all other times except at the three reservoirs;
P) close unneeded roads to reduce your road maintenance costs and mitigate road-related resource impacts.

Response: Although the primary goal of this analysis is to reduce the impacts of unmanaged cross-country motor vehicle travel, additions and changes to system routes are also being considered to better provide for resource concerns and public access. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users and address future resource concerns as needed.

A) Alternative 5 was developed in response to Significant Issue #1 to address the public's concern about motor vehicle access and recreation opportunity. Although Alternative 5 proposes the most miles added to the NFTS, and managed use on three lake bottoms totaling thousands of acres, the commenter believes NEPA regulations have been violated because the additions represent a small percentage of the inventoried unauthorized routes, and therefore, do not adequately address the issue. This analysis adheres to NEPA regulations in the development of alternatives (40 CFR 1502.14) and offers the highest level of access and opportunity possible given the required resource protection and time constraints. As discussed in Chapter 2 and Appendix G, all unauthorized routes were considered and none were excluded for no reason. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

B) The commenter is correct in that motor vehicle cross-country travel will be eliminated with this decision. Proposed seasonal closures assigned to selected routes are necessary to protect resources, while still allowing motor vehicle travel for part of the year. The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel (and therefore eliminating motor vehicle travel on most unauthorized routes) are evaluated and disclosed in each resource section in Chapter 3. Measurement indicators considered relevant and meaningful for each resource are used.

C) The potential effect of concentrated use is disclosed in the Recreation and Transportation sections of Chapter 3.

D) The Purpose and Need for action (Chapter 1) refers to limited changes to the existing NFTS to provide additional motor vehicle access and recreation opportunity after prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel off designed roads, trails and areas. The range of alternatives was developed in accordance with NEPA regulations and FS policy, and the analysis adheres to requirements of the TMR.

E) Adding all of the unauthorized routes to the NFTS would violate the TMR's mandate to protect natural and cultural resources. The rationale for eliminating such an alternative from detailed analysis (FEIS page 55) remains valid. The FS analyzed the existing condition (including cross-country motor vehicle travel on all unauthorized routes) in Alternative 1 and found unacceptable resource impacts (Chapter 3).

F) There is no question that motor vehicle access and recreation opportunity is important to many visitors who come to the STNF to pursue a variety of interests. Motor vehicle travel is an integral part of a wide spectrum of recreational pursuits. Motor vehicle travel provides access for camping, hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, and many other activities. Motorized recreation is also supported by the STNF with opportunities ranging from OHV use on a remote trail to driving for pleasure to enjoy the beauty of the national forest along major travel ways. As the commenter notes, the DEIS acknowledges this use and has provided NVUM data that reflects it. One of the

purposes of this analysis is to continue to provide motor vehicle access and recreation opportunity by adding roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS.

G) The range of alternatives considered adheres to the CEQ regulations (40 CFR Part 1502.14). A reasonable range of alternatives is one that fulfills the Purpose and Need, addresses the significant issues, includes the no action alternative, and includes mitigation. The IDT developed Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 in response to the significant issues raised by the public during scoping. In addition, Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), and Alternative 1 (No Action), were studied in detail in the FEIS. The FS also evaluated 12 alternatives submitted by the public, which were eliminated for detailed analysis, as described in Chapter 2 (FEIS page 55). The Forest Service believes the range of alternatives considered is adequate and reflects the values and interests expressed by the public during this analysis process.

H) Affordability of the NFTS is one of the criteria considered when making changes to the NFTS. When adding roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS, the STNF Forest Supervisor considers the need for their maintenance. The TMR and agency direction (FSM 7715.03) require such consideration. The STNF's Forest Supervisor is charged with managing a sustainable transportation system that balances administrative needs, public uses, environmental protection, and affordability. She will consider the current backlog of maintenance needs and the budget trends for future maintenance when selecting the routes for addition to the NFTS. Although no alternative was designed around affordability, it is an indicator of effects disclosed for each alternative (see Transportation section in Chapter 3.12).

I) As stated in the FEIS, FSM Sections 2350 and 7700 contain agency policy for management of the NFTS (FEIS, page 539). The policy requires the development of trail management objectives (TMOs) and road management objectives (RMOs). The TMOs and RMOs document the purpose of each trail or road. The purpose for the trail or road sets the parameters for maintenance standards needed to meet user needs, resource protection and public safety. FSH 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet road management objectives (RMOs) for the road system and including considerations for public safety. Less than 117 miles of the existing NFTS are ML 3 native surface roads. None of the action alternatives under consideration add any ML 3, 4, or 5 roads to the system. A blanket reduction of all native surface roads to ML 2 to reduce maintenance costs is not possible nor is it being considered. The road surface is not the deciding factor for determining whether it is legal to use OHVs/ATVs on the road. Federal regulations and state laws determine the type of vehicle that is authorized (16 USC 480, 36 CFR 212.5).

J) See Chapter 2, "Alternatives Submitted in Response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement" for information on the STNF’s consideration of allowing OHVs on all unpaved NFTS roads. All ML 2 roads allow all vehicle classes and are currently available for motorized mixed-use at this time. ML 3 roads, paved or not, that are proposed for motorized mixed-use must undergo analysis by an engineer qualified to assess the safety issues and mitigations connected to each road. Appendix C describes the process in detail, and notes the conclusions reached regarding crash probability on the ML 3 road segments studied in Alternatives 4 and 5. The STNF may consider changes to maintenance levels on some NFTS roads to provide desired motorized recreation and access in future planning efforts outside of this analysis.

K) For the purpose of this analysis, motorized trails are limited by motor vehicle width rather than type of vehicle. ATV trails are available to all motor vehicles not wider than 50 inches. This includes UTVs, if they are not wider than 50 inches. UTVs larger than 50 inches are permitted on trails for all-trail vehicles (4WD trails), ML 2 roads, or ML 3 roads where designated for mixed-use. Route additions to the NFTS, changes in vehicle class, or modification of motorized trail width are not precluded from consideration in future actions.

L) Appendix C in the FEIS has been updated with a summary of the engineering studies conducted on the NFTS segments proposed for mixed use. Twenty-three separate reports were prepared by a qualified engineer after surveying each proposed road segment according to FS policy. The reports range from 13 to 19 pages each and are available for public inspection in the project record.

M) The STNF does not have field data on all of what might be considered historically-used recreation sites. An alternative to add all or most of the unauthorized routes, many of which may access such sites, was considered and eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2. When evaluating benefits and risks associated with each route requested by the public during scoping, the IDT identified "access to a documented dispersed site" as a benefit and a reason to further study a particular route, if there was no resource concern with the route. The District Rangers

also provided input into routes selected based on their local field knowledge of dispersed recreation and access needs. This conversation will continue with future planning efforts and regular updates to the MVUM.

N) An alternative to allow dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of the surface of NFTS roads and trails was considered and eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2. The rationale for elimination is applicable to the consideration of providing a 30-foot parking corridor along designated roads and trails as well. The analysis shows that cultural sites, sensitive plants, noxious weeds at risk for spread, and serpentine soils occur within 30 feet of some of the proposed routes. Access to these areas should be minimized to protect resources and provide for public safety.

O) The STNF is considered to be a heavily roaded Forest, providing ample opportunity to retrieve game without traveling cross-country. Therefore, designating areas for cross-country motor vehicle travel for big game retrieval was not identified as part of the Purpose and Need for this project and is outside the scope of this project.

P) An alternative to close existing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis as described in Chapter 2 - Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis. Indentifying unneeded roads is an ongoing process conducted in project analyses as they occur across the STNF.

Sample Public Comment(s):

After review of the DEIS, we recommend your staff analyze a new alternative to comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to provide a better balance between motor vehicle access, affordability and environmental stewardship. (#152)

Subconcern # A-D
NEPA regulations state, alternatives are developed to address significant Issues. This document has failed to design an alternative that addresses Issue #1; Reduced Motorized Access and Recreation Opportunity. No alternative as proposed will support current or future levels of motorized use. This "Concern" is the adverse impacts to motorized recreation and access due to loss of trails and roads where public use has been well established, requested by the public and such use has been accepted by the agency. All proposed alternatives have failed to meet the existing and future use for motorized access. Alternatives 2 through 5 would carry forward 7.6 miles of trail to 43.4 miles of trail respectively out of a total of approximately 1,252 miles of inventoried routes currently used by the public. This is a reduction of 99.9% to 96.4% of the total miles of inventoried routes used by the public. Under alternatives 2, 4, and 5, seasonal closures will have increased on Forest roads and trails as well. This closure action will reduce Forest access by 33% of the time currently available by the public. Such a reduction in riding and access opportunities raises the question of unintended consequences of any of the action alternatives such as displacement of use and overuse of the few remaining roads and trails that are ultimately designated. We ask that this consequence be re-analyzed in the final EIS under "cumulative effects analysis". We consider these MAJOR changes not "Limited changes" to the Shasta Trinity National Forest transportation system and are well beyond the scope and intent of the Final Rule. This document validates our position in its' own words as we reference chapter 2. We quote; "the Responsible Official has determined that existing NFTS roads and trails will not be considered for repair, reconstruction or decommissioning as part of this proposal. This action is not addressing the creation of a travel management plan, but rather deals specifically with Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule, which provides direction for a system of NFTS roads, trails and areas designated for motor vehicle use and the prohibition of motor vehicle use off designated roads, trails and areas. Subpart B is intended to prevent resource damage caused by unmanaged motor vehicle travel by the public. Therefore, any analysis of our existing system and comprehensive changes made to that system (#139)

Subconcern # E F
Therefore, are beyond the scope of this current proposal. " and in the same paragraph we also quote "This project is strictly focused on reducing the impacts of unmanaged motorized recreation per Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule and is not intended to be a comprehensive reconsideration of the NFTS for all aspects of National Forest management." All action alternatives as proposed fail to address this issue adequately. Alternatives as defined under NEPA must be developed to address the significant issues. All action alternatives developed in this DEIS fail to respond to issue #1, Reduced Motorized Access and Recreation Opportunity. Public scoping has identified inventoried routes that are important for motorized recreation and access. This use included access for dispersed camping, hunting, hiking, equestrian use, OHV opportunities and driving for pleasure. Developing an alternative that is more in line with the 800 miles of public requested routes along with the prohibition of cross-country travel more completely addresses issue #1. We want the agency to re-evaluate the alternative listed in

"Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis (Add the entire inventory of unauthorized route or majority of routes receiving motor vehicle use to the NFTS.). The proposal of prohibition of use on lands that are located between these routes (true cross-country use) and designation of routes has been widely encouraged and accepted among the broad OHV community. The agency must develop a modified alternative which combines the guidance stated above and considers public requested routes that appropriately addresses current and future motorized use as described in chapter 3. (Recreation and Scenic values where data and studies have shown that two thirds of Shasta Trinity National Forest visitors are at least partly tied to motorized recreation) (#139)

Subconcern # G
Significant issue statement #1, "Reduce Motorized Access and Recreation Opportunity" in the DEIS it states: "The proposed action will adversely affect the quality of motorized recreation and provides insufficient public access to STNF lands. The prohibition of cross-country travel, restrictions below the high-water mark of the reservoirs and the addition of only 44 miles of routes to the NFTS unfairly limits motorized recreation." We believe there is an inadequate range of action alternatives in the DEIS to respond to the significant issues in compliance with NEPA Regulations, which require: "Alternatives included the proposed action. (a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated. (b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail. Forest Service regulations specify the following in developing and analyzing alternatives."The EIS shall document the examination of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. An alternative should meet the purpose and need and address one or more significant issues related to the proposed action." "Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action should fulfill the purpose and need and address unresolved conflicts related to the proposed action. Be alert for alternatives suggested by participants in scoping and public involvement activities." After the receipt of public comments on the DEIS, the agency shall: 'Response to comments. (a) An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond to one or more (#152)

Subconcern # J
Alternative 1 does not contribute towards your range of alternatives since it is infeasible to select and implement. "Under Alternative 1, the Travel Management Rule would not be implemented, and no motor vehicle use map (MVUM) would be published." Please analyze a new Action Alternative (# 6) that provides a better balance between motor vehicle access, affordability and environmental protection in response to significant issue statement #1. Add a significant issue to address the affordability of your NFTS. This alternative has the following elements:

a) Based on valid traffic data, reclassify most of the STNF's unpaved ML 3 roads to ML 2 to better align your road system with projected annual road maintenance costs and current vehicle use.

b) Convert many of your ML 2 roads to motorized trails (open to all vehicle classes) to, again, better align your road system with projected annual road maintenance costs.

c) Designate all ML 2 and unpaved ML 3 roads for motorized mixed use (all vehicles) unless a rare exception exists that cannot be mitigated. (#152)

Subconcern # K-P
d) The adoption of a) through c) will eliminate short OHV roads and trails that go nowhere when they terminate at the intersection of a road where non-highway legal vehicles are prohibited.

e) Allow side-by-side vehicles (54 inches wide) on all "ATV trails" which are formally defined as 50 inches or less in width. It would be imprudent to prohibit "Rhino type" vehicles on these trails because they exceed the width definition by a mere four inches. f) Include all combined use/mixed use assessments (engineering reports) in an Appendix to the FEIS so the public understands why some routes may not be recommended for mixed use. g) Provide access to all historically used recreation sites unless there is no evidence of recent use. h) Allow parking 30 feet from a designated route and allow vehicle access for dispersed camping within 100 feet from a designated route consistent with FSM 7715.74, FSM 7716.1, and FSM 7716.13. i) Allow cross-country travel by ATVs only for the sole purpose of big game retrieval during the hunting season if desired by the public for certain zones or all zones. Prohibit cross-country travel at all other times except at the three reservoirs. j) Close unneeded roads to reduce your road maintenance costs and mitigate road related resource impacts. (#152)

Public Concern # 35. The Forest Service should develop an alternative that more accurately reflects the recreational trend (increasing motorized recreation, including driving for pleasure) as described in the Transportation section on Chapter 3 and that removes the unwarranted CVC combined use restrictions on the NFTS.

Response: Part of the Purpose and Need for the TMR is the trend of increasing motorized recreation. A range of alternatives was considered in the FEIS that balanced protection of natural resources with motorized access and recreational opportunities in different ways. The responsibility for the CVC lies with the State of California. The FS cannot determine where the CVC applies and where it does not. The responsibility of the FS is to publish a MVUM that provides for public safety. Accordingly, Alternatives 4 and 5 indentified particular ML 3 roads where mixed use would provide enhanced recreational benefits. Engineering studies were conducted on these road segments to evaluate risk and are described in Appendix C.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Transportation Management, Affected Environment. Please note that this document has stated; "Public use of the road system has grown steadily. In 1950, the nationwide average ratio of recreation to timber traffic on Forest Service roads was 10 to 1. In 1975, the ratio was 27 to 1 and in 1996 the ratio was estimated at 114 to 1. Driving for pleasure has become the single largest recreation use of Forest Service managed lands. Almost all National Forest visitors travel on NFTS roads. The roads provide access for recreation, research, OHV use, fish and wildlife habitat management, grazing, timber harvesting, hunting and fishing, fire suppression, fuels reduction, mining, insect and disease control and access to private land." , and also stated; "State Highways and County roads are considered public roads. Public roads are roads constructed and maintained by a public road agency such as a city, county or State. These roads are for public travel and fall under the National Highway Safety Act. ", these conclusions and statements represent the growing recreational trend on the STNF and the Forest Service has not been classified as a public road agency therefore sections of the CVC relating to combined use definitions do not apply. We want the agency to develop an alternative that more accurately reflects the recreational trend as described here and to remove the unwarranted CVC combined use restrictions on the NFTS. (#139)

Public Concern # 36. The Forest Service should adopt the alternative submitted by the Stewards of the Sierra National Forest, which provides a broad spectrum of recreational opportunities required under the NFMA; and it includes routes in Alternative 5, additional routes listed in Appendix B, seasonal closures, monitoring and mitigation, combined use, and allowance of wheeled over-snow use on designated routes because this alternative would:

- **A) improve access to public and private lands for recreation activities;**
- **B) protect the environment by dispersing traffic on a system of adequate size and prohibit travel off designated routes;**
- **C) provide high quality recreation by dispersing traffic, identifying difficulty levels and different vehicle classes, and preserving loops and destinations;**
- **D) designate combined use on roads and allow all vehicle classes to access dispersed sites;**
- **E) precisely identify maintenance needs and monitoring after maintenance would be implemented;**
- **F) allow for combined use that would connect riding areas with each other, campgrounds with riding areas, and is proven to be safe;**
- **G) provide the economic benefit to the surrounding communities.**

Response: The commenter submitted an alternative comprised of a list of 418 routes; a closure plan with a minimum season of use assigned as March 1 to December 31 with wet weather closures implemented as "One inch of rain in 24 hours then close area to wheeled travel for 48 hours, then reopen"; wheeled over-snow use; combined use, and a monitoring plan. The routes submitted are identical to those submitted by motorized recreation groups during the scoping period for the Proposed Action and were considered by the IDT for inclusion in the NFTS. Of them, 39 routes are duplicates, 263 routes are existing NFTS, and therefore, considered only for motorized mixed-use in this analysis, and 13 routes are unidentifiable. Twenty-three routes are part of alternative proposals in the FEIS and one route remains viable (TC849 on Map 16) but has not been assigned to an alternative at this time. The screening process used in consideration of all route requests is detailed in Appendix G.

The seasonal restrictions in the alternatives are assigned based on documented needs for wildlife and watershed protection. Please note that just five of the proposed routes are assigned wet weather closures; these are assigned because their parent roads, existing NFTS, have wet weather closures in place. Wet weather closures are recommended on additional routes but will be implemented as required by on-the-ground conditions. The wording in the Watershed section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS has been updated to clarify this approach.

Actions related to over-snow vehicles are outside of the scope of this EIS, which is solely focused on implementing 36 CFR 212 Subpart B, Designation of Roads, Trails, and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use. Use by over-snow vehicles may be allowed, restricted, or prohibited under Subpart C, if the Forest conducts such an analysis in the future, or through other environmental analyses.

Combined use, also referred to as motorized mixed use, is studied in Alternatives 4 and 5 and Modified Alternative 2. The STNF identified roads that would create loops or extended rides if motorized mixed use is permitted. Appendix C of the FEIS has been updated with the results of the engineering studies conducted on the proposed road segments.

The monitoring plan submitted by the commenter is a logical approach intended to bring routes up to standard and will be considered by STNF managers. Monitoring of designated roads and trails will be conducted as required by FS regulation and policy. Condition surveys and other monitoring designed to protect natural and cultural resources is planned and detailed in Appendices D and L.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A-C
The Stewards proposed system meets the purpose and need as stated in the DEIS by designating roads and trails provided as open to the appropriate class of motor vehicle. The goal is to:

- Develop an environmentally sustainable, outstanding and enjoyable designated road and trail system.

- Provide for a diversity of recreational opportunities by adding a sufficient number of roads and trails to the Forest Transportation system.

- Adding wheeled motorized access to recreation opportunities (camping, fishing, hunting, hiking, horseback, etc.)

The above additions will improve access to public and private lands. (#139)

Subconcern # D-F
The inclusion of these roads and trails would do the following:

1. Designate all roads and trails shown as open to the appropriate class of motor vehicle (motorcycle, ATV, 4X4, etc.).

2. Designate all roads necessary to provide trail connections open to combined use.

3. Designate roads that give access to dispersed camping areas as open to all vehicles.

The Stewards of the Sierra National Forest understand that monitoring and mitigation plans are to be developed as part of the implementation of the agency selected alternative. For a trail system to be sustainable we recognize that a monitoring plan is essential, and therefore ask that the following be incorporated into the Shasta Trinity National Forest monitoring and mitigation requirements. (#139)

Subconcern # F
The Stewards of the Sierra National Forest Alternative was designed with Public Safety in mind. For system roads proposed for combined use, we understand that an engineering traffic study is required to approve this type of combined use. Combined use roads should provide primary connectivity from one riding area to another and/or provide access from existing Forest campgrounds to riding areas. We believe that the validation of prudent traffic speeds, average daily traffic counts, surface conditions and past use and accident history will show that these roads are suitable for combined use designation. We have included references and statistics that will support our request. Accident records from several Forests close to metropolitan areas (with significant levels of heavy auto traffic on the Forest roads), such as the Mendocino, the San Bernardino, and the Los Padres, reveal approximately one reported motorcycle auto accident (which resulted in injury or fatality) per ten years. A lost tort claim study completed in January of 1990 by the Region 5 OHV Coordinator 12 showed that nationwide, reported motorcycle-auto accidents on National Forest roads between 1977 and 1990 were so rare that they did not even have their own

reporting category. We believe that our proposal provides an economic benefit to the surrounding communities of the Shasta Trinity National Forest, which merits consideration in the development of alternatives. (#139)

Subconcern # G
There is an economic benefit to keeping roads and trails open to motorized use. OHV users contribute about $1.7 million to the local economy per the National Forest Visitor Study economic estimates (based on 12,500 user days, per Forest Reports, at $136 per overnight stay, per National Visitor report spending profiles. (#139)

Public Concern # 37. The Forest Service should adopt an alternative that minimizes impacts to the resources, while allowing appropriate motorized access by:

- **A) adding roads that provide loops;**
- **B) adding fewer routes than Alternative 5 and additions should be similar to Alternatives 3 and 4;**
- **C) prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel, except snowmobiles, in authorized areas;**
- **D) producing a MVUM and implementing the TMR;**
- **E) developing a mixed use analysis with public input, if mixed use is going to be expanded;**
- **F) affirming the Pacific Crest Trail as non-mechanized and restricts problematic access points;**
- **G) allowing appropriate use below the high-water marks on Shasta and Trinity Lakes, and Iron Canyon Reservoir.**

Response: The commenter describes components consistent with Alternatives 2 and 4 as described in Chapter 2 and evaluated in Chapter 3. A primary outcome of this analysis will be the publication of the MVUM depicting the NFTS, updated to include the suitable routes and areas selected for addition to the NFTS as a result of this analysis. Decisions or affirmations regarding the management of the Pacific Crest Trail are outside the scope of this analysis and no proposed routes affect the Pacific Crest Trail.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We support the adoption of an alternative that minimizes impacts while allowing appropriate motorized access. And while, generally, we do not want to see additional areas of the Forest opened up to motorized vehicles we understand and support the addition of roads that specifically connect existing routes and allow for "loop" trips; thus hopefully helping to minimize additional unauthorized cross country travel. Specifically, we would like to see and would support an alternative that: Restricts or limits the addition of new roads and motorized trails (alternatives 3 and 4). We believe Alternative 5 is too expansive with regard to new roads and trails; Prohibits all (excluding snowmobile in authorized use areas) cross county motor vehicle travel (alternative 2-5); Develops a motor vehicle use map; Implements a Travel Management Rule as proposed; If mixed use is going to be expanded, develops a mixed use analysis (alternatives 4-5) and decision making process with public input prior to implementation; Specifically affirms the Pacific Crest Trail National Scenic Trail as a non-mechanized use area (including snow mobiles), and restricts access points that allow for "convenient" non-authorized use; Allows an appropriate level of use below the ordinary high water mark of Shasta and Trinity Lake as well as Iron Mountain reservoir. (#144)

Public Concern # 38. The Forest Service should develop a new alternative, coordinating with the counties and the public, to create a system for non-highway-legal vehicles that recognizes CVC provisions allowing OHV use on unpaved NFTS roads, and would include:

- **A) designating all ML 3 and 4 roads for motorized mixed use if the engineering study allows it;**
- **B) providing trails for a variety of vehicle types and difficulty levels;**
- **C) analyzing all requested routes and disclosing the rationale for their elimination in the FEIS;**
- **D) allowing continued access to ten riding areas until the completion of future environmental analyses;**
- **E) providing motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites;**

F) allowing parking for dispersed camping 100 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so;
G) permitting parking up to 30 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so;
H) reducing the operational maintenance level of unpaved ML 3 and 4 roads to accommodate OHV s, consistent with available road maintenance resources and current vehicle use;
I) allowing OHV use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

Response: A) Although other state laws are based on road surface type, the CVC is not. At the beginning of this planning effort, ML 3, 4, and 5 roads under the jurisdiction of the STNF were restricted to highway-legal vehicles only. To better provide for "legal" non-highway-legal vehicle access and accommodate the associated public interest, a feasible subset of passenger car road segments was proposed to be designated for motorized mixed use. In accordance with FS policy, an engineering analysis was conducted on each of these segments. As described in Appendix C, these analyses consider the safety aspects of allowing various uses, including various vehicle classes, to utilize the same roadway. Mitigation measures and the associated change in risk are presented in the documents, which are located in the project record. These reports documenting the analyses provide information to the STNF Forest Supervisor for consideration during decisionmaking. If the STNF Forest Supervisor believes that the crash risks can be mitigated to an acceptable level, then a decision can be made to designate a passenger car road for motorized mixed use. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users.

B) The alternatives studied in detail propose trails with a variety of vehicle classes assigned, ranging from motorcycle-only to allowing all trail class vehicles. In addition, the proposed road additions would allow all vehicle classes. The range of difficulty levels is discussed in the Recreation section of Chapter 3.

C) Appendix G describes the screening criteria for all requested routes. The list of routes requested during the scoping period and the screening results for specific routes are located in the project record. Those incorporated in alternative designs are listed in Appendix A.

D) The alternative ultimately selected will adhere to the TMR, which prohibits motor vehicle travel off designated roads, trails, and areas. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

E) The STNF does not have field data on all of what might be considered historically used recreation sites. An alternative to add all or most of the unauthorized routes, many of which may access such sites, was considered and eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2. When evaluating benefits and risks associated with each route requested by the public during scoping, the IDT identified "access to a documented dispersed site" as a benefit and a reason to further study a particular route, if there was no resource concern with the route. The District Rangers also provided input into routes selected based on their local field knowledge of dispersed recreation and access needs. This conversation will continue with future planning efforts and regular updates to the MVUM.

F/G) An alternative to allow dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of the surface of NFTS roads and trails was considered and eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2 (FEIS page). The rationale is applicable to providing a 30-foot parking corridor along designated roads and trails as well. The analysis shows that cultural sites, sensitive plants, noxious weeds at risk for spread, and serpentine soils occur within 30 feet of some of the proposed routes. Access to these areas should be minimized to protect resources and provide for public safety.

H) Changing maintenance levels is an administrative action accomplished outside of this analysis. The STNF Forest Supervisor is considering such actions to provide connectivity and the opportunity for riders of all vehicle types to enjoy loops and extended rides through the STNF (see the ROD for further information).

I) Alternative 5 allows all vehicle types to travel below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

Sample Public Comment(s):

In conclusion, Shasta County finds the EIS to be extensive in its objectives but disappointing in its delivery. A new action alternative is needed. The following elements are needed to properly bookend and balance environmental stewardship and public access: a) Coordinate with all affected counties and the public to create a seamless

transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles using both county and NFS roads (unpaved); b) Recognize California Vehicle Code provisions for OHV use on unpaved NFS roads. Designate all unpaved ML 3 and 4 NFS roads for motorized mixed use unless engineering analyses demonstrate a need to do otherwise; c) Provide a range of OHV opportunities such as single track trails and trails with different levels of difficulty; d) Analyze all unauthorized routes commented on by public. Provide site-specific reasons for eliminating unauthorized routes from consideration in the FEIS; e) Provide continued motor vehicle access to ten OHV riding areas until future environmental analyses are completed; f) Provide motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites; g) Allow parking for dispersed camping 100 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so; h) Permit parking up to 30 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so; i) Reduce the operational maintenance level of unpaved ML 3 and ML 4 roads to accommodate OHV s, consistent with available road maintenance resources and current vehicle use; j) Allow OHV use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake. (#145)

Public Concern # 39. The Forest Service should include an alternative analyzing the effect of specific road closures pertinent to the licensing of the McCloud-Pit Project, and develop mandatory mitigation and enhancement measures for the McCloud-Pit Project, to protect water quality.

Response: These comments were presented as a new alternative, which the STNF considered but eliminated from detailed analysis, as described in Chapter 2 (FEIS page). Facilities and roads that are part of the FERC relicensing of a hydropower facility are not affected by this process. Any road or facility that is part of the license would be governed by the terms of the license. Alternatives 2 and 3 do not propose to designate Iron Canyon Reservoir as an open area and therefore, would eliminate unmanaged vehicle travel below the high-water mark in Iron Canyon Reservoir.

Sample Public Comment(s):

To ensure the protection of clean water, staff suggests that as the travel management process moves forward, that the travel planners include an additional alternative analyzing the effect of specific road closures pertinent to the McCloud-Pit Project. We recommend that travel planners collaborate with their forest service counterparts working on the licensing of the McCloud Project to develop a more specific alternative in the final EIS, which is both protective water quality and consistent with the forest service goal of developing 4(e) mandatory mitigation and enhancement measures for the McCloud-Pit Project. (#150)

Public Concern # 40. The Forest Service should do additional analysis in a modified environmental review document or a substantially modified Alternative 5 to designate roads, trails, and areas in a true recreation alternative as submitted by various groups (Blue Ribbon Coalition, Recreation Outdoor Coalition, counties, and others).

Response: The alternatives submitted by various organizations supporting a "true recreation" alternative were considered as the alternatives were being developed for the DEIS and FEIS. Some organizations listed specific routes and alternative design requests, while other organizations provided more general descriptions of what a true recreation alternative should look like. Descriptions of all alternatives submitted are included in the scoping report in the project record. Specific routes requested in these alternatives were considered by the IDT and either included in one of the alternatives studied, or excluded from further consideration. Appendix G has been updated to provide a more detailed discussion of the route screening process. The list of routes requested during the scoping period and the screening results for specific routes are located in the project record. Those incorporated in alternative designs are listed in Appendix A.

Some of the elements proposed as part of a true recreation alternative are outside the scope of this analysis, such as restrictions on over-the-snow vehicles and creation of volunteer programs to support recreation. Most of the elements presented as part of a true recreation alternative were considered and incorporated into one or more of the alternatives, such as motorized mixed use; allowing all vehicle classes on the lake bottoms; providing opportunities for loops, extended rides, and access to dispersed recreation sites; providing for a diversity of riding experiences and vehicle types; and assigning seasonal restrictions only where there is a documented need.

The primary element of a true recreation alternative as submitted by the recreation groups is an expanded road and trail system that includes all, mostly all, or a large proportion of the inventoried unauthorized routes, as well as noting existing NFTS considered valuable to motorized recreation experiences or access. Such a large expansion of the NFTS was considered but not analyzed in detail as described in the Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study section of Chapter 2 in the FEIS. The limited changes to the NFTS analyzed here are the initial step of implementing the TMR. Identifying the minimum road system while building a road and trail network that provides the quality, access, and experiences sought by motorized recreationists will occur over time through further collaboration, project-level decisions, and annual updates to the MVUM. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis. Other elements submitted in the true recreation alternative include the creation of OHV play areas and the designation of routes that access private lands. These were considered but eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2.

As the FS gains experience with this program, there will be opportunities to build collaborative relationships and reevaluate routes where it is appropriate to do. This is the first step in an ongoing iterative process.

Sample Public Comment(s):

BRC believes the DEIS as currently constructed is fatally flawed and should be withdrawn and a supplemental DEIS issued that contains a planning process based on accurate information and contains a true recreation alternative based all or in part on concepts submitted by BRC, ROC, county government, and other interests. (#154)

Public Concern # 41. The Forest Service should include an alternative that protects wildlife and natural resources by:

- **A) closing problematic existing NFTS routes in order to minimize and mitigate the potential for vehicles to spread weeds from those routes;**
- **B) adding no new miles of motorized routes, and closing and reclaiming existing roads in deer migration corridors, winter range, fawning grounds, and population centers;**
- **C) closing unauthorized routes or NFTS roads and/or trails causing resource damage;**
- **D) disclosing impacts to IRAs and potential wilderness;**
- **E) disclosing benefits of closing roads to watersheds, wildlife habitat and species, plant habitat and species, water retention, and use.**

Response: Actions, such as closing existing NFTS roads or unauthorized routes, are outside the scope of this analysis and therefore not analyzed in this FEIS. Such actions are initiated if indicated by LRMP monitoring or through project analyses. The STNF Forest Supervisor determined that existing programs and actions involving road decommissioning are adequate and that closure activities would be outside the scope of this project. Alternative 4 addresses the need to minimize resource impacts by avoiding all areas considered sensitive for a variety of resources. The significant issue addressed by Alternative 4, the description of the alternative, and the predicted environmental effects are located in Chapters 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The DEIS should include an alternative that closes problematic existing NFTS routes in order to minimize and mitigate the potential for vehicles to spread weeds from those routes. (#151)

Subconcern # B
The STNF manages portions of three deer hunting zones and two species of deer, Columbian blacktail and mule deer. The adverse effects on deer and other large ungulates of roads, high road densities, and motorized use are well documented. Habitat effectiveness would be enhanced under all the alternatives if the STNF took the position that no new motorized routes would be added, and existing motorized routes would be closed and reclaimed, where they intersect with or traverse critical deer habitat (the location of deer habitat considered critical is unclear in the DEIS). We therefore suggest, and petition, that the STNF amend the final Action Alternative to add zero new miles of motorized routes in deer migration corridors, winter range, fawning grounds, and population centers. (#161)

Subconcern # C-E
None of the alternatives address the issue of closing any roads or motorized trails that are illegal user-created, or that are current system roads/trails causing resource damage. According to the DEIS there are 5,329 miles of

roads; 87 miles of motorized trails; and 1,252 miles of illegal unauthorized routes for a total of 6,668 miles of motorized access. The STNF does not advocate officially closing any of them and simply states if they aren't open then they are closed. This fails to take into consideration that lawless drivers (those responsible for the current 1,252 miles of unauthorized roads) will continue to use these routes Due to the lack of an alternative that considers closing roads/trails several impacts and values go undisclosed and unconsidered: Short and long term benefit of maintaining current IRA attributes of unroaded potential wilderness areas Forest-wide (adding the route to the system -even if permanently closed to the public severely handicaps wilderness options and attributes ranging from availability to manageability); Long term benefit due to decrease in amount of detrimental soil impacts in watersheds across the Forest; Long term benefits due to increased habitat effectiveness on TES and MIS plants and animals; Long term increased water infiltration and retention rates in the mountains, maintaining or enhancing late- summer water availability, both for wild life and human communities. (#91)

Public Concern # 42. The Forest Service should develop an adequate range of alternatives to comply with NEPA, and include an alternative that:

- **A) considers historic/traditional access to woodcutting, hunting, gathering, camping, sightseeing, and other forms of recreation;**
- **B) closes NFTS routes to motor vehicles that are causing resource damage or are inappropriately located;**
- **C) is a functional "recreation alternative" based on general planning comments from Blue Ribbon Coalition and site-specific comments from Recreation Outdoor Coalition, Redding Dirt Riders, and other groups that propose or consider keeping open a significant or substantial percentage of the established unauthorized routes;**
- **D) considers many factors, such as simply closing areas/routes might actually redirect use in a manner that disrupts the management balance in a fashion that creates more resource impacts, increases frustration within and between user groups, and creates greater management challenges for the STNF;**
- **E) is based primarily on road closures and restoration of areas previously damaged by OHVs, given that OHVs are associated with both the ignition of wildfires and the spread of exotic weeds;**
- **F) addresses climate change by minimizing soil disturbance caused by motorized use;**
- **G) considers consulting with the EPA, which can provide information on how existing practices could be adjusted or new strategies developed, to address the effects of climate change on natural resources;**
- **H) considers a minimum transportation system, which is required under NEPA, otherwise the FS has constrained the range of alternatives;**
- **I) truly considers public proposals for route designation rather than an appearance that the FS has already made the route designation decisions;**
- **J) includes route closure recommendations submitted by The Wilderness Society (along with other route closure recommendations emerging from Travel Analysis) in a revised DEIS or that no new currently unauthorized routes be designated;**
- **K) follows the "Proven Principles" for developing a new alternative that provides better balance between public access and environmental stewardship.**

Response: The range of alternatives considered adheres to the CEQ regulations (40 CFR Part 1502.14). A reasonable range of alternatives is one that fulfills the Purpose and Need, addresses the significant issues, includes the no action alternative, and includes mitigation. The IDT developed Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 in response to the significant issues raised by the public during scoping. In addition, Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) was developed to address the Purpose and Need for action established by the STNF Forest Supervisor. The range of alternatives includes proposals to add roads, trails, and open areas to the NFTS and considers a range of vehicle types, access needs (such as dispersed camping and water access), and experiences. Twelve additional alternatives submitted by the public after scoping and six additional alternatives submitted after publication of the DEIS were also evaluated but eliminated from detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2. The range of alternatives considered is adequate and reflects the values and interests expressed by the public during this analysis process.

A) Adding roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS to provide motor vehicle access for a myriad of activities is one of the purposes of this analysis. Alternatives 1 through 5 provide a range of actions and detailed analysis of associated effects. The Recreation section in Chapter 3 discusses recreation access in detail.

B) An alternative to close existing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis as described in Chapter 2 - Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis. Identifying and mitigating resource damage on roads is an ongoing process conducted through formal and informal monitoring and in project environmental analyses as they occur across the STNF.

C) See the response to PC #40 regarding the development of a "recreation alternative" as submitted by various supporters of motorized recreation.

D) The potential effect of concentrated use is disclosed in the Recreation and Transportation sections of Chapter 3.

E) Physical road closures of unauthorized routes and NFTS roads are outside the scope of this analysis. Such closures and decommissioning are done routinely through project-level analyses as they occur across the STNF. See Appendix B for a list of present and reasonably foreseeable road closures as an example of the ongoing revisions to the NFTS and mitigation of impacts caused by unauthorized routes. The passive restoration of unauthorized routes no longer available for public motor vehicle travel is discussed as a beneficial effect to several resources as disclosed in Chapter 3.

F) All of the action alternatives would reduce soil disturbance by restricting cross-country motor vehicle travel; however the degree to which that may affect climate change is outside the scope of this document. This action is focused on managing where motorized vehicles travel. This action does not change or regulate the number of vehicles on NFS land so there is no discernable connection between the action alternatives and climate change. However, climate change may have an effect on soils as discussed in the Watershed section. The regulation of emissions is not within the jurisdiction of the FS.

G) The USDA Forest Service is engaged in many inter-agency discussions regarding the effects of climate change on natural resources. This new science is being carefully tracked and any new land management strategies determined to be effective in resource protection will be studied on a local level and applied as appropriate.

H) Please see response to PC #237 regarding the identification of a minimum road system at this time.

I) Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 were developed in response to the significant issues identified through public comments on the Proposed Action. The routes considered in those alternatives are those submitted by the public during scoping, in addition to routes requested by District Rangers based on their local knowledge of motorized recreation use and needs.

J) Road closure recommendations are outside the scope of this analysis, which is narrowly focused on implementing Subpart B of the TMR. Evaluation of roads for closure is on ongoing process as the STNF manages the NFTS through monitoring and other project-level environmental analyses.

K) The "proven principles" submitted by the commenter in a document titled "Roads and Trails as Recreational Route Systems" (located in the project record) includes elements necessary for successful travel management, including an acceptable level of resource impact, sustainable routes, satisfaction of participants (fun), and active and responsible management by the Agency. The principles are thoughtful and logical. The document describes a planning process, data needs, and many desired elements for a road and trail network. Many of the proven principles have been applied in this analysis, although clearly not to the extent desired by the commenter. The proven principles would be a valuable part of continued conversations about motorized recreation on the STNF. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The Travel Management EIS fails to consider an adequate range of alternatives as it relates to historic/traditional access to woodcutting, hunting, gathering, camping, sightseeing, and other forms of recreation. (#55)

Subconcern # B
We believe, however, that the DEIS is flawed in the following ways: 3) The Forest is arbitrarily limiting the scope of the planning effort. The agency has made proposals and is considering comments from the public related to a) changing the season of motor vehicle use on existing NFTS routes; and b) changing the class of vehicles that are allowed on existing NFTS routes. Yet, the agency is eliminating from detailed analysis our recommendations to close to motor vehicles the NFTS routes that we feel are causing resource damage or are inappropriately located. Due to this deficiency, a full range of reasonable alternatives has not been evaluated. (#151)

Subconcern # C
BRC believes the agency has created a flawed and deficient DEIS which fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives as mandated by National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321) regulations at 40 CFR 1502.14. There is no action alternative that considers less than an effective blanket closure of the approximately 1,200+ miles of inventoried user routes that are presently open to motorized travel. The failure to develop a functional "recreation alternative" based on general planning comments from BRC and site specific comments from ROC, RDR, and other groups has produced a legally inadequate DEIS that does not include the mandated reasonable range of alternatives. BRC notes that this requirement has been construed to be the very "heart" of the EIS process. (#154)

Subconcern # D
BRC wishes to note that restrictions of existing use and substantial closures of existing routes under the guise of erring on the side of caution may actually increase adverse effects to the physical environment. Active and effective management requires an understanding and proper balance of use patterns, types, locations, seasons and myriad other factors. Simply closing areas/routes might actually redirect use in a manner that disrupts the management balance in a fashion that creates resource impacts, increases frustration within and between user groups, and creates greater management challenges for the Forest. Again, when developing your range of alternative's it should be noted that NEPA imposes a mandatory procedural duty on federal agencies to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to proposed actions or preferred alternatives analyzed during a NEPA process. 40 CFR 1502.14; 40 CFR 1508.9. "Agencies shall rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." 40 CFR 1502.14. The alternatives section is considered the "heart" of the NEPA document. 40 CFR 1502-14 (discussing requirement in EIS context). The legal duty to consider a reasonable range of alternatives applies to both EIS and EA processes. Surfrider Foundation v. Dalton, 989 F. Supp. 1309, 1325 (S.D. Cal. 1998) (citing Bob Marshall Alliance v. Hodel, 852 F.2d 1223, 1229 (9th Cir. 1988) ("Alternatives analysis is both independent of, and broader than, the EIS requirement."). (#154)

Subconcern # E
The DEIS also violates NEPA by limiting the scope of the alternatives. Analysis of the beneficial environmental effects of closing the forest to OHVs has been excluded. The final environmental impact statement must consider and disclose the potential consequences of motorized recreation in the Shasta- Trinity National Forest as it pertains to both increased carbon from vehicle emissions as well as ecosystem disjunction where a natural area is cleared for a road. Given that OHVs are associated with both the ignition of wildfires and the spread of exotic weeds, it is likewise reasonable to expect that the Forest Service would design an alternative based primarily on road closures and restoration of areas previously damaged by OHVs. (#151)

Subconcern # F G
An understanding of the predicted impact of climate change should, in turn, shape in important ways the various alternatives under consideration by the Forest Service. For example, given that so many of the predicted outcomes of climate change center on increased soil erosivity, dust storms, shrinking water resources, drier riparian areas, invasion of exotic plants, and the spread of hotter, larger wildfires, it is entirely reasonable to expect the Forest Service to design alternatives that minimize soil disturbance as much as possible. Instead, without information about the effects of climate change in the area, the DEIS proposes a mix of exactly the kinds of actions that would compound the deleterious effects of a warming climate. Yet experts note that the "response of arid lands to climate change will be strongly influenced by interactions with non-climatic factors at local scales" including pressure related to the use of motorized off-road vehicles and grazing. In this regard, the Forest Service's failure to consult the scientific literature, and in particular EPA's report, resulted in a fatally flawed document with none of the required options for managing a significant impact that will likely have systemic impacts throughout the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. The Forest Service should have drawn on EPA's own research and consulted with EPA staff whose report "provides information on how existing practices could be adjusted or new strategies developed, to

address the effects of climate change on natural resources." According to the report itself, these strategies involve increasing the resilience of ecological systems to climate change. (#151)

Subconcern # H
The National Environmental Policy Act requires a "hard look" at "all reasonable alternatives," which would include one or more alternatives emphasizing a minimum transportation system which is streamlined, non-redundant, and protects natural resources. A range of alternatives that does not include the minimum transportation system is not sufficient under NEPA. The Forest Service Handbook guides managers to "develop other alternatives fully and impartially"[and] ensure that the range of alternatives does not prematurely foreclose options that might protect, restore, and enhance the environment.' There is much legal precedent to guard against an insufficient range of alternatives. By not considering in detail our comments advocating that the Forest perform Travel Analysis to determine a minimum transportation system, the Forest is foreclosing options that might protect, restore, or enhance the environment. In addition, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest has arbitrarily constrained the range of alternatives in the DEIS by not considering in detail public comment regarding the deletion of motor vehicle routes from the NFTS. The Forest maintains that it is dealing only with limited changes" to the transportation system. But the Forest does not precisely define those limits. The agency has made proposals and is considering comments from the public related to a) changing the season of motor vehicle use on existing NFTS routes, and b) changing the class of vehicles that are allowed on existing NFTS routes. Yet, the agency asserts that it is implementing only Subpart B of the Travel Management regulations and is eliminating from detailed analysis our recommendations to close NFTS routes that we feel are causing resource damage or are inappropriately located. (#151)

Subconcern # I J
Due to this deficiency "only USFS proposals for NFTS routes, not public proposals, are considered in the scope" a full range of reasonable alternatives has not been evaluated. The DEIS gives no convincing rationale for this decision. The Forest is giving the impression that the DEIS is a foreordained formality by not rigorously exploring all reasonable alternatives. This is a violation of NEPA. We request that our route closure recommendations be included in an alternative (along with other route closure recommendations emerging from Travel Analysis) in a revised DEIS or that no new currently unauthorized routes be designated. (#151)

Subconcern # K
There is an inadequate range of alternatives to meet the purpose and need of the NOI. The four action alternatives propose to designate between 0 to 8.4 percent (0 to 106 miles) of your total unauthorized routes (1,252 miles) and allow motor vehicle access to 0 to 223 dispersed recreation sites (out of 5,219). ROC requests the STNF analyze a new alternative (#6) that would provide a better balance between public access and environmental stewardship. These two goals are not mutually exclusive. Our organization has developed a set of "Proven Principles" that will result in good travel management plans when there is effective collaboration with interested parties (Exhibit 1). (#152)

Aquatic Resources

Public Concern # 47. The Forest Service should use miles of routes, location, use levels, and times of year to describe and analyze effects to aquatic species.

Response: The indicators used for the analysis of impacts to aquatic species are outlined on page 175 of the FEIS. They include miles of routes and location in relation to aquatic species and riparian reserves. The effects on these indicators are discussed for each alternative in the Environmental Consequences section beginning on page 186 of the FEIS. A summary table of indicators for each alternative can be found at the end of the effects discussion for each alternative. While it is assumed that more use will result in more erosion and sedimentation, data on use level is mostly anecdotal for most routes. Therefore, it is a more conservative approach to analyze effects from routes as being even across all routes. The times of year routes are used is addressed in the Environmental Consequences section. A discussion can be found for each alternative under the section Direct and Indirect Effects of Adding Facilities.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under Aquatic Biota methodology by Action: These sections fails to describe what and how impacts are created based on numbers of miles of roads and routes in relation to aquatic species and their locations. We want the STNF

to display the different impacts created resulting from location, use levels and time of year and reevaluate the conclusions found in these sections. (#139)

Public Concern # 48. The Forest Service should reevaluate the aquatic biota analysis, use the latest science and evaluation of local conditions, and:

A) that will distinguish the differences in effects of roads versus trails;
B) that will support the assertion of increased mortality due to route additions and human activity;
C) use the actual route data, including tread width, collected during field survey and GIS route inventory during the reevaluation.

Response: The FEIS identifies the methods used to analyze effects (including assumptions) and references scientific sources upon which it relied. Impacts of roads and motor vehicle travel off roads described in the FEIS were derived from a number of sources and included the most current and best scientific information available at the time of publication. The FEIS cites articles or documents to corroborate statements made therein. These documents include technical publications in peer reviewed journals, professional communications, agency publication, and are available in the project record. Much of the information presented is summarized in Gaines et al. (2003), which utilized 183 articles to identify the interactions between roads and recreation trails and focal wildlife species. It is generally accepted in the scientific community that roads have a greater impact on aquatic biota than trails and there have been no recent publications or studies that have identified an alternative conclusion.

There is long standing evidence documented in the literature that supports the assertion of increased mortality and effects to aquatic species due to increases in road density and human activities. On page 184 of the FEIS, several literature citations can be found that spans three decades of research findings regarding effects. The most recent is from 2007. Actual route data collected during field surveys and GIS was used in the analysis and examples of route data used can be found in Appendix A. Tread width was not isolated as an indicator for evaluation because the use of it as an indicator would not have resulted in a meaningful analysis in terms of effects to aquatic biota.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We note several references are dated as old as 1962 and 1982. We strongly suggest that conclusions and assertions resulting from this literature are stale and do not represent the latest science and local conditions. We want the STNF to reevaluate their determinations based on latest science. (#139)

Subconcern # A
Under Aquatic Biota Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences. There are many assertions and conclusions from literature references that do not represent local conditions and latest science. Many of the studies stated they address road conditions and that studies of effects on trails are more limited. Drawing conclusions for route analysis using these literature citations can result in errant results. (#139)

Subconcern # B
Under Human Caused Mortality. The STNF has not provided science to support the assertion of increased mortality due to the additions of route and human activity. We want this section removed from the final EIS. (#139)

Subconcern # C
Under Assumptions Specific to the Aquatic Biota Analysis - We are extremely concerned that many of the assumptions listed here are over reaching, unduly conservative, and not supported by sound science that would lead to probable conclusions, specifically; (#139)

Subconcern # C
Use of an average of 8 feet for trail width for analysis when actual route data is currently available for width determinations. There is a significant difference in tread widths of a motorcycle trail, verses a 4wd trail. We want the STNF to reevaluate all analysis utilizing the tread width identified during the field data collection and GIS route inventory collection process. (#139)

Public Concern # 50. The Forest Service should support the recovery of federally listed salmonids by closing existing NFTS routes and prohibiting new motorized routes anywhere that might compromise salmonid habitat, migration, or population health.

Response: The closing of NFTS routes is outside the scope of this action and occurs through a variety of other means across the STNF. Appendix B, Table B-6 identified 261.61 miles of roads to be closed, decommissioned, or abandoned as a result of other project level planning efforts. Salmonid species considered in the FEIS included federally listed threatened and endangered species, FS sensitive species, and Pacific Southwest Region Management Indicator Species (MIS) known to occur on the STNF. Occurrences of these species or important habitat for these species were considered in the development of the Proposed Action and each action alternative. Each unauthorized route analyzed in the FEIS was assessed to determine whether it occurred in important habitat for salmonids or posed a threat to species security. In areas where potential conflicts between species security and motor vehicle travel were identified, a variety of options were explored, including not adding the route to the NFTS.

The effects on salmonids of adding or not adding routes to the NFTS are displayed in Chapter 3.03 of the FEIS. The effects analysis addresses the potential impacts of each alternative on TES animals and their habitat. None of the action alternatives were shown to result in significant deleterious impacts to salmonids, federally listed or otherwise. The unauthorized routes in Riparian Reserves of Southern Oregon Northern California Coho salmon habitat are displayed in Table 3.03-5 of the FEIS and the effects are disclosed for each alternative in Chapter 3.03 of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There are a variety of anadromous and resident salmonid species on the STNF, as acknowledged in the DEIS. Three of these species are imperiled and federally listed under the Endangered Species Act: the Southern Oregon-Northern California Coho salmon; the Central Valley steelhead; and the Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook salmon. Given the collapse of both chinook and coho salmon stocks in Northern California, and the economic fallout of the closure of all commercial and most recreational salmon fishing seasons for the past two years, resource agencies must do everything possible to support the recovery of these species, including closing portions of the National Forest Travel System (and not designating new motorized routes for the NFTS) where there is even a slight chance that their existence and use will compromise salmonid habitat, migration, or population health. For this reason, we cannot support designation of new motorized routes anywhere in the South Fork Trinity River basin, which is properly identified in the DEIS as the "primary area of concern" for summer steelhead and spring and fall run chinook. More specifically, we urge the STNF not to designate the user-created routes described in Table 3.03-4 (DEIS p. 166, Chapter 3, Aquatic Resources), which are located in critical habitat for coho salmon. (#161)

Public Concern # 51. The Forest Service should ensure the Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species lists reflect the true condition of the species through ensuring species are monitored.

Response: The USFWS, through the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service through the Secretary of Commerce are responsible for monitoring Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E) status and condition. The FS works collaboratively with both the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries Service to insure that we have the most current information available on the status of T&E species. The FS complies with the requirements of the ESA and cooperates with the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries to support species recovery. The FS does not control and cannot ensure the status determinations by the regulatory agencies reflect the current condition of the species. Additionally, each Regional Forester maintains a list of Sensitive Species that are not listed as "Threatened" or "Endangered" by the regulatory agencies listed above. Data used to compile the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species list is derived from a number of sources.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There are a variety of anadromous and resident salmonid species on the STNF, as acknowledged in the DEIS. Three of these species are imperiled and federally listed under the Endangered Species Act: the Southern Oregon-Northern California Coho salmon; the Central Valley steelhead; and the Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook salmon. Given the collapse of both chinook and coho salmon stocks in Northern California, and the economic fallout of the closure of all commercial and most recreational salmon fishing seasons for the past two years, resource agencies must do everything possible to support the recovery of these species, including closing portions of the National Forest Travel System (and not designating new motorized routes for the NFTS) where there is even a

slight chance that their existence and use will compromise salmonid habitat, migration, or population health. For this reason, we cannot support designation of new motorized routes anywhere in the South Fork Trinity River basin, which is properly identified in the DEIS as the primary area of concern for summer steelhead and spring and fall run chinook. More specifically, we urge the STNF not to designate the user-created routes described in Table 3.03-4 (DEIS p. 166, Chapter 3, Aquatic Resources), which are located in critical habitat for coho salmon. (#9)

Public Concern # 52. The Forest Service should protect wild, self-reproducing populations of trout by identifying these populations and improving motorized routes that affect these species.

Response: All of the action alternatives would likely benefit aquatic biota by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel (FEIS, Table 3.03-8, page 203). While improving motorized routes for the benefit of trout populations is not a component of this project and is outside of the scope of this decision, it is an action that occurs on the STNF through a variety of projects. The Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) is available for review upon request from the STNF or by visiting the Forest's website. This schedule contains a list of projects proposed to be implemented on the Forest, including the project purpose.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There are many perennial streams and perhaps some seasonal streams on the STNF that are known to harbor, or may harbor, populations of wild, self-reproducing (unstocked) trout. Wild trout are a high value for sportsmen, yet in many areas OHV use and insufficient route maintenance and improvements (particularly at stream crossings) are degrading aquatic habitat and small stream fishing opportunities. We request that the STNF work with TU and other sportsmen's groups to identify streams which are incurring substantial damage from motorized use and improve motorized routes as necessary to protect fish values. (#161)

Best Available Science

Public Concern # 70. The Forest Service should analyze and address the potential effects and cumulative impacts of climate change on the ecosystems and diverse species of the STNF, to further determine the impacts of the road and trail system, which includes addressing the:

A) effects of rising temperatures and reduced seasonal water flow;
B) effects of greenhouse gas emissions;
C) effects of ORV use resulting in increased dust on snow causing earlier snowmelt;
D) effects of timing and quantity of precipitation - such as erosion and sedimentation as a result of climate change, on the road and trail system;
E) effects of carbon emissions from OHV use;
F) impacts of roads and use on these roads, which affect connectivity and habitat, air quality, water quality and quantity, fire management, invasive species management, and road maintenance; which in-turn may further exacerbate species' ability to adapt to the changing climate;
G) effects of climate change on existing conditions, such as prevalence of exotic plant species, the availability of water and health of riparian areas, zones of soil erosion or vulnerability to erosion, which will provide a critical baseline in determining your route system;
H) includes findings on potential environmental effects and recommendations for climate change adaptation and mitigation measures.

Response: While motorized vehicles certainly contribute greenhouse gases, the IDT did not identify any connection between the TMR and climate change. All of the action alternatives would reduce soil disturbance by restricting cross-country motor vehicle travel; however the degree to which that may affect climate change is outside the scope of this document. This action is focused on managing where motorized vehicles travel. This action does not change or regulate the number of vehicles on NFS land so there is no discernable connection between the action alternatives and climate change. Climate change is discussed in the Watershed and Air Quality sections of Chapter 3. The regulation of emissions is not within the jurisdiction of the FS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Appendix B begins on page 29 of the pdf of the comment letter. The Shasta-Trinity DEIS violates NEPA in several respects by failing to analyze the Impacts of climate change. See appendix B. (#151)

Subconcern # A
It is our perception that Shasta-Trinity National Forest's aquatic ecosystems and the diverse species they support are exceptionally vulnerable to California's changing climate via rising temperatures and reduced seasonal water flow. (#9)

Subconcern # B
Your destructive proposals can only produce even greater damage to these beautiful forests, harm wildlife and create an unnecessary level of noise pollution and air pollution as well as increasing substantially greenhouse gases threatening global warming. (#143)

Subconcern # C
Climate change will disturb normal ecosystem functioning by drying up watersheds and progressively making more areas uninhabitable. Developing forest plans around global ecosystem conservation principles is an important part of improving how we will fare as a planet, which must include examining the role of forests in the carbon cycle. Specific knowledge of the effects of wilderness management on climate is avoided or unavailable in the Shasta-Trinity DEIS, and no attempt is made to utilize existing studies as the basis for any further information about how climate change "with expected warmer weather" may affect the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. Several federal entities have published studies on climate change that could easily have been utilized by the Forest Service in its climate change analysis of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest DEIS. These recent studies include: 1) U.S. Climate Change Science Program Final Report, Synthesis and Assessment Product 4.4, "Preliminary Review of Adaptation Options for Climate-Sensitive Ecosystems and Resources" (June 2008), available at http://www.epa.gov/ord/npd/pdfs/gcrp-factsheet_SAP-4-4.pdf; 2) Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, National Science and Technology Council, "Scientific Assessment of the Effects of Global Change on the United States" (May 2008), available at http://www.climatescience.gov/Library/scientific-assessment/; and 3) U.S. Climate Change Science Program, Synthesis and Assessment Product 5.2, "Best Practice Approaches for Characterizing, Communicating and Incorporating Scientific Uncertainty in Climate Decision Making," (April 2008), available at http://www.climatescience.gov/Library/sap/sap5-2/public-review-draft/default.htm. (#151)

Subconcern # D F G
The DEIS provides no estimate of how much temperatures will increase in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest or even in the general region, or how that increase may affect natural resources such as water, vegetation, wildlife, or any others managed by the Forest Service. The Shasta-Trinity National Forest must address the issues of smaller snowpack, earlier snowmelt, less rainfall, drier climates leading to more fires and the impacts associated with these phenomena on ecosystems, in connection with the Travel Management Plan, to properly determine the impacts of the proposed route system on the Forest. The Forest Service must make predictions with these effects in mind. At a minimum, a description of the effects of climate change on existing conditions such as the prevalence of exotic plant species, the availability of water and the health of riparian areas, zones of soil erosion or vulnerability to erosion, all provide critical baseline information necessary to the Forest Service's ability to determine whether public land resources can withstand any of the proposed management alternatives, including many miles of OHV routes and roads. Without this basic foundational information about the existing impacts of climate change on the land, and future expected impacts, it is impossible to make informed decisions about the level, location, and kind of activities the land and its ecosystems can support in the future. This omission is a significant oversight given that federal departments and agencies including the USDA, the Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Geologic Survey have all published documents and/or provided public statements and even congressional testimony acknowledging the impacts of climate change on public lands resources. Together with the failure to incorporate the newer studies cited above, this oversight amounts to a failure to take the necessary "hard look" at the challenge of resource management in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, and an important aspect of that challenge. (#151)

Subconcern # D-H
Address climate change and its potential effects on proposed route designations. The DEIS does not consider the effects of climate change on route designations. A number of studies specific to California have indicated the potential for significant environmental impacts as a result of changing temperatures and precipitation. Climate change effects and the need to adapt to climate change are emerging issues which should be considered in this action. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled, "Climate Change: Agencies

Should Develop Guidance for Addressing the Effects on Federal Land and Water Resources" 3 (August 2007), federal land and water resources are vulnerable to a wide range of effects from climate change, some of which are already occurring. A change in the timing and quantity of precipitation may increase the vulnerability of native surface roads and trails to erosion and sedimentation. Roads and their use also contribute to species stress through habitat fragmentation, increased disturbance, introduction of competing invasive species, and increased fire risk; which may further exacerbate species' ability to adapt to the changing climate.

Recommendations: The FEIS should include a discussion of climate change and its potential effects on the Forest as they relate to route designation decisions and the final NFTS. Of specific interest are potential cumulative effects of climate change and the NFTS on the connectivity of wildlife and threatened and endangered species habitat, air quality, water quality and quantity, fire management, invasive species management, and road maintenance. We recommend the discussion include a short summary of applicable climate change studies, including their findings on potential environmental effects and their recommendations for climate change adaptation and mitigation measures. (#164)

Botanical Resources

Public Concern # 326. The Forest Service should protect botanical areas from motorized recreational uses.

Response: Botanical areas are a subset of the STNF's designated Special Interest Areas (SIAs). Routes requested that are located in SIAs, including botanical areas, were excluded from all action alternatives during the initial screening phase for alternative development (Appendix G of the FEIS). Due to this, there will be no effect from the project to botanical areas. The botanical BA/BE has been updated to further explain this part of the process.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I value non-motorized recreational opportunities on the Forest, especially in roadless areas larger than 1,000 acres, designated botanical areas, and in high value wildlife habitat including Late-Successional Reserves and Riparian Reserves designated by the amended Forest Plans. Please protect these important resources from motorized recreational uses in your Travel Management Plan. (#111)

Public Concern # 327. The Forest Service should correct the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences in the Botanical Resources section and:

A) remove any reference to survey requirements prior to designation of routes because the Purpose and Need is to eliminate cross-country motor vehicle travel and designate routes and areas where motorized travel is allowed, and this action doesn't constitute ground-disturbing activities;

B) display the different impacts created as a result of location, use levels, and time of year; and reevaluate the conclusions found in the Botanical Resources Indicators and Methodology section;

C) address the direct effect of designating routes which confine the travel width from 2 to 12 feet, institute mitigations measures including reroutes and barriers as protections measures, and reevaluate conclusions in this section of the DEIS.

Response: Open roads undergo continual ground disturbance, whether it is from the tires of vehicles, through maintenance (i.e. grading), or other uses. Roads are especially vulnerable to noxious weed invasion, because roads undergo continuous regular disturbance and most noxious weeds thrive in open environments.

Location: impacts were analyzed in the Botanical BA/BE by location through the use of GIS. Road locations were overlaid with TES plant and noxious weed locations, and impacts were analyzed where they intersected as described in the FEIS (FEIS Chapter 3.07).

Use level: it is assumed that increased use will result in increased erosion and sedimentation. Data on use level is anecdotal for most routes therefore; it is a more conservative approach to analyze effects from routes as being even across all routes, regardless of anticipated amount of use.

Season of use restrictions are discussed in Direct / Indirect effects for each alternative (FEIS, Chapter 3.07).

Direct effects to botanical resources were assessed using a measurement area of 30 feet. Use of this area is discussed in Assumptions Specific to Botanical Resources analysis (FEIS, Chapter 3.07, page 400). Mitigations are analyzed for each known site in the effects discussion by alternative. The effect of these mitigations (monitoring with potential placement of barriers of rerouting as needed) are taken into account in determination (see the FEIS, Compliance with the Forest Plan and Other Direction, page 438, "Under these alternatives, sensitive plant species will be monitored and site-specific action taken as needed to maintain viability. This is in compliance with the STNF LRMP. Monitor the effects of management activities on sensitive and endemic plants. If monitoring results show a decline in species viability, alter management strategy" (see Botany BA/BE Appendix A).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Botanical Resources- Our review of this section has raised several concerns. A) This section is asserting that this DEIS identifies "ground-disturbing activity in areas that sensitive plants are known or suspected to occur." Whereas the purpose and need is to eliminate cross-country motorized travel and designate routes and areas where motorized use are allowed. This does not constitute ground disturbing activities. We want any references to survey requirements prior to designation of routes removed from the final EIS. B) Under Botanical Resources Indicators and Methodology. This section fails to describe what and how impacts are created based on numbers of miles of roads and routes in relation to plants and their locations. We want the STNF to display the different impacts created resulting from location, use levels, time of year and reevaluate the conclusions found in this section. C) This section does not address the direct effect of designating routes which confine the travel width from 2 feet to 12 feet. By implementing these routes and eliminating cross country travel you eliminate any effects to plants that are not located directly within the travelway, and within the 100 and 200 foot corridors. For use areas and route travelways containing plants of concern, simple mitigation measures including reroutes, and barriers are examples of protection measures that could be applied. We want the STNF to incorporate these points and reevaluate your conclusions in this section. (#139)

Cultural Resources

Public Concern # 71. The Forest Service should analyze potential impacts to cultural and historic resources and sites from OHV use; and develop a management strategy that establishes a baseline of the condition of the sites, which is based on an inventory and survey of the sites, monitoring, and identifying mitigation measures before the routes are designated and:

A) use past and future required surveys before determining addition of routes; use aggressive protection methods such as barriers and vegetative screening; and use aggressive law enforcement of vehicle and speed restrictions in proposed open lake areas.

Response: The STNF analyzed the potential impacts to cultural resources from the designation of roads, and areas, and motor vehicle travel. The strategy used was based on the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement (PA) that was developed by the USDA Forest Service units in Region 5, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation specifically for this purpose. The PA was subsequently amended in 2009 to provide additional direction for lake bottoms.

Under 36 CFR 800.14(a), a Federal Agency may enter into PAs (36 CFR§800.14(b)) to substitute for the specific procedures outlined in Section 106 of the NHPA. In the case of designating motor vehicle routes and managing motorized recreation on national forests in California, the FS entered into the Motorized Recreation PA as amended, (2006; Motorized Recreation PA - FEIS, page 362). The Motorized Recreation PA "includes a strategy outlining the requirements for cultural resource inventory, evaluation of historic properties, and effects determinations; it also includes protection and resource management measures that may be used where effects may occur". The FEIS utilized this methodology to analyze impacts from all types of vehicles on proposed routes.

In accordance with the Motorized Recreation PA, the STNF has utilized a strategy of priority and deferred surveys combined with use of existing information to determine site locations and effects. All routes with use levels above "light", as defined in the PA, will be surveyed for Cultural Resources prior to a decision (FEIS Chapter 3.07, page 371). This data is incorporated into the FEIS. In addition, a monitoring plan based on the Motorized Recreation PA will also be implemented. All routes proposed for actions in the FEIS have received adequate previous cultural resource survey, current survey, or are scheduled for deferred survey. Only routes receiving "light" use (as defined

by the Motorized Recreation PA) will be scheduled for deferred surveys. This is consistent with the Motorized Recreation PA, as amended.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The TMP/FEIS should be modified so that: Designation of all ORV routes are based on full reviews and surveys of all direct and indirect adverse effects resulting from increased availability of route maps, and the associated increased access to backcountry areas and increased use of travel corridors resulting from formal designations; The TMP should clearly state that inventories, site assessments and site mitigations will be completed prior to the designation of OR V routes and areas for dispersed motorized camping, including existing routes and open ORV areas that have not been surveyed; The TMP should articulate that inventory and site evaluations along designated routes will include all areas of indirect impacts, with 'specific focus on cultural resources in' adjacent topographic settings that could be impacted by increased vehicular access. This 'should include, but not be limited to, the identification of sites with potentially intact cultural deposits that are visible from a designated route regardless of distance, and to all localities within 200 meters of an existing route or camp area (cf. Spangler, Arnold and Soomgarden 2006). Route or area closures are an appropriate and proven management tool to mitigate the adverse impacts of ORVs on and around cultural sites. The plan should clearly specify such a management strategy. (#91)

Subconcern # A
Minimize and mitigate impacts to priority heritage sites and other cultural resources. The DEIS states that all routes proposed for addition to the NITS and with "greater than light use" will require survey prior to a project decision being signed. Alternative 2 has six routes in or near priority heritage sites, which would require amendment of the Forest Plan to allow addition of those routes. Alternatives 3 and 4 have no routes proposed for addition in or near priority heritage sites.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that information from past and future required surveys be used to determine addition of routes. We recommend that addition of routes in or near priority heritage sites be minimized. Where routes will be added, we recommend aggressive methods, including barriers and vegetative screening, to protect cultural resources that may be impacted. We also recommend aggressive enforcement of vehicle and speed restrictions in proposed open lake areas to minimize potential impacts to cultural resources within those areas. (#164)

Public Concern # 72. The Forest Service should follow the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement

A), reinstate all routes previously deleted because of cultural concerns, and determine what appropriate mitigation measures may be undertaken to allow for protection of the cultural resources and the route designation.

Response: Six requested routes were eliminated from further study primarily for cultural resource concerns. These six routes were thoroughly evaluated and it was determined that no mitigations available within the Motorized Recreation PA could be successfully applied. These routes have sites that are either too large and complex to successfully mitigate without adverse effects or are located in an area where re-routing or avoidance is not feasible.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Cultural Resources-We feel the Motorized Recreation PA provides adequate mitigation alternatives to protect cultural resources while providing a motorized recreational experience. However, the STNF interpretation and application of mitigation measures was ultra conservative and resulted in complete routes being deleted without the opportunity to apply the mitigation available to the Forest. An example would be to apply a short reroute around a site to provide protection in lieu of closing the entire route. Additionally, the PA Appendix (A) allows the HRM to make determinations for screened exemptions that fall within those categories listed under section II Screened Exemptions that address those sites where existing conditions and prior disturbance has resulted in the loss of cultural integrity. Examples would be existing road templates loss of surface materials. Given the potential mitigation measures provided in the PA along with the authority given the HRM nearly every site could be mitigated to provide protection while allowing motorized use and maintenance activities. We want the agency to reinstate all routes previously deleted because of cultural concerns, and determine what appropriate mitigation measures may be under taken to allow for protection of the route and its designation to the NFTS. (#139)

Public Concern # 73. The Forest Service should consider the criteria, and not just the minimal criteria, outlined in the 2005 TMR and EO 11644 in regards to consideration of impacts to cultural resources when designating routes.

Response: In accordance with the TMR and EO 11644, the STNF utilized the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement PA) that was developed by the USDA Forest Service units in Region 5, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for considering effects (impacts) to cultural resources. A site-by-site and route-by-route analysis of available data was used and the criteria outlined in the Motorized Recreation PA were applied to each site and/or route. The analysis in the FEIS is consistent with the "site-specific" analysis (FEIS page 371 “Routes”, Table 3.06-1, and Tables 3.06-3 to 3.06-11, Appendix A and L). In addition, further surveys and site recordings were conducted to provide information used to consider effects to cultural resources. See also discussions of Direct / Indirect and Cumulative Effects for each alternative.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Executive Order 11644 and the Travel Management Rule set clear and unambiguous criteria that must be considered before designating any road/trail open to motorized travel. These criteria are necessary to ensure that motorized designations are informed by thorough consideration of the impacts to cultural resources and other uses of National Forests. Despite these clear mandates, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest has misconstrued its obligations to apply the minimization criteria at a site-specific level during the route designation process and is proposing to designate motorized use through at least 363 known cultural resource sites, 322 of which are in areas open to cross-county travel, resulting in potentially negative effects to the heritage resources on those sites and in the analysis area. (#151)

Geology

Public Concern # 74. The Forest Service should remove the 0.5 mile limitation pertaining to natural occurring asbestos (

A) and mitigation measures for NOA in the FEIS due to insufficient science because the 0.5 mile corridor used for determining safety measures for abandoned mines is too restrictive and adversely impacts motorized uses.

Response: The FS did not use a 0.5 mile limitation pertaining to naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). Routes within 30 feet of serpentine soils that may include NOA were identified (FEIS Table 3.13-1 page 565). The analysis of routes selected for study in the alternatives used three different data layers to identify routes which may be within 30 feet of serpentine soils. The mitigation measures are described in Chapter 2 in the description of alternatives and in Appendix D.

Public health and safety are central goals in development of the NFTS. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified asbestos as a toxic air contaminant and has concluded there is not sufficient scientific evidence available to identify a threshold exposure level for asbestos below which no significant health effects are anticipated (Title 17, California Code of Regulations, Section 93000). The EPA has also listed asbestos, in all its forms, as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (FEIS, page 562). The actions of the CARB and EPA were based on best available science.

The 0.5 mile buffer on mines was applied to provide for public safety. The data sources used for the mapping, while the best available, may not have mapped the full extent of hazardous materials. Some old mines on the STNF have highly contaminated soils, unsafe structures, acidified outflows into streams, and other issues. As we gain experience with this issue, we can revisit this in future iterations of the MVUM. It may be possible to add routes determined to be safe to the system that meets all of the criteria for the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences-The DEIS has not provided sound science to assert the concerns pertaining to natural occurring asbestos (NOA). The STNF has stated there is little to no known information available on this subject specifically with regards to OHV and other motorized activities. Therefore any assumptions are conjecture. We want this section relevant to NOA, including mitigation measures removed from the final EIS. (#139)

Any reference to naturally occurring asbestos in this section must be removed as it is outside the scope of this analysis. The 0.5 mile corridor used for determining safety measures for abandoned mines is too restrictive and adversely impacts motorized uses. Many other riding areas throughout the State have very limited to no restrictions, some include fencing and signage. We want the STNF to remove the 0.5 mile limitation and implement alternative measures as stated above. (#139)

Public Concern # 75. The Forest Service should be more specific in the standards, guidelines, and mitigation measures as to type of vehicle (i.e., 4WD vehicles versus commercial vehicles used for timber harvest activities) and it's effect on the soils and geology.

Response: Distinctions for use of commercial vehicles are outside the scope of this analysis. Use of the NFTS for commercial purposes, such as timber harvest, is by permit only. Vehicles used in commercial activities, such as timber sale harvest, are regulated by the permit or contract for the intended harvest activity, not the MVUM. Those commercial activities would have a site-specific analysis under the procedures of the NEPA that would consider and disclose effects on soils and geology as appropriate for the project and establish use limitations and mitigations as needed. Planning activities for those projects may identify or create new routes that need to be added to the NFTS. Activities within the permit or contract area would be controlled by the terms of the permit or contract. Use of OHV or 4WD pickups outside of a commercial timber sale contract or other permit would fall under this rule.

The ML classification for roads or the trail designation on the MVUM is the way that the FS distinguishes between types of motor vehicle travel such as a trail for ATVs and motorcycles only versus a ML 2 road, which would include ATVs or motorcycles and high-clearance vehicles. Maintenance Level 3, 4, and 5 roads are considered suitable for a standard passenger car (FEIS, page 621).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Geology-Our review of this section has raised several concerns. 1. This section does not distinguish Standards and Guidelines, and mitigation measures designed specifically for 4 wheeled vehicles such as pickups and vehicles used for commercial activities such as timber harvest activities and recreational vehicles. Each has distinct engineering characteristics and requires different applications of mitigation measures. (#139)

Public Concern # 76. The Forest Service should include all effects (not just unauthorized motorized vehicle travel) that cause displacement of soil, such as drainage structures becoming non-functional when void of maintenance, little or no maintenance on routes, rain events, and other management activities such as fuels reduction.

Response: The FS agrees lack of maintenance, rain events, and management activities can cause displacement of soil. The scope of this analysis as described in Chapter 1, page 5 of the FEIS is confined to analyzing existing unauthorized routes for potential addition to the NFTS for the purpose of public motorized use. That necessarily focuses the scope of analysis for new routes that are proposed for addition to the NFTS. Appendix A shows roads that are proposed for addition to the system and identifies any resource concerns associated with a chosen route. Routes that are not suitable for public use or would require more than the equivalent of basic maintenance to be suitable are not being added to the system at this time. Maintenance and repairs can be conducted on existing and future system roads and trails when problems are identified and appropriate planning has been conducted.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This section has stated the direct effects were: "displacement of soil caused by unauthorized motor vehicle traffic". We disagree that motorized traffic be used as the sole methodology factor. Several other factors must also be incorporated in this analysis: A) Drainage structures become non-functional when void of maintenance. The

STNF has performed little to no maintenance on the routes; B) Rain events cause natural erosion; and C) Other management activities may have contributed to increased erosion such as fuels reduction and masticating projects. (#139)

Public Concern # 77. The Forest Service should better describe the details of the soils analysis by describing:

A) methods of choosing the locations for control and study plots for the soils analysis; consider using a random method rather than a subjective method as implied in the DEIS by the terminology "areas of risk";
B) evaluations that determined "degraded soil productivity";
C) the activities and levels of those activities making something adverse or not adverse;
D) percentage of soil erosion natural for these soil types;
E) methods that verified the hazard classes;
F) normal rate of erosion with and without vehicle use; and for each soil rating;
G) the field reviews and how data was gathered and processed;
H) how control and study groups were analyzed to determine the difference in erosion processes relating to various management activities.

Response: A) The locations for soils analysis were defined by the route locations. All proposed routes were considered for their impacts to soils (FEIS, Sec. 3.02, pages 127-113).

B, D, F, H) The soils analysis methodology is described in the FEIS, Sec. 3.02, pages 127 - 132.

E) Soil hazard classes were developed through the Region 5 Soil Erosion Hazard Rating system (R5 FSH 2509.22, Chapter 50, ex. 2, IIC)

G) Field reviews were conducted on many proposed routes by the STNF Soils, Hydrology, and Geology personnel (FEIS, Chapter 3.02, page 128 and Geology Chapter 3.13 page 559). Field review data is located in the project record.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
"Area of risk" implies a subjective method of choosing the locations for the analysis. These should be chosen using a random method. Did this take place for the analysis? (#139)

Subconcern # B
How, by whom, and what were the evaluations that determined "degraded soil productivity"? (#139)

Subconcern # C
What is considered "adverse" ? What specific activities and levels of those activities make something adverse or not adverse? (#139)

Subconcern # D
What percentage of soil erosion is natural for these soils? (#139)

Subconcern # E
What methods verified hazard classes? (#139)

Subconcern # F
What is the normal rate of erosion without vehicle use and what is the rate of erosion with vehicle use? For each soil rating? (#139)

Subconcern # G
What did field reviews entail? What data was gathered and how was it processed? (#139)

Subconcern # H
Were control and study groups analyzed to determine the difference in erosion processes relating to various management activities? (#139)

Public Concern # 78. The Forest Service should identify the routes that were analyzed to determine soil impacts and include:

A) what percentage were inventoried routes, methods used, and date of inventory;

B) what percentage were unauthorized routes, were they surveyed, what methods were used for the survey, and what methods were used to determine the red, yellow, and green surface condition class.

Response: All proposed routes were analyzed for soils impacts. The methodology used to determine effects to watersheds is discussed in Chapter 3. Field reviews were conducted on many proposed routes by the STNF Soils, Hydrology, and Geology personnel (FEIS, Chapter 3.02, page 127 and Geology in Chapter 3). Field review data, including field visit dates, is located in the project record.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
If the soil analysis was conducted on inventoried routes, what percentage of routes was inventoried and how long ago? (#139)

Subconcern # B
What percentage of the total un-authorized system was surveyed and what methods were used to determine the red, yellow, and green surface condition class? (#139)

Public Concern # 79. The Forest Service should test any routes on serpentinite soils proposed for addition for the presence of naturally occurring asbestos (

A) and:

A) if NOA is present, do not add routes to the NFTS and if the route is added to the NFTS, provide rationale for the addition, include data to demonstrate that these routes would not significantly increase the risk of adverse health effects;

B) clarify if any proposed routes in the DEIS are near serpentinite rock formations;

C) signs should be posted informing visitors that NOA is present, what the risks are, and how visitors can avoid exposure for heavily-used NFTS roads, trails, and unauthorized routes near serpentinite rock formations.

Response: The analysis of the routes selected for study in the alternatives used three different data layers to identify routes which may be within 30 feet of serpentine soils. Not all Serpentine soils contain NOA. (FEIS page 566; Table 3.13-1, page 565) Routes where NOA is likely to occur have been field tested. NOA was found on routes in the Beaughton and Dubakella soil families. Inclusions of NOA will be capped with crushed rock before being added to the MVUM. Mitigation measures are described in Chapter 2 in the Description of Alternatives and in Appendix D. Posting all routes, NFTS and unauthorized, located in or near serpentine soils is outside the scope of this analysis.

Public health and safety are central goals in development of the NFTS. There is abundant scientific evidence that NOA can be dangerous, but thresholds are difficult to establish. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified asbestos as a toxic air contaminant and has concluded there is not sufficient scientific evidence available to identify a threshold exposure level for asbestos below, which no significant health effects are anticipated (Title 17, California Code of Regulations, Section 93000). The EPA has also listed asbestos, in all its forms, as a hazardous air pollutant pursuant to Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (FEIS, page 562). The actions of the CARB and EPA were based on best available science.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Do not add routes on land containing naturally occurring asbestos. Disturbance of rocks and soils that contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), such as serpentinite soils, can result in the release of asbestos fibers to the air and exposure to the public. Asbestos is a known human carcinogen and represents a potential human health risk for those exposed while using roads or trails where it occurs. Recommendations: Any routes on serpentinite soils proposed for addition should be tested for the presence of NOA. If NOA is present, we recommend these routes not be added to the NITS. If such routes are added to the NFTS, the FEIS should provide the rationale for their addition and include data to demonstrate that these routes would not significantly increase the risk of adverse health effects. The FEIS should also verify whether Alternative 2 includes any proposed routes near serpentinite rock formations, as the text on page 510 and Tables 3.12-1 and 3.13-2 indicate that it does not, but the text on page 519 states that it does. For heavily-used existing NFTS and unauthorized roads and trails on land "most likely" to contain NOA, we recommend assessing the potential for exposure to elevated levels of NOA. This information should be provided in the FEIS. We recommend prohibition of public motorized use and closure of roads and trails where monitoring

indicates the potential for significant NOA exposure. The Forest should post signs informing visitors that NOA is present, what the risks are, and how visitors can avoid exposure. These measures should be incorporated into the preferred alternative and committed to in the Record of Decision (ROD). (#164)

Inventoried Roadless Areas

Public Concern # 80. The Forest Service should consider allowing motorized routes within IRAs and CIRAs because of the light use that occurs on these routes, thus providing more access on the STNF.

Response: Of the IRAs and CIRAs that have proposed routes within them, there are 475 miles of system roads already in use in the IRAs (FEIS, page 482), and 59.9 miles within the CIRAs (FEIS, page 483). All of these existing NFTS routes would remain open under this analysis, many of them for OHV use. The Travel Management project identified unauthorized routes within IRAs and CIRAs that under either Alternative 2 or 5 would be brought into the NFTS provided they met certain criteria. See Chapter 3.09 beginning on page 488 in the FEIS for the analysis of consideration of designating routes in IRAs and CIRAs. Note that IRAs are based on Appendix C of the STNF LRMP and are a FS inventory subject to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Citizen Inventoried Roadless Areas are from an inventory provided by the California Wilderness Coalition. The FS has not validated CIRA inventory for accuracy, nor endorsed it. The CIRAs have no status under the STNF LRMP and it is a citizen inventory by an advocacy group.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under assumptions specific to recreation analysis "3.09 IRAs - The rugged topography of the STNF and the relatively limited opportunities for resource extraction has contributed to the classification of approximately 22 percent of the forest as inventoried roadless areas (IRAs)." So effectively almost 75 of the forest is already off limits to OHV use, and you want to increase the closures of my lands? Most of what I read in regards to IRA and CIRA, is that while routes may be established most are lightly used and mainly for fishing and hunting access. All the more reason to keep these routes open so that all aspects of society can enjoy the forests. (#85)

Public Concern # 81. The Forest Service should not allow motorized travel or any additional motorized routes within an IRA and:

A) close routes that intrude into IRAs, intrude onto nonmotorized routes, and cause significant resource damage;
B) motorized trails inside an IRA damages the essential integrity of the roadless area;
C) the IRAs provide for the nonmotorized recreational experience and allowing motorized use in IRAs would cause conflict between the uses;
D) OHVs contribute to soil erosion at rates much greater than are natural; thus causing soil erosion into streams and rivers reducing the quality of native fish habitat and other aquatic life; declining soil quality and quantity which can't support vegetation, thus harming wildlife and degrading entire ecosystems; and these effects conflict with the criteria established for the IRAs;
E) it would violate USDA Secretary's Memorandum 1042-154.

Response: The FS recognizes that IRAs are important in that they provide remote recreation opportunities including OHV use without the activity restrictions of Wilderness. Regulations do not prohibit motor vehicle travel within IRAs, nor do they require the closure of existing NFTS roads in IRAs. The Travel Management project is specific to unauthorized routes and did not analyze the effect nor recommend actions on existing system roads already within the IRAs. The prohibition on cross-country motor vehicle travel in all of the action alternatives would be consistent with values associated with IRAs (FEIS, page 483, Table 3.10-5 page 489). The IRAs were considered in this analysis under their inventoried boundaries which date from the Roadless Area Review and Inventory (RARE II) in 1976 and as described in Appendix C of the FEIS for the STNF LRMP. Since the RARE II inventory, roads have been constructed within IRAs. In this FEIS, the IRAs were analyzed with present system roads in place. This was regarded as baseline for predicting environmental effects (36 CFR Part 294 Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule; see project record for Roadless specialist report). Adding new routes in IRAs would be

subject to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule and the consideration of the Secretary of Agriculture. No new routes are proposed for addition to the NFTS in IRAs.

A) The Roadless Rule allows semi-primitive motorized recreation (Table 3.10-1, FEIS, page 479).

B) The FEIS considered the effect of adding routes to IRAs (FEIS, pages 488 to 504) under Subpart B of the TMR. Closing existing NFTS routes is outside the scope of this analysis. Existing classified roads in IRAs may be maintained and used.

C) IRAs were specifically designated to provide for primitive and semi-primitive motorized and nonmotorized recreation (Table 3.10-1).

D) The FS agrees that unregulated OHV/ATV use can negatively affect national forest resource values (FEIS, page 2). All of the action alternatives would reduce impacts on Roadless values compared to the No Action Alternative (current condition) (FEIS, page 504).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The Preferred Alternative, and in some cases other alternatives, (a) fail to' propose closure of routes that unnecessarily intrude into Inventoried Roadless Areas, (b) invite motorized intrusion onto non-motorized routes, and/or (c) cause significant resource damage without justifying designation decisions. (#91)

Subconcern # B
We would like to register our, strong opposition to designating any openings for vehicle travel inside IRAs. To most Americans, trails are travel ways that are traversed in a nonmotorized fashion (feet and hooves), while roads are meant for motorized use. Dictionary.com defines a trail as "a path or track made across a wild region, over rough country, or the like, by the passage of people or animals." Designating "motorized trails" inside a roadless area thus, by definition, damages the essential integrity of the roadless area with what is essentially a rough road. (#91)

Subconcern # C
We contend that agency inventoried roadless areas (IRA) and citizen-inventoried roadless areas (CIR) generally should not contain designated OHV routes. The responsible National Forest officials are required to "minimize conflicts between motor vehicle use and existing or proposed recreational uses of National Forest System lands." By definition, roadless areas afford a type of quiet and primitive recreation that cannot be found near roads. To allow OHV use in these areas would cause disproportionate conflict between quiet recreationists and OHV users and will risk precluding roadless areas from further consideration for Wilderness designation. (#151)

Subconcern # D
Over 75 scientists stated that "off-highway vehicles quickly strip vegetation and rut the land, leading to erosion of soil at rates much greater than are natural." Soil eroded into streams and rivers can dramatically reduce the quality of native fish habitat as well as that of most other aquatic life. Declining soil quality and quantity cannot support vegetation, thus harming wildlife, and degrading entire ecosystems. These effects obviously conflict with the criteria established for roadless areas; high quality or undisturbed soil, water, and air; sources of public drinking water; diversity of plant and animal communities; habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species and for those species dependent on large, undisturbed areas of land. (#151)

Subconcern # E
We are opposed to any addition of unauthorized routes within IRAs. We believe such additions would be in violation of USDA Secretary's Memorandum 1042-154, which is attached. (#9)

Public Concern # 82. The Forest Service should follow the Roadless Rule prohibitions and not allow road construction within an IRA; and if allowing road construction, analyze the effects of designating roads on potential wilderness designation.

Response: The alternatives do not propose any new road construction in IRAs. Regulations do not prohibit motor vehicle travel within IRAs, nor do they require the closure of existing NFTS roads. The impacts to wilderness values of adding unauthorized routes are discussed in Chapter 3.10 - Inventoried Roadless Areas (FEIS Table 3.10-5 pages 490-491).

Sample Public Comment(s):

The DEIS fundamentally fails to satisfy this standard, particularly as it relates to post 2001 agency inventoried roadless areas. With respect to post-2001 agency-identified roadless areas, the Forest Service must evaluate two distinct types of effects resulting from a motorized travel plan. First, the DEIS must "disclose that significant roadless areas will be affected [under the motorized travel plan 1 and take the requisite 'hard look' at the environmental consequences of that fact," including analyses of the plan's effects on "water resources, soils, wildlife habitat, and recreation opportunities." Lands Council v. Martin, 529 F.3d 1219, 1230, lQ32 0.7 (9th Cir. 200S); Smith v. U.S. Forest Service, 33 F:3d 1072, 107S (9th Cir.1994j; Or: Natural Desert Ass 'n v. ' Bureau of Land Mgmt.,.531 F.3d 1114, 1137-3S (9th Cir. 200S). Second, the Forest Service must disclose the effect of designating roads in roadless areas on potential wilderness designation. Lands Council, 529 F.3d .at 1230. (#91)

Public Concern # 83. The Forest Service should withdraw any travel management decisions that are in violation of the STNF LRMP management direction as the LRMP does not require complete prohibition of motorized use in semi-primitive motorized and nonmotorized areas (Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classes). The references to "CIRAs" do not conform to the STNF LRMP land allocations for Roadless Area designations, nor do they reflect the Roadless Area Conservation Rule. They are outside the scope of this analysis and the FS should include all routes requested by the public within the so called "CIRAs" to the NFTS.

Response: The FS agrees that there is not a complete prohibition of motorized use in semi-primitive motorized and nonmotorized Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes because ROS is a continuum of possible recreation opportunities, not a binding management direction, such as a land allocation or standard and guideline in the LRMP (FEIS, page 81). ROS informs decisionmakers and may be reflected in LRMP land allocations and management prescriptions. We also agree that we would not issue a Travel Management decision that is inconsistent with the STNF LRMP unless we amended the LRMP to make a provision for that decision. Like the ROS, IRAs are an inventory, not a land allocation. There are 475 miles of NFTS roads in IRAs (FEIS, page 482). These roads were constructed between the time of the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II-1976) that identified the IRAs and the promulgation of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Inventoried Roadless Areas are described in the FEIS for the STNF LRMP in Appendix C. CIRAs are from an inventory put forth by the California Wilderness Coalition, a private advocacy group with an interest in roadless and Wilderness issues. We agree that CIRAs are not a LRMP land allocation. In many cases, CIRAs overlap IRAs. CIRAs are included here for the sake of comparison but they are, as the title describes, a citizen-advocacy based inventory. The accuracy of the CIRA inventory and the criteria used to identify it has not been validated by the FS, nor is it endorsed by the Agency. The CIRA inventory is simply another point of view.

Requested unauthorized routes located in the nonmotorized ROS were excluded from further consideration in the route selection process (see Appendix G). Routes located within IRAs and CIRAs are proposed in Alternatives 2 and 5 because motor vehicle travel in those areas is consistent with their emphases. Routes are not proposed in Alternatives 3 and 4.

A total of 2.38 (FEIS, page 493) and 2.81 (FEIS, page 499) miles of unauthorized routes within CIRAs are proposed for addition into the NFTS under Alternatives 2 and 5, respectively. Requested routes within CIRAs which are not proposed for designation in an alternative, were eliminated for environmental or other reasons. All of the routes submitted were considered.

No routes are proposed in IRAs in modified alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative (FEIS Chapter 3.15)

Sample Public Comment(s):

The FLRMP does not require complete prohibition of motorized use in ROS classes semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized areas. The references to "citizen-inventoried roadless areas" do not conform to the STNF FRLMP land allocations for Roadless Area designations, nor do they reflect the Inventoried Roadless Area Rule. Any travel management decisions that are in violation of the STNF FRLMP management direction must be withdrawn from this document as they are outside the scope of this analysis. We want the agency to include all routes requested by the public within the so called "citizen inventoried Roadless Areas" to the transportation system. (#139)

Public Concern # 84. The Forest Service should analyze the effects of the motorized travel plan on IRAs and the potential that numerous routes would damage or disqualify potential eligible wilderness.

Response: The effects of the proposed routes on IRAs and CIRAs are documented in the Chapter 3.10 of the FEIS. Impacts to Wilderness values were considered (FEIS, Table 3.10-1 and numerous citations in Chapter 3.10). Recommendations for Wilderness designation are generally made during the process of LRMP revision. Recommendations for Wilderness designation or impacts on possible recommendations for designation are outside the scope of this analysis. The added concern of Wilderness classification is outside the scope of this project.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest Service also failed to analyze the effects of the motorized travel plan on citizen proposed wilderness, NEPA analysis must be completed in light of other governing statutes and regulations, including whether a travel plan will impinge upon Congress's prerogative to designate wilderness. Numerous routes in the proposed Travel Management Plan would damage or disqualify possible eligible wilderness (as in the case of any newly designated routes in roadless areas more than 5,000 acres). See California v. Block, 690 F.2d 753, 757 (9th Cir. 1982); cf Norton v. So. Utah Wilderness Alliance, 542 U.S. 55,65-66 (2004) (stating purpose of FLPMA's nonimpairment standard is to preserve Congress's ability to designate wilderness). The "possibility of future wilderness classification triggers, at the very least, an obligation ... to disclose the fact that development will affect a 5,000 acre roadless area" or a roadless area of "sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition." Smith, 33 F.3d at 1078; see also 16 U.S.C. 1131(c). The DEIS fails to satisfy this basic obligation. (#91)

Public Concern # 85. The Forest Service should limit or restrict any new roads from being built within Wilderness.

Response: No new roads in designated Wilderness are proposed in this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

If people really want to get into the backcountry then they can hike in. We have got to stop the developers and "day users" at some point or we will have no wilderness left. Please stop this unwise development of such a wonderful and ir-replaceable wilderness area. (#143)

Public Concern # 86. The Forest Service should reevaluate addition of unauthorized routes within CIRAs or within a 0.5 mile area adjacent to IRAs and CIRAs, including portions of Shasta Lake, below the high-water line, which are adjacent to California Wilderness Coalition's potential wilderness inventory in the Bohemotash Mountain, O'Brien, Minnesota Mountain, and Devil's Rock quads.

Response: The 0.5 mile buffer is used to measure effects of proposed routes on the nonmotorized recreational experience. The buffer for Backbone and Devil’s Rock IRAs includes 1,169 acres of Shasta Lake. When lake levels descend to potentially allow motor vehicle travel, the effects are considered similar to motorboat use when lake levels are higher (FEIS, page 497).

Sample Public Comment(s):

We strongly object to any addition of unauthorized routes within Citizen-IRAs, and to any addition of unauthorized routes within the adjacent 0.5-mile area of IRAs and CIRAs, including portions of Shasta Lake, below the high water line, which are adjacent to California Wilderness Coalition's potential wilderness inventory in the Bohemotash Mountain, O'Brien, Minnesota Mountain, and Devil's Rock quads. (#9)

Lands

Public Concern # 87. The Forest Service should develop, apply, and enforce OHV restrictions that are identified in grazing permits; for example the permittees who are using OHVs in the Hat Creek, Trinity, Kangaroo, Lily Pad, China Mountain, and Scott Mountain areas should be ticketed.

Response: The TMR ends cross-country motor vehicle travel. Conditions of the grazing permit prohibit damage to national forest resources. Once the TMR is implemented, use should be occurring only on designated roads and trails, or under the conditions of the grazing permit. The TMR allows for motor vehicle travel authorized by permit. Individual permits specify conditions for access and motor vehicle travel if necessary. Authorizing or otherwise revising special use permit is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Much of this is attributable to grazing. When I managed federal range allotments, the permittees thought it was perfectly acceptable to go anywhere they want in wet areas with ORVs instead of horses, particularly in the Hat Creek, Trinity areas, Kangaroo, Lily Pad, China Mt., and Scott Mtn. areas. The overgrazing is actually disgraceful, but the intrusion of OHV by permittee is a mess. They feel it's just fine, and you need to address this use in range permits. Tearing up the meadows with OHVs should not be allowed, even by permittees. (#46)

Law Enforcement, Education, and Signage

Public Concern # 88. The Forest Service should enforce the regulations and protect from illegal use by motorized and mechanized equipment on the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, especially between Girard Ridge and the Parks Creek trailhead.

Response: The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCNST) is not part of the motorized vehicle NFTS so motorized use of the trail is not legal under the TMR. No routes were added to the NFTS that intersect the PCNST. While other mechanized use, such as mountain bikes, is outside the scope of the Proposed Action, the FS is aware of the mountain bike issues on the PCNST and provides law enforcement, depending on availability. We appreciate the PCTA's willingness to work on this issue with the Forest. Implementation of any of the action alternatives would aid enforcement by prohibiting all motorized use off designated NFTS roads, trails, and areas, unless authorized by permit. Laws and regulations related to the TMR will be enforced equally in authority and weight, as with all other Federal laws and regulations. Appendix E (Law Enforcement) describes the framework for enforcement and building cooperative relationships. As we gain experience implementing this rule, we hope to build on education and cooperative relationships as our best tools.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We ask that the Forest consider allocating law enforcement resources to curtailing the illegal bicycle use of the PCNST. The areas of the Forest that are of particular concern on the PCNST are between Girard Ridge and the Parks Creek Trailhead. We at the PCTA stand ready and willing to work alongside Forest staff as the Travel Management Process moves forward. We take our role as advocates for the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail very seriously and look forward to working with the staff on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest to ensure that the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail is properly protected from illegal use by motorized and mechanized equipment. (#156)

Public Concern # 89. The Forest Service should develop a law enforcement plan that will be more effective in enforcing and implementing the regulations, follow through with prosecuting the violations, secure funding to implement the plan, and:

A) gates, closures, and barriers are placed in effective areas (i.e., areas where they can be driven around), mismanaged, and ineffective; however these closures "should be" sufficient enough to prosecute the violators;

B) insure that legal use of these routes and existing laws are enforced rather than imposing prohibitive restrictions on all users, especially with the abusive minority;

C) enforce regulations in a few sensitive areas rather than expecting limited law enforcement resources to cover such a large area;

D) enforce current regulations before developing new road and trail closures that will also need to be enforced;
E) enforce seasonal restrictions and closures of unauthorized routes;
F) the most effective means of enforcing regulations is through a combination of physical road decommissioning, increased law enforcement presence, enactment of penalties for illegal activities, and education.

Response: The TMR is not intended to impose prohibitive restrictions. There are over 4200 miles of designated routes open to all classes of motorized vehicles on the STNF in the Proposed Action. Appendix E (Law Enforcement) in the FEIS speaks to many of the suggestions offered. The FS agrees that some of the existing physical barriers (gates or barricades) have been less than effective. Part of that may be related to placement of some of the barriers, and partly related to the mobility of OHVs in the hands of a skilled rider. In many places, there simply is not a location to put a gate or barrier that can't be maneuvered around by skilled OHV users. That is one of the reasons that the FS is moving to implement the TMR. Implementation of any of the action alternatives would aid enforcement by prohibiting all motorized vehicle travel off designated NFTS roads, trails, and areas, unless authorized by permit. Laws and regulations related to the TMR will be enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal laws and regulations. A designated system of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle travel, established with public involvement, will enhance public enjoyment of the national forests, while maintaining other important values and uses on NFS lands.

The STNF agrees a program that incorporates both education and enforcement would help to increase public cooperation. After a decision is made, the Forest will publish a MVUM that identifies roads, trails, and areas designated for motor vehicle travel. In addition to the MVUM, the Forest will continue to engage in education and outreach efforts such as the "Tread Lightly" and "Stay on the Right Trail" programs to increase awareness of appropriate motor vehicle travel on the national forest. As the FS gains information through implementation of the TMR, we will adapt our management to make the program as effective as possible.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I am certain the USFS will find it nearly impossible to enforce the regulations, as there are not enough rangers in the universe to patrol the vast acreage covered by the proposed regulations. (#63)

Subconcern # A B D E
Describe enforcement of seasonal restrictions and closure of unauthorized routes. The DEIS states that seasonal restrictions would apply to certain routes and to the lake areas to protect wildlife and reduce erosion. EPA commends the Forest Service on these proposed restrictions. For the Travel Management Plan to adequately protect natural resources, the Forest Service must ensure the enforceability of the designated route network. Research regarding OHV use has demonstrated that signs and barriers are not always effective in closing roads and trails or in reducing impacts and protecting forest resources. We are concerned with the enforceability of proposed seasons of use periods and closure of unauthorized routes.

Recommendation: We recommend the FEIS describe in detail how seasonal restrictions and route closure will be enforced and what enforcement approaches have been successful. EPA encourages the Forest Service to consider enforcement as a significant issue driving the design and analysis of alternatives for motorized travel management. (#164)

Subconcern # C
Logic would indicate that from a law enforcement perspective, it would be easier and more effective to enforce a few sensitive areas rather than expect limited LE resources to be spread thin trying to enforce such a large-scale plan. (#67)

Subconcern # F
The efficacy of seasonal (or year-round) closure mechanisms was not disclosed in the DEIS. Please note that our organizations strongly believe that such an analysis would indicate that only a combination of physical road decommissioning, increased law enforcement presence, enactment of penalties for illegal activities, and education to user groups will prove effective. (#118)

Public Concern # 90. The Forest Service should develop and promote an information and education program that focuses on etiquette for all users, which will be more effective than law enforcement and:

- **A) implement the concepts of the Tread Lightly program, which encourages responsible OHV use;**
- **B) educate the irresponsible users about the consequences of destroying signs, damaging resources, and other federal property;**
- **C) use high-visibility prevention patrols and public information checkpoints, especially during peak use periods.**

Response: The FS agrees that education and public cooperation are much more effective than law enforcement, but there needs to be a provision for law enforcement, as well, for this program to be successful. Appendix E (Law Enforcement) in the FEIS discusses how education, cooperative relationships, and law enforcement can work together to make implementation of the TMR effective. This is the first year of this program and we expect to build on education and cooperative relationships each year as we learn together with the public about how best to make this work.

In addition to the MVUM, the Forest will continue to engage in education and outreach efforts such as the "Tread Lightly" and "Stay on the Right Trail" programs to increase awareness of appropriate motor vehicle travel on the national forest. As the FS gains information through implementation of the TMR, we will adapt our management to make the program as effective as possible.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
I would also recommend that our local USFS office present a tread lightly program to OHV/ATV enthusiasts, I think it would be positive and educational for all. It is greatly needed and would improve communication and understanding of many concerns. (#92)

Subconcern # B-C
Appendix E "Have motor vehicle use maps easily available to public. Have route numbers visually marked on the ground. Distribute maps and brochures promoting responsible use." How are these to be implemented, what happens if signs are pulled and placed on unauthorized routes? If the signage isn't correct, what happens? "Utilize high visibility prevention patrols and public information checkpoints, especially during the peak use periods." The Travel Management Rule and associated motor vehicle use map clearly define the designated routes; therefore, making violations to the rule unequivocal" Really? Often, people have no idea exactly where they are at. Also no one is going to be pulling out a map every 5 minutes to check where they are, so violations will be high, and many people will become frustrated with the system and quite possibly ignore all of the signs and laws, backfiring on what the Forest Service intended to do. (#85)

Public Concern # 91. The Forest Service should not rely on further information and education to convince off-roaders to stay on designated trails, because information and education does not result in behavioral change and:

- **A) an inordinate number of riders prefer to ride off-trail;**
- **B) riders will go off-trail to retrieve big game even when they are aware it is not allowed;**
- **C) messages promoting responsible ATV riding or use will need to be reformulated and law enforcement will need to be increased in order to prevent resource damage and user conflict;**
- **D) the majority of FS recreation rangers and law enforcement feel that off-road vehicles present a significant law enforcement problem, they are out of control, and getting worse.**

Response: The FS has a long history of environmental education and collaboration with stakeholders but we agree law enforcement is a necessary part of this proposal, just as it is with Wilderness hikers in the backcountry. We have seen many cases where education has resulted in behavioral change. When we started the human waste packout program on Mt. Shasta, we had similar dire predictions about enforcement, but with a strong educational message, we influenced people's behavior with this program. The same can be said of our "Leave No Trace" program. Over

time, it has been our experience that education and collaborative programs are much more powerful than law enforcement.

Enforcement of the laws and regulations related to travel management will be enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal laws and regulations. As with any change in a regulation on NFS lands, there is usually a transitional period for the public to understand the changes. It is anticipated there will be a higher number of violations to the TMR the first few years and the number of violations will decline as the users understand and comply with the rules. Once the MVUM is published, the implementation of the established dedicated network of roads, trails, and areas with signs and user education programs, will reduce the number of motor vehicles traveling off of designated routes. Providing motorized recreation opportunities in popular, key areas will help relieve pressure to travel off of designated routes (FEIS, page 73). Appendix E (Law Enforcement) provides additional information and as noted in Appendix E, "Green Sticker" funds have helped the FS increase law enforcement presence.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Monaghan and Associates, a marketing research firm, conducted a 2001 study at the behest of the Colorado Coalition for Responsible OHV Riding, a coalition of off-road vehicle representatives, environmentalists and public officials. See Status and Summary Report; OHV Responsible Riding Campaign, attached hereto. Researchers surveyed Colorado off-road vehicle riders through a series of three focus groups. Monaghan and Associates found that the majority of off-roaders understand that staying on designated routes is "fundamental trail etiquette" and that going off trail is not "correct" off-road vehicle behavior (Id.at11). The survey revealed, however, that regardless of this knowledge "as many as two-thirds of adult users go off the trail occasionally." Id. A significant percentage of riders, 15-20%, admitted to frequently breaking the rules and riding off of legal routes often. Id. Survey participants also stated that "others" ride off-route and cause most of the damage (Id. at 7). "Many reluctantly admit to having gone off trail "a couple times" but felt that it is permissible if rarely done .... "just this one time. Id. Tellingly, the report concluded: "In a "nutshell," it is our premise that further information and education per se - will not result in substantial behavioral change." (Id. at 1) (#118)

Subconcern # A
Similar results were found in Utah. In 2002, the Utah Division of Parks & Recreation commissioned Utah State University to survey riders to determine their "OHV uses and owner preferences." The university conducted a telephone survey of 335 riders from a random sample of the 50,676 people who registered off-road vehicles with the state in 2000. See Fisher, Andrea L., Dale J. Blahna, and Rosalind Bahr, 2001; Off Highway Vehicle Uses and Owner Preferences in Utah. Logan, Utah. Utah State University, at iv, attached hereto. The Utah report reveals that an inordinate number of riders prefer to ride off established trails. Of the ATV riders surveyed, 49.4% prefer to ride off established trails, while 39% did so on their most recent excursion. Of the dirt bike riders surveyed, 38.1% prefer to ride off established trails, while 50% rode off established trails on their most recent excursion. It should be noted that pro-ORV groups commissioned both of the studies cited above. (#118)

Subconcern # B
Additionally, these data are ratified by two other recent reviews. In 2006, the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks received survey responses from 446 owners of registered off-road vehicles. See Lewis, M.S., and R. Paige. 2006: Selected Results from a 2006 Survey of Registered Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Owners in Montana. Responsive Management Unit Research Summary No. 21. Prepared for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, attached hereto. Among the full sample of respondents, almost a quarter, 23%, "never" or "sometimes" comply with Montana's law against cross-country driving even though off-route riding has been illegal there since 2001. Over 28% "never" or "sometimes" avoid riparian areas and wetlands, in violation of rules for federal and state public lands in Montana. Sixty-four percent of those surveyed have used an off road reported they never follow this guideline. And, 52 percent reported they follow this guideline sometimes vehicle while hunting. The majority of this hunting subset admits to illegally riding cross country over 58% have traveled off of legal routes to retrieve downed game. In the context of the assumption that "education" will cure unlawful ORV behavior, this figure is notable to the extent that the survey found that two-thirds of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting reported they have seen written materials (e.g., brochures, posters, articles, etc.) that address the topic of hunting and responsible OHV use. The survey concluded, therefore, that "most OHV owners in Montana have been exposed to a variety of safety and responsible use information." Regardless of this "education," the survey noted: OHV owners do not always follow important guidelines for responsible use when operating OHVs. For instance, about a third of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting disagree or strongly disagree that OHV users should NOT travel off legal routes to

retrieve harvested game. Only 42 percent of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting reported they always follow this guideline. Nearly 7 percent reported they never follow this guideline. And, 52 percent reported they follow this guideline sometime). (#118)

Subconcern # C
Echoing these findings are the results of a 2003 survey of Wisconsin ATV users. A study of motivations and attitudes by graduate student Robert A. Smail at the University of Wisconsin - Steven's Point included a survey of user preferences for riding and found nearly two-thirds of respondents prefer to ride off maintained trails. Robert A. Smail, July 2007, Wisconsin All-Terrain Vehicle Owners; Recreational Motivations and Attitudes Toward Regulation, A Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree Master Of Science In Natural Resources Resource Policy And Planning College Of Natural Resources University Of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, copy obtained from author attached hereto. Survey respondents were asked to indicate where they prefer to ride their ATV. Of the five possible choices, On maintained trails (28.5%) ranked third. The top choice was on user created trails (33.3%) followed closely by cross country, off trails and roads (32.0%). In other words, 65.3% of all users prefer to ride off of maintained trails. Dr. Smail concluded that the survey results demonstrated that past orthodoxies premised on education and the assumed positive peer-pressure flowing from membership in established rider clubs are not adequate to generate trail-riding compliance, they had no influence. Rather, these results indicate that messages promoting responsible ATV riding or use will need to be reformulated and law enforcement will need to be increased in order to prevent resource damage and user conflict. (#118)

Subconcern # D
In a closely tracking review on federal land managers, in December 2007, the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility ("PEER") released the first-ever survey of federal rangers" views on off-road vehicle issues. "Rangers for Responsible Recreation: Off-Road Vehicle Issues Survey of SW Law Enforcement Professionals - Bureau of Land Management (BLM) & Forest Service (FS), 2007, (available from: http://www.peer.org/docs/az/07_11_12_sw_le_orv_survey_results.pdf) Strikingly: " 91% of respondent rangers agree that "off-road vehicles present a significant law enforcement problem in my jurisdiction"; " More than half (53%) feel "off-road vehicle problems in my jurisdiction are out of control"; and " 74% say that off-road abuses "are worse than they were five years ago" while fewer than one in six (15.2%) believe the situation is improving. Moreover, the survey found that rangers believe their agencies are unequal to the task of controlling ORV abuse: " 62% believe their agency is not "prepared to deal with the ORV problems we are experiencing"; and " 78% do not think their department "devotes adequate resources to cope with ORV problems." (#118)

Public Concern # 93. The Forest Service should develop a Motor Vehicle Use Map that is more understandable and easily available to the public; and sign closures on-the-ground, which in-turn will be more effective than law enforcement and paying people to interpret the maps and restrictions.

Response: The FS agrees that the MVUM needs to be useable by the public since this is the primary tool for displaying which roads are open. The TMR specifies that the designated roads and trails be identified on a MVUM and every effort will be made to produce a user-friendly map. We also expect to make improvements in the MVUM as we gain experience with this program. Our sign program will be focused on posting open roads with the associated maintenance level, i.e., high clearance, passenger car, etc. The FS will not be doing additional signage of closed roads.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The TM maps would have to be detailed enough and large-scale enough to expect the average visitor to be able to see and interpret them. They would need to be at least as large as the current forest recreation maps to be useful. What we currently experience with our fuelwood and Christmas tree maps, is that because they are smaller in scale the public must "back them up" with a larger-scale recreation map. If this approach is to be used with the new TM map, there will be discrepancies between the two maps that will further confuse the public.

In addition to the cost of producing these maps, I also anticipate that the forest will be spending a lot of time and money paying front-liners, LE, and other patrol people to interpret these maps for the public, as we already do with other forest product maps and the recreation maps. Signing a few closures on the ground to protect sensitive areas seems like a more cost effective approach. (#67)

Law, Regulation, and Policy

Public Concern # 94. The Forest Service should ensure it is in compliance with the Clean Water Act provisions for point source pollution and stormwater discharge as required in NPDES permits.

Response: The FS complies with the both the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act through the NEPA process and its responsibilities as a Water Quality Management Agency (WQMA) on NFS Lands. The FS complies through NEPA by scoping and responding to State Water Board comments and concerns. Secondly, the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) is the designated WQMA for NFS lands in California. The agency has developed and is implementing its Water Quality Management Plan, entitled Water Quality Management for National Forest System Lands in California (Appendix D). This plan, which is part of the State of California's Nonpoint Source Management Plan, outlines FS BMPs that have been certified by the State Water Quality Control Board and approved by the EPA. It is through the proper application, monitoring, and revision of these BMPs that the agency meets requirements of various provisions of the CWA and Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and fulfills its obligations as a WQMA.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The TM maps would have to be detailed enough and large-scale enough to expect the average visitor to be able to see and interpret them. They would need to be at least as large as the current forest recreation maps to be useful. What we currently experience with our fuelwood and Christmas tree maps, is that because they are smaller in scale the public must "back them up" with a larger-scale recreation map. If this approach is to be used with the new TM map, there will be discrepancies between the two maps that will further confuse the public.

In addition to the cost of producing these maps, I also anticipate that the forest will be spending a lot of time and money paying front-liners, LE, and other patrol people to interpret these maps for the public, as we already do with other forest product maps and the recreation maps. Signing a few closures on the ground to protect sensitive areas seems like a more cost effective approach. (#151)

Stormwater discharges are covered under section 402(p) of the CWA, which applies the NPDES permitting program to "industrial" stormwater discharges as well as municipal discharges. U.S.C.1342(p). As of 1994, all stormwater discharges containing any pollutants must obtain a NPDES permit. The CWA provides no express exemption for either OHV routes or recreation areas. The Forest Service is not exempted from these requirements. Under the existing arrangement with the State of California, "waste discharges from land management activities resulting in point source discharges, as defined by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, will be subject to NPDES permit requirements, since neither the State Board nor the Regional Board has authority to waive such permits." Management Agency Agreement Between the State Water Resources Control Board, State of California and the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1981, section 2 (b). (#151)

Public Concern # 95. The Forest Service should clearly demonstrate that the preferred alternative will contribute to the reduction of water quality impairment of Section 303(d) Clean Water Act listed water bodies and potential TMDL requirements.

Response: The watersheds on the STNF, which currently have Section 303(d) listed streams are primarily impacted through the pollution generated from non-surfaced roads, land use practices, and historic mining. Some of the impacts possible from the alternative proposals are related to the non-surfaced roads. The analysis clearly shows a substantial reduction of roads in all TMDL watersheds (FEIS, Chapter 3.02, pages 141 - 169).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Demonstrate that the Preferred Alternative will contribute to the reduction of water quality impairment of Section 303(d) Clean Water Act listed water bodies and potential TMDL requirements. Pursuant to future TMDLs, the Forest Service may be obligated to meet temperature or sediment load reductions from dirt roads and trails.

Recommendations: The FEIS should include data that demonstrates the Preferred Alternative will help contribute to the reduction of water quality impairment of Section 303(d) listed waterbodies. We recommend the Forest Service consult the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding potential Forest Service obligations to meet required sediment or temperature reductions. If such load reductions may not be achieved, than additional Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures should be considered and incorporated into the

Preferred Alternative to meet current and potential future TMDL requirements. See http: //epa.gov/owow/nps/unpavedroads.html for a Recommended Practices Manual for Maintenance and Service of Unpaved Roads. (#164)

Public Concern # 97. The Forest Service should ensure it is in compliance with the RS2477 law in regards to rights-of-way on RS2477 roads and the 1872 mining law.

Response: This Travel Management project will have no effect on RS2477 rights and has not proposed to provide direction on roads or trails that are under the jurisdiction of the State or County. Under RS2477, only Counties or other public agencies can hold the right-of-way and not individual members of the public. Since RS2477 involves the county claiming jurisdiction over any public highway that predates the reservation of the national forest, designating public use on NFS roads and trails by vehicle class and season of use would not be a RS2477 violation. Additionally, exercising RS2477 would be a county-level decision. The 1872 Mining Law and the TMR are not in conflict. Access to mining activities is accomplished through an approved Plan of Operation, which would address appropriate ingress and egress to a claim.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Congress granted a right-of-way, not a road. In fact, RS 2477 rights-of-way can host a number of things besides roads. The legal definition of "highway" in the law means not only the frequently-traveled, periodically-maintained roads commonly associated with it, but also other kinds of public ways, which may be rights-of-way rarely used for many years. Public ways include carriage-ways, bridle-ways, footways, trails, bridges, and even railroads, canals, ferries and navigable rivers. The essential element in defining "highway" is that whatever the means of transport, the public has the right to come and go at will. RS 2477 applies to all of the land in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest that had any rights-of-way that were in existence prior to 1905-1907, the time at which this land became national forest. Congress specifically bypassed the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in making RS 2477 grants. Under our Constitution, Congress has the exclusive power to manage and dispose of public lands and property (Article IV, Section 3: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; "). In 1976 when Congress reaffirmed the RS 2477 right-of-way granting process established 110 years earlier, it had the total power to do so. The federal land management agencies have no independent power or authority over FS2477 (or anything else to do with public lands). Their only authority over public lands is what Congress delegates to them. No federal agency has the authority to close an RS 2477 road for any reason. But many federal employees believe they have this authority and try to act accordingly. Would you please cite the legal authority by which you claim you may close an RS 2477 road? (#30)

Public Concern # 98. The Forest Service should apply the precautionary principle of the Rio Declaration to this project within the limits of law and regulation.

Response: Management of the national forests is governed by the NFMA, management direction in the LRMPs, various regulations including the TMR, and funding provided in annual appropriations from Congress. Decisions which may have a significant effect on the human environment are made under the procedures of the NEPA and accompanying regulations. None of these appear to be in conflict with the Rio Declaration.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Principle #15 of the "Rio Declaration", signed by the USA at the 1993 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, notes: "In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation." In our comments we ask Shasta-Trinity National Forest to apply the Precautionary Principal within the limits of USDA Forest Service orders, rules and regulations. (#9)

Public Concern # 99. The Forest Service should ensure it is in compliance with Executive Orders (EOs) 11644 and 11989 regarding route designation procedures.

Response: These regulations are intended to implement EO 11644 (February 8, 1972), '"Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands,'" as amended by EO 11989 (May 24, 1977). These EOs direct Federal agencies to ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands. Appendix D (Mitigation and Monitoring) describes the implementation monitoring tools that will help determine compliance with these EOs and the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

All current direction and authority that allow, restrict, and prohibit vehicle use off roads on National Forest lands are tiered from Executive Order (E.O.) 11644, signed by President Nixon in 1972, and modified by President Carter's E.O. 11989 in 1977. These executive orders should be the guiding principles for the purpose and needs related to OHVs and route designation. The Orders state that the route designation procedures "will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands." In accomplishing this broad goal, the executive orders specifically require that the designation of motorized areas and trails shall be in accordance with the following: 1) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands. 2) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. 3) Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors. 4) Areas and trails shall not be located in officially designated Wilderness Areas. (#151)

Public Concern # 102. The Forest Service should consider closing other motorized routes because it added motorized routes in complying with the TMR.

Response: The FS received and considered requests from the public to close existing routes. The STNF Forest Supervisor determined that existing programs and actions involving road decommissioning are adequate, and that closure activities would be outside the scope of this project. Therefore, actions to close existing NFTS roads or unauthorized routes are not analyzed in this FEIS. Such actions are initiated if indicated by monitoring or through project analyses. Consideration of the requests to close existing routes is fully described in the Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis section in Chapter 2.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We also note the Forest Service could just amend the plan to comply with the Travel Management Rule without adding additional motorized roads and trails. Since it has chosen to do so, it must also consider closing some motorized roads and trails. (#91)

Public Concern # 103. The Forest Service should avoid arbitrary deadlines for project completion, such as what is stated in the Memorandum of Intent between R5 and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, because they violate NEPA and the Travel Management Rule.

Response: The Forest has been instructed by the Chief of the Forest Service to complete the designation process and publish a MVUM) by the end of 2009 (http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/ programs/ohv/). While deadlines may seem arbitrary and rushed, they do serve the purpose of keeping this complex analysis moving forward steadily and in a coordinated manner. The STNF began this process in 2005 and has spent these years engaged in activities necessary to successfully implement Subpart B of the TMR and produce an MVUM that represents a reasonable balance of motorized access and environmental protection. Those activities have included many public meetings and collaboration with stakeholders (Chapter 1 Public Involvement), building the inventory of unauthorized routes, receiving and considering all public input, field surveys and extensive data collection and analysis, developing alternatives, and a thorough examination of all proposals. Every step of the process has been done in accordance with law, regulation, and policy, including the TMR 36 CFR part 212; NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts

1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF LRMP.

The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The DEIS refers to the Memorandum of Intent between Region 5 and both the California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission, and the Off- Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation in August 2003, with a completion date for Route Designation by December 2007. We submit that the arbitrary nature of this completion date of December 2007 for trail inventory violates both the spirit of the Final Rule, and the legalities of NEPA. To quote the Final Rule: page 68269, 3rd paragraph on left; "The Department shares an interest in completing route and area designation as quickly as possible. The problems associated with unmanaged motor vehicle use are important and deserve immediate attention. The Forest Service will make every effort, within its available resources, to complete route and area designation as quickly as possible. However, the Department disagrees with establishing an enforceable deadline for completion of the process. Imposing an enforceable deadline for completing designations would subject the Forest Service to legal challenge..... An inflexible deadline can make collaborative solutions more difficult." Another explanation is offered by the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) concerning a deadline for construction of an EIS; "The Council also recognizes that some projects will entail difficult long-term planning and/or the acquisition of certain data which of necessity will require more time for the preparation of the EIS. Indeed, some proposals should be given more time for the thoughtful preparation of an EIS and development of a decision which fulfills NEPA's substantive goals". A self-imposed deadline fails to allow the agency to meet the purpose and need sections of this DEIS. We want the agency to allow the NEPA process to dictate the necessary time required to develop a sustainable transportation system that meets the needs of public access and public support. (#139)

Public Concern # 104. The Forest Service should ensure that travel management planning is occurring at the local level rather than the regional level, which would then be in violation of the TMR.

Response: The Forest Supervisor, District Rangers, and employees of the STNF have been involved throughout this process. The STNF Travel Management planning process incorporates many local aspects, including public meetings to collect and clarify route data, hear differing perspectives from a variety of stakeholders, and to define the issues. See the Public Involvement and Issue Development sections in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

The regional office provided structure, guidance, and oversight to assist Region 5 national forests in completing travel management analyses; however the STNF's analysis is directed by the STNF Forest Supervisor. The environmental analysis is based on STNF data (Chapter 3 and the project record), issues, and the STNF LRMP.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Many of the forests in Region 5 have issued DEIS's. When comparing the various DEIS's published in the Federal Register by Region 5 forests, it is difficult not to notice a similarity between said documents. This region-wide similarity defies the intent of the Department, and serves to illegally deny the forests in Region 5 the local determination as described by the Final Rule. According to the Final Rule, page 68266, middle column; "The Department believes such choices and evaluations are best made at the local level, with full involvement of Federal, tribal, State, and local governments, motorized and non-motorized users, and other interested parties, as provided for in this final rule". This clearly states that the decision making power in the Route Designation process is best made on a local level, not on a regional level, by regional authorities. Please be advised that all evidence of similarity between individual documents prepared by forests in Region 5 in compliance with the Travel Management Rule will be closely scrutinized for undue influence made by the Regional Office. (#139)

Public Concern # 105. The Forest Service should comply with the TMR, CFRs, and LRMP by adding more routes to the NFTS.

Response: The commenters cite law, regulation, and policy to which this Travel Management analysis must adhere. Of particular concern to them is the need to identify and protect natural resources such as soil and water resources, fish and wildlife, and the diversity of plant and animal communities. This analysis was conducted in accordance with all relevant law, regulation, and policy, including the TMR 36 CFR part 212; NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF LRMP. Where applicable, management indicator species (MIS) are identified and incorporated into the analysis (see the project record and Chapter 3 for aquatic biota and wildlife MIS species analyses). Chapter 3 discloses the evaluation and predicted effects of all alternatives on an array of natural, cultural, social, and economic resources.

Another concern is that the STNF is misinterpreting the TMR, causing some routes to be excluded from consideration for designation, now and in the future. Building the inventory of unauthorized routes was a multi-step process that involved public input (Chapter 1, Public Involvement, in the FEIS), field surveys, and mapping (project record). The STNF then considered all inventoried unauthorized routes when developing the Proposed Action. Input from public meetings, District Rangers, Forest staff, stakeholders, and a pre-NEPA earth science team was used when selecting the proposed roads, trails, areas, and design elements of the Proposed Action (FEIS, page 9, Proposed Action). After scoping the Proposed Action, the Forest developed significant issues and screening criteria for selecting routes, trails, and areas for evaluation in the alternatives (Appendix G). The Forest has adhered to the requirements of the TMR throughout the process and has not excluded any route from further consideration without reason. Unauthorized routes excluded during this process are not precluded from consideration in future environmental analyses, when conditions and needs may be different. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis. The STNF plans to continue the conversation regarding motor vehicle access and is expecting that updates will occur regularly over time.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest Service must manage public lands in an ecologically sustainable manner that protects soil and water resources, streams, stream banks, shorelines, wetlands, fish and wildlife, and the diversity of plant and animal communities. 36 CFR 219.27(a)(4)(1982). The agency must also show how it is protecting these resources and what species are being used to serve as management indicators of forest health and wildlife viability. 36 CFR 219.19(a)(1982). (#118)

Miscellaneous

Public Concern # 176. The Forest Service should consider some type of recourse for the people paying fees to enjoy access over those who do not pay fees.

Response: Fee payments as a means of regulating access on the STNF are outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There needs to be some form of recourse for the people that pay fees to enjoy access over those that pay nothing. (#162)

Public Concern # 177. The Forest Service should not include all of the NFTS roads that are in INFRA as part of the baseline, as noted in Appendix A that we've attached to our comment letter because:

A) these roads have been determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate for long-term public motor vehicle travel;
B) these routes should not appear on the MVUM without adequate justification and environmental analysis.

Response: The commenter submitted a list of 5,154 NFTS road segments to exclude from the MVUM. Defining which categories of existing NFTS roads should or should not appear on the MVUM is outside the scope of this

analysis. This analysis is focused on making limited changes to the existing NFTS only in terms of additions, vehicles classes, and season of use. The MVUM will display only roads and trails open to the public.

Sample Public Comment(s):

INFRA, the database used by the USFS to document and track its transportation system, is one of the few places where detailed information regarding the USFS road and trail system can be found. It is logical that this database be used as a starting point for travel planning. However, there are certain roads in INFRA that should not be listed as part of the baseline travel system. We have included in Appendix A an Excel spreadsheet of roads and trails in the INFRA transportation database (provided by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest on July 17, 2009) that have, at some point in the past, been determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate for long-term public motor vehicle travel. These routes should not be treated as open system routes merely because they exist on the ground or have been entered into INFRA. These routes should not appear on the MVUM without adequate justification and environmental analysis. In Appendix A, the Excel spreadsheet lists all roads that should NOT appear on the MVUM unless they have been analyzed as part of the Travel Management Planning process. The column labeled "Operating Maintenance Level" lists all of the roads that are labeled in INFRA as "basic custodial care (closed)" (defined as an intermittent service road closed to vehicular traffic). These roads should not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map because they are not currently open to motor vehicles. The column labeled "Service Life" lists all of the roads that are labeled in INFRA as "short term service" (defined as a road for short term use/including temporary roads), "intermittent stored service" (defined as an intermittent service road closed to traffic), or "intermittent term service" (defined as a road closed to vehicle traffic between periods of use; the closed period must exceed one year). Roads in these categories were not constructed for long-term public motor vehicle recreation and should not appear on the MVUM without justification and environmental analysis. The column labeled "Objective Maintenance Level" lists all roads that are labeled in INFRA as "basic custodial care (closed)," "converted," or "decommissioned." These roads should not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map because the Forest has determined that their objective for these roads is to close them to motor vehicles. (#151)

NEPA – Process, Consultation, Scope, and Monitoring

Public Concern # 201. The Forest Service should re-scope the modified Purpose and Need because it could generate a different set of significant issues than the original Purpose and Need.

Response: The Purpose and Need was modified between the publication of the Notice of Intent in August 2008 and publication of the DEIS in June 2009. The most substantive updates reflected two changes in the project design that came about from the continuing analysis and public input received during scoping: the need for managed use below the high-water marks in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs, and the need for a non-significant LRMP amendment to allow motor vehicle travel near particular cultural sites. Wording was revised in a number of places for consistency with the TMR or for clarification.

One of the purposes of scoping is to gather information from the public that the FS needs to know. It is not uncommon to have minor changes in a proposal as a result of scoping comments. Scoping comments highlighted issues with the Proposed Action that are addressed in the DEIS. The public was also afforded an opportunity to comment on the DEIS and those comments were considered in the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We want the agency to acknowledge that the "Purpose and Need" in this DEIS has been significantly altered from the "Purpose and Need" as stated in the Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register on or about August 8, 2008. The detailed descriptions of each identified "need" are displayed in such a way that comments from the public on the NOI could be very different than what is displayed in the DEIS. Therefore it is highly probable that different significant issues may have been brought forward as a result of scoping and causing different alternatives to be developed. We want the agency to withdraw this DEIS as written, release a NOI for public comment, with a Purpose and Need section that truly expresses the intent of the proposal and will not change in its description throughout the NEPA process. (#139)

Public Concern # 202. The Forest Service should analyze this project at a programmatic level, rather than at the project level.

Response: The Department of Agriculture believes that the scope, content, and documentation of NEPA analyses associated with designating routes and areas for motor vehicle travel depends on site-specific factors, including the local history of travel planning, public input, and environmental impacts at the local level. Evaluating routes and areas for possible addition to the NFTS requires site-specific resource data to determine the environmental consequences of motorized use of each potential addition. A site-specific analysis is necessary to determine the benefits and risks associated with each individual route. This level of analysis cannot be accomplished through a programmatic EIS.

A programmatic EIS (40 CFR 1500.4(i), 1502.4(b) and (c), 1502.20) is one that analyzes broad-scope actions that are similar in terms of timing, geography, or other characteristics that provide a basis for evaluating environmental consequences. It provides a generic analysis of impacts that may not attempt to define the site-specific effects in detail but that do present at least a range of effects that reflect the reasonably foreseeable consequences of the program. A programmatic EIS supports broad policy or program decisions that constrain or define specific proposals that may be proposed as part of the program or under the policy. Subsequent analysis of more specific proposals would generally be required under NEPA and would be more specific, since it would be of narrower scope. Regulations implementing NEPA are issued by the CEQ and are found at 40 CFR part 1500. Agency direction on NEPA compliance is found in FSH 1909.15.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Though it is stated many times in the DEIS that this is a project level analysis and this fact triggers many required consistency reviews and more detailed analysis, we note the level of analysis more appropriately falls under the definition of a programmatic analysis for the forest. (#139)

Public Concern # 203. The Forest Service should include specialists on the IDT that have expertise in OHV management.

Response: The TMR is not limited to management of OHVs, but rather applies to all motor vehicle travel on NFS lands. Credentials of the IDT assigned to work on the Travel Management project are listed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. All team members, regardless of their recreational pursuits when off-duty, were selected because of their ability to identify and to evaluate the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative social, economic, physical, and biological effects of the Proposed Action and its alternatives in relation to applicable laws and regulations (FSH 1909.15, Chapter 12.2). In addition to the core IDT identified in Chapter 4, the FS consulted formally and informally with many additional resource specialists, governments, groups, and individuals representing a wide range of expertise and experience which was very valuable to this environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Add more OHV planning expertise to the planning team. Examination of the list of preparers reveals no reference to experience specific to OHV management. (#147)

Public Concern # 204. The Forest Service should improve integration of other critical forestwide management issues into this travel management analysis.

Response: The STNF Forest Supervisor identified the scope of the analysis (FEIS, pages 4 and 5), which is narrowly focused on the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel and the limited additions of roads, motorized trails, and areas open to motorized use to the NFTS. Other forest management issues were integrated into this analysis through the application of LRMP direction, mitigation measures, and consideration of cumulative effects as related to proposals to add routes to the NFTS. The STNF Forest Supervisor considered the compatibility of motor vehicle travel on the proposed routes and areas within the context of other forest management objectives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This forest-wide transportation management plan, as presented, is isolated from all of the other critical management issues for the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. For example, it has been extremely difficult to evaluate the alternatives in the DEIS in isolation from recreation, forest health/forest management objectives, watershed restoration or public safety needs. (#80)

Public Concern # 205. The Forest Service should analyze the dozer lines created throughout the STNF as a result of fire suppression and should not be authorized in the NFTS. This should have been a significant issue in the DEIS and should be substantively addressed.

Response: Dozer lines constructed during fire suppression are part of an emergency fire response. They are not part of the NFTS trail or road system unless officially designated at some point in the future after appropriate environmental analysis. Typically, rehabilitation is completed on dozer lines shortly after use, thus eliminating continued motor vehicle travel. However, some of the routes considered in this analysis could have originated as dozer lines and subsequently, were used by motor vehicles and added to the inventory of unauthorized routes. All inventoried routes, regardless of their origins, were evaluated according to the methodology described in Appendix G at some point during this process.

Sample Public Comment(s):

it is our understanding that during the wildfires of 2007 and 200S hundreds of miles of dozer lines were made in roadless areas, wilderness areas, as well as throughout the forest. These lines will be used by 0HVs and none should be authorized in the travel system. This significant issue was ignored in the DEIS and must be substantively addressed. (#91)

Public Concern # 206. The Forest Service should clearly delineate which proposed routes lie in IRAs, CIRAs, wilderness, or late successional reserves; and the impacts from motorized use to these areas.

Response: The location of proposed routes are depicted on the alternative maps in the FEIS. In an effort to keep the maps readable with clear definition of the Proposed Action, including additions to the NFTS, vehicle classes, and seasonal restrictions, very few management areas and other land allocations could be added to the maps. GIS data in the project record provides route locations by land allocations. Environmental effects of the alternatives are disclosed in Chapter 3, including effects to IRAs, CIRAs, and late successional reserves. It should be noted that CIRAs are not a FS designation; the CIRA data and locations are provided by a citizen advocacy group and is not verified or endorsed by the FS. Noise impacts to designated Wilderness are disclosed in the Recreation section in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We were surprised that IRAs and CIRAs and not shown on STNF's DEIS maps. This makes it very difficult for the public to participate in an informed manner. (#9)

Public Concern # 207. The Forest Service should more clearly describe the actions proposed in this travel management analysis in terms that take into consideration the underlying assumptions of different user groups, in order to avoid misinterpretation.

Response: This concern is related to access for dispersed vehicle camping. The commenter notes that the DEIS appears to equate parking within one vehicle length of a designated road with dispersed vehicle camping, yet the two activities are not the same. Also of concern is the use of the term "cross-country," which has different meanings for different user groups, and the fact that it’s not clearly stated that use of access roads to dispersed campsites, which remain unauthorized, will be considered prohibited cross-country motor vehicle travel.

Cross-country motor vehicle travel is any travel off designated NFTS roads, motorized trails, and areas by the public except as allowed by permit or other authorization (excluding over-snow use). This definition is repeated throughout the FEIS. The commenter is correct in that motor vehicle travel on unauthorized routes to dispersed campsites would be prohibited. The need for motor vehicle access for dispersed camping and other activities is an element of the TMR, the Purpose and Need for this action, the Proposed Action, and all alternatives. The alternatives were designed with designating access to dispersed campsites as a design element, and individual routes that provide access for dispersed activities were selected if they met environmental criteria as well (Chapter 1, Proposed Action; Chapter 2, Alternative Development; Appendix G, Alternative Development; Travel Analysis Process and field survey data, project record). Many of the short spurs proposed for addition to the NFTS were chosen because they access dispersed campsites.

The FS understands that parking and dispersed camping are different experiences, and will consider future road and motorized trail additions to the NFTS as opportunities arise with further collaboration and environmental analyses. Wording in the FEIS has been revised to clarify the meanings of parking and cross-country motor vehicle travel.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Public Notice to day use and dispersed vehicle camping enthusiasts for Region 5 Plans is inadequate. Dispersed vehicle camping enthusiasts and day users would be required to infer and read between the lines to determine how the new Plans apply to them. The public would somehow have to understand that the Forest Service essentially relies on the absurd proposition that vehicle camping is the same as vehicle parking for the purposes of these Plans. Dispersed vehicle camping will be relegated to the "parking" rule. Dispersed vehicle camping may only occur along side Forest system roads such that "all parts of the motor vehicle are within one vehicle length from the edge of the route surface when it is safe to do so and without causing damage to NFS resources or facilities." The term "cross country" travel for the purpose of these Plans is unclear. Context and mode of travel are necessary to fully understand the term. A motorcyclist's concept of cross country travel is very different from that of a person pulling a trailer. The public would have to understand that what many would reasonably consider driveways for access to dispersed campsites is "cross country travel" for the purposes of these Plans. Re-cross country and dispersed vehicle camping: " One would have to continue to dig in the web site to find the frequently asked questions section question #26: "Will this process have an effect on dispersed camping? "The purpose of this process is to designate motorized routes and to prohibit cross-country travel. Dispersed recreation activities (i .e. activities which occur after the motor vehicle stops such as camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, etc.) will not be part of the scope of the environmental analysis. Designated routes may change the way some people camp (i.e. in some cases campers may need to carry gear to a campsite instead of driving cross country." (Attached portion of FAQ) The unvarnished reality is it will change the way most, if not all, vehicle campers will camp because most, if not all, dispersed vehicle camp sites are located more than one vehicle length from the route surface. Everybody who disperse camps "in" their vehicles would have to "carry their camping gear." This is one of the ludicrous outcomes of the fiction the Forest Service adheres to when it attempts to deny the dual nature of camping vehicles. The "gear" and the vehicle are one. (#94)

Public Concern # 208. The Forest Service should clearly display and analyze existing unauthorized routes and dispersed camping areas and those proposed for NFTS designation or closure.

Response: The scope of this analysis is narrowly focused on the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel and the limited additions of roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS. Analyzing dispersed camping areas is outside the scope of this analysis. However, when evaluating benefits and risks associated with each route requested by the public during scoping, the IDT identified "access to a documented dispersed site" as a benefit and a reason to further study a particular route, if there was no, or minimal resource concerns with the route. The dispersed sites themselves were not studied.

The commenter believes that the Purpose and Need statement in the DEIS is inaccurate regarding the age and proliferation of unauthorized routes. The STNF does not have comprehensive historical data for the inventory of unauthorized routes. While arguments can be made regarding the origins of the routes, (i.e., whether they were created decades ago for timber management or more recently by a riding club) and the accuracy of the Purpose and Need statement questioned, the conditions to be addressed in implementing the TMR do exist on the STNF. There is unmanaged cross-country motor vehicle travel causing unacceptable damage to natural and cultural resources.

The alternative maps accompanying the FEIS depict all roads, trails, and areas proposed for addition to the NFTS. No road closures are proposed as such activities are outside the scope of this analysis. The project record contains survey data of unauthorized routes considered in this analysis. The route inventory maps in the project record and posted on the Forest's website depict the inventory of unauthorized routes which was built with the help of the people who use the routes.

The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Need to "maintain motor vehicle access to dispersed recreation activities that historically have been accessed by motor vehicles." Need a clear separate analysis to know how many and where these historical access points are and how many now lost. In the alternate provide the dispersed camping areas provided for in the Travel Management Rule. Existing analysis is inadequate and frankly, lacks candor. (#94)

Public Concern # 209. The Forest Service should analyze the needs of and effects to dispersed camping separately from other forms of motorized access:

A) in terms of safety;
B) in terms of user conflicts;
C) in terms of near-road access;
D) because their voice is lost in the larger OHV interest group.

Response: The predicted effects of the alternatives on motor vehicle access for dispersed recreation are disclosed in the Recreation section of Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Provide a diversity of wheeled motorized recreation opportunities. Has not been accomplished as the recreation aspect of highway licensed vehicles particularly in the form of trucks pulling trailers, campers, rv's, tent trailers, cabover campers, family vehicles etc has not been recognized in this plan. (#94)

Subconcern # A
The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Provide for public safety. Not met as to dispersed vehicle day use/camping. Placing vehicle camping spots within one vehicle length of the edge of forest routes, when is "safe to do so", is not safe for the campers or the route traffic nor is relying on the "safe to do so" caveat good management in light of the huge loss of alternate off route dispersed camping opportunities. (#94)

Subconcern # B
The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Have created conflicts between wheeled motor vehicles and existing proposed recreational uses of NFS lands. Fewer routes, means more traffic per route and now dispersed day use/campers must "camp" adjacent to the road ways. This intensifies conflicts. (#94)

Subconcern # C
The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Have not assured adequate access to public lands as to the dispersed vehicle day use/camper. Initially Stanislaus allowed a 100' area alongside the remaining approved routes for direct access to camp sites, parking, etc. However, I believe that has been removed as has been the Forester. (#94)

Subconcern # D
The otherwise laudable purpose and needs of the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan is not met with regard to dispersed motor vehicle recreation/transportation. Constrain proposal to that which is within the capability of the forest. Understaffed and under the gun of an administration that is concerned with legal gamesmanship. The cost has been born by the particular group of traditional dispersed vehicle day use/campers who are not organized or represented by strong lobbies so they take the hit of the Forest Service expediency needs. (#94)

Public Concern # 210. The Forest Service should include in the ROD or elsewhere, a statement of commitment to starting the Travel Analysis process shortly after the publication of the MVUM, potentially as a pre-NEPA component of the STNF Plan revision. Once Travel Analysis is completed for all system routes and a minimum system is achieved by decommissioning unneeded routes, the STNF should only then consider the addition of unauthorized routes.

Response: The commenters cite law, regulation, and policy to which this Travel Management analysis must adhere. Of particular concern to them is the need to identify and protect natural resources such as soil and water resources, fish and wildlife, and the diversity of plant and animal communities. This analysis was conducted in accordance with all relevant law, regulation, and policy, including the TMR 36 CFR part 212; NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF LRMP. Where applicable, MIS are identified and incorporated into the analysis (see the project record and Chapter 3 for aquatic biota and wildlife MIS species analyses). Chapter 3 discloses the evaluation and predicted effects of all alternatives on an array of natural, cultural, social, and economic resources.

Another concern is that the STNF is misinterpreting the TMR, causing some routes to be excluded from consideration for designation, now and in the future. Building the inventory of unauthorized routes was a multi-step process that involved public input (see Chapter 1, Public Involvement, in the FEIS) , field surveys, and mapping (project record). The STNF then considered all inventoried unauthorized routes when developing the Proposed Action. Input from public meetings, District Rangers, Forest staff, stakeholders, and a pre-NEPA earth science team was used when selecting the proposed roads, trails, areas, and design elements of the Proposed Action (FEIS, page 9, Proposed Action). After scoping the Proposed Action, the Forest developed significant issues and screening criteria for selecting routes, trails, and areas for evaluation in the alternatives (Appendix G). The Forest has adhered to the requirements of the TMR throughout the process and has not excluded any route from further consideration without reason. Unauthorized routes excluded during this process are not precluded from consideration in future environmental analyses, when conditions and needs may be different. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis. The STNF plans to continue the conversation regarding motor vehicle access and is expecting that updates will occur regularly over time.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest should include in the ROD or elsewhere a statement of commitment to starting the Travel Analysis process shortly after the publication of the MVUM, potentially as a pre-NEPA component of the Shasta-Trinity Forest Plan revision. Once Travel Analysis is completed for all system routes and a minimum system is achieved by decommissioning unneeded routes, the Forest should only then consider the addition of unauthorized routes. (#151)

Public Concern # 211. The Forest Service should revise this DEIS in order to fully incorporate the public comment generated by this travel management planning process as provided by law and regulation.

Response: It is understandable that the commenter, who actively participated in this process, feels that the alternatives considered in detail do not reflect public input and efforts. Public involvement in this analysis was ongoing and varied as described in Chapter 1. The willingness of the motorized recreation community to volunteer their knowledge and time is much appreciated. The FS considered alternatives which proposed all or most of the inventoried routes and all or most of those requested during scoping, but eliminated them from detailed analysis (Chapter 2). The IDT evaluated each route requested for resource risks and recreation benefits. The route screening process is detailed in Chapter 2, Proposed Action, and Appendix G, Alternative Development.

This analysis was conducted in accordance with all relevant law, regulation, and policy, including the TMR 36 CFR part 212; NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF LRMP. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Since first hearing about the process, I have spent many hours gathering information to respond to each request made by the Forest. I have turned in GPS routes, paper maps and drawings, highlighted your maps, commented about why specific areas are important to me and attended meetings to clarify each item along the way. The result of

my efforts is apparent in the alternatives that you are presenting for me to select from. It appears that all of the efforts I have put into this process have been ignored. It appears that you are attempting to meet an arbitrary deadline that does not factor in the work required to complete said work. This is being forced into law without adequate consideration of my comments or wishes and there are no reasonable alternatives to choose from. (#136)

Public Concern # 212. The Forest Service should incorporate local OHV sales and usage data into the travel management analysis.

Response: Guidelines for conducting economic impact analysis recommend not using sales of durable goods because they provide utility to consumers on multiple occasions. It would be impossible to determine the proportion of sales attributable to motorized recreation specific to the STNF.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under Background of the DEIS, National and California figures are documented to reflect the increase in sales and usage of OHVs and sport utility vehicles. This information reflects the "Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation in the United States, Regions and States: A National Report from a National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, USDA Forest Service, 2005)". We ask that the Travel Management Team furnish information regarding local sales figures, vehicle type, and motor vehicle usage for the Shasta Trinity National Forest region. This type of information is vital to determine "purpose and need" and evaluate the potential impacts to resources based on actual local use. The DEIS is silent to this concern and we see this as a significant lack of vital data when making decisions that affect local conditions and uses. (#139)

Public Concern # 213. The Forest Service should justify the disposition of those unauthorized routes that have historically been signed and put on administrative maps by the FS, as defacto NFTS routes.

Response: Historic use of a road does not make it a defacto NFTS route. The Forest Service's INFRA database is the official dataset for use in transportation planning. While is it recognized that there may be coding errors, the database is still the best tool available. As project-specific changes to the NFTS are made, the database is updated to reflect these changes. The current status (baseline conditions) of the NFTS is summarized in Table 3.12-2 of the FEIS (page 545). Project-specific reasonably foreseeable future proposed changes to the NFTS are detailed in Appendix B of the FEIS. Project proposals, draft and final Decision Notices or Records of Decision for the projects are available from the Forest Supervisor's office if these projects have reached that stage in the planning process.

Revisiting the discussions about how the present road system came to be is outside the scope of this FEIS, however the comment warrants response because it relates to the need for this action. Over the years, the FS has built roads associated with timber sales and other management activities that are no longer needed or used for those purposes. In some cases, these routes were intended to be temporary and were not intended to be part of the NFTS, but nevertheless, have remained open to public travel. In many cases, those routes have been signed and have also appeared on various Agency maps. The public too has constructed routes or created routes by repeated use that may have become "local spurs." As management needs have changed, those roads have remained signed and on maps, even though they were no longer needed. In defining the existing NFTS as reflected in the INFRA database, the FS used monitoring data, local project plans, watershed analysis, and knowledge of the ground to define the current transportation system as shown on the Forest transportation atlas. In many cases, the disposition of old roads is documented in project level NEPA decisions or in other access and travel management efforts. However, the purpose of this exercise is to make a decision on routes and trails to add to the existing system, not revisit the past concerning old routes that have been taken out of the NFTS. As the FS gains experience with this program, there will be future opportunities to revisit route designations.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Shasta Trinity National Forest has condoned and encouraged motorized use. The Forest has supported, maintained and signed trails open and placed them on Motorized Travel plan maps. These Pre-NEPA routes have never been signed closed. No NEPA, public process or site specific analysis to legally close these routes are referenced in the DEIS. There is no index of the required NEPA posting in the US Federal Register. There is no

evidence in the DEIS to demonstrate legal closures of roads and trails. We want the agency to add these routes to the NFTS as motorized trails in the final EIS. (#139)

Public Concern # 214. The Forest Service should analyze, display the methodology and results, and provide rationale for every mile of NFTS or unauthorized routes proposed for closure or not selected to be part of this analysis; and for routes proposed for addition and:

- **A) for those routes proposed for closure, identify the site-specific resource concerns and develop potential mitigations to address those concerns;**
- **B) when you close routes, it requires an irretrievable commitment of resources to close that route and therefore, an in-depth site-specific analysis should be completed;**
- **C) by proposing these routes for closure you are not meeting the Purpose and Need of this project;**
- **D) the additions in Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 do not provide a diversity of road and trail opportunities as required by FSM 2353.03(2);**
- **E) the analysis, discussion, and treatment of the 1,252 miles of routes that are currently being used by the public should be documented;**
- **F) the analysis of environmental impacts is insufficient under NEPA because no consistent method of analysis is given for determining which unauthorized routes were added to the transportation system.**

Response: Routes may be designated for motor vehicle travel pursuant to 36 CFR 212.51 of the TMR following public consideration and appropriate site-specific environmental analysis. The STNF chose to inventory and evaluate unauthorized routes as disclosed in the FEIS, Chapter 1, Proposed Action. This early process included a preliminary effects evaluation by natural resource specialists for each route that was not screened out due to law, regulation, or policy (such as the Forest Plan). In addition, the screening process used to select routes for consideration in the alternatives is described in Chapter 2, Development of the Alternatives, and Appendix G, Alternative Development. All routes brought forth for detailed study in an alternative were analyzed using site-specific data gathered from a variety of sources, as described at the start of each resource section in Chapter 3. Each alternative developed meets the Purpose and Need as described in Chapter 1.

The alternatives were developed by applying consistent criteria to protect resources and provide recreation benefits, but with different emphases in the various alternatives. These criteria balanced the potential opportunities and experiences provided by each route with potential conflicts or impacts to various resources caused by designating that route for public motorized use. Use of these criteria ensured that effects on natural and cultural resources were considered throughout the development of the alternatives, not just in the analysis of effects.

All routes requested by the public were considered and evaluated by the IDT. Some routes were excluded early in the process due to law, regulation, and policy, while others were excluded because they were out of the scope of this analysis (such as existing NFTS roads and roads under another agency jurisdiction). Routes were ranked by the IDT for the predicted risk to natural resources and all routes were considered for the recreation benefit they could provide. Appendix G describes the methodology used. Detailed information and data regarding the screening process is included Appendix G and in the project record. The specific routes requested by the public during scoping are listed in the project record.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Road/Trail cards. The document states that roads and trails fell into two categories, those brought forward and those that were eliminated from detailed study. The STNF has failed to display in detail the rationale for elimination of approximately 1,209 miles of available routes for consideration. This omission denies the public the ability to review and analyze the agencies conclusion on these routes. The agency needs to revise this document to clearly display all decisions relating to each inventoried road or route and allow additional time for public comment. (#139)

Subconcern # A
There are over 1,209 miles of inventoried routes that are proposed for closure without site-specific rationale. We want the STNF to provide, display, and identify site-specific problem areas and provide potential mitigation to correct the problem. Examples include; armoring creek crossings or sensitive soils, re routes, trail adoptions by user groups, etc. Trail closure should be the last option not the first. (#139)

Subconcern # B
BRC believes the arbitrary closure of close to 100% of motorcycle and A TV trails over 92% or more of historic user roads in even the most access friendly alternative (Alt. 5) brings to question the very nature and extent of analysis necessary to transition from an "open" to "designated" system in the current Forest Plan or this DEIS. This issue was analyzed at length in Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation v. Berry, Case No. CV 02-325 (E.D.Cal.). The Court in that case summarized the procedural backdrop, including appeals decisions from the Forest Service Chief, as follows: "In a 1995 decision of an appeal by both the CSNC preservationists and ORV vehicle users, the Chief of the Forest Service ("Chief') agreed with the ORV Users' contention that the Forest Service failed to complete an adequate NEPA analysis before issuing the 1990 ORV Plan. The Chief ruled that the Forest Service had not considered the site specific impacts associated with restricting ORV use to designated routes and directed the Forest Service to complete the required NEPA analysis by November of 1997. AR Vol. 6 at 981. Specifically, the Chief ruled that the LRMP EIS is an inadequate substitute for an independent ORV Plan EIS because: "There was insufficient environmental disclosure to implement a policy of ORV closures on the Forest when the 1990 ORV Plan was completed. This site-specific analysis is required at the point when an irretrievable commitment of resources is made. (Sierra Club v. Hathawav, 579 F.2d. 1162, 1168 (9th Cir. 1978)). Implementation of the 1990 ORV Plan was premature without site-specific rationale on the need for and effects of a closed, unless designated as open policy. AR Vol. 6 at 984." Accordingly, the Chief directed the' Forest Supervisor "to supplement the ORV Plan with environmental analysis that addresses reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the No Action alternative, for ORV use in General Forest. (#154)

Subconcern # B
Berry, Order dated February 15, 2005 at 46-47. Particularly relevant here is the Court's analysis of whether the applicable Forest Plan could serve to support designated-route decisions: "As noted, the Forest Service tiered the 1990 ORV Plan to the LRMP's EIS. The LRMP is a plan that establishes standards and guidelines for the management of the Eldorado National Forest. See 16 U.S.C. 1604. Such land use plans are 'not ordinarily the medium for affirmative decisions that implement the agency's projections, rather, they guide the development of future, more detailed plans. Norton v. SUWA, 124 S.Ct. 2373, 2382 (2004). The LRMP FE IS did not analyze the programmatic environmental impacts of a designated-route-only ORV trail system in Eldorado, nor did it analyze the environmental impacts of any particular ORV routes in the Forest or of permitting travel off of designated routes. While the LRMP's EIS does discuss the general impacts of the proposed 1990 ORV plan, it does not account for the specific impacts of the plan's actual implementation. As determined by the Forest Chief, the analysis of the proposed ORV plan may have been adequate for the LRMP itself, since, at that point, the closure of ORV areas and designation of trails had not yet occurred. As the Ninth Circuit has explained, '[w]hen a programmatic EIS has ... been prepared, site-specific impacts need not be fully evaluated until a 'critical decision' has been made to act on site development.' California v. Block, 690 F.2d 753, 768 (9th Cir. 1982)(citing Sierra Club v. Hathaway, 579 F.2d 1162, .1168 (9th Cir. 1978)). (#154)

Subconcern # B
When the Forest Service implemented the directive of the LRMP by creating the 1990 ORV Plan, however, it was required to either create a new EIS or supplement the LRMP's programmatic EIS to account for the ORV Plan's specific requirements and procedures The 1990 ORV plan contains a concrete plan and makes an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources throughout the Eldorado. Therefore, the Forest Service's duty under NEPA was not satisfied by tiering the ORV Plan to the LRMP's EIS." Id. at 51-52. The Shasta-Trinity National Forest appears poised to repeat this mistake. While the DE IS is certainly not a program-level plan as was the Forest Plan, this is a distinction without a difference given the rather substantive absence of site-specific analysis elements in the DEIS. (#154)

Subconcern # C
The Shasta-Trinity National Forest was legally open to cross-country travel, these areas and trails are legal cross-country areas and any trails that are in them are legal routes. I will support the concept of designated routes, only because most people will stick to the routes that are designated. But they will only do that if there are enough miles of routes! Eliminating 1200 miles of current legal routes is not the right or correct way of doing this Travel Management Plan (TMP)! Each existing legal route has to go through the NEPA Process on individual bases before it can be closed. The initial environmental damage has already occurred on these routes. When new routes are created because the existing ones are closed a larger impact will ultimately occur. This portion of the TMR states, "Without additions to the NFTS, implementation of subpart B of the Travel Management Rule would severely limit motorized recreation opportunities relative to the current levels". The additions as proposed are insignificant when

compared to the current 1200+ miles of OHV trails in use by the public. No alternative presented will meet the stated Purpose and Needs identified above. (#160)

Subconcern # D E
The addition of 6-43 (alt. 2, 4 & 5) out of 1,252 miles of the "unauthorized routes" does not meet the objective of; "providing a diversity of road and trail opportunities (FSM 2353.03(2))" as indicated in the statement of purpose and need. We fail to understand how and why the Forest Service chose these miles and ask that the Forest Service provide written rationale how these routes were chosen and why the remaining 1,246 to 1,209 miles of routes were not proposed for inclusion into the transportation system. What are obviously absent throughout this document are the analysis, discussion, and treatment of the 1,252 miles of routes that are currently being used by the public. We want the agency to provide this documentation and rationale under the final EIS. (#139)

Subconcern # F
We believe however, that the DEIS is flawed in the following ways: 5) The analysis of environmental impacts is insufficient under NEPA because no consistent method of analysis is given for determining which unauthorized routes were added to the transportation system. While the DEIS provides an abundance of information on possible environmental impacts and future mitigations, the decisions concerning which new routes to designate are arbitrary. In addition, much of the information necessary for the public to make informed and timely comments is not available in the DEIS. (#151)

Public Concern # 216. The Forest Service should eliminate the 1 to 5 risk ranking system because it implies major differences in risk, and instead use the indicators because they provide a quantitative and objective comparison.

Response: The ranking tables provide a relative comparison of the alternative effects and are not intended to absolute thresholds or detailed comparisons. The quantified effects indicators are disclosed within each resource section in Chapter 3. One table displaying all indicators for all alternatives would be very complicated and time-consuming to build, difficult to understand, and would not necessarily enhance the STNF Forest Supervisor's decisionmaking process.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Comparison of Alternatives and Relative Risk Rankings: These rankings are very subjective and unscientific. For example in Table 3.04-70, the Wildlife rankings for Alternative 3 is 5 (least impact) while Alternative 5 is 2 (great impact). There are minor differences between these two alternatives from looking at the indicators in Table 3.04-69. Yet the rankings imply they are significant! Among the four action alternatives, there are minor differences in the environmental consequences as few unauthorized routes are proposed for designation (15.53 to 106.12 miles). However, the risk rankings (based on a score of 1 to 5) indicate major differences in risk. ROC recommends you delete all of these tables from the FEIS as they are not helpful in comparing the alternatives. (#152)

Public Concern # 218. The Forest Service should review the Purpose and Need for this travel management plan because:

- **A) it implies a pre-determined outcome and bias;**
- **B) it should be amended as follows: eliminate widespread cross-country motor vehicle travel and move to a system of designated roads, trails, and areas consistent with the TMR and the EOs on use of off-road vehicles on public lands; address degradation of environmental, social, and cultural resources associated both with unauthorized routes and current system roads, trails, and areas, as identified through Travel Analysis; use science-based analysis to identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands and identify roads that are no longer needed to meet Forest resource management objectives and that, therefore, should be decommissioned or considered for other uses, such as for trails; provide opportunities for motorized and nonmotorized recreation within the carrying capacity of the land (minimizing damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, cultural sites, and other resources of the public lands; and minimizing harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats); adjust**

both the core transportation system and recreation travel network in light of funding limitations for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement; and address public safety concerns, user conflicts, private property rights, lost nonmotorized recreational opportunities, and impact to natural soundscapes and air quality that have arisen or might be expected to arise given recent trends in motorized use;

C) it doesn't accurately reflect that the origins of most of the unauthorized routes on the STNF are former temporary roads built for timber harvest, the statement that "Unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails ..." is inaccurate, and the DEIS did not address these roads by adding them to the NFTS or decommissioning them, and is now blaming the users for their existence.

Response: Several commenters requested that the Purpose and Need statement in the EIS be adjusted or adhered to in a variety of ways. The Purpose and Need statement is derived from identifying discrepancy between the existing condition and the desired future condition. The statement is defined by the STNF Forest Supervisor and reflects the underlying Purpose and Need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the Proposed Action (40 CFR 1502.13).

Forest Service direction states, "The Purpose and Need statement defines the scope and objectives of the proposal. A well-defined Purpose and Need statement narrows the range of alternatives that may need to be developed in the "alternatives" section. It describes in detail why action is being proposed at that location and at that time. In this way, the Purpose and Need reflects the difference between the existing condition and the desired condition. The analysis may be tiered to other EISs that influence the scope of the analysis or support the rationale for the need for action (40 CFR 1502.20). If a forest plan amendment is included, it should also describe why there is a need for this project to vary from the LRMP to move toward the desired condition" (FSH 1909.15 part 22.3).

The commenter states that the Purpose and Need statement in the DEIS is inaccurate regarding the proliferation of unauthorized routes; that the routes are actually temporary FS roads built for timber harvest and then not added to the system or decommissioned. In some cases that is correct. In some cases, routes predate current site-specific planning regulations. The STNF does not have comprehensive historical data for the inventory of unauthorized routes and cannot pinpoint the origin of every route. It is very likely a mix of former timber harvest roads and newer user-created routes. While arguments can be made regarding the origins of the unauthorized routes, there is no question that the conditions to be addressed in implementing the TMR do exist on the STNF. There is unmanaged cross-country motor vehicle travel causing unacceptable damage to natural and cultural resources. Much of this use is occurring on unauthorized routes that receive no maintenance or mitigation to protect resources.

Another commenter believes the outcome of this analysis is predetermined because the Purpose and Need statement calls for limited additions to the NFTS. The STNF did not attempt to restrict the additions of unauthorized routes to the NFTS. All routes requested by the public were considered, and the Forest proposed as many as possible that would benefit motorized vehicle opportunities and access, while adhering to law, regulation, and policy and protecting the site-specific resources of the STNF. Each alternative responds to the significant issue of motor vehicle IDT team selected routes that would provide diverse motorized experiences as is indicated by the variety of vehicle classes assigned to the proposed routes. They range from motorcycle-only trails to roads allowing all vehicle types. Routes were selected for addition to the NFTS, and motorized mixed use proposed on existing roads, based on their ability to enhance connectivity, quality, diversity, and access for motor vehicle travel. See Appendix A for route-specific data such as assigned vehicle types.

Another commenter requested that the Purpose and Need statement be revised to reflect the intent of EOs and Subparts A and B of the TMR. The STNF Forest Supervisor identified the scope of the analysis (FEIS, page 5), which is narrowly focused on the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel and the limited additions of roads, trails, and areas to the NFTS. The purpose of this analysis is to implement Subpart B of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
I was then and am now very concerned that this process is very flawed. After reviewing several Forest NOI?s and DEIS's including the Shasta- Trinity, my concerns have been warranted. The Forest has used the $12 million OHV grant to inventory and close our legal OHV routes instead of adding them to the NFTS. When the purpose and need

states that there will be limited additions to the NTFS that shows both a pre-determined outcome and a bias against OHV's. (#160)

Subconcern # B
We recommend strongly that you adjust the purpose and need statement, as follows, to reflect more accurately the intent of the Executive Orders, Subparts A and B of the Travel Management regulations, and the purpose of travel planning. We have identified the following needs for this proposal: the need to eliminate widespread cross-country travel and move to a system of designated roads, trails, and areas consistent with the Travel Management regulations and the Executive Orders on use of off-road vehicles on public lands; the need to address degradation of environmental, social, and cultural resources associated both with user-created routes and current system roads, trails, and areas, as identified through Travel Analysis; the need to-by way of a broad-scale, science-based analysis-"identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of National Forest System lands" and identify roads that are "no longer needed to meet forest resource management objectives and that, therefore, should be decommissioned or considered for other uses, such as for trails"; the need to provide opportunities for motorized and non-motorized recreation within the carrying capacity of the land (minimizing damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, cultural sites, and other resources of the public lands; and minimizing harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats); the need to adjust both the core transportation system and recreation travel network in light of funding limitations for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement; and the need to address public safety concerns, user conflicts, private property rights, lost non- motorized recreational opportunities, and impact to natural soundscapes and air quality that have arisen or might be expected to arise given recent trends in motorized use. (#151)

Subconcern # C
The Purpose and Need (page 2) states that "Unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails ..." I find this very hard to believe. The DEIS has painted a picture of destruction left by OHV/ATV users when nothing could be further from the truth. Like the Lassen NF, the bulk of the unauthorized routes on the Shasta-Trinity were developed as temporary roads for timber sales over the last 50 years that were never properly addressed and added to the NFTS or were never decommissioned. This is an Agency issue that should not be blamed on recreational use. This DEIS is a major step towards shutting down the National Forest to a select group of users and that is unacceptable. (#167)

Public Concern # 221. The Forest Service should reanalyze the effects of engine noise propagation around roads and trails.

Response: All of the action alternatives would reduce engine noise around roads and trails by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel (FEIS, Table 3.01-1, page 88). Measurement Indicator 2 as described on page 87 of the FEIS looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on nonmotorized recreation (dust, noise, use conflicts). It also addresses the effects on "quiet" recreation. The method chosen was the number of acres within 0.5 mile of an area where motorized use is allowed (designated roads, trails, and areas in the NFTS miles that would result under each alternative). This method was determined through a literature review of sound studies and reports listed in Chapter 4. Also, this method could be performed and readily applied by the Forest recreation specialist utilizing existing GIS data. There are no LRMP standards for noise propagation that would require the analysis recommended in the comment.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Shasta-Trinity National Forest inadequately considers the potential impacts of the propagation of engine noise around roads and recreational trails in either its route-specific assessment or its analysis of cumulative impacts of the motorized system. Many spatial models and software packages are available for analyzing potential noise propagation from transportation systems, including a GIS model that our office (TWS) recently developed for the specific purpose of analyzing noise propagation from off-road vehicles in forest landscapes. The model we developed is based on the System for the Prediction of Acoustic Detectability (SPREAD), a workbook issued by the Forest Service and Environmental Protection Agency for land managers to "evaluate potential "acoustic impacts when planning the multiple uses of an area." We adapted the SPREAD model to a GIS environment so that potential noise impacts could be integrated with other variables being considered in the travel management planning process. We have included the user's guide for the SPREAD-GIS model as an appendix to this document (Appendix C), and we would be happy to provide an up-to-date version of

the software at your request. The SPEAAD-GIS model can be implemented in your existing ArcGIS software at no additional cost. (#151)

Public Concern # 223. The Forest Service should ensure that the travel management planning process accommodates the legitimate concerns of motorized users.

Response: The commenter expressed concern that specific objectives and needs of the public, and potential workable suggestions were eliminated from detailed analysis (Chapter 2) simply because of the timeframe allotted to complete this analysis, and that this analysis should be considered the initial step in refining the management of motorized travel on the STNF. The FS understands this perspective and agrees that there is much opportunity to continue the conversation. This analysis is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

It is the process that apparently does not accommodate many of the legitimate concerns of motorized users. For example, the MTM process does not allow for suitable consideration of the needs of motorized "dispersed camping." The responsible official determined that "dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of the surface of NFTS roads" should be eliminated from detailed study because it "would require extensive additional analysis," and "it is not feasible for the Forest to complete the required site-specific analysis needed to implement a travel corridor." Similar reasons were given for eliminating detailed study of other workable suggestions from motorized users. Clearly, the MTM process is on the fast track and unable to accommodate the complexity and intensity needed to truly solve the challenges of motorized travel at this time. The MTM process, then, must be viewed as simply the "first shot" at refining the management of motorized travel. The reasonableness of the proposal must be viewed in the light of this necessity. Also, it has been my perception that the majority of people offering opinions on this process seem to favor the maximum amount of motorized access that does not significantly impair environmental standards or that does not detract from the obligation to balance multiple uses of the National Forests. (#132)

Public Concern # 225. The Forest Service should engage in formal consultation to comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Response: In an effort to streamline consultation on route designation for the national forests of Region 5, the USFWS and the USFS developed regional programmatic project design criteria (PDC) for the designation of unauthorized roads, trails, and areas for recreational wheeled motorized vehicle travel. By using the design criteria and eliminating impacts in northern spotted owl Critical Habitat, the Forests are able to maintain either a No Effect or May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination under the ESA without further USFWS consultation. (See the ESA determinations associated with each alternative, and the Biological Assessment prepared for the Preferred Alternative. Current system roads, trails, and areas are not subject to these criteria or consultation.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest Service must engage in formal consultation over the proposed action. By not conducting formal consultation according to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Forest Service fails to comply with the ESA. (#91)

Public Concern # 226. The Forest Service should coordinate and collaborate travel planning and analysis with all other federal, state, and local land management agencies to ensure that federal decisions are as consistent as possible with local guidelines and policies, and ensure a seamless transportation system for the public.

Response: The STNF is committed to involving the public and state, local, and tribal governments in all stages of the Travel Management planning process, but must do so within the mandated timelines set by the Chief of the Forest Service for this staged implementation of the TMR. The Chief of the Forest Service directed all national

forests to complete Subpart B of the TMR by the end of 2009 and the Forest remains on track to do so. Subpart A of the TMR provides a framework for ongoing evaluation of the NFTS and coordinated planning and collaboration with state and local governments, and members of the public.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Management of motorized travel on the Shasta-T NF is a prudent and reasonable goal. In making the transition from an unmanaged state, motorized travel will obviously be restricted to a much smaller level of access. How this occurs on federal land is a matter for the federal land management agency to decide. Siskiyou County is more than 62% federal with most of it managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS). In August of 2008, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution #08-153 (attached) asserting legal standing and formally requesting coordination with federal and state agencies. In response to the USFS MTM initiative, in November of 2008, Siskiyou County further adopted Resolution #08- 186 (attached) regarding Motorized Access and/or Travel on Federal Lands in Siskiyou County. The intent of this latter resolution was to assist the USFS in federally mandated coordination with the County on the MTM effort. A key element of that Resolution states, "that before any road, trail or area on federal land is closed to motorized access and/or travel, all reasonable mitigations and alternatives should be explored in order to prevent closure" Essentially, within the context of prudent environmental protection and balancing multiple use, the County policy seeks to maximize motorized access. While federal law does not require the USFS to completely toe the line on such local government policies, it does generally require that the USFS "coordinate" with local government to insure that federal decisions are 'as consistent as possible" with such locally expressed guidelines. While coordination between the County and the Shasta-T has been somewhat active, the level of achieving consistency could be greater in some areas. For example, many of the suggestions "dismissed from detailed study" can be reasonably mitigated and thus allow the USFS to accomplish their mandates while being consistent with the policies of local government. I am hopeful that further refinements of the Shasta-T management of motorized travel will help accomplish a higher level of consistency. (#132)

Public Concern # 227. The Forest Service should ensure they print enough hardcopy maps.

Response: Due to the large area studied in this analysis (2.1 million acres), the hardcopy maps must be at a scale that clearly depicts the proposed routes, many of which are short spurs. The map set accompanying the FEIS is comprised of more than 60 large color maps and are costly to reproduce. Therefore, the STNF cannot print maps at that large scale for individual use but the map sets are available for viewing at the Forest headquarters in Redding, California and all Ranger District offices. Electronic maps have been distributed with the FEIS on DVDs and are available at www.fs.fed.us/r5/shastatrinity/. In addition, a MVUM will be published upon completion of a Record of Decision.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Print enough hard copies of your FEIS maps for those who need them to understand your proposals and provide meaningful comments. (#152)

Public Concern # 228. The Forest Service should change the DEIS maps and:

A) show ML 1 roads and extend mapping beyond the boundaries of NFS lands;
B) use a more publicly accessible format for electronic maps;
C) include additional information on the FEIS maps in order to be useful for public comment and feedback.

Response: The alternative maps accompanying the FEIS are developed primarily to depict the actions proposed in each alternative within the project area. As stated in Chapter 1, "The area analyzed for travel management includes all STNF NFS lands outside of designated wilderness, an area covering approximately 1.6 million acres. Private, State, county, other Federal lands, or other ownerships are excluded from the project area." At this time, the Forest could not propose routes that cross boundaries with other jurisdictions without first seeking right-of-way agreements or other authorities to allow such travel. This would be a possibility to explore in the future, as necessary.

A) One of the purposes of this analysis is to make limited additions to the existing NFTS for the benefit of motorized recreation and access. Since ML 1 roads are closed to public travel and not proposed for opening or any other use in this analysis, they are not depicted on the alternative maps.

B) The five alternatives in the FEIS require a total of more than 60 large maps to depict the proposed additions to the NFTS and other elements of the alternatives. Other map formats available such as Google Earth and ArcGIS would require purchase and installation of specific software. In addition, Google Earth was not used because the data quality (accuracy, precision) displayed is not known. GPX and GPD file formats are not common to the general public. Most recreation-grade GPS units used by the public limited storage capacity, which would be inadequate for the NFTS roads, trails, and proposed routes. The FS chose to use the PDF format because the viewing software (Adobe Reader) is readily available at no charge to the general public, and the PDF maps are easy to navigate. Each map element used on the PDF maps meet USDA Forest Service GIS data quality standards.

C) Several commenters requested that additional information be included on the alternative maps, such as existing unauthorized routes, identifiable names, landmarks, waterways, and numbers. Some feel that maps are formatted in a way that makes it impossible to make informed comments or locate the routes on the ground. The intent of the maps is to depict the proposed elements of each alternative. In an effort to keep the maps readable with clear definition of the Proposed Actions, including additions to the NFTS, vehicle classes, and seasonal restrictions, additional information not related to the proposals was largely excluded from the maps. Unauthorized route inventory maps and other STNF maps are available for the public's use, if needed to better inform their comments.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
This has been further complicated by the use of presentation maps that excluded all Level I roads and mapping that ends abruptly at the boundaries with Six Rivers National Forest. (#80)

Subconcern # B
Your use of multiple maps for each quadrant of the forest makes it hard for people to learn and understand these closures. Was this done on purpose? I enjoy looking at and studying maps, and I consider myself at least familiar with how they are to be used and often times while in the forest, I still don't know exactly where I am. Why wasn't an easier format used, similar to the .gpx, .gpd files and maps used by GPS units. (#85)

Subconcern # C
Inventoried routes and route ID numbers identified on the Inventory maps and NOI have been excluded from the DEIS maps. It has been all but impossible to address specific routes and make informed comments. The No-Action Alternative Map in the DEIS does not reflect the true condition on the ground. The maps do not reflect the 1,252 miles of "unauthorized routes " as displayed in the Notice of Intent. Over 1,246 miles of "unauthorized routes " have been removed from alternative 1. We want the agency to correct this omission to Alternatives 2, 4, and 5, and its analysis to reflect the true existing condition. (#139)

Public Concern # 230. The Forest Service should correct the maps to show all the trails in the Weaverville Basin Trail System and ensure the management proposals for trails subject to the STNF and Trinity County Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in compliance.

Response: The referenced MOU is between the FS and the Trinity County Resource Conservation District (RCD). It was signed in May 2006 and supports the collaboration between the parties for trail construction and maintenance in the Weaverville Basin and Lewiston areas to provide for construction and maintenance of a trail system that will "enhance the recreation experience of hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians and, to a limited extent, off highway vehicles (OHV)". The maps provided as part of this project would only show inventoried motorized trails. Other trails that may be part of the Weaverville or Lewiston trail systems but are not motorized trails would not necessarily be shown on the maps. The MOU calls for annual meetings among the parties to discuss an array of topics related to the trail network including maintenance schedules, construction requests, environmental analysis needs, signage, etc. The need for data collection and accuracy in mapping should be a topic for discussion at the next annual MOU meeting. The TMR specifically provides for future collaborative efforts in the development and maintenance of motorized routes. The MOU with the Trinity County RCD provides a good framework to accomplish this collaborative effort.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Some of the motorized Weaverville Basin Trail System trails are not shown on the alternative maps. It is my understanding that the STNF and the Trinity County Resource Conservation District signed an MOU and collaborated on the creation of this trail system. In particular, the section of trail that connects 34N01Y and 34N34

is not shown on the final maps. I believe that that section of trail is incorrectly indicated as signed for closure. Please update the maps to include this connection. (#138)

Public Concern # 232. The Forest Service should extend the comment period:

A) because there are a number of travel management plans coming out in a compressed timeframe;
B) for 45 days to provide more time for the public to comment;
C) to adequately advertise for public comment;
D) and provide for a 45-day comment period for the FEIS so the public has adequate time to review the substantive changes from the DEIS.

Response: The STNF followed CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, which specify a minimum 45-day comment period on a DEIS (40 CFR 1506.10(c)). The Forest understands that reviewing and commenting on a large and complex document, such as the Travel Management DEIS, can be time-consuming and in response to public requests, extended the comment period to 60 days.

Notice of the original comment period and the extension was provided as required by FS regulations with notices in the Federal Register, newspapers of record, as well as posting on the STNF's website. Several articles were published in the media to alert the public regarding the opportunity to comment.

To make this review as efficient as possible for the public, the STNF has made every effort to provide the information needed to submit meaningful comments on the DEIS, including hosting a series of informational meetings, developing a concise yet site-specific DEIS organized by resource area, and designing maps that use accessible technology to facilitate comparison of the alternatives. Providing a 60-day comment period gave the public additional time to review and comment on the DEIS, while still allowing the STNF to implement the TMR and publish and MVUM within the required national deadline.

Due to the limited scope of changes to the analysis and alternatives between Draft and Final EIS, the FS will not be providing an additional public comment period prior to publication of the ROD. While consideration of public comments on the DEIS and further study and new information did lead to adjustments in the alternatives and analyses, these changes did not result in discernibly different levels of effects. Changes include revised protection measures for lake bottom cultural sites, elimination of seasonal closures for northern spotted owl on the lake bottoms and routes, and additional information and analysis regarding herpetafauna, motorized mixed-use, and cultural resources. See "Changes between Draft EIS and Final EIS" summary in Chapter 2 of the FEIS for further details.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
I would also suggest that you immediately extend the comment period as most other Ca R/5 forests have. If the ST Doc is like other forests, 45 days is NOT sufficient for the public to dissect and make substantive comments. This has been the case with forests recently. Please remember that the PUBLIC is getting hit with 16 of these in our state. (#1)

Subconcern # B
We request you extend the public comment period for an additional 45 days (#7)

Subconcern # C
We would like it if you would extend the comment period and try to get more advertising out there of the situation. (#99)

Subconcern # D
Provide an additional 45 day public comment period on the FEIS so the public can review the many changes from the DEIS and submit their comments prior to issuance of the Record of Decision. (#152)

Public Concern # 234. The Forest Service should provide empirical data to show that motorized recreation opportunities will be severely reduced.

Response: Data reflecting the existing conditions and the effects of all alternatives is included in each resource section in Chapter 3. The effects to motorized recreation in terms of miles of unauthorized routes available and proposed for addition to the NFTS, acres of areas proposed, and acres open to cross-country motor vehicle travel, are discussed in the Recreation section in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Federal Register Notice also states that implementing Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule "will severely reduce motorized recreation opportunities relevant to current levels. As a PO Box 52 result, there is a need to consider limited changes and additions to the type of use permitted on existing NFTS roads as well as potential additions to the NFTS ". This is a galling statement for the aforementioned reasons. In addition, the Forest Service fails to include any empirical data to support motorized recreation opportunities will be severely reduced. The STNF is about 2 million acres in size and has about 5,145 miles of roads available to highway legal vehicles resulting in about 389 miles of roads per acre of land . There are 3,786 miles of roads available to all vehicle classes resulting in about 528 miles of road per acre . In reality, these numbers are actually higher when you exclude wilderness areas and watersheds where motorized vehicle use is prohibited. (#91)

Public Concern # 235. The Forest Service should ensure it is properly interpreting Subpart B of the TMR because:

A) in section 212.55(a) of the TMR it requires "provision of recreational opportunities" in identifying the NFTS, rather than minimizing motor vehicle travel and that is what the DEIS is proposing to do;

B) nowhere in Subpart B does it state that providing motorized recreational opportunities is a primary need; however the term "motor vehicle use" is used in the context of the objectives of minimizing damage to natural resources, harassment of wildlife, and conflict among users.

Response: This analysis was conducted in accordance with all relevant law, regulation, and policy, including the TMR 36 CFR part 212; NEPA, the CEQ regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), USDA NEPA Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1b), FS NEPA Procedures (36 CFR part 220), FSM Chapter 1950, and the STNF LRMP. The Purpose and Need for action is based on Subpart B of the TMR (FEIS, Chapter 1, page 7). The FS identified "Reduced Motorized Access and Recreation Opportunity" as a significant issue to be addressed in this analysis through the development of Alternative 5, which provides the highest level of motor vehicle access and opportunity of all the alternatives. The IDT evaluated all routes requested by the public during scoping and weighed resource risk if the route were added to the NFTS against the motorized recreation benefit provided by the route. The STNF has adhered to the TMR with proposed additions to the NFTS, including roads, trails, areas, and motorized mixed-use, that offer the best balance of protecting resources while providing recreational opportunities as the TMR requires.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The EIS rejects the proposal to add all unauthorized ATV routes to the NFTS, based on the false statement that subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (39 C.F.R. 212) "requires" that motorized vehicle use be "minimized." No such language is found in the TMR. To the contrary, section 212.55(a) of the TMR requires "provision of recreational opportunities" in determining the NFTS. The proposed action already will prohibit any cross-country ATV use. The roads and trails are already in use, and comprise only 20 square miles of the forest. Non-motorized areas therefore take up the remaining 3260 square miles of the forest, meaning that greater than 99% of the forest is available for only non-motorized use. Since the provisions of the TMR and of the MOU both require the Forest Service to provide recreational opportunities for public use and enjoyment, where is the data to show greater than 99% of the forest users are nonmotorized? No such data exits. The proposed action described in the EIS is based on false assumptions and false claims. (#105)

Subconcern # B
Furthermore, we believe the Forest has misinterpreted the purpose of Subpart B of the Travel Management regulations in writing its purpose and need statement. The purpose of proposed travel management actions under 36 CFR 212 Subpart B is clearly established: to designate roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use and prohibit motor vehicle use off those designated routes and areas (i.e., ending widespread cross-country travel).5 The general criteria for designating roads, trails, and areas are also clearly established in Subpart B: the responsible official shall consider effects on "natural and cultural resources, public safety, provision of recreational opportunities, access needs, conflicts among uses of National Forest System lands, the need for maintenance and administration of roads, trails, and areas that would arise if the uses under consideration are designated, and the availability of resources for that maintenance and administration." The Forest, however, has elevated to the same level as ending cross country travel the need for changes to the Shasta-Trinity NFTS to "maintain motor vehicle access to dispersed recreation activities" and the need to "provide a diversity of wheeled motorized recreation opportunities." But nowhere in Subpart B of the Travel Management regulations is it stated that providing motorized recreational opportunities is a primary need. In fact, the term "motorized recreation" is never used in Subpart B. The term "motor vehicle use" is used, but only in the context of the objectives of minimizing damage to natural resources, harassment of wildlife, and conflict among users. (#151)

Public Concern # 236. The Forest Service should analyze the unsurveyed, unauthorized routes that were originally excluded because the TMR does not allow eliminating routes for consideration by ignoring them in the process.

Response: The STNF's process for developing the Proposed Action is described in Chapter 1 and Appendix G. Unauthorized routes were selected based on several steps including field surveys, District Ranger recommendations, recreation benefits, and results of the preliminary effects analysis conducted by the earth science team. Some routes, which may be appropriate additions to the NFTS, were not selected because field surveys could not be done given time and staffing constraints. The TMR does not require all unauthorized routes to be evaluated, nor does it preclude further analysis and additions to the NFTS in the future. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

It is not the purpose of this document to develop a conceptual OHV plan, but forethought and consideration to future opportunities must be a part of the decision process. The process of developing the proposed action illustrates this oversight. The five step process described on page 10, Chapter 1 says district rangers recommended routes to add to the system. Field surveys were conducted on "most" routes recommended by the rangers. Not all recommended routes were surveyed due to time constraints, wildfire and weather. If a route was not surveyed, it was not included in the proposed action. Some of these routes may have great potential for implementation into the transportation system now or in the future. Failure to examine them at this point in the planning process is not consistent with direction provided in the travel management rule. Nowhere does the direction allow elimination of routes for consideration by ignoring them in the process. (#147)

Public Concern # 237. The Forest Service should ensure that it meets the scope and intent of the TMR by also implementing Subpart A of the TMR as a part of this travel management plan:

- **A) because the impacts of implementing Subpart B cannot be assessed without considering the road and trail network as a whole;**
- **B) to align the transportation system with maintenance and enforcement capabilities;**
- **C) because Subpart A is designed as the 'left side' analysis that is used to inform designations under Subpart B;**
- **D) and develop a new Proposed Action and DEIS;**
- **E) because there is no evidence of previous administrative decisions or NEPA analysis for much of the NFTS;**

F) or include in the ROD for the Forest Travel Management Plan, a statement that it will amend the Plan following a comprehensive roads analysis;
G) which will identify the minimum road system rather than simply adding unauthorized routes to the NFTS, which is required in the FS Roads Policy (36 CFR 212.6(b)(1);
H) and consider closure of NFTS and unauthorized routes;
I) and examine the environmental impacts of the existing NFTS, as well as additions to the NFTS;
J) and consider a full range of alternatives;
K) and describe the monitoring, maintenance, and enforcement plans;
L) and address NFTS roads, motorized trails, and unauthorized routes in areas of resource concern as recommended by The Wilderness Society, such as: not designating any unauthorized routes in concern areas; decommissioning or keeping some NFTS roads open depending on monitoring results and the concern areas; and closing some motorized trails to motorized use or keeping some trails open depending on monitoring results and the concern areas.

Response: The TMR is comprised of three parts: Subpart A - Administration of the Forest Transportation System; Subpart B - Designation of roads trails and areas for motor vehicle travel; and Subpart C - Use by over-snow vehicles. The focus of the current action is to implement the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel contained in Subpart B of the TMR in order to protect the cultural and natural resources of the national forest and to add routes and designated areas to the NFTS so that the recreation goals in the LRMP are achieved (FEIS page 7). The identification of the minimum road system needed for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands is contained in Subpart A of the Travel Management Rule. Travel analysis is a tool developed to assist with that process (FSM 7709.55). The FS is committed to fully implementing the TMR. However, there is no legal requirement in the regulations to implement Subpart A as a pre-condition to, or part of, the current Proposed Action. The STNF decided to complete Subpart B prior to Subparts A and C because: 1) In 2006, the Chief of the FS directed the STNF to complete the identification of designated roads, trails, and areas on a MVUM as required by Subpart B by the end of 2009. The FS believes that the greatest urgency lies in establishing a designated system of roads, trails, and areas and prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel. The clear identification of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle travel will enhance management of NFS lands; sustain natural resource values through more effective management of motor vehicle travel; enhance opportunities for motorized recreation experiences; and address needs for access to NFS lands; and 2) The permanent prohibition on travel off of the designated system of roads, trails, and areas (36 CFR 261.13) will aid enforcement of motor vehicle travel by substituting a regulatory prohibition for closure orders and providing for a MVUM supplemented by signage. This prohibition cannot take effect until designated roads, trails, and areas are identified on a MVUM. Implementing the prohibition without first undertaking an analysis of unauthorized routes would likely lead to unacceptable consequences on recreational access.

Designations of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle travel are not permanent. Completion of travel analysis as required by Subpart A of the TMR, unforeseen environmental impacts, changes in public demand, route construction, and monitoring may lead the STNF Forest Supervisor to consider revising designations under 36 CFR 212.54. As such, travel planning is considered as an ongoing process and the NFTS is updated or amended regularly.

Actions such as closing existing NFTS roads or unauthorized routes are not analyzed in this FEIS. Such actions are initiated if indicated by monitoring or through project analyses. The STNF Forest Supervisor determined that existing programs and actions involving road decommissioning are adequate, and that closure activities would be outside the scope of this project.

The environmental effects of the proposed additions are disclosed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. The impacts of the existing NFTS were not evaluated in this analysis other than the safety implications connected to the ML 3 roads which are proposed for motorized mixed use as described in Chapter 2, the Transportation section in chapter 3, and Appendix C.

The IDT developed Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 in response to the significant issues raised by the public during scoping. Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, was developed in response to public comments. The FS also evaluated 12 alternatives submitted by the public, which were eliminated for detailed analysis as described in Chapter 2 (FEIS page 55). The range of alternatives considered is adequate and reflects the values and interests expressed by the public during this analysis process.

Monitoring is described in Appendices D and L, Enforcement is described in Appendix E, and Maintenance is discussed in the Transportation section of Chapter 3, as well as in Appendices A and F.

The STNF regularly evaluates the existing NFTS roads and trails as part of other planning efforts and environmental analyses for vegetation management, watershed restoration, fuel treatment, and other projects. These site-specific analyses evaluate existing transportation system and unauthorized routes in the project area, and may propose and decide to close or decommission system roads and trails, or add routes to the transportation system. These decisions are based on the Purpose and Need for the projects, the project-level travel analysis planning conducted in the project areas, and the conclusions reached in evaluating environmental effects. In addition, repair and maintenance of the existing NFTS is routine and ongoing across the national forest and is not part of the Purpose and Need for this analysis.

While this analysis does not close existing NFTS roads and trails in the concern areas requested by the respondents, the STNF addressed the request, in part, by using those areas as a screen to exclude proposed additions to the NFTS in Alternative 4.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest has not completed a Forest-wide science-based travel analysis of the transportation system, which includes a determination of the minimum road system and identifies other roads for decommissioning, routes that are impacting resources, and an examination of the economic and management capabilities of the Forest. This includes policing the private individuals growing crops on public property managed by the Forest Service as well as maintenance of culverts and attention to road failures. We want the Shasta-Trinity to focus on doing this based on science. The current transportation system continues to allow motor vehicle use in ecologically and socially important roadless areas, Riparian Reserves, and in habitat containing sensitive plant and wildlife species. (#153)

Subconcern # A
It is important to note that the Travel Management Rule1 which drives the development of the DEIS is not merely an off-highway vehicle (OHV) rule, but rather applies to all public motor vehicle use on National Forest System (NFS) lands.2 Hence, we believe that it is the legal responsibility of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest to consider any changes to the baseline transportation system as within the scope of the proposed action. Unfortunately the scope of the DEIS seems limited solely to additions to the transportation system. Some unauthorized OHV routes are well sited and provide excellent opportunities for motorized recreation, while some system routes are poorly-sited, ecologically damaging, or conflict with non-motorized recreationists. Therefore, in order to comply fully with the intent of the Travel Management Rule, all routes " system and non-system " should be considered for designation or closure. The Travel Management Rule has identified the need to "provide the minimum transportation system needed for safe and efficient travel by the public and for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands. "This need cannot be met without considering changes within the entire transportation system. (#118)

Subconcern # B
We acknowledge the constraints of funding and resources, and the current efforts to address NFTS maintenance requirements; nevertheless, we had hoped the Forest Service would take this opportunity to review and rationalize the NFTS, pursuant to Travel Management Rule direction to identify the minimum road system needed (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart A); to address known road-related resource impairments and use conflicts of both the existing NFTS and unauthorized user-created system; and to align the transportation system with maintenance and enforcement capabilities. We note a similar request has been made by Senator Feinstein (see attached letter) and Congress (H.R. 1105 Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 Conference Report.

Route designations are only part of what is needed to reduce the ongoing adverse impacts to water quality and other resources from the NFTS, We continue to believe a more holistic approach to travel management planning, whereby route designations are guided by travel analysis, known locations of resource impairment, and prior determination of the minimum road system needed, would better serve the long-term interests of the public, Forest Service, and National Forest resources. (#164)

Subconcern # C
We believe that the Forest is improperly restricting its purpose and need statement to reflect only Subpart B of the Travel Management regulations. In doing so, the Forest is sidestepping regulations that have been in place since 2001 and is missing an important opportunity to evaluate the entire transportation system. Subpart A of the Travel Management regulations is intended to be a pre-NEPA "left side" analysis that is used to inform designations under

Subpart B. It is therefore logical, and necessary, that conducting analysis under Subpart A precede designations under Subpart B. If Subpart A is postponed due to the urgency of ending cross-country travel, then new routes should not be designated under Subpart B until the minimum road system is determined under Subpart A. Without knowing the minimum system, new routes might be designated stemming from roads that are found to be unneeded. (#151)

Subconcern # D
The Shasta-Trinity National Forest should immediately conduct a broad-scale, science based Travel Analysis as required by the Travel Management regulations, document its findings in a Travel Analysis report, identify the minimum transportation system, and publish a list of routes recommended for decommissioning. After these steps have been completed, the agency should develop a new proposed action and analyze this proposal along with a full range of reasonable alternatives in a new DEIS, including an alternative that incorporates the NFTS route decommissioning recommendations of The Wilderness Society, et al., as outlined in our "scoping" comments. (#151)

Subconcern # E
The Shasta-Trinity DEIS makes a fundamental error by placing existing system routes outside of its direct and indirect impacts analysis. To justify this action, the Forest relies mistakenly on Travel Management regulations which state that the responsible official may incorporate previous administrative decisions regarding travel management made under other authorities, including designations and prohibitions of motor vehicle use, in designating National Forest System roads, National Forest System trails, and areas on National Forest lands for motor vehicle use under this Subpart.

This justification is misguided for two reasons: 1) We have no record of previous administrative decisions regarding travel management in spite of our request (September 8, 2008 scoping comments) to the Forest to provide us with a summary of those decisions. The only information the Forest has provided is INFRA transportation data that lacks the crucial and relevant columns of data labeled event, event_subtype, and event_date, which would have described the transportation planning documentation, decision documentation, and the dates on which these decisions were made. 2) Even if we had received records of previous administrative decisions regarding travel management, this does not relieve the Forest from analyzing, in the context of this proposal, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of these previous decisions on social, cultural, and natural resources. The Travel Management regulations allow the Forest to incorporate previous decisions into designations of those routes (which is not a NEPA process); the regulations say nothing of incorporating previous decisions into the analysis of the impacts of those routes. We suspect that many existing so-called "system" routes have never been subject to NEPA analysis for direct and indirect impacts to natural and cultural resources. Moreover, those routes for which the Forest might be able to provide NEPA decision documents or other previous administrative decisions would need to be analyzed for impacts given their role as long-term recreational motor vehicle routes that would appear on a widely-available Motor Vehicle Use Map as opposed to impacts from their use at the time of construction. Finally, by not conducting travel analysis on and considering the environmental impacts of the entire transportation system, the assessment of cumulative impacts is deficient under NEPA. (#151)

Subconcern # F
Even in the event that the Forest chooses an alternative that designates only the current transportation system, we expect an explicit statement in the Record of Decision or elsewhere that Congress has directed the Forest to conduct a travel analysis and to identify unneeded roads, and hence the Forest will be amending the travel plan following a comprehensive science-based roads analysis. (#151)

Subconcern # G-K
Please note that during the scoping period your colleagues in the EPA requested that: 1) Route designations be guided by travel analysis and prior determination of the minimum road system needed; 2) The Forest Service consider closure and future de-commissioning of authorized and nonauthorized routes that may no longer be needed for management objectives; 3) The Forest service evaluate the environmental impacts of both the existing transportation system and the proposed addition of unauthorized routes; 4) The DEIS consider a full and reasonable range of alternatives; and 5) The Forest Service describe in detail how the designated system will be monitored, maintained and enforced. Hence the EPA agrees with our organizations that for the Forest Service to consider a full range of reasonable action alternatives, and follow the directives of the Travel Rule, the agency must identify the minimum road system rather than simply adding user-created routes to the existing system. We remain perplexed at the decision of the agency planners to ignore these common sense requests. (#118)

Public Concern # 238. The Forest Service should adopt a clear, responsive, and implementable strategy for implementation and enforcement of changes needed to the Travel Management Plan, as a result of monitoring and ensure dedicated funding for the Travel Management Plan monitoring strategy.

Response: Dedicated funding for monitoring would be at the discretion of Congress through the annual appropriations process. However, it is the responsibility of the FS to see to it that monitoring is accomplished. The TMR requires monitoring of the effects of motor vehicle travel on roads, motorized trails, and designated areas (36 CFR 212.57).

Monitoring is critical for evaluating the effectiveness of management decisions and the accuracy of analysis assumptions and conclusions. Monitoring of road, trail, and area conditions is required each year. Road and trail condition surveys are conducted using a random sample and must meet national standards. If monitoring or road and trail condition surveys determine motor vehicle travel on a national forest is directly causing or will directly cause considerable adverse effects on public safety or soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, or cultural resources associated with that road, trail, or area, the STNF Forest Supervisor, in accordance with 36 CFR 212.52(2) of the TMR shall immediately close that road, trail or area to motor vehicle travel until the official determines that such adverse effects have been mitigated or eliminated and that measures have been implemented to prevent future reoccurrence (FEIS, page 51). Appendices D and L provide additional information on specific monitoring elements.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Develop, describe, and implement a Travel Management Plan Monitoring and Enforcement Strategy. It is important that wildlife protection, vegetation management, and erosion control goals be achieved to minimize the potential adverse effects of the Travel Management Plan. We believe the public and decision makers would benefit if a strategy is developed that includes specific information on funding, monitoring and enforcement criteria, thresholds, and priorities.

Recommendations: We recommend development of a detailed Travel Management Plan Monitoring and Enforcement Strategy. Such a strategy should include specific information on monitoring and enforcement priorities focus areas (e.g., issues, specific locations), personnel needs, costs, and funding sources. We recommend the FEIS demonstrate that the proposed monitoring and enforcement strategy is adequate to assure that motorized vehicle use will not violate access restrictions or exacerbate already identified road-related resource impacts. We recommend the monitoring and enforcement strategy be periodically updated (e.g., annually or biennially). (#164)

Public Concern # 240. The Forest Service should fully disclose and analyze the efficacy of seasonal or year-round closures as mitigation measures designed to protect significant environmental values.

Response: Seasonal closures for water quality protection have substantial value in reducing sediment delivery to adjacent stream channels. Traffic volume is well documented as being a major influence on sediment production from road surfaces and has been studied by several researchers ((Reid and Dunne, 1984; Swift, 1984; Bilby et al., 1989; Burroughs and King, 1989; Coker et al., 1993; Foltz, 1999; Ziegler et al., 2001). Many of these researchers report a range of doubled to thirty times the sediment production attributable to traffic volume. Further, studies that included concentration samples from storm events or simulated storm events indicated that there are short-term increases in production due to the saturated road surfaces. Therefore, by reducing overall traffic volume, and specifically wet weather traffic volume, it is expected that sediment production and sediment delivery to stream channels will be reduced.

Seasonal closures within threatened and endangered species habitat reduces disturbance to species during critical breeding and brood rearing seasons. These specific seasons are very stressful to individuals. Attempts by people to get close to animals may have detrimental effects on the animals themselves, causing increased stress, alteration of feeding behavior, changes in habitat use, and den abandonment (Boyle and Samson 1985, Cassirer et al. 1992). Griffiths et al (1993) also suggests that animals may even change their period of activity toward a more nocturnal lifestyle in order to avoid people.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Throughout the DEIS the Forest Service relies on seasonal or year-round closures to mitigate the environmental and economic impacts of its travel management proposals. If the Forest Service intends to rely on seasonal closures, gates, or barricades as mitigation measures designed to protect significant environmental values (such as wildlife and watersheds) from damage, then the efficacy of those closure methods must be fully disclosed and analyzed. (#118)

Public Concern # 241. The Forest Service should consider route network enforcement as a significant issue to drive alternative design and analysis which may help identify alternatives that minimize the need for enforcement.

Response: Enforceability of the TMR is certainly a concern but the FS saw this as a factor to be applied equally across all alternatives rather than a factor to drive a specific alternative. Resource protection and access were the central issues in development of alternatives (FEIS, page 19). As a matter of policy and law, enforcement of the laws and regulations related to travel management will be enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal laws and regulations (FEIS page 73).

As with any change in a regulation on NFS lands, there is usually a transitional period for the public to understand the changes. It is anticipated there will be a higher number of violations to the TMR the first few years and the number of violations will decline as the users understand and comply with the rules. Once the MVUM is published, the implementation of the established dedicated network of roads, trails, and areas with signs and user education programs, will reduce the number of motor vehicles traveling off of designated routes. Providing motorized recreation opportunities in popular, key areas will help relieve pressure to travel off of designated routes (FEIS, page 73). We also expect that collaboration with our partners and education will help to reduce enforcement needs over time (See Appendix E - Law Enforcement for additional discussion on this topic).

Sample Public Comment(s):

The EPA has identified the efficacy of route network enforcement as a significant issue: For the public motorized travel management plan to adequately protect natural resources, the Forest Service must ensure the enforceability of the route network. Research regarding OHV use has demonstrated that signs and barriers are not always effective in closing roads and trails nor in reducing impacts and protecting forest resources. This information indicates that enforcement of a route network is both necessary and difficult.

Recommendation: We recommend the DEIS describe in detail how use restrictions will be enforced and what approaches have been successful. EPA encourages the Forest Service to consider enforcement as a significant issue driving the design and analysis of alternatives for motorized travel management. Designing and evaluating alternatives based on the potential for unauthorized use could result in alternatives that help minimize the need for enforcement. Please note that your colleagues in the Ashland Resource Area of the Medford District BLM concluded on page III-110 of the Deadman's Palm EA that barricades are seldom 100 percent effective in eliminating autos and trucks, and they don't stop any of the OHV-type of vehicle use. Consequently, even with barricades in place the negative impacts of noise disturbance, increased poaching potential, and the potential for over hunting remain. As the Medford BLM has not posted that EA on-line, a hard copy of the Deadman's Palm EA is available from KS Wild at your request. These findings are relevant to the Forest Service's forthcoming decisions regarding closure methodologies for roads and routes that are not appropriate for motorized use by the public. Tragically, the difficulty of keeping agency gates locked and vandalism-free has consequences for human health and safety: http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/travel/2003517023_webkimfamily09.html The DEIS failed to contrast the above examples of ineffective closure mechanisms with the apparent successes of the nearby High Cascades Ranger District in the Rogue-Siskiyou National Forest of preventing illegal motorized use through law enforcement presence enabled by the agency's green dot program. (#118)

Public Concern # 242. The Forest Service should allow concurrent use while mitigation measures are implemented to bring routes up to standards before they are added to the NFTS. The FEIS should include a schedule of when pre-mitigation measures will be implemented in each alternative to inform the public when the proposed routes will be available for use.

Response: Roads or trails that are added to the NFTS will meet their designated maintenance level and be available for use when the MVUM is published. There is no allowance in FS policy for authorizing public travel on designated roads and trails that do not meet standards. If the route does not meet standards, it will not appear on the MVUM and will not be added to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Implementation of Mitigation Measures. It is stated that some routes will require mitigation measures to be completed prior to the route being added to the system. Much of the required mitigation is routine maintenance. This requirement is overreaching and would pose adverse impacts to motorized recreation. We want the Forest to re-evaluate this requirement and allow use where mitigation activities can occur concurrently. (#139)

Public Concern # 243. The Forest Service should include FS activities that affect water quality and soil movement in the travel management analysis.

Response: The cumulative effects analysis conducted by resources, including soil and water resources (Chapter 3) includes consideration of known past, present, on-going, and reasonable foreseeable future actions and are listed in Appendix B.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We note that the STNF has omitted the effects of some of these activities in their analysis. Examples include;

A. The effects to water quality and erosion of road surfaces from early season snow removal on native surfaced roads for tree planting activities.

B. The use of forest roads during rain and wet season periods to access fuel reduction projects for burn activities. Each of these activities often requires vehicles to be chained up to access the project sites. We suggest these activities provide more of an impact to water quality and movement of soils than all of the effects generated by public use combined. (#139)

Public Concern # 244. The Forest Service should remove Best Management Practices (BMP) that respond to new road construction and remove BMP 2-26 as it is outside the scope of this analysis.

Response: Some of the routes that are proposed to be added to the FS road and trail system will require some improvement to meet FS road and trail standards. These improvements will generally include installation of road drainage features and measures to reduce road surface erosion and improve road surface conditions. The commenter is correct about BMP 2-26, which was inadvertently left in the list of appropriate BMPs for this project. It has been removed in the FEIS, as it is outside of the scope of this project.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We want the STNF to remove BMP 2-26 from this document as it outside the scope of this analysis. (#139)

NEPA – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Cumulated Effects

Public Concern # 310. The Forest Service should complete field studies to determine the appropriate "risk rating" and to correctly identify the data required for each alternative in order to appropriately compare alternatives in Chapter 2 because:

A) the effects on key viewsheds determined for Alternative 1 seems contradictory to the "no negative effect" determined for alternatives that add routes;

B) the conclusions for non-native invasive species in Alternative 1 is over-reaching and unsupported by science and inconsistent with its application as an indicator;
C) field checks are necessary to ensure there are no resource problems before they are designated for recreational motorized use.

Response: A) Alternative 1 has the potential to cause negative scenery effects, because when cross-country motor vehicle travel is allowed, unauthorized routes have the potential to appear at random anywhere and seen from key viewshed areas. Unauthorized routes have the potential to appear in a manner that conflicts with an area's visual quality objective; that is, appearing too dominant for their setting. Route additions included in Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 were analyzed with that in mind, and would not have been proposed if the analysis performed revealed they might exceed adopted visual quality objectives for their setting.

B) The noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with FS standards and EO 13XI2 Invasive Species 64 FR 6183 (February 8, 1999). At the beginning of the project, the STNF Forest Supervisor directed the IDT resource specialists to use existing data to analyze effects from noxious weed species. In the absence of known data, unsurveyed roads were assumed to have occupied habitat and assigned a "high risk." Assumption of occupied habitat is a common tool for biological analysis. This method ensures that the most conservative conclusions are drawn. Specific mitigations for noxious weeds, including treatment of known sites, were listed in the DEIS Appendix D page D-26, Table D-9. Overall, the project reduces the risk of noxious weed spread from the current condition by eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel to include IRAs. A full discussion of project effects on noxious weeds can be found in the Botanical BA/BE Appendix A: Noxious Weeds Risk Assessment. This document can be found in the project record and is summarized in the FEIS in Chapter 3.08.

C) Each route considered in this analysis was looked at individually in a site-specific manner using the data sources as noted in each resource section in Chapter 3. Formal field surveys were conducted on many of the routes considered, while other routes were recommended, or not, based on resource databases and the field knowledge of local FS staff. All routes added to the NFTS will meet FS standards for public travel, which provide for safety and resource protection, prior to designation and publication of the MVUM.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A B
Chapter 2, Comparison of Alternatives by Effects. We have found that much of the summary data displayed in this table is overreaching conjecture and are in conflict within the separate alternatives presented. Example 1. Visual Resources indicate Alternative 1 has the potential to have effects on key viewsheds yet when routes are added to the system in all other alternatives there is no negative effect. This brings into question the validity of unauthorized routes providing a dominant appearance on the landscape rather than a sub-dominant appearance due to the lack of canopy removal and small footprint that these routes place on the landscape. Example 2. Non-native Invasive Plant Species. The statement found under Alternative 1 is an over reaching conclusion that is not supported by sound science and is not consistent as defined with its application as an indicator. We want the agency to complete field studies to determine the appropriate Risk rating and to correctly indentify the data required for each alternative. This information is required to appropriately compare the alternatives. (#139)

Subconcern # C
We believe however, that the DEIS is flawed in the following ways: The Forest did not perform adequate site-specific field checks of unauthorized routes. Because these routes are unofficial and many are user-created, these routes should be checked on site to ensure that there are no resource problems before they are designated for recreational motor vehicle use. (#151)

Public Concern # 312. The Forest Service should reanalyze the existing condition to include the footprint and existing impacts of the 1,252 miles of inventoried routes and the effects of eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel, and then reanalyze all alternatives based on the new existing condition to display the neutral, beneficial, or adverse effects of increasing or decreasing access miles by volume of traffic, traffic type, and use rates.

Response: Alternative 1 (No Action) is the current condition, including the footprint and existing environmental impacts of the unauthorized routes. The effects associated with this network of unauthorized routes are disclosed in Chapter 3. Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel and the environmental effects are

disclosed in Chapter 3. The alternatives propose adding a range of mileages to the NFTS, and the effects of these mileages are noted in the each resource section in Chapter 3 and compared in Chapter 2. Data regarding traffic volumes, types, or use rates on the unauthorized routes is largely anecdotal or very localized and would not be useful for comparison among the alternatives. However, some of the resource analyses are based on assumptions regarding use of the routes and vehicle types. Please refer to the list of assumptions at the start of each resource section in Chapter 3 for more information, as well as the methodologies and environmental consequences.

The FEIS did not include the section cited by the commenter (Unavoidable Adverse Effects); however the FEIS is updated to define and discuss the possible occurrences of neutral , beneficial, and adverse effects related to the alternatives. Whether an effect is neutral, beneficial, or adverse is a resource and site-specific determination. Each resource specialist evaluated the alternatives for effects using a set of measurement indicators relevant to the resource and specifically selected to assess the effects of the Proposed Actions. Each resource area in Chapter 3 describes the measurement indicator development and rationale tied to the Purpose and Need for the project, as well as law, regulation, and policy.

The analyses in Chapter 3 may include measures suggested by the commenter if relevant for particular resources. For example, miles of proposed routes are evaluated for all resources. Vehicle types are not relevant for effects on most resources, but are included in the recreation analysis. Anecdotal traffic volume and use rates are meaningful for cultural resources but not for most other resources. The incremental effects mentioned by the commenter are disclosed in the analyses of the five alternatives, each proposing a different level of additions to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences. This section refers to Effects can be neutral, beneficial or adverse yet nowhere in the DEIS are these terms defined or applied in the analysis. This section along with neutral, beneficial or adverse effects, and their application to the decision making process is vital in allowing the deciding official to make an informed decision. (#139)

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Wildlife. Again, this document has failed to display the threshold of use to terrestrial and aquatic species to determine the range of positive, neutral and adverse affects. The STNF has used the existing condition and all past human and natural activities to establish a baseline of condition for analysis and comparison of affects by alternative. This baseline condition needs to include the footprint and existing impacts of the 1,252 miles of inventoried routes and the effects of eliminating cross-country use. The agency has failed to analyze and determine the affects of these miles in relation to terrestrial and aquatic species impacts. More than 80% of these routes are over 25 years old and most impacts resulting from the creation of these routes have diminished to a point of immeasurable significance to the watershed. Age of the activity is an important factor when analyzing cumulative effects. The elimination of cross-country travel and reduction of use from the deletion of over 1,209 miles of routes can only reduce the baseline affects of the existing condition including road/trail densities and stream crossings. The reduction of use, road/trail densities, and stream crossings are not analyzed nor compared to any action alternatives anywhere in the document. Elimination of cross-country travel is the only activity that makes a measurable effect. The agency's findings of adverse affects for any of the action alternatives is conjecture based on a false implication that the actual miles of use will be increased. We believe the true mileage of use will be decreased by at least 1,209 miles. There is very little difference between alternatives when you look at the indicators in Table 3.04-69, but the value rankings would imply they are significant difference between the four action alternatives. There are is virtually no differences in environmental consequences between the ranges of routes proposed, yet the risk rankings would display (#139)

major differences in risk. We suggest that the addition of routes to support motorized recreation will not adversely change the risk factor. The findings by the agency within this section as incomplete as they may be, have documented that there are no adverse effects that would cause Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources. The agency simply states that one alternative may have more of an effect because it offers more routes. Again, failing to establish a threshold based on miles to weigh and compare the impacts of each alternative. We want the agency to strike any analysis, references and conclusions that would state there were any adverse affects resulting from additions of any action alternative. We want the agency to strike this section as written and perform an analysis that displays the incremental affects of increasing or decreasing (1,252 miles and cross-country travel) access miles by volume of traffic, traffic type, and use rates. This analysis must display the threshold of routes and the effects of removing cross-country travel for all terrestrial and aquatic species on the STNF. It is our belief this more complete analysis will allow more routes to be designated and continue to be a beneficial effect to terrestrial and aquatic species. (#139)

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Unavoidable Adverse Effects. This document has failed to display a range of environmental affects relating to the number of miles of routes, volume of traffic, traffic type, and use rates. The threshold of effects has not been determined to quantify how many miles results in a positive, neutral or adverse affect. Therefore the statement that all alternatives would result in some unavoidable adverse environmental effect is purely conjecture and not founded by science or analysis results. We want the agency to strike this section as written and perform an analysis that displays the incremental affects of increased access miles by volume of traffic, traffic type, and use rates. This analysis must display what is the threshold for miles of routes on the STNF. (#139)

Public Concern # 314. The Forest Service should include the effects of the existing 1,252 miles of unauthorized routes into the baseline existing condition when quantifying road and trail densities, and stream crossings, because then the resulting cumulative effects analysis would show a decrease in negative cumulative effects to watersheds and the routes requested by the Stewards of the Sierra National Forest should be added because the extra miles added to the NFTS would not adversely affect watersheds

Response: The baseline of 1,252 miles of unauthorized routes is included in the analysis for Alternative 1 (No Action). Alternative 1 is the baseline by which all the other proposed alternatives are evaluated. The analysis shows that there is a substantial reduction in road and trail densities and stream crossings for each of the action alternatives when compared to Alternative 1(FEIS Table 3.03-3). Routes which were not included in an action alternative were usually omitted because they were in conflict with some resource issue (watershed, wildlife, botany, recreation, or heritage resources). See Appendix G for detailed description of the screening process applied to routes requested to be added or removed from the NFTS during the scoping period.

Sample Public Comment(s):

As stated in previous comments, we note again, that the existing footprint and effects of the 1,252 miles of routes have been completely omitted from the existing condition baseline when quantifying road/trail densities and stream crossings. If the agency would have properly incorporated the existing affects of these routes into their analysis the results would have shown an even a greater decrease in negative cumulative effects to watersheds. Even with this omission, the STNF shows a decrease in negative cumulative effects to watersheds. Thus the Forest could reasonably increase the number of miles added to the transportation system without adversely affecting the watershed resources. We ask that the agency add the routes requested by the Stewards of the Sierra National Forest. (#139)

Public Concern # 317. The Forest Service should analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of system roads, as well as unauthorized routes, and consider the level of impacts currently existing on the STNF in meeting the need of providing a minimum transportation system while protecting natural resources because:

- **A) the cumulative impacts of adding new routes and the indirect impacts caused by increased traffic due to system and new routes being placed on a MVUM should be studied;**
- **B) additional miles of motorized access will further exacerbate these impacts;**
- **C) to include past activities in this analysis as stated in the soils resource, is an important deviation from direction on how the cumulative effects analysis is usually performed, therefore results that incorporate past activities should be deleted from the cumulative effects analysis.**

Response: As stated in Chapter 3, the cumulative effects analysis in this FEIS is consistent with FS NEPA Regulations (36 CFR 220.4(f)) (July 24, 2008), which state, in part: "CEQ regulations do not require the consideration of the individual effects of all past actions to determine the present effects of past actions. Once the agency has identified those present effects of past actions that warrant consideration, the agency assesses the extent that the effects of the proposal for agency action or its alternatives will add to, modify, or mitigate those effects. The final analysis documents an agency assessment of the cumulative effects of the actions considered (including past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions) on the affected environment. With respect to past actions, during the scoping process and subsequent preparation of the analysis, the agency must determine what information

regarding past actions is useful and relevant to the required analysis of cumulative effects. Cataloging past actions and specific information about the direct and indirect effects of their design and implementation could in some contexts be useful to predict the cumulative effects of the proposal. The CEQ regulations, however, do not require agencies to catalogue or exhaustively list and analyze all individual past actions. Simply because information about past actions may be available or obtained with reasonable effort does not mean that it is relevant and necessary to inform decisionmaking" (40 CFR 1508.7).

The evaluation of cumulative effects includes the existing conditions, present actions, on-going uses and activities, and reasonably foreseeable future actions as listed in Appendix B of the FEIS. Actions that could meaningfully affect resources were considered by each resource specialist as noted in the individual resource sections in Chapter 3. In all resource areas, the effects of the Proposed Actions were considered in addition to the effects of other present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. While it is understandable to believe that additional miles of roads would most likely worsen any existing environmental effects across the landscape of the STNF, this is not the case because the proposed routes were selected after careful consideration of resource risk. See the cumulative effects analyses in each resource section in Chapter 3 and the screening process described in Appendix G for additional information.

The effects analyses for most resource areas include consideration of the existing NFTS as part of the existing condition, or past actions contributing to cumulative effects. In many resource areas, miles of existing NFTS roads and trails are considered when evaluating the effects of adding miles to the NFTS. The commenter suggests that publication of the MVUM will cause increased traffic on existing roads and trails. This is speculative and considering it would not result in meaningful effects conclusions. See the resource section in Chapter 3 for rationales for the selected measurement indicators. Examination of the direct and indirect effects of the existing NFTS is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
As stated in previous comments, we note again, that the existing footprint and effects of the 1,252 miles of routes have been completely omitted from the existing condition baseline when quantifying road/trail densities and stream crossings. If the agency would have properly incorporated the existing affects of these routes into their analysis the results would have shown an even a greater decrease in negative cumulative effects to watersheds. Even with this omission, the STNF shows a decrease in negative cumulative effects to watersheds. Thus the Forest could reasonably increase the number of miles added to the transportation system without adversely affecting the watershed resources. We ask that the agency add the routes requested by the Stewards of the Sierra National Forest. (#118)

Subconcern # B
The cumulative effects analysis will likely have to be exhaustive considering the level of impacts currently experienced on the STNF. We fail to see how additional miles of motorized access will not further exacerbate these impacts. (#91)

Subconcern # C
The agency has stated that the cumulative affects analysis was derived from affects resulting from past, present and future activities, actions, and decisions on the soil resource. To include past activities in this analysis is an important deviation from direction on how the cumulative affects analysis is usually performed. As sited in Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Cumulative Effects, past activities would not be considered and the existing condition would be used as the baseline to compare the action alternatives. We want the agency to re-evaluate the cumulative effects analysis and strike any results that would incorporate past activities. (#139)

Public Concern # 318. The Forest Service should analyze the potential adverse effects of reducing the existing motorized recreation system, which includes:

- **A) a comparison of effects of existing and future growth of motorized use and elimination of cross-country motor vehicle travel considering a reduced road and trail system;**
- **B) displaying this baseline effect in your Cumulative Effects Analysis for each alternative;**
- **C) revising the Purpose and Need so that it addresses local conditions, trends, and future desired conditions specific to the STNF.**

Response: The No Action Alternative 1, under 3.01 Recreation Resources, presents the current motorized use situation on the Forest, and includes cross-country motor vehicle travel. Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 propose a reduction of motorized opportunities from current levels, due mainly to the fact that cross-country motor vehicle travel is prohibited. The recreation indicators (FEIS pages 85) are described and presented in a manner that intends to provide a basis of comparison for effects per alternative. The specifics of these effects, including the effects of the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel, are described in detail under the Direct and Indirect Effects to Motorized Recreation Opportunity in each alternative's section. The addition of roads, trails, and areas will expand the existing NFTS and will accommodate growth in motorized use if it occurs. Past, present, and future effects under each alternative, based on the proposed future actions, etc., are disclosed under the Cumulative Effects section for each alternative. Additional motorized routes could be added to the system over time as the travel management process continues into the future, and effects (direct/indirect, and cumulative) of these will be analyzed and disclosed through the NEPA process as they are proposed.

3.01 Recreation Resources, Affected Environment section addresses the quality of data in question regarding local conditions and trend types and describes the NVUM data. NVUM serves as the primary means of monitoring recreational activity and is updated every five years. Further use, trend, and information pertaining to the desired condition of the Proposed Action can be found in the Background section of Chapter 1 - Purpose and Need for Action. Some of the stated Purpose and Need for this analysis (FEIS, page 7) is likely similar to other travel management analyses around the region and nation because the TMR is effective nationwide and all national forests must implement it. However, the STNF Forest Supervisor for the STNF established the Purpose and Need for this project to reflect the local conditions and trends, such as use and management below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs, and the proposed non-significant amendments to the STNF LRMP. See Chapter 1 for a full description of the Purpose and Need, including components specific to the STNF. Information pertaining to the desired condition of the Forest can also be found in the Introduction section of 3.11 Socioeconomics of the FEIS. The adverse effects of use on a reduced road and trail system are identified. A reduced road and trail system has potential to cause crowding or concentrated use in certain area, and can affect dispersed recreation, which is addressed in the Environmental Consequences section for each alternative.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest Service has failed to develop the Purpose and Need that addresses local conditions, trends, and future desired conditions specific to the Shasta Trinity National Forest. We want the agency to; clearly display the current and future growth of motorized use, the elimination of cross-country use for the Forest; display its impacts on the existing roads and trails and the effects of this use on a reduced road and trail system; display this baseline effect in your Cumulative Effects Analysis for each alternative. The DEIS has failed to address potential adverse affects of use on a reduced road and trail system when developing the EIS. (#139)

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Recreation Resources. We are very discouraged to see that the recreation section has failed to describe and analyze the true effects and consequences of reducing the existing motorized recreation system (Alternative 1) to any of the other alternatives as proposed. Nowhere in this document is there any discussion or comparison of the effects of existing and future use. We want the STNF to re-evaluate this consequence and display the results in the final EIS. (#139)

Non-native Invasive Plants

Public Concern # 328. The Forest Service should correct the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequence in the Nonnative Invasive Plants section and:

- **A) remove any reference to survey requirements prior to designation of routes because the Purpose and Need is to eliminate cross-country motor vehicle travel and designate routes and areas where motorized use is allowed and this action doesn't constitute ground-disturbing activities;**
- **B) display the different impacts created as a result of location, use levels, and time of year; and reevaluate the conclusions found in the Assumptions Specific to the Noxious Weed Analysis section;**
- **C) address the direct effect of designating routes which confine the travel width from 2 to 12 feet, institute mitigations measures including reroutes and barriers as protections measures, and reevaluate conclusions in this section of the DEIS.**

Response: Open roads undergo continual ground disturbance, whether it is from the tires of vehicles, through maintenance (i.e., grading), or other uses. Roads are especially vulnerable to noxious weed invasion, because roads undergo continuous regular disturbance and most noxious weeds thrive in open environments.

Location: impacts were analyzed in the Noxious Weed Risk Assessment by location through the use of GIS. Route locations were overlaid with noxious weed locations, and impacts were analyzed where they intersected. Therefore, location was integral to the analysis.

Use level: data on use level is mostly anecdotal for most routes and therefore, it is a more conservative approach to analyze effects from routes as being even across all routes, regardless of anticipated amount of use.

Time of year: Seasonal restrictions would have negligible effect on weed dispersal and spread since primary use would occur during the growing season. The primary concern with weed spread is ground disturbance and vectoring of noxious weed seeds. Seasonal closures do not affect routes during this critical time period. (Assumptions Specific to Nonnative Invasive Species Analysis, FEIS, Chapter 3.08, page 440).

Direct effects to non-native invasive species were assessed using an area of 30 feet from the route. Use of this area was discussed in Assumptions Specific to Botanical Resources analysis (FEIS, Chapter 3.08, page 440). Mitigations are analyzed for each known site in the effects discussion by alternative. The effect of these mitigations (hand treatment of known sites) are taken into account in risk determinations (see FEIS Appendix D: Mitigation and Monitoring) for a complete listing by route.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Nonnative Invasive Plants. Our review of this section has raised several concerns.

A. This section is asserting the DEIS identifies ground disturbing activity in areas where noxious weeds are known or suspected to occur. Where the purpose and need is to eliminate cross country motorized travel and designate routes and areas where motorized use are allowed. This action does not constitute ground disturbing activities. We want any references to survey requirements prior to designation of routes removed from the final EIS.

B. Under Assumptions Specific to the Noxious Weed Analysis. This document does not provide the science that supports these assumptions. We want any simple mitigation measures including reroutes, and barriers are examples of protection measures that could be applied. We want the STNF to incorporate these points and reevaluate your conclusions in this section references to these assumptions removed from the final EIS.

C. Under Noxious Weeds Indicators and Methodology. This section fails to describe what and how impacts are created based on numbers of miles of roads and routes in relation to plants and their locations. We want the STNF to display the different impacts created resulting from location, use levels and time of year and reevaluate the conclusions found in this section.

D. This section does not address the direct effect of designating routes which confine the travel width from 2 feet to 12 feet. By implementing these routes and eliminating cross country travel you eliminate any effects to plants that are not located directly within the travelway, and within the 100 and 200 foot corridors. For use areas and route travelways containing plants of concern, simple mitigation measures including reroutes, and barriers are examples of protection measures that could be applied. We want the STNF to incorporate these points and reevaluate your conclusions in this section. (#139)

Public Concern # 329. The Forest Service should conduct on-site surveys for noxious weeds on all proposed additional routes and should not designate routes until these surveys have been conducted and proposed mitigations are completed.

Response: The noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with NEPA standards. At the beginning of the project, the STNF Forest Supervisor directed the IDT resource specialists to use existing data to analyze effects from noxious weed species. In the absence of known data, unsurveyed roads were assumed to have occupied habitat and assigned a "high risk". Assumption of occupied habitat is a common tool for biological analysis. This method ensures that the most conservative conclusions are drawn. Specific mitigations for noxious weeds, including treatment of known sites, were listed in the FEIS, Appendix D. Overall, the project reduces the risk of noxious weed spread from the current condition by eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel. A full discussion of project

effects on noxious weeds can be found in the Botanical BA/BE Appendix A: Noxious Weeds Risk Assessment. This document can be found in the project record and is summarized in the FEIS, Chapter 3.08.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We were disturbed to find that the Shasta-Trinity NF did not conduct on-site surveys for noxious weeds on all proposed additions. We believe that routes should not be designated until on-site surveys have been conducted and after proposed mitigations are completed. Routes with noxious weeds should be put into a "bucket" and considered for designation only after the mitigation is completed. Weed surveys should be done for all routes proposed for motor vehicle use; weeds on system routes may pose unacceptable threats of spreading weeds. Those routes should be closed unless or until that threat is adequately mitigated. (#151)

Public Concern # 330. The Forest Service should include a discussion in the cumulative effects analysis for all alternatives concerning weed populations on existing NFTS routes and the potential for those populations spreading to other areas of the STNF through vehicles or other vectors.

Response: Cumulative effects occur where there is a direct overlap in time and space with the incremental effects of this project, and other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects (FEIS, page 68, Chapter 3.08 and Appendix B). Known weed populations are considered in the cumulative effects analysis for both TES plants and nonnative invasive plants where these sites occur on or near routes found in the action alternatives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Cumulative effects analysis for all alternatives should include a discussion of weed populations on existing NFTS routes and the potential for those populations being spread to other areas of the forest through vehicle or other vectors. This should include the potential for spreading weeds from infested NFTS routes to newly designated routes. (#151)

Public Concern # 331. The Forest Service should prohibit unnecessary roads to prevent the spread of invasive weeds.

Response: All of the action alternatives reduce the risk of spreading noxious and invasive weeds by eliminating cross-country motor vehicle travel on unauthorized routes. The noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with NEPA standards. Specific mitigations for noxious weeds, including treatment of known sites, were listed in the FEIS, Appendix D. A full discussion of project effects on noxious weeds can be found in the Botanical BA/BE Appendix A: Noxious Weeds Risk Assessment. This document can be found in the project record and is summarized in the FEIS, Chapter 3.08.

Sample Public Comment(s):

These unnecessary roads will increase soil erosion, degrade clean drinking water, fragment wildlife habitat, spread invasive weeds, and disrupt fishing and hunting opportunities. (#143)

Public Concern # 332. The Forest Service should conduct field reviews and based on these field reviews, assign risk ratings for weed introduction and spread, and disclose the findings in the FEIS.

Response: The effects analysis for the noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with NEPA standards. At the beginning of the project, the STNF Forest Supervisor directed the IDT resource specialists to use existing data to analyze effects from noxious weed species. Assuming occupied habitat in the absence of known data is a common tool for biological analysis. This method ensures that the most conservative conclusions are drawn. However, this criteria is applied evenly over all alternatives, so no alternative is favored in assigning project risk through the use of this technique.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Non-native Invasive Plant Species: Under Alternative 5, 212 unauthorized routes were assigned a "high risk" ranking because of a lack of recent surveys along them. They are "considered at high risk for weed introduction and spread" if added to the NFTS. This assumption is unreasonable and lacks a scientific basis. Risk ratings should be assigned based on valid field inventories. Please conduct these field reviews and describe the findings in the FEIS. As with the Cultural Resources section above, there is incomplete and missing information in this section for the public to fully understand and comment on the environmental effects. (#152)

Public Concern # 333. The Forest Service should protect IRAs from the introduction and spread of noxious weeds by prohibiting motorized access.

Response: All of the action alternatives would reduce the risk of noxious weeds in inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel and the motorized use of unauthorized routes. However, prohibiting motorized access on existing routes is outside the scope of this decision. The noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with NEPA standards. Specific mitigations for noxious weeds, including treatment of known sites, are listed in the FEIS, Appendix D. A full discussion of project effects on noxious weeds can be found in the Botanical BA/BE Appendix A: Noxious Weeds Risk Assessment. This document can be found in the project record and is summarized in the FEIS, Chapter 3.08.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Furthermore, the Executive Order on Invasive Species states that all federal agencies will use relevant programs and authorities to prevent the introduction of invasive species, and "not authorize, fund, or carry out actions that it believes are likely to cause or promote the introduction or spread of invasive species, unless, the agency has determined and made public its determination that the benefits of such actions clearly outweigh the potential harm." Given that roads and OHVs serve as corridors for exotic plant and disease invasion, and that invasion by exotic species is one of the four threats to the health of the National Forests identified by the former Forest Service Chief Bosworth, we believe that roadless areas should serve as refuges from motorized encroachment. (#151)

Out of Scope

Public Concern # 325. The Forest Service should reevaluate the directive that grants the exemption to perform the travel analysis because it is contrary to the TMR (36 CFR 212).

Response: Travel analysis is used both to identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of NFS lands as per 36 CFR 212.5(b), and to designate NFS roads, trails, and areas on NFS lands for motor vehicle travel per 36 CFR 212.51(a). The commenter refers to the travel analysis directives in the FSM, which were updated in January 2009 to align FS direction and terminology with the TMR. The directives do not exempt the STNF from conducting travel analysis but rather clarifies that identification of the minimum road system under Subpart A of the TMR is not required to inform decisions related to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for those administrative units already conducting the environmental analyses on a Proposed Action. The directives further states that travel analysis may address identification of the minimum road system and route and area designation decisions separately or simultaneously, and that proposals resulting from travel analysis may be addressed in the same or different environmental analyses. Identification of the minimum road system on the STNF is an on-going effort and is addressed routinely during project-level analyses, as is evidenced by the present and reasonably foreseeable road proposals identified in Appendix B of the FEIS.

We do understand the commenter's position that the STNF should examine the Forest's entire existing NFTS and identify the minimum road system prior to or concurrent with adding roads, trails, and areas. However, the Forest's approach is consistent with agency policy and will facilitate completion of this phase of travel management close to the agency timeline. As importantly, completing this phase of travel management at this time is the most effective and responsive approach given the public and agency's effort, time, and engagement in this process over the past several years. The public input and extensive data collected during this analysis provide valuable information in the continuing efforts to identify the minimum road system on the STNF. For further information on the Forest's response to this comment, see Chapter 2, "Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Analysis."

Sample Public Comment(s):

Unfortunately, the new directives also grant an exemption which relieves Forests that have released proposed actions before January 8, 2009, from the obligation to perform the Travel Analysis that the agency believes "can and should be used" to designate motorized routes. We could not disagree more strongly with this exemption. It is our opinion that the directives are meant to instruct Forest Service employees how to implement Travel Management regulations, not how to avoid them. We (and the U.S. Congress) believe that the exemption in the final directives is contrary to the Travel Management regulations at 36 CFR 212. (#151)

Public Involvement

Public Concern # 334. The Forest Service should allow comments to be amended after public review of data obtained from field checking the unauthorized routes listed for exclusion.

Response: Field survey results are in the project record and available for public inspection. Field survey results were one tool used to include routes in the alternatives, exclude routes from further consideration at this time, and assign mitigation measures as needed. In addition to survey work completed by the FS, several groups and individuals engaged in this process and have supplied the FS with helpful information on individual routes. The STNF Forest Supervisor did extend the comment period in response to public requests and appreciates the public's time and thoughtful input to this process.

The STNF is not specifically field-checking routes excluded from consideration at this time; however routes may be considered in future projects and surveyed for suitability for inclusion in the NFTS. The Forest appreciates any field survey information obtained from the public and any further comments for use in future discussions and analyses. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Due to unforeseen Forest Service delays in completing and releasing STNF's MTM DEIS, and to the timing of the release (at the beginning of summer vacation) we reserve the right to amend our comments to include data obtained from field checking the unauthorized routes listed for exclusion. (#9)

Public Concern # 335. The Forest Service should improve the public involvement process and:

A) make the Travel Management Plan more comprehensive, more logical and less confusing, and properly inform and include all STNF visitors;
B) include local residents and businesses in discussion about how all the stakeholders might or will be affected;
C) broaden and increase advertisements including TV and radio not just local newspapers, to reach the broadest public;
D) publicize and hold public hearings in affected areas;
E) ensure that the DEIS is on the website and not just available at physical office locations;
F) restore public trust by maintaining promises made concerning that this planning effort will not be used as a closure tool.

Response: Public involvement for this analysis is directed by the TMR (36 CFR 212.52) and other relevant law, regulation, and policy, including the implementing regulations for the NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), and policy as set in the FSH1909.15. Public involvement surrounding this analysis began in 2005 and has spanned more than four years with a wide spectrum of activities. Public meetings with a variety of objectives have been attended by numerous local individuals representing all interests (Public Involvement, Chapter 1). The public has contributed valuable information and perspectives to this analysis every step of the way. The STNF expanded beyond the requirements directed in law, regulation, and policy in an effort to reach out to all interested parties. Forest Service staff hosted public meetings, attended meetings sponsored by others, and met with special interest groups to clarify

submitted comments and discuss the analysis. Numerous articles have been printed in local newspapers and on various websites, and the Forest has maintained project information, including inventory maps, the Proposed Action, and the FEIS, on the Forest website: www.fs.usda.gov/stnf. In addition, public involvement has included two formal public comment periods, publishing project information on the Schedule of Proposed Actions, and publication of the Notice of Intent and the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register to announce the comment periods. Legal ads have been published in three local newspapers, and informational meetings were held in four different areas around the Forest during the DEIS comment period in an effort to clarify any points as needed. Television ads would be cost prohibitive for the FS and were not considered in this process due to the many other avenues used to inform and engage the public in a personal and collaborative manner.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The entire user group of forest visitors that will be affected by this plan need to be properly informed and included in this process to prevent legal backlash. There is obviously more at stake than the use of OHV's. For the public to support this plan, it needs to be more comprehensive, more logical, and less confusing. (#67)

Subconcern # B
The USFS should actually start over. The process needs to legitimately involve local residents and businesses in the discussion, and how all the stakeholders might or will be affected. (#92)

Subconcern # C
You need to properly put out the news about this. You need to put this on TV and radio and tell the people. (#93)

Subconcern # D
As for public hearings, I did not know of any public hearings. Why wern't the hearings publizised and held in the area affected? (#98)

Subconcern # E
The action seems to be far less than transparent. If the Forest truly wanted public input, the draft EIS could have been digitized and placed on their website inexpensively. To have to go to a location to physically read the document seems medieval. (#108)

Subconcern # F
As a stakeholder and active participant in the early stages (circa 2001-2003) of the Route Designation Process in California, BRC was highly skeptical of a state-wide route inventory and designation (RID) planning effort that was developed behind closed doors without a formal public process. BRC shared those concerns in the public comment period during various OHMVR Commission meetings and in talks with Region 5 staff. BRC was assured by Region 5 staff that the planning effort WAS NOT going to be used as a closure tool by federal agents to get "RID" of OHV trails. BRC believes this DEIS (essentially all action alternatives are closure alternatives) has created a serious breech in the public trust and violates the tone and direction of promises made to BRC that RIDITMR was not going to be used to implement massive landscape level closures of historic OHV trails. (#154)

Public Concern # 336. The Forest Service should display all routes requested by the public so that they understand why most were eliminated from detailed study and not proposed for designation, and provide the documentation for public collaboration regarding the reasons for submitting these routes.

Response: Appendix G has been revised to better describe the methodology used in developing the alternatives. As described in Appendix G, all routes requested by the public during the scoping period were considered during alternative development. The specific routes requested by the public during scoping are listed in the project record. Many of these routes requested were existing NFTS roads and therefore, not within the scope of this analysis to either add (since they already are part of the NFTS) or remove from the NFTS. Many of the remaining requested routes were eliminated from detailed study due to the screening criteria described in Appendix G and therefore, are not part of the decision supported in this FEIS.

Public involvement in this process has been extensive, including public meetings before and after the DEIS was published (Public Involvement, Chapter 1). Stakeholders were invited to and attended these meetings, which were helpful in clarifying specific interests, routes, and activities important to everyone. Information regarding public

involvement activities and all complete documentation regarding routes submitted by the public are included in the project record.

Sample Public Comment(s):

ROC was not aware of or invited to the November 2008 meeting with the OHV community. We are a local recreation group and have asked repeatedly to sit down with the STNF's interdisciplinary team to develop a travel management alternative that would best meet the purpose and need in the Forest's Notice of Intent (NOI) to: "Provide wheeled motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities . . .Provide a diversity of wheeled motorized recreation opportunities . . ." Approximately 618 routes are listed in Appendix G. Please display all routes (unauthorized and NFTS) requested by the public so that they understand why most were eliminated from detailed study and not proposed for designation. The analysis does not conform with NEPA regulations to describe the reasons for eliminating routes. One reason for eliminating many routes in Appendix G was "no access to water or documented dispersed site; no loop opportunity." Other reasons included "crosses other jurisdiction" or "access to private lands" or "no connection to NFTS or proposed route." These routes were submitted by the public for a reason. They exist on the ground and show evidence of motor vehicle use. There is no information in the DEIS if you contacted the requester to determine why a route was important and how it could be used to create loop opportunities or to provide access to a desired location. There is no information if the private landowner was contacted for authorization to use a route that crosses private land. This kind of collaboration is needed during travel management planning. (#152)

Public Concern # 337. The Forest Service should involve the public in a travel analysis and secure funding through the economic stimulus package.

Response: The FS appreciates the offer of help in evaluating the current NFTS through travel analysis funded through federal programs (Legacy Road and Trail Remediation and the Federal economic stimulus package, also known as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act). These funding sources are highly competitive and the STNF currently has no travel analysis funding secured under these programs and will not in the foreseeable future. The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR, and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We would like to be involved in travel analysis and are ready to assist in any efforts to evaluate the current transportation system. Congress, for the second consecutive year, has provided funding ($50,000,000) through Legacy Road and Trail Remediation which is specifically authorized for decommissioning work and can be used for conducting travel analysis. The President's economic stimulus package also provides funds which may be used for road decommissioning. (#151)

Public Concern # 338. The Forest Service should remove Significant Issue #2: Impacts on Nonmotorized Recreation because it fails to meet the criteria of a significant issue as described in Issues. This concern more accurately describes the unintended consequences of actions resulting from the concerns raised by Significant Issue #1.

Response: Significant issues are defined as "those that identify a point of disagreement, debate, or dispute based on the predicted effects of the Proposed Action. These issues are directly related to the Proposed Action and may be incorporated into the environmental analysis and addressed by (1) developing one or more alternatives to the Proposed Action, or (2) developing design features, mitigation measures, and/or monitoring tasks that are incorporated in the alternatives." The CEQ's regulations for implementing NEPA specify that agencies are required to "Study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources" (40 CFR 1501.2(c)). The alternatives considered in the DEIS were developed to resolve the conflicts (e.g., significant issues) raised by the public during the scoping period. Some scoping respondents felt that the additions to the NFTS included in the Proposed Action would not adequately alleviate the adverse effects of current motorized recreation use. Concerns

include effects to public health and safety and disruption of the recreation experiences sought by hikers, equestrians, and other nonmotorized users. The STNF appropriately identified this as a significant issue, which is addressed by Alternative 3 and which proposes no additions to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Issue #2; Impacts on Non-motorized Recreation. This issue as described, fails to meet the criteria of a significant issue as described in Issues. This concern more accurately describes the unintended consequences of actions resulting from the concerns raised by issue #1. This concern is more appropriately described as a non significant issue and be must removed as a separate significant issue (#139)

Public Concern # 339. The Forest Service should remove impacts to natural and cultural resources because as defined under NEPA, a significant issue becomes a non-significant issue when the concern has been mitigated. As noted throughout this document, mitigation measures for all natural resource and/or cultural resource concerns identified have been applied for roads, trails, and use areas brought forward by the IDT.

Response: The STNF Forest Supervisor does not have the authority to revise the TMR. The protection of natural and cultural resources is a component of the TMR at 36 CFR 212 and therefore, is incorporated into the Purpose and Need statement for this analysis. The analysis appropriately studies and discloses the predicted effects to natural and cultural resources. An extensive review of the routes brought forward for study indicates that in some cases, mitigation measures would not be feasible or their effectiveness is uncertain. These findings are disclosed in the Introduction and particular resource sections in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Issue #3; Motor Vehicle Resource Impacts. As defined under NEPA, a significant issue becomes a non-significant issue when the concern has been mitigated. As noted throughout this document mitigation measures for all natural resource and/or cultural resource concerns identified have been applied for roads, trails and use areas brought forward by the inter-disciplinary team. Therefore, impacts to Natural and Cultural Resources become a non-significant issue and should be removed as a significant issue. (#139)

Recreation Resources

Public Concern # 350. The Forest Service should reevaluate the recreation analysis using frequency of use, duration of use, speed, vehicle type, trail location, trail width, and vegetation type as analysis measures to compare project direct, indirect and cumulative effects as the use of road and trail mileages alone represents a fundamentally flawed analysis tool.

Response: As stated in the FEIS, Chapter 3.01, page 85, one of the assumptions disclosed is that data is lacking regarding use analysis of the unauthorized routes and it would be speculative to make assumptions of use levels on unauthorized routes. More data is always preferred when performing analysis, and knowing the precise types of use that occur on unauthorized routes, the volume, and the frequency of use would be ideal. However, the Agency has limited time and resources to perform such data collection, and directs its Forests to focus collecting such data on NFTS routes for inventory and management purposes. A qualitative approach for providing information on unauthorized routes, based on local knowledge and experience of Forest recreation staffs and the public during scoping, was relied upon when considering adding unauthorized routes to the system.

As stated in Chapter 3.01, page 85 of the FEIS, indicator measures are intended to address how each alternative (as the sum total of its Proposed Actions) conforms to the LRMP, significant issues identified in scoping, and Subpart B of the TMR. Indicators were developed based on information the Forest had readily available or could be easily generated. They are to help determine whether the motorized recreation opportunity conflicts with other recreation opportunities. These are specific to nonmotorized opportunities that include the proximity of motor vehicle travel to populated areas or neighboring private and Federal lands, the quality of the motorized recreation experience, and the quality of motorized access to dispersed areas for both motorized and nonmotorized uses.

Indicators developed also respond to the amount of motorized access available on the unit. To support the issues identified in scoping and Subpart B of the TMR, measurement indicators did analyze for duration of use (i.e., season

of use), vehicle type (to include route width), and effects to opportunity provided (i.e., miles and acreage) per alternative. Other factors such as trail location, frequency of use, speed, vegetation types, traffic levels, and public preference etc., were all factors considered for each route in the selection process as opposed to analysis of effects.

As stated in the Proposed Action, field surveys were conducted on most routes recommended by the District Rangers to collect site-specific data regarding the physical condition of the route, proximity to water bodies, apparent uses, and suitability for public use. Not all recommended routes were surveyed due to time constraints, wildfires, and weather conditions. If a route was not surveyed, it was not included in the Proposed Action. The use of road and trail mileage was the type of information the Forest had in its inventoried data to measure effects against, not frequency of use. Field survey data was considered in the screening process used to select or eliminate particular routes for further study in alternatives to the Proposed Action.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under assumptions specific to recreation analysis: Data is lacking regarding use analysis of the unauthorized routes (traffic counts, etc.); therefore, it would be highly speculative to make assumptions of use levels on the unauthorized routes. Exactly the reason why more time should be allowed to study what type of uses occur on unauthorized routes, how often they are used and impacts on recreation to closing those routes. (#85)

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Recreation Resources, Recreation Indicator Measures. The use of road and trail mileages as indicator measure alone represents a fundamentally flawed analysis tool. We challenge the validity of using this measure for the following reasons. Example 1: The agency has omitted the "frequency of use" as a very important analysis measure to compare project effects. This measure is vital to determine the true effects and must be included in the agency analysis. An example is comparing the effects of a route that has an ADT <2 to a route that has an ADT >15. We want the agency to re-evaluate the Recreation Analysis to consider the frequency of use on each specific route. Example 2: All vehicle types do not produce the same amount of disturbance. An example would be to compare a logging truck traveling 30 mph on a 2 lane aggregate road with an Average daily Traffic (ADT) count of 25 vs. a motorcycle or 4wd traveling less than 10 mph on a trail that has a footprint of 8 feet or less and an ADT of less than 2. Disturbance levels must take into consideration, road and trail widths, frequency of use and speeds. We want the agency to strike this assumption and re-evaluate the Recreation Analysis to consider the factors listed above. Example 3: A designed road will have removed vegetation; including canopy cover, where as single and two track trails will meander around vegetation without requiring vegetation removal. Each trail will have varying degrees of disturbance based on location, vegetation type, trail width and frequency of use. We want the agency to strike this assumption and re-evaluate the Recreation Analysis to consider the factors listed above. The following comments are consistent for all alternatives addressed in the section. The analysis used to determine the direct and indirect effects is fundamentally flawed because the analysis restricts the comparisons to mileage totals only. There is no science to suggest what number of miles would result in what type of an effect (adverse neutral, positive). The analysis must take into consideration traffic levels and types, duration of use and speeds. All action alternatives increase the number of users on designated routes by restricting use to a limited system; increasing impacts and maintenance costs. The DEIS fails to discuss trail use capacity on the STNF. We want the Recreation cumulative effects analysis to address the effects of increased use on a reduced trail system as proposed by the action alternatives. (#139)

Public Concern # 351. The Forest Service should reconsider and disclose in the recreation analysis that vehicle use and route closures do not affect bald eagle nesting and that the low quantity of cross-country motor vehicle travel on the STNF will limit bear encounters.

Response: Eagles are a Forest Service "sensitive" species. The STNF LRMP lists limited operating periods within 0.5 miles of bald eagle nests from January 1 to August 15. An analysis of possible impacts to eagles from human activity is found in the analysis of effects for each alternative in the FEIS, Chapter 3.05, Wildlife. Black bears are a "Management Indicator Species" used to evaluate effects on other wide ranging carnivores. Possible impacts to black bear habitat are discussed in each of the alternatives in the Wildlife analysis in Chapter 3. Encounters with black bears are not uncommon on the STNF. All of the action alternatives would likely reduce encounters with black bears by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under assumptions specific to recreation analysis: 3.04(in reference to bald eagle impacts and bear encounters) Vehicle use and closures of routes doesn't have much effect on nesting success. All you have to do is look at the highway 44 project and the success of determined eagles. When referring to bear incidents; the forest service report says "These impacts are expected to be infrequent because of the low quantity of cross-country travel on the forest" I say that is true for all species. Cross country travel is very limited; most prefer to stay on legal established routes. If all available unauthorized routes were to be added, in all likelihood, very few if any new routes would be added. (#85)

Public Concern # 352. The Forest Service should include an analysis of snowmobile impacts.

Response: As described in the FEIS, (Chapter1, page 9), designation of areas open to over-snow use is covered under 36 CFR 212, Subpart C, and is outside of the scope of this decision, which is focused on implementing 36 CFR 212, Subpart B of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We question why the proposal will not prohibit cross-country snowmobile use. Snowmobiles cause air pollution; noise pollution; disrupt wildlife migration and corridors; increase predation on some species by creating easier pathways through the snow; among other impacts. It would be prudent to include an analysis of snowmobile impacts in the EIS - indeed the EIS process is the opportune time to conduct such an analysis. If the Forest Service chooses not to include snowmobiles in the proposed action it had better have a legally sufficient reason as to why. (#91)

Public Concern # 353. The Forest Service should provide factual data that supports the increased usage and specifically identify what areas are experiencing the increased usage.

Response: In the FEIS, the Background section of chapter 1 provides factual support regarding the trend of increased OHV usage nationally and throughout the State of California. National forests generally do not patrol or measure use levels on individual unauthorized routes.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Independently Establish Increased Vehicle and OHV Usage: The DEIS needs to provide actual factual support that there is increased usage and these must specially identify what areas are experiencing the purported increased usage. Global and unsubstantiated assumptions are not appropriate in any environmental impact statement. (#100)

Public Concern # 354. The Forest Service should clearly articulate the relative use-levels and effects of motorized and nonmotorized recreationists among resource areas.

Response: The commenter states that the level of OHV use identified as the primary recreational pursuit on the STNF, as noted in the NVUM data, is small and that nonmotorized use generates greater economic benefits, has greater numbers, and is better for the land than OHV use. Because motorized use levels on particular unauthorized routes are largely anecdotal, resource specialists assumed use levels when analyzing environmental effects. In many resource areas, use levels do not influence the environmental effects. See the "Assumptions" sections in the resource areas in Chapter 3, well as the Methodology and Environmental Consequences sections for information on how use levels are incorporated into the analyses. Use level data in various vicinities below the high-water mark on Shasta and Trinity Lakes is in the project record and is generally addressed in the Recreation section in Chapter 3. National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) data encompassing many forms of motorized and nonmotorized recreation is discussed in the Recreation and Socio-economic sections in Chapter 3. This provides a picture of the existing condition regarding recreation uses across the STNF. The effects of nonmotorized use on the Forest’s resources are not analyzed; however the effects of motorized use on the nonmotorized experience are studied in the Recreation section in Chapter 3. Measures related to nonmotorized recreation include noise and dust.

Sample Public Comment(s):

As stated on page 76 of the DEIS, "as many as ten times the number of visitors seek nonmotorized forms of recreation than motorized" on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. Indeed, page 76 of the DEIS concludes that only 0.3% of Forest Users identify ORV use as their "main activity." Please note that non-local non-motorized forest uses create approximately three times the amount of labor income for services surrounding the Shasta-Trinity National Forest as compared to income derived from motorized use. See DEIS page 472. While ORV enthusiasts may attend open houses regarding this planning process and loudly decry any limits on their activities, hopefully the agency's final decision will be guided by what is best for the land and results the greatest good for the greatest number, rather than who shouts the loudest. (#118)

Public Concern # 355. The Forest Service should remove the Recreation Indicator Measures in the Nonmotorized Recreation Opportunity section of the DEIS because it is outside the scope and analysis to use a measurement indicator that looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on nonmotorized recreation.

Response: As stated in the FEIS, (Chapter 3.01, page 85), indicator measures are intended to address how each alternative (as the sum total of its Proposed Actions) conforms to the LRMP, significant issues identified in scoping, and Subpart B of the TMR. The effects of motorized use on nonmotorized recreation are a significant issue and appropriately analyzed. Proximity of motor vehicle travel to populated areas or neighboring private and Federal lands is one component of measuring the effects of motorized use on other users. Analyzing how motorized recreation opportunity conflicted with other recreation opportunities, specifically nonmotorized opportunities fell within the scope of analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Recreation Resources, Recreation Indicator Measures, Non-motorized Recreation Opportunity. Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on non-motorized recreation (dust, noise, use conflicts). It also addresses the opportunity for quiet recreation issue. This indicator measure as described above is outside the scope and analysis. We want the agency to remove this section and its analysis results from the final EIS. (#139)

Public Concern # 357. The Forest Service should reevaluate the roads that are segmented and allow for passenger vehicles and OHVs, as this will result in repeated OHV transportation from one location to another.

Response: Alternative 5 responds to the motorized recreation access and opportunities issue, Significant Issue #1, by providing the highest additional route mileage and reducing restrictions. Route additions and motorized mixed-use road segments were chosen to provide loops and extended rides. However, not all user demands, preferences, or desires are expected to be met. As mentioned on page 19 of the FEIS, the routes identified in the scoping process were either brought forward for detailed study in one or more alternatives or eliminated from detailed study. These decisions were made by the STNF Forest Supervisor based upon the Purpose and Need, the scope of the FEIS, and issues raised by the public and the IDT. See Appendix G for a discussion of alternative development. The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which requires identification and designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle travel.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I reviewed the maps that accompany the plan. The roads that will be available to the ORV group have been segmented by roads designated for passenger vehicles. This takes away much of the pleasure of ORV riding. It will require the repeated transport of an ORV from one location to another over roads that should be available for ORV use. (#73)

Public Concern # 358. The Forest Service should provide a connected system of OHV trails and roads that provide quality, distance, and varying levels of difficulty that will enhance motorized recreation opportunities.

Response: Alternative 5 responds to the motorized recreation access and opportunities issue, Significant Issue #1, by providing additional routes and reducing restrictions. Route additions and motorized mixed-use road segments were chosen to provide loops and extended rides. The analysis attempted to avoid subjectivity in terms of one person's perception of quality versus another person's so mileage provided is given instead. The Forest understands that not everyone's expectation of a quality motorized or nonmotorized experience will be met under any of the proposed alternatives, but the FS can consider revising route additions or classifications to respond to changing conditions or preferences in the future. As a practical matter, all of the action alternatives have at least 4,200 miles of ML 2 roads that are open to OHV/ATV use (FEIS, Appendix F: Annual Maintenance Cost by Alternative, Table F-1). Imbedded within this network of roads are numerous opportunities for a variety of riding experiences.

Sample Public Comment(s):

DEIS, Volume 1, Page 68, Measurement Indicator 3: Motorized Recreation Opportunity. The number of miles for each class of vehicle is not a useful indicator of the motorized recreation opportunity or the quality of the opportunity for non-highway legal vehicle travel. OHV users are looking for "time in the saddle" or quality, long distance rides and routes with varying difficulty levels according the National Off-highway Vehicle Conservation Council. Mileages alone do not indicate if these kinds of opportunities are provided. Many riders would like to travel across the STNF on a connected system of OHV trails and NFTS and other roads. In reviewing the maps for Alternative 5, there are still major gaps in the proposed system for non-highway legal vehicle travel. (#152)

Public Concern # 359. The Forest Service should analyze the alternatives using the proposed indicator for quality of trail experience because the STNF's OHV system provides numerous opportunities for long-distance touring (greater than 30 miles) across the STNF using connected NFTS, private and county roads, and motorized trails.

Response: Defining quality is subjective because it means different things to different people. The indicator that attempts to define and analyze for quality of the trail experience is a quantitative measure of miles of additions by trail class and a qualitative measure of difficulty. Something measurable and quantitative, such as mileage and area, is objective when comparing effects of the proposed alternatives, and the reader can then determine what that means to them in terms of quality. The results of this analysis are discussed in the Recreation section of Chapter 3. The commenter infers that quality may be measured by the opportunity for extended rides. Cumulative miles available by proposed addition to the NFTS, is not assessed in this analysis. However, the IDT evaluated the opportunity for loops and extended rides as a criteria for bringing a route forward for further study. This was considered an important recreation benefit when evaluating the risks and benefits of each route.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The DEIS attempts to evaluate "Quality of Trail Experience" on page 68 by using "Number of miles by trail class and degree of difficulty." However, this indicator is not used for evaluating the alternatives. Instead, page 72 rates "Quality of Trail Experience" by the "Number of facilities provided as a surrogate for number of dispersed sites access." The indicators in the Recreation section are not consistently evaluated under each alternative. In the FEIS, please analyze the alternatives using the indicator below. Proposed Indicator for Quality of Trail Experience: The Forest's OHV system provides numerous opportunities for long-distance touring (>30 miles) across the STNF using connected NFTS, private and county roads, and motorized trails. (#152)

Public Concern # 360. The Forest Service should provide for nonmotorized recreation without any potential conflicts.

Response: In designating roads, trails, and areas, local agency officials must consider minimization of conflicts among uses of NFS lands (CFR 212.55(a)).These regulations implement EO 11644 (February 8, 1972), "Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands," as amended by EO 11989 (May 24, 1977). These EOs direct Federal agencies to ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the

various uses of those lands. Opportunity for nonmotorized recreation will continue unimpeded as a result of implementing the TMR (See Chapter 3.01, Recreation). Further, national forests are managed by law for multiple use under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA). Balancing demands and expectations of users is an ongoing challenge of STNF's management. All of the action alternatives would reduce the potential for conflicts with nonmotorized user by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel on unauthorized routes. Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, does not add any new routes in IRAs.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The use of OHVs has been shown to be incompatible with non-motorized recreational activities because OHV activity reduces the opportunity for quiet recreationists to experience solitude (a measure of primitive and semi-primitive non-motorized experiences) and isolation from the sights, sounds, and presence of others. (#151)

Public Concern # 361. The Forest Service should evaluate the effects of motorized recreational crowding.

Response: In designating roads, trails, and areas, local agency officials must consider minimization of conflicts among uses of NFS lands (CFR 212.55(a)).These regulations implement EO 11644 (February 8, 1972), "Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands," as amended by EO 11989 (May 24, 1977). These EOs direct Federal agencies to ensure that the use of offroad vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands. The alternatives respond to the need to provide a wide range of recreation opportunities rather than the need to address current crowding or overuse. However, crowding or concentrated use is addressed for each alternative in the Recreation analysis in Chapter 3. If designated routes or motorized trails become overcrowded or lead to unacceptable concentration of use in the future, the FS can consider revising route designations to respond to changing conditions.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Travel Management Plan would essentially shove everyone into a few small areas. (#55)

Public Concern # 362. The Forest Service should evaluate the effects of restricted OHV use to persons with disabilities and senior citizens, and limiting dispersed access will limit persons with disabilities dependent on motorized transport.

Response: All action alternatives propose expanding the NFTS by adding miles of routes open to all vehicle classes. Many comments were received expressing a concern that the TMR was discriminating against persons with disabilities and senior citizens by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel. Implementation of the Subpart B of the TMR, including the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel, is forestwide and applies to all Forest users equally. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states a person who has a disability may not be denied participation, due to their disability, to a program operated by a Federal agency that is open to all other people. The requirement not to deny participation to a program also includes the requirement that a program is not to be changed just so people who have disabilities can participate more easily, if doing so would "fundamentally alter" that program. An example is allowing motor vehicles in an area not designated for that use, which would be a fundamental alteration of that program.

There is no legal requirement to allow people with disabilities to use motor vehicles on roads, on trails, and in areas that are closed to motor vehicle travel. Granting an exemption from designations for people with disabilities would not be consistent with the resource protection and other management objectives of travel management and would fundamentally alter the nature of the FS's Travel Management program (29 U.S.C. 794; 7 CFR 15e.103).

A person whose mobility impairment requires the use of a wheelchair is allowed to use a wheelchair wherever foot travel is allowed, as long as that wheelchair or mobility device meets both parts of the legal definition of a wheelchair per the ADA title V section 508c, 36 CFR 212.1 and FSM 2353.05. Motorized vehicles, including OHVs and ATVs, do not meet that definition of a wheelchair.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I am opposed to any road/trail restrictions within MY National Forests. Restrictions only serve to exclude the less physically fit, the disabled, the elderly and other individuals from the use of their National Forests, and make criminals of the unfortunate person who may stray upon a roadway closed to motor vehicle travel. Thus a policy or rule such as proposed is discriminatory and may face legal challenge on that basis, costing the taxpayer immense sums. (#18)

These plans also tend to discriminate against seniors and the disabled as OHV/ATV is their only way to see and experience our forests. (#92)

Public Concern # 367. The Forest Service should reevaluate the effects of losing dispersed camping opportunities on minority and low-income groups because:

A) high campground fees could reduce recreational opportunities for minority and low-income groups;
B) limiting dispersed access will limit persons with disabilities dependent on motorized transport.

Response: The commenters state that reduced motorized access will adversely affect low-income and minority populations who rely on dispersed camping opportunities found across the STNF. In fact, the opportunity for dispersed camping remains the same because this analysis does not propose to close or otherwise restrict dispersed camping activities. The reduction in motorized access to dispersed sites affects all populations equally. There is no indication or evidence that any particular population will be disproportionately affected by the proposals studied in this analysis.

B) Please see the response to Public Concern #362 for a discussion on access for persons with disabilities.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
Under Environmental Justice. The STNF states; "There is no evidence to believe that minority or low-income groups will be adversely or disproportionately affected by the alternatives that have been presented in this document." We strongly disagree with this statement and want it to be removed from this document. The STNF has failed to analyze the adverse effects of the massive loss of dispersed recreation opportunities (nearly 1250) that will reduce recreational opportunities to minority or low-income groups. (#139)

Subconcern # B
Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences. We disagree with the agencies' implication that there are no known impacts. The public has raised the concern of economic impacts to families and individuals that choose to recreate in dispersed camping areas where a fee is not charged. High campground fees $16-$25 per night are often prohibitive to low and middle income recreating public. Loss of dispersed camping areas as proposed in the action alternatives will have an adverse affect for these groups. Another concern is the loss of access for those that are physically handicapped and rely on motorized access to recreate on the Forest. We want the Civil Rights Impact Analysis to be revised and address these concerns and the effects of the alternatives. (#139)

Public Concern # 363. The Forest Service should consider mixed motorized use on ML 4 or 5 roads and address the impact of prohibiting non-highway-legal vehicle travel within developed recreation sites, such as campgrounds.

Response: The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which requires identification and designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motorized vehicle travel. Generally ML 4 and 5 roads have higher traffic service levels, providing for more efficient and higher speed highway-legal vehicle flows. Using current travel management direction as a starting point, the Forest carefully selected the proposed motorized mixed use segments on ML 3 roads to provide connection and loop opportunities for non-highway-legal vehicle traffic. Generally, ML 3 roads have lower speeds, lower traffic volumes, and lower crash risks than ML4 and ML5 NFS roads. Maintenance level 3 roads also provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities. Ultimately, 23 segments were proposed for motorized mixed use on roads currently open only to highway-legal vehicles. An engineering analysis was conducted on each of these segments and will inform the

applicable STNF Forest Supervisor decisions regarding motorized mixed use. The Forest offers 30.41 miles to promote better connectivity with motorized trails under Alternatives 4 and 5. Policy regarding the use of non-highway-legal vehicles within developed recreation sites, such as campgrounds, remains unaffected by the need to implement Subpart B of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Non-Highway Legal Vehicle Travel within Developed Recreation Sites and Campgrounds: The DEIS does not consider any ML 4 or 5 roads for combined use or address the impact of prohibiting non-highway legal vehicle travel within developed recreation sites such as campgrounds. Please analyze motorized mixed use on ML 4 and 5 roads currently used by OHVers for egress/ingress to access NFTS roads outside the site. In the Forest's MVUM, ROC recommends the STNF adopt a 5 mph speed limit for nonhighway legal vehicles (if not all vehicle classes) within developed recreation sites. Concern over excessive noise, public safety, and visitor conflicts can be avoided by requiring OHV operators to "idle in" and "idle out" of developed campgrounds where this is allowed. There is no reason to go any faster. Prohibit non-highway legal vehicle travel within developed sites where there are no adjacent NFTS roads to ride on. In this scenario, users would have to trailer their OHVs and drive to a NFTS route/ staging area to off load. Do not encourage OHV use on private land without the concurrence of the landowner or land management entity. (#152)

Public Concern # 364. The Forest Service should allow limited cross-country motor vehicle travel for dispersed camping, parking, and big game retrieval within 300 feet of designated routes unless signed as sensitive environmental areas:

A) or should allow low-impact off-road travel of light OHVs to retrieve big game animals that have been legally harvested during hunting season;

B) and should describe compliance with the EO and the collaboration with the State Department of Fish and Game regarding the STNF's proposal to prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel for big game retrieval in the FEIS.

Response: Motor vehicle travel off designated routes for the purpose of big game retrieval is guided by direction in FSM 7716.1. It states, "The Responsible Official may include in a designation the limited use of motor vehicles within specified distance of certain forest roads and forest trails...for purposes of dispersed camping or retrieval of a downed big game animal by an individual who has legally taken that animal (big game retrieval)." None of the alternatives allow motor vehicle travel off designated routes for the purpose of big game retrieval. Rather, Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 propose adding motorized routes that can be used for big game retrieval or dispersed recreation. An alternative similar to this proposed by the commenter, to allow parking and camping within 100 feet of a designated route, was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis (Chapter 2). There are over 4000 miles of all-vehicle class routes on the STNF providing ample opportunity to retrieve game without traveling cross-country. Therefore, designating areas for cross-country motor vehicle travel for big game retrieval was not identified as part of the Purpose and Need for this project and is outside the scope of this project. Additional rationale is provided on page 60 of the FEIS.

Collaboration with the California Department of Fish and Game regarding the Proposed Action was their involvement in providing feedback on the FEIS. They are included among the other State and local agencies on the distribution list found in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Specific references to California Department of Fish and Game subject matter can be read in the FEIS on pages 180, 181, 206, 245, 271, 274 and 398. The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which require designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle travel.

Sample Public Comment(s):

CRPA's position is that limited cross-country travel for dispersed camping, parking and big game retrieval should be allowed within 300 ft. of designated routes, unless signed as sensitive environmental areas (e.g., meadows). (#37)

Subconcern # A
ROC recommends the STNF include at least one alternative that seasonally allows cross-country travel with all-terrain vehicles (ATVs or Rhinos) for the specific purpose of big game retrieval (barring any wet weather, fire-related or other off-road closures already in place during the hunting season). See FSM 7715.74 and FSM 7716.13 for designations for big game retrieval. This is a reasonable accommodation to hunters if desired by the public.

Vehicle operators causing damage to national forest resources can be cited. If cross-country travel is not allowed, describe the social/economic and environmental effects of prohibiting ATV use for big game retrieval in the FEIS. (#152)

Subconcern # B
Compliance with the EO and collaboration with State Department of Fish and Game is not described in the DEIS regarding the STNF's proposal to prohibit cross-country travel for big game retrieval. Include this information in the FEIS. (#152)

Public Concern # 365. The Forest Service should adopt the Plumas National Forest's dispersed camping policy.

Response: The FS adopts and applies the same policy for recreation, including dispersed use, nationwide. Deciding whether areas of dispersed use are eliminated or not falls outside the scope of this analysis and eliminating dispersed use is not proposed. The scope of this action, under the TMR, is to designate roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle travel. The STNF is focused on providing access for a variety of recreational opportunities when considering the addition of motorized routes to the NFTS under Alternatives 2, 4 and 5, including access to existing dispersed recreation sites. Perhaps a distinction between a dispersed recreation area or campsite itself and any motorized travel to access it, needs to be made. Like all Forests, the STNF allows and will continue to allow dispersed camping. However, motorized access to such a site may be limited by the prohibition on cross-country motor vehicle travel under all alternatives. Motor vehicle travel off designated routes is guided by direction in FSM 7716.1. It states, "The Responsible Official may include in a designation the limited use of motor vehicles within specified distance of certain forest roads and forest trails...for purposes of dispersed camping or retrieval of a downed big game animal by an individual who has legally taken that animal (big game retrieval)."

None of the alternatives allow motor vehicle travel off designated routes for the purpose of big game retrieval. Rather, Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 propose adding motorized routes that can be used for big game retrieval or dispersed recreation. An alternative similar to this, for 100 feet, was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis. The STNF is considered to be a heavily roaded Forest, providing ample opportunity to retrieve game without traveling cross-country. Therefore, designating areas for cross-country motor vehicle travel for big game retrieval was not identified as part of the Purpose and Need for this project and is outside the scope of this project. Additional rationale is provided on page 60 of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

CRPA strongly urges you to adopt the same dispersed camping policy as the Plumas National Forest. The Plumas National Forest has eliminated designating dispersed camping sites from their Travel Management Project because it does not closely relate to travel management. The Plumas National Forest Interdisciplinary Team also pointed out, in section 2.4.2 of their Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), that: "Dispersed campsites are flat areas where people can camp and park vehicles incidental to camping, generally adjacent to roads. They are not travel routes." The proposed action by the Plumas National Forest could allow dispersed camping within 300 feet of designated routes. This approach is reasonable and demonstrates common sense relative to regulating dispersed camping on Forest Service lands. In order to provide consistency, the same logic should" be applied to permit big game retrieval and dispersed camping throughout all national forests. CRPA's position is that there should be consistent application of the Travel Management Rule and strongly urges you to adopt the same dispersed camping policy as the Plumas National Forest. (#37)

Public Concern # 366. The Forest Service should do comprehensive management to provide for dispersed camping and day use, as allowed by the TMR, and explain the rationale for decreasing opportunities for dispersed camping:

A) because the FS relies on dispersed camping to meet the recreational needs of the public due to a lack of developed facilities;
B) because sites are a long distance from official roads and unrealistic for people to pack gear in, parking for heavily used sites is limited creating a safety hazard, and secure parking for privacy, peace and quiet;

C) and include an estimate of existing route mileage devoted to dispersed camping for comparison of lost access;
D) and consider limiting access to one vehicle length reduces opportunities to recreate in private and explain the rationale for this in the DEIS;
E) and reanalyze the adverse effects in the economic analyses;
F) because the limited number of additions to the NFTS will not provide a beneficial effect for dispersed recreation opportunities;
G) and an analysis is needed to explain closing 95.7 percent of dispersed campsites to motorized recreation;
H) because none of the alternatives discuss the direct and significant impacts to dispersed day use/campers;
I) and by adding some individual spur roads, as described in the DEIS, the potential is there to miss thousands of dispersed sites across the STNF that aren't near those additional spur roads, thus decreasing dispersed camping opportunities;
J) and the number of lost access points for dispersed recreation should be identified along with the newly added spurs that access dispersed sites;
K) and the FS needs to identify how the purpose and need is met regarding providing for dispersed recreation access;
L) and complete a more comprehensive outreach to dispersed motorized recreationists (i.e., websites, press releases, and project summaries) to inform users of parking limitations;
M) because there is decreased access to dispersed sites for campers and trailers;
N) and the FS should develop a budget strategy for implementation and compliance to enforce the TMR and the chosen alternative, and increase enforcement personnel;
O) and allow for dispersed camping within 100 feet of a designated road, trail or OHV area, when feasible, and where it does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities.

Response: The FS believes the TMR, in concert with the STNF's LRMP adequately describes "comprehensive management" for dispersed camping and day use. As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this project is to stop resource damage from use of the inappropriate routes and cross-country motor vehicle travel and redirect this use to sustainable NFS roads and trails (FEIS, page 7-8). In Chapter 1, the need to provide public motor vehicle route access to dispersed recreation opportunities is recognized (FEIS, page 7-8), along with providing a diversity of public motor vehicle recreation opportunities. The alternatives presented in Chapter 2 provide a range of access opportunities.

A) Expansion of this action into the analysis and designation of dispersed camping areas and activities or an overall evaluation of recreation demand goes outside the scope of the current proposal (FEIS, pages 7-8 and 72).

B, H, K, and M) The FS understands that opportunity for motorized access to places where people can camp in a dispersed manner will be reduced due to the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel. We also understand that people who prefer to camp outside of developed recreation areas (or cannot reserve a site) and prefer or need to camp from their vehicles or remain in close proximity to them, can be inconvenienced by implementing the Subpart B of the TMR as only authorized routes will be available to drive upon. However, the ability to camp in a dispersed manner will not be eliminated; only cross-country motor vehicle travel to that dispersed site will be prohibited.

B, C, G, I, J, and M) The nature and value of dispersed camping is that the user can choose almost anywhere on the Forest to camp, making it almost impossible to identify all routes used to access dispersed campsites. Identifying and designating all dispersed campsite routes would introduce additional controls and regimentation, something dispersed campers often try to avoid. The STNF's route inventory identified unauthorized routes, even very short spurs that can provide access to dispersed campsites, but understood that adding all into the NFTS was not feasible or desirable. Many of the unauthorized routes which are proposed under the alternatives to be added to the NFTS were chosen based on public feedback with dispersed recreation in mind or have associated documented dispersed recreation activities. As discussed in Chapter 3.01 - Recreation Resources, Environmental Consequences for each alternative, limiting the number of additions has the potential to concentrate use at certain dispersed locations, which can have the effect of generating more noise and offer less solitude. In this instance, the dispersed experience may not be enhanced for some; however, the experience may be enhanced for others who find value in the MVUM that

will help guide them to public places on the NFTS, and the fact that the Forest will be able to better monitor and maintain such areas better for garbage, safety, etc.

B, C, D, and O) Motor vehicle travel off designated routes is guided by direction in FSM 7716.1, which states, "The Responsible Official may include in a designation the limited use of motor vehicles within specified distance of certain forest roads and forest trails." The Forest Supervisor considered an alternative to allow vehicle camping within 100 feet of designated routes but eliminated it from detailed study as described in Chapter 2. Allowing such use would create corridors of cross-country use that would not meet the intent of the TMR because it would leave thousands of acres open to cross-country travel and would require extensive additional analysis. To meet the intent of the TMR would involve surveying thousands of acres where motor vehicles would be allowed to travel off NFTS roads. Potential impacts to cultural resources, threatened and endangered species, wildlife and other resources would need to be analyzed. To address dispersed recreation activities, the STNF focused on identifying routes to specific, well defined dispersed campsites and included these routes in Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 if they were not excluded for other concerns; for example, resource impacts, jurisdiction, law, regulation, or policy. As a result, there is opportunity for dispersed recreation access and a roadside corridor is not needed.

C, F, G, and M) To give a relative comparison of motorized access to dispersed sites, the Recreation Resource Analysis (Measurement Indicator 4, Table 3.01-5, FEIS page 91) considers the total number of unauthorized sections of motorized routes. There is no inventory of dispersed campsites on the Forest, so the IDT developed a method to approximate the association of routes with sites. The proxy of 1 dispersed site per route section (versus miles) was used to derive at a figure that represented likely number dispersed sites accessed on the Forest by motorized vehicles. As mentioned above, the nature of dispersed camping is that the user can choose almost anywhere on the Forest to camp, and identifying where anyone or group has camped at any time, at random, was not feasible for this study. Under the current condition, which is Alternative 1 (No Action), 5,219 unauthorized route sections exist - by proxy, which means 5,219 sites are accessed by motorized vehicles. Alternative 5 maintains the most of any action alternative, 223 route sections - by proxy, that's 223 dispersed sites accessed by motorized vehicles. These figures result in a percent estimate of sites no longer accessible by motorized routes, but the dispersed recreation site is not closed. Campsites were used as one of the criteria for opportunities for motorized recreation in the development of all action alternatives. Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 designate many spurs specifically for the purpose. The FS evaluated the effects to dispersed recreation and disclosed its findings for each alternative (Chapter 3.01 – Recreation).

E) Economic impacts of the alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 3.10, Socio-Economic Resources. The economic analysis used IMPLAN, a standard and accepted economic model. No new information is known that would require a new economic analysis.

K) The Recreation section of Chapter 3.01 analyzes these effects and uses access to motorized dispersed recreation as a measurement indicator (FEIS, page 78-79).

L and N) Forest Service law enforcement personnel play a critical role in ensuring compliance with laws and regulations, protecting public safety, and protecting national forest resources. The FS also maintains cooperative relationships with many State and local law enforcement agencies that provide mutual support across jurisdictional boundaries. Education and cooperative relationships with users support enforcement efforts by promoting voluntary compliance. The TMR will not increase the Agency's budget or the number of law enforcement officers. However, the TMR will enhance enforcement by substituting a regulatory prohibition for closure orders and providing for a motor vehicle use map supplemented by signage.

N) To support enforcement of the TMR, Region 5 Forest Recreation Programs have applied for and received grant dollars (Green Sticker funding) from the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division Grants Program. These State funds are earmarked specifically for enforcement of OHV laws and regulations on the various Forests, which is performed primarily by Forest Protection Officers (FPO). In addition, Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) support the FPOs as needed, especially if serious violations have occurred. In recent years, State law enforcement grants have ranged from three to four million dollars annually with similar funding anticipated for the 2009-2010 grant cycle.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
According to the DEIS, the new TM plan will not allow vehicles to use unofficial "spur" roads, and therefore drive-in dispersed camping would no longer be allowed on our unit. This is particularly distressing to our forest visitors

because the Mt. Shasta district relies almost entirely on dispersed vehicle camping to accommodate their needs. Our current facilities are grossly inadequate to meet the expectations of the recreating public.

For example, west of I-5, where most visitors want to camp, there are a total of 6 individual campsites that have delineated sites with picnic tables, fire-rings, and an old vault toilet. That's it. These are located at the primitive, free-use, unsigned campground a mile below Castle Lake. The "campground" listed for Gumboot Lake is misleading. There are no tables, official fire-rings, or even delineated sites there. It's actually just a dispersed site with a vault toilet and a small sign board. Likewise, the Toad Lake "campground" was recently removed from the forest Recreation Opportunity Guide because it is also just a dispersed walk-in site with no facilities and was misleading the public with false expectations. (#67)

Subconcern # B
As previously mentioned, the motorized component of dispersed camping is a source of major concern for Siskiyou County with the National Forests' MTM process. In the decision by the "responsible official" that nothing can be done within the MTM EIS process to accommodate the ability for people to pull a little way off the road to camp and get away from dust and traffic when conditions allow, the stage is set for a lot of needless heartache. This contusion won't simply be limited to forest users, but will extend to USFS law enforcement people who will have to inform "mom, dad and the kids" who are out on their family vacation that they are breaking the law. The idea that they are violators of the law when all they are trying to do is secure a little privacy and peace and quiet without having to huck all their camping gear away from their now-vandal-prone vehicle is not going to go down well with the public. It would seem that given such a public relations disaster, the "responsible official" could have somehow managed to address the "low hanging fruit" areas where detailed analysis is not needed. The McCloud flats are a perfect example of such areas of the Shasta-T where a programmatic response to the issue could be easily done. (#132)

Subconcern # C
The DEIS fails to provide any estimate of existing route mileage devoted to dispersed vehicle camping and the enormous loss of this specific mileage that results in the equally enormous reduction in access to dispersed vehicle camping sites due to implementation of this plan. Since any dispersed camping site over one vehicle length is off limits to vehicles on all remaining routes in the forest, thousands of sites are lost without expressly addressing their suitability in any way. There has been no comparable outreach to identify dispersed camping sites by dispersed vehicle campers, gold miners, or hunters on par with that of the OHV community to identify key roads, loops and motorized trails. The valiant last minute effort by understaffed field personnel to locate an admittedly tiny portion of spur roads used for camping will hardly contribute to the enhanced management of Forest System Lands and nor enhanced opportunities for motorized recreation experiences on such lands envisioned by the Travel Management Rule. (paraphrase of 36 CFR 212) Mr. Moore's simple assertion regarding spur roads in his 10-30-2008 letter is meaningless without providing any express number of such roads so a real comparison can be made between the lost access and the preserved spurs. (#94)

Subconcern # D
Limiting access to dispersed areas to one vehicle length from designated roads significantly reduces the opportunities to recreate in the forest with any sense of privacy. Requiring all vehicles to park right on a roadside severely reduces the enjoyment of dispersed camping. This will also increase the amount of theft and damage done to unoccupied vehicles parked right along side roadways. (#138)

Subconcern # E
This DEIS fails to adequately address dispersed camping. No action alternative addresses the hundreds of campsites that will be eliminated with the adoption of one vehicle length off the road rule and the closure of nearly over 1200 miles of existing routes. This eliminates access to the historically used areas for parking and camping and dispersed recreation. We want the STNF to add these traditional use routes to the transportation system to support dispersed recreation. Alternative maps show very few locations proposed for dispersed camping and parking. This will surely result in adverse impacts as a result of user conflicts and overuse. We want the STNF to maintain wheeled motorized access to well established dispersed recreation opportunities. Parking vehicles along the roadways present multiple concerns including safety and theft issues. We want to be able to park at least 150 feet from a designated road, trail or OHV area. The economic impact of virtually eliminating all historical dispersed access to camping areas has been grossly misstated. Much of the public are dependent on this type of dispersed recreation. Low cost and availability makes this type of recreation economically feasible. We want the STNF to reanalyze the adverse effects in the economic analysis. (#139)

Subconcern # F
Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Recreation Resources, Assumptions Specific to Recreation Analysis. We challenge the following assumptions because they are not supported by fact or are merely an assertion that does not represent existing conditions. Proposed additions to the NFTS will have a beneficial effect on motorized recreation opportunities by providing a variety of trail riding experiences and increasing the amount of motorized recreation opportunities (loops and connectors). Although we agree with this assumption in concept, the limited number of proposed additions to the NFTS in all action alternatives significantly falls short in providing a beneficial effect on motorized recreation opportunities. Proposed changes and additions to the NFTS will have a beneficial effect on the amount of motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities available. Again, we agree with this assumption in concept, the limited number of proposed additions to the NFTS in all action alternatives significantly falls short in providing a beneficial effect on dispersed recreation opportunities. The removal of access routes to approximately 1200 dispersed recreation opportunities. (#139)

Subconcern # G
The DEIS states: "For each unauthorized route added to the NFTS as a road or trail for the purpose of accessing dispersed recreation, we assume a minimum of one site is accessed." Alternative 5 proposes to add 223 unauthorized routes to the NFTS. Under the above assumption, these routes access 223 dispersed recreation sites out of 5,219 routes that were inventoried (or 4.3 percent). Motor vehicle access will be prohibited to the remaining 95.7 percent of these sites, although walk-in access is allowed. None of the action alternatives meet your purpose and need to: "Maintain wheeled motorized access to specific, well established dispersed recreation opportunities . . ." And ". . . to provide a diversity of wheeled motorized recreation opportunities . . ." ROC understands the STNF and other forests in Region 5 must complete their FEISs by January 2010. Strict adherence to this timeline is not required by law, regulation, policy or court order. ROC recommends the STNF team analyze the merits of each route that accesses a dispersed recreation site. If any routes are dropped from an alternative, display your rationale in an Appendix to the FEIS. There is insufficient analysis in the DEIS to explain why you are closing 95.7 percent of your dispersed sites to motor vehicles under Alternative 5, which is the Forest's "maximum motorized recreation opportunities" alternative. (#152)

Subconcern # H
The action alternatives identified in the Shasta Trinity are inadequate. None of the Shasta Trinity action alternatives provide for reasonable dispersed day use/camping as provided for in the Travel Management Rule. Interestingly, I am not aware of any of the Forests? in Region 5 that have any action alternative that make a reasonable provision for dispersed camping. National top down fiat has supplanted local decision making provided for the Travel Management Rule. Since the Forests have used similar language and formats which exclude clear discussion regarding direct and significant impacts to the dispersed day use/camper. (#94)

Subconcern # I
A reasonable action alternative would require the Travel Management Plans provide dispersed vehicle camping/big game hunter areas at some distance, maybe 100' off area roads for day use/dispersed camping with specific criteria displayed on the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). I am not suggesting a corridor, as Mr. Moore implies, since the MVUM would also include criteria and actual mapped areas available for this use. The Region 5 Guidance document has a good example of this proposal. Many roads near streams are removed already per the Plans and 100 feet is still within visual of roadways so this should not overwhelm enforcement. The current process of adding spur roads on a case by case basis is a valiant effort to right a wrong. I appreciate that the Forest Service recognizes the need to provide vehicle camping opportunities (notwithstanding no explicit information to this fact exists in the documents) However, it is but a partial, piecemeal, unsupported solution as it misses potentially thousands of appropriate dispersed day use/campsites in our vast Forests. I request the Forest Service Plans in process identify the approximate number of lost access points for day use/dispersed vehicle camping and the identify the number of newly included short spur roads added to the system to meet the need for day use and dispersed vehicle camping. Also, this approach is not the comprehensive management which this user group is entitled to under the Federal regulation. (#94)

Subconcern # J- N
Continued from comment above:

- Increase Ranger personnel so this rule can be enforced

- Require that the Travel Management plans in process identify the number of lost dispersed vehicle campsites as a result of forcing vehicle campers to "camp" next to the route surface. Also they must identify how the purpose and needs of these plans have been met with regard to this motorized recreation activity.

- Require that this particular motorized recreation user group be notified with a renewed effort at out reach. This would include press releases, Forest Service travel management home pages websites and project summaries contain this explicit statement: : "Parking of motor vehicles for dispersed camping and day use will be limited to within one vehicle length of designated roads and trails." And "Decreased direct motor vehicle access to dispersed use areas will directly impact recreationists with campers and trailers, limiting their choices in camping location to the designated system." (#94)

Subconcern # O
ROC recommends motor vehicle access for other dispersed camping (separate from historically used campsites) be permitted within 100 feet of a designated road, trail or OHV area when it is feasible to do so and does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities. (Refer to FSM 7715.74 and FSM 7716.13.) Monitor impacts to see if access needs to be modified in some areas. (#152)

Public Concern # 368. The Forest Service should allow continued motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites unless there is no evidence of recent use, and they should designate and monitor an area for vehicle parking when dispersed sites are near sensitive areas.

Response: Motor vehicle travel off designated routes is guided by direction in FSM 7716.1. It states, "The Responsible Official may include in a designation the limited use of motor vehicles within specified distance of certain forest roads and forest trails...for purposes of dispersed camping or retrieval of a downed big game animal by an individual who has legally taken that animal (big game retrieval)." Accessing historically used areas was a factor when considering motorized route additions as reflected in Alternatives 2, 4, and 5. Parking and camping within one vehicle length of a designated road or trail is allowed; however none of the alternatives allow further motor vehicle travel off designated routes for any purpose. Dispersed recreation such as camping will still continue, but not by means of cross-country motor vehicle travel. Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 allow motor vehicle travel to dispersed camping in the proposed open areas below the high-water mark of the Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir.

Sample Public Comment(s):

ROC urges continued motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites unless there is no evidence of recent use. The public does not want to stage one vehicle length from the edge of a road. They desire the security, privacy, solitude, and scenic amenities that these sites provide. If there were prior resource concerns, ROC assumes action would have been taken before now to address them. At some dispersed sites, please designate an area for vehicle parking to protect riparian areas, meadows or other sensitive resources. Monitor these sites to determine if other mitigation is required. (#152)

Public Concern # 370. The Forest Service should allow parking within 30 feet from any designated road, trail or open OHV area when it does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities.

Response: Motor vehicle travel off designated routes is guided by direction in FSM 7716.1. It states, "The Responsible Official may include in a designation the limited use of motor vehicles within specified distance of certain forest roads and forest trails." In addition, please see the response to PC# 366.

Sample Public Comment(s):

ROC recommends parking be permitted within 30 feet from any designated road, trail or open OHV area when it does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities. This is consistent with the new FS travel management directives found in FSM 7716.1. Regulations in 36 CFR 261.15 allow FS officers to issue violation notices for damage to national forest resources. Monitor use and determine if this length needs to be modified in some areas. (#152)

Public Concern # 373. The Forest Service should consider the impact of reduced access on harvesting forest products, such as wood cutting, mushroom gathering, Christmas tree cutting etc.

Response: Among the key elements considered when developing the scope of the action are the type of activities mentioned here. Chapter 3.10 of the Socioeconomic Resources on page 520 defines extractive capacity as the levels of forest product removal sustainable by the forest for activities such as timber harvesting, mining, grazing, mushroom picking, etc.; and in addition, that natural-resource-based activities play an integral role in the lifestyle of many residents in the study area. From employment status to leisure activities, natural resources on the STNF impact both social and economic conditions. Under the Assumptions and Limitations section, number 12, page 72 of the FEIS, it is stated that any activity associated with contract, permit, lease or other written authorization is exempt from designation under the TMR (36 CFR 212.51 (a) (8) and is not part of the proposal (e.g., fuelwood permits, motorized SUP permits, mining activity, recreation residences, etc.). Such actions are subject to separate NEPA analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Another huge point of concern for non-OHV users is the impact this plan will have on harvesting forest products. Like the dispersed camping issue, fuelwood cutters, mushroom gatherers, and Christmas tree cutters will all be restricted under the new TM plan. The agency has said that some degree of access on unofficial spur roads will be allowed for permitted forest users. What is unclear to the public at this time is to what degree will their activities be affected and how this will be enforced. I have heard suggestions such as allowing fuelwood cutters to be 100 feet from a NFTS road, as opposed to the standard one vehicle length. Even if this were extended to 300 feet or more, it will not be endorsed by the cutters. If the spur roads are barricaded, the cutters will just create new routes to reach their cutting sites. It is unrealistic to expect people to hand-carry loads of firewood long distances to their vehicles. (#67)

Public Concern # 374. The Forest Service should consider the impacts of reduced access on hunting and fishing areas.

Response: Hunting and fishing areas were considered when formulating alternatives to implement the TMR. On page 16 of the FEIS, hunting and fishing access was, among other recreational pursuits, identified under Significant Issue #1. Existing hunting and fishing areas will not be closed off to the public under this Travel Management Plan; however cross-country motor vehicle travel to these areas will be prohibited. The IDT evaluated access to water resources when selecting routes for further study. It was considered an important recreation benefit when assessing the risks and benefits of each route.

Sample Public Comment(s):

No consideration for the impact of closing off access to hunting areas has been entertained. (#55)

Public Concern # 375. The Forest Service should consider the impacts from unnecessary roads on hunting and fishing opportunities.

Response: Hunting and fishing areas were considered when formulating alternatives to implement the TMR. On page 16 of the FEIS, hunting and fishing access was, among other recreational pursuits, identified under Significant Issue #1. Existing hunting and fishing areas will not be closed off to the public under this Travel Management Plan; however cross-country motor vehicle travel to these areas will be prohibited. Considering the impacts of "unnecessary roads" on hunting and fishing were not analyzed; however the effects of the action alternatives and the existing condition (Alternative 1) on water resources and access were studied and are disclosed in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

These unnecessary roads will disrupt fishing and hunting opportunities. (#143)

Public Concern # 377. The Forest Service should consider that actual timber operations will be taking place in the same areas. Permits must be obtained by prospective timber purchaser's or contract logger's to evaluate their economic feasibility.

Response: The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which requires identification and designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motorized vehicle travel. Identifying permittee needs for future activity, on a special needs basis which may include authorization for motorized access, can be handled on a case by case basis with the Forest as it currently exists. Addressing concerns regarding the permitting process falls outside of the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

In regards to "Abstract" (1), cross-country motor vehicle travel is essential in looking at timber sales and projects proposed by the USFS. On a special need basis permits must be easily attainable (preferably an annual basis) to allow prospective timber purchaser's and contract logger's or equipment operators the opportunity and ability to travel off-road through project boundaries and adjacent areas to evaluate their economic feasibility in a timely manner. Remember that actual operations will be taking place in these same areas eventually (#50)

Public Concern # 376. The Forest Service should consider that if permittees are allowed to access the STNF via spur roads, then it would appear that the non-permitted dispersed campers and other Forest users should be allowed to access these roads also.

Response: The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which requires identification and designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motorized vehicle travel. This applies to general or non-permitted motorized access. Permittees requiring motorized access to specific sites for example, are exempt under the TMR and are instead, regulated by the terms of their permit. Under the Assumptions and Limitations section, number 12, page 72 of the FEIS, it is stated that any activity associated with contract, permit, lease or other written authorization is exempt from designation under the TMR (36 CFR 212.51 (a) (8) and is not part of the proposal and this includes recreation residences.

Sample Public Comment(s):

If "permittees" are allowed to access the forest via spur roads, then it would appear that the non-permitted dispersed campers and other forest users are being discriminated against. (#67)

Public Concern # 378. The Forest Service should recognize the need for Class II trails.

Response: Class II trails are nonmotorized trails, and such type or class of trail falls out of the scope of this analysis, which focuses on motorized trails. Access to existing ML 2 roads, which are suitable for use by high-clearance vehicles, will remain unchanged under any alternative.

Sample Public Comment(s):

For you not to recognize class II trails as a recreation is not acceptable I will demand you to give us trails for class II vehicles. (#64)

Public Concern # 379. The Forest Service should not limit dry lake shores to highway-legal vehicles only, nor should they limit the vehicular speed.

Response: Alternatives 1 and 5 consider and analyze the effects of use of lake bottom areas below the high-water mark to all vehicle classes. Existing speed regulations apply under Alternative 1 and Alternative 5 proposes a speed limit of 10 miles per hour. Speed limit restrictions are proposed under all action alternatives. These restrictions are assigned to protect cultural resources below the high-water marks in the reservoir open areas, as is directed by the Motorized Recreation programmatic agreement. Vehicle class and speed limit restrictions are the primary and initial protection measures to be applied, followed by a variety of other measures, or area closures as needed. Resource protection measures and the adaptive management approach planned to protect cultural resources below the high-

water marks in the proposed open areas are fully described in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 (Cultural Resources), and Appendix L.

Sample Public Comment(s):

In regards to "Abstract" (4), dry lake shores provide perfect areas for off road vehicle operation, there is no erosion potential as the sediment is already in the lake, no vegetation is present of environmental concern, and there is no disturbance to wildlife as it is not their natural habitat. Do not limit these areas to highway legal vehicles alone, include off-road vehicles and do not set a speed limit for any vehicular travel. (#50)

Public Concern # 380. The Forest Service should reconsider designating dirt roads as open to passenger vehicles only, on the basis of being unsafe when many types of vehicles are sharing the same road.

Response: As defined in the glossary ML 3 roads are assigned to roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. Roads in ML 3 are typically low speed, single lane with turnouts and spot surfacing. Some roads may be fully surfaced with either native or processed material. The Forest considered the impacts of allowing motorized mixed use on them and proposes re-classifying 30.41 miles under Alternatives 4 and 5 to accommodate all vehicle classes to increase motorized opportunities to include off-highway vehicles. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 do not propose reclassifying use on roads to accommodate additional vehicle classes.

Generally ML 3 roads have lower speeds, lower traffic volumes, and lower crash risks than ML4 and ML5 NFTS roads and in some cases, can accommodate use by all vehicle classes. Using current Travel Management direction as a starting point, the Forest carefully selected the proposed motorized mixed use segments on ML 3 roads to provide connection and loop opportunities for non-highway-legal vehicle traffic. Maintenance level 3 roads also provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities. Ultimately, 23 segments were proposed for motorized mixed use on roads currently open only to highway-legal vehicles. An engineering analysis was conducted on each of these segments and will inform the STNF Forest Supervisor decisions regarding motorized mixed use. See Appendix C for more information on the motorized mixed use analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Once again, from their point of view it is easier to enforce OHV use by sticking to the old axiom "dirt OK-paved not OK". It is very hard to justify taking these routes out of legal use status with the argument that it is somehow unsafe for all vehicles to share these dirt roads based on maintenance level status alone. These roads may be in better shape than some of the NFTS roads, but according to the OHV users, vehicle speeds on these roads are still low enough not to jeopardize safety. (#67)

Public Concern # 381. The Forest Service should enhance and maintain motorcycle use only trails.

Response: All action alternatives propose the addition of motorized trails which would be limited to motorcycles only. Miles of motorcycle-only trails proposed are listed under Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 in Chapter 2, and the specific routes identified for motorcycle-use only are listed in Appendix A. The STNF recognizes that such trails are important in providing the diversity of motorized recreation experiences desired and identified in the Purpose and Need for this project. Additional information about the trail proposals are in the Recreation section of Chapter 3..

Sample Public Comment(s):

I was very disappointed to see the lack of motorcycle only and atv trails in the DEIS. (#163)

Public Concern # 382. The Forest Service should address the impacts to the trail tread, which will result when the decision will require riders to ride heavy, powerful, licensed bikes, to have legal access to the most challenging OHV trails, when these type of trails are most suited to lighter Green sticker bikes.

Response: The Purpose and Need of the current action is to implement Subpart B of the TMR, which requires identification and designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motorized vehicle travel. The alternatives propose three types of motorized trails: all trail class vehicles, 50 inches or less in width, and motorcycle-only. Motorcycle-only trails have tread widths (due to terrain in most cases) too narrow for other types of trail vehicles. Any motorized trail added to the NFTS would be subject to monitoring and maintenance by the managing unit, as existing motorized trails are now, to address any impacts resulting from use, to include trail treads.

Sample Public Comment(s):

A decision to restrict access, to licensed vehicles, to the most challenging trails, on the Shasta- Trinity NF, when lighter, less powerful bikes are most suited to high skill trails. In addition, Green Sticker bikes can run an environmentally friendly, low impact, "Trials Tire." The Radial Trials tire, is not a DOT approved tire and illegal on a licensed bike. The DEIS does not address the impact to the trail tread which will result when the decision will require riders to ride heavy, powerful, licensed bikes, to have legal access to the most challenging OHV trails, which are most suited to lighter Green sticker bikes. (#160)

Public Concern # 383. The Forest Service should reconsider closing over 800 miles of motorcycle only and ATV trails less than 50 inches in width, as the FS will not be able to provide a diversity of wheeled motorized recreation opportunities and it will limit many local communities' access to motorized recreation.

Response: The Forest has an inventory of 373 miles (not over 800 miles) of combined authorized and unauthorized motorized trails. Tables 3.01-2 and 3.01-3(FEIS page 89-90) list the miles of roads and trails per alternative. Alternative 3 serves as the base of comparison by removing all unauthorized routes to comply with the prohibition of the cross-country motor vehicle travel provision and showing all existing authorized routes. Among other concerns, diversity of experience based on route type was considered when selecting vehicles classes assigned to routes selected for study under each action alternative. In the future, the Forest can consider adding trails to the system to better diversify use, if necessary.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I note with disappointment that nearly every small community on the Shasta-Trinity NF has had all of the nearby close-width trails (<50") and a majority of the class 2 and under roads eliminated from every alternative. Communities such as Wildwood, Hayfork, Hyampom, Weaverville, McCloud and Weed no longer have any close access to motorized trails, even though they are in the STNF. I do not believe that this is in the best interests of the Forest or the communities or the stakeholder therein. (#148)

Public Concern # 384. The Forest Service should designate several areas 2 to 5 acres in size for OHVs to play and those areas could include but are not limited to the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and Clear Creek areas.

Response: The STNF offers such an area already, the 52,000 acre Chappie-Shasta Off-Highway Vehicle Area (FEIS page 90). Designating additional open OHV areas and play areas were alternatives considered, but eliminated from detailed analysis. The rationale for this is provided in Chapter 2 on page 59 of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I would like to see a place set aside just for off road type vehicles to play and have fun (not a road) but some acreage. For instance, in Weaverville, Bally road just passed the high school has jumps, paths, hill climbs etc. that have been used over the years and are all rutted, etc. already. I think at the most you're talking 2-5 acres out of millions of acres, or somewhere else so kids have a certain place to go and have fun. As it is every time they make a place it gets blocked so they go somewhere else and ruin it. I think if a place was set aside just for that it would cut down on the making of other trails (not all of course). (#40)

Public Concern # 385. The Forest Service should include a description of wheeled over-snow travel, allow this travel with exceptions to elevation-based closures from May 15th through June 15th for elevations over 5000 feet and February 15th through May 1st for those elevations below 5000 feet and if wet conditions permit, roads below 5000 feet could be considered open if they meet the minimum coverage of 12 inches of snow. If conditions are dry enough, lower elevations could be considered to be posted open.

Response: Designation of areas open to over-snow use is covered under 36 CFR 212, Subpart C and is outside of the scope of this decision, which is focused on implementing 36 CFR 212, Subpart B of the TMR. In addition, conflict which may occur between wheeled and tracked motorized recreation is outside the scope of this analysis because the proposed route additions do not coincide with designated snowmobile trails.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We have found that according to the definitions in the FSM, FSH and RD Handbook, there is absolutely no mention or definition of wheeled vehicles traveling over the snow with one minor exception where snow is among a list of types of terrain listed for OHV's. [cite: 36 CFR 212.1] "Over-snow" is usually referred to snowmobiles and that use is not a part of this comment. The DEIS is silent to travel over snow by wheeled vehicles. We want the agency to include in the final EIS appropriate measures that will allow this use while protecting the natural resources. These measures should include altitude based seasons and conditional wheeled snow travel by wheeled motor vehicles and OHV's. Per 36 CFR 212.81 (subpart b) (5) Route Designation guidebook Appendix P (33.2) it is completely discretionary and "appropriate" for the Forest Supervisor and within their authority to "encourage or accept" this type of use. (FSM 7731.1 (5) FSM 7731.11(3a 3b)). Motor Vehicles and OHV's should be allowed use on native surface routes when conditions permit zero impact. We suggest 12 inches of snow with minimal ground contact (FSM 7731.1 (5). There is sufficient snow accumulation in the months of January, February and March to support wheeled over the snow use with little to no impact to native surface routes above 5000 feet. (#139)

We want the agency to amend the DEIS to include; (A). A description of wheeled over snow travel. I.e. Wheeled motor vehicles with low tire pressure create a wide footprint which greatly enhances traction in the snow by allowing the vehicle to "float" on top of the snow. (B). Acceptance of said activity considering the restrictions below. (C). Elevation based closures will be May 15th through June 15th for elevations over 5000 ft. and February 15th through May 1st for those elevations below 5000 feet. With supervisor discretion as previously stated in the proposed alternative. (FSM 7731.11, 36 CFR 212.51) If wet conditions permit, roads below 5000 could be considered open if they meet the minimum coverage of 12 inches of snow. If conditions are dry enough, lower elevations could be considered to be posted open. (#139)

Public Concern # 387. The Forest Service should restrict OHV access to protect all resources.

Response: All of the action alternatives provide resource protection by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel. Alternative 3 proposes and analyzes the effects of not adding any motorized routes to the NFTS. An alternative to physically close all existing unauthorized routes not added to the NFTS, utilizing berms, gates, or other barriers to prevent illegal use was considered, but eliminated from further analysis. The rationale is given in the Alternatives Considered But Eliminated from Detailed Analysis on page 55 of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Please also keep up you work to keep OHVers out of trout, salmon and roadless areas in general. (#12)

Public Concern # 388. The Forest Service should use "Green sticker" funds to enhance and maintain OHV/ATV recreational opportunities rather than increase law enforcement and should address the financial impact and loss of revenue to State Parks and the Green sticker grant funds available to the STNF when decreasing access.

Response: Green sticker funds are provided in the form of grants from the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreational Division Grant program. The FS agrees that we would rather use "Green sticker" funds to enhance and maintain OHV/ATV recreational opportunities than spending those funds on law enforcement. However, the reality of our current situation is that we need to use those funds to augment appropriated funds for law enforcement related to OHV use. Implementation of any of the action alternatives would aid enforcement by

prohibiting all motorized use off designated NFTS roads, trails, and areas, unless authorized by permit. Through education and building cooperative relationships, we hope to reduce the need for enforcement. As the need for enforcement declines, we hope those funds can be directed to other uses. This is an excellent opportunity for the FS to work with the OHV community to reduce cross-country motor vehicle travel and the use of unauthorized routes in order for more of the "Green sticker" funds to be used for OHV/ATV recreational opportunities.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Mixed use on ML 3 & 4 roads. These roads provide access to the OHV trails. The reclassification to licensed vehicles eliminates access by OHV, green sticker vehicles. The DEIS does not address the financial impact and loss of revenue to State Parks and the green sticker grant funds available to R5 forests, such as the Shasta-Trinity NF. The management decision forced upon R5 forests will not reduce the number of vehicles on the ML 3 & 4 roads. These riders will either ignore the law or purchase a licensed dual sport bike. Street Licensed OHV are "Dual Sported", no green sticker means no revenue for trails, law enforcement and O & M grants. (#160)

Appendix E: Law Enforcement refers to "Green Sticker" money as a source of funding to "enhance enforcement of the Travel Management Rule." Green Sticker money should be used to enhance and maintain OHV/ATV recreation opportunities rather than beef up law enforcement. (#167)

Socio-economic Resources

Public Concern # 460. The Forest Service should base their decisions, in part, on an evaluation of the comparative intrinsic economic value and cost of natural resources and human uses.

Response: Quantitative analysis of non-market values is outside the scope of this analysis. However, the effects of action alternatives on ecosystems and nonmotorized recreation are addressed qualitatively in Chapter 3. There is no data available regarding changes in recreation use and non-market values that would allow for a numerical valuation or ranking of action alternatives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Economically, I think the value of salmon fisheries, wildlife, and hiking recreation is hundreds of times more valuable than OHV sales and driving. Clean water for humans is more valuable yet, and pollution of our headwaters by machine fluids, and the general watershed ecological disruption and erosion from vehicles is not worth the value obtained by OHV sales. (#46)

Public Concern # 461. The Forest Service should reconsider the effects the action alternatives could have on local economies.

Response: A qualitative analysis of the economic effects of action alternatives is conducted in Chapter 3; however there are no estimates of changes to recreation use across the action alternatives that would allow for estimates of the economic impacts of those alternatives. Data for that type of an analysis is not available. Changes in use for one activity type may be offset by changes in use in other activity types, but there is no means of predicting the levels of change. Response coefficients report the jobs and income supported per thousand visits by activity type and may be used to estimate economic impacts when data becomes available. At this time, any impacts to economic conditions remain speculative. Estimates are provided for the current contributions of nonmotorized and motorized recreation to local economies (FEIS page 529).

Sample Public Comment(s):

The USFS has not done an adequate job in considering the negative effects plans Alt 2 through Alt 5 will have on our local community and economy. (#92)

Public Concern # 464. The Forest Service should reevaluate the time frames for the socio-economic effects of the action alternatives.

Response: Forest Service regional economic modeling capabilities are static. All economic modeling was conducted using IMPLAN 2.0 software and the Travel Management Economic Contribution Application (TMECA). They

represent a snap shot in time and are constrained by the availability of data. The only recreation use data available is from the NVUM survey which is assumed to represent current visitation levels. That data is used to conduct an economic contribution analysis of current recreation levels under the no action alternative in Chapter 3. The effects analysis for action alternatives does not assume any specific levels of recreation. Any estimated change in recreation use across alternatives would be highly speculative and would not suffice as the basis for an economic impact analysis.

IMPLAN, NVUM survey results, and TMECA were not used as a rationale for eliminating or adding unauthorized routes to the NFTS. For a complete description of the statistical methods used for the NVUM survey, please refer to the documents at: http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum. IMPLAN data is drawn from a variety of long-standing and well documented sources such as the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Labor, County Business Patterns, National Income and Product Accounts, Survey of Current Business, among others and more information can be found at www.implan.com. The use of the IMPLAN software requires a thorough understanding of the underlying theory and assumptions of input-output analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Socioeconomic Resources. It states; "Predictions about changes in recreational use that may occur on the STNF are difficult to make and would be highly speculative. The Forest Service believes that under all action alternatives, levels of use would be relatively static although the use patterns may change. For example, even though the overall number of available roads and trails is reduced in all of the action alternatives, the same levels of use would simply become more concentrated in those areas. However, motor vehicle use is already concentrated in many areas of the STNF at this time, so this effect may not be realized either during implementation; but at some point, some users would no longer attain the experience they desire and would likely seek other areas off forest. The point at which this would occur is speculative." We believe that the adverse effects of the implementation of any of the action alternatives as proposed will be felt immediately. You need only to look at recent closures and reduction of riding areas throughout the State to see the immediate effects. Adverse economic impacts and loss of historical use are examples of these effects. The action alternatives fail to provide the motorized recreational experiences that are currently offered to the general public. (#139)

Transportation Management (Roads and Trails)

Public Concern # 490. The Forest Service should not require all forests to be managed in identical fashion because all forests do not have the same issues and therefore, the same management concerns and solutions in regards to OHV use. The relatively few environmentally sensitive areas should be designated and closed instead of restricting motorized access to NFTS roads and specified routes.

Response: The Department of Agriculture believes that the scope, content, and documentation of NEPA analyses associated with designating routes and areas for motor vehicle travel depends on site-specific factors, including the local history of travel planning, public input, and environmental impacts at the local level. Evaluating routes and areas for possible addition to the NFTS requires site-specific resource data to determine the environmental consequences of motorized use of each potential addition. A site-specific analysis is necessary to determine the benefits and risks associated with each individual route. The STNF conducted this site-specific analysis with resource protection identified as an important part of the Purpose and Need, along with the need to provide diverse motorized recreation opportunities and access. All issues and alternatives in this FEIS were developed based on public involvement and analysis conducted at the Forest level. Rather than identifying sensitive areas for closure, the methodology focused on evaluating individual routes for potential benefits and effects. Designated roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle travel and prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel is the primary focus of the Subpart B of the TMR and of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The next point of concern is why the Shasta Trinity, or more specifically the Mt. Shasta Ranger District, is required to follow the same management framework as other forests and regions. It is the directive of the WO that all the forests will be managed in an identical fashion, presumably so visitors from other regions would know what to

expect on other forests. Here again the public is in dismay. This cookie-cutter approach implies all forests across the country have the same issues and therefore the same management concerns and solutions in regards to OHV use. Time and again I hear our local forest users say, "What problem I don't see any damage being done on our forest" we're being forced to conform to problems that don't apply here! People are supportive of a management plan to control environmental damage, but from the public's perspective, it makes more sense to designate and close the relatively few environmentally sensitive areas to prevent damage instead of taking the approach that all of the forest should be closed except for NFTS roads and specified routes. This is exactly why the public is claiming that the Forest Service is closing down their forests. The agency is trying to claim that they are actually adding miles of routes, when in fact there is a net loss due to the unofficial spur roads not being factored in. (#67)

Public Concern # 491. The Forest Service should analyze the impacts of ATVs to existing roads.

Response: All terrain vehicles are allowed to operate on ML 2 roads, and in some alternatives, on some ML 3 roads. These roads are subject to road condition surveys on a rotating basis and these surveys are the basis for scheduling maintenance activities. The damage associated with ATV use is difficult to differentiate from damage caused by highway-legal vehicles, but is recorded as part of the cumulative condition of the road. Analyzing the effects of motor vehicles to existing roads, other than those predicted as part of the motorized mixed use proposals in Alternatives 4 and 5, is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There is no evidence of the Forest Service or anyone else for that matter doing any kind of study as to the impact of ATV's to existing roads or how much ATVs or any other kind of travel for that matter on these roads actually takes place. It's true when a vehicle, ATV or otherwise leaves established road damage can occur to the environment, but to existing roads? (#82)

Public Concern # 492. The Forest Service should clearly identify the baseline conditions for the current transportation system and clarify recommended road status.

Response: The Forest Service's INFRA database is the official dataset for use in transportation planning. While it is recognized that there may be coding errors, the database is still the best tool available. As project specific changes to the NFTS are made, the database is updated to reflect these changes. The current status (baseline conditions) of the NFTS is summarized in the FEIS Table 3.12-2 (page 545). Project specific reasonably foreseeable proposed changes to the NFTS are detailed in Appendix B of the FEIS. Draft and final Decision Notices or Records of Decision for the projects are available from the Forest Supervisor's office.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We believe however, that the DEIS is flawed in the following ways: 4) The Forest has not provided adequate or reliable documentation for what it considers to be the "baseline" of the current transportation system. The Forest has not provided Decision Notices, Records of Decision (ROD), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, Road Management Objectives, or funding allocation data for putative system routes in its jurisdiction. The Forest is, therefore, unable to provide convincing evidence that all of the routes listed as open to motor vehicles in the INFRA database were, in fact, designed to be open for long-term, public motorized recreation. Moreover, some NFTS routes that are in the INFRA database and are listed as currently closed (or are recommended for closure) to motor vehicles may be designated as open to motor vehicles on the maps depicting the Alternatives. The Forest should make certain that this is not occurring. (#151)

Public Concern # 495. The Forest Service should disclose how they have distinguished a road from a highway, as they ignored the CVC definition of such, yet cite CVC policy in determining national forest policy regarding mixed use.

Response: By definition, Maintenance Level 3, 4, and 5 roads are open to the public for the use of passenger cars. Consistent with 23 USC 101 and 23 CFR 460.2, the FS considers these roads to be public roads and highways. Under 36 CFR 212.5(a)(1), state traffic laws generally apply on NFS roads. The STNF intends to follow State law and the CVC.

The definition of "highways" as used in this context, is importantly distinct from "Forest Highways", which is a term used to describe forest roads designated by the Federal Highway Administration that meet the special program criteria listed in 23 CFR 660. There are nine designated Forest Highways on the STNF, while there are hundreds of highways managed by the STNF. See http://www.cflhd.gov/FHRoadInv/_documents/cafh2008.pdf for more information.

Sample Public Comment(s):

"National Forest System roads maintained for passenger car use (operational maintenance level 3-5) are considered highways on the STNF. Because these roads generally would not be open to motorized mixed use (MMU) under the California Vehicle Code (CVC), Forest Service policy requires that decisions regarding designation of MMU on these NFS roads be performed by an engineering analysis conducted by a qualified engineer." The CHP doesn't classify these roads as highways, so they do not fall under the CVC. They are roads and should remain open to all vehicle travel. (#85)

Public Concern # 497. The Forest Service should provide supporting traffic survey data for maintaining 785 miles of ML 3 passenger car roads.

Response: The scope of this project does not include the need to undertake a comprehensive analysis of all existing ML 3, 4, and 5 roads in order to justify the appropriateness of their current maintenance level (ML). When these roads were assigned MLs, appropriate criteria in FSM and FSH's were utilized. Travel Management planning for roads and trails is found in FSM 7700 and further direction for roads in found in FSH 7709. Future analysis of the transportation system may include reviews of assigned maintenance levels to determine if reclassification to a different ML would better achieve management objectives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

*The DEIS does not indicate if any traffic counts have been conducted to the level ROC provided for the Lassen NF in 2005. ROC has been unsuccessful in obtaining any engineering analyses or reports from the STNF to determine what traffic count and vehicle class (composition) data were used to evaluate your ML 3 roads for combined use. The DEIS says: When making any limited changes to National Forest System Roads, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest will also consider the following: *Speed, volume, composition and distribution of traffic on roads; and *Compatibility of vehicle class with road geometry and road surfacing (DEIS, volume 1, pg 10). We note, the STNF is not proposing to lower any ML 3 roads to ML 2 high clearance roads. Absent recent and statistically valid traffic survey data and vehicle class information, ROC questions the need to maintain 785 miles of ML 3 passenger car roads on the STNF. (#152)*

Public Concern # 498. The Forest Service should explain why only 30.41 miles out of 785 miles (3.9 percent) of ML 3 roads were considered for combined use and reclassify many of the STNF's unpaved ML 3 roads as ML 2 to allow mixed use and reduce road maintenance costs. If reclassification is not feasible, they should analyze a new alternative that will designate all unpaved ML 3 roads for motorized mixed use and prepare engineering judgments when the three criteria in FSH 7709.55, 30.3 are met.

Response: The roads proposed for mixed-use provide valuable connections for loops and extended rides for non-highway-legal vehicles. Less than 117 miles of the existing NFTS are ML 3 native surface roads. This proposal is not intended to revisit previous decisions that resulted in the current NFTS. This proposal is narrowly focused on the addition and designation of roads, trails and areas for motor vehicle travel in accordance with 36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B, through publication of a MVUM. Only roads, trails, and areas that are part of a NFTS may be designated for motorized use (FEIS, page 2). Reclassification of segments of the existing NFTS from ML 2 to ML 3 is outside the scope of Subpart B of the TMR and subsequently, outside the scope of this Proposed Action. The road surface is not the deciding factor for determining whether it is legal to use OHVs/ATVs on the road. Federal regulations and state laws determine the type of vehicle that is authorized (16 USC 480, 36 CFR 212.5).

At the beginning of this planning effort, ML 3, 4, and 5 roads under the jurisdiction of the STNF were restricted to highway-legal vehicles only. To better provide for non-highway-legal vehicle access and accommodate the associated public interest, a feasible subset of passenger car road segments was proposed to be designated for

motorized mixed use. Alternatives 4 and 5 make provisions for mixed use. In accordance with FS policy, an engineering analysis was conducted on each of these segments. These analyses consider the safety aspects of allowing various uses, including various vehicle classes, to utilize the same roadway. The reports documenting the analyses provide information to the STNF Forest Supervisor for consideration during decisionmaking. If the STNF Forest Supervisor believes that the crash risks can be mitigated to an acceptable level, then a decision can be made to designate a passenger car road for motorized mixed use. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users. See Appendix C for a summary of the process and conclusions related to the motorized mixed use proposals.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The DEIS states: "A decision to designate a section of ML 3-5 NFTS road for motorized mixed-use requires that the decision be informed by an engineering analysis conducted by a qualified engineer. Based on the analysis conducted, the qualified engineer will identify risks and prepare documentation for the appropriate responsible official. The analysis may include mitigation measures that would reduce the risk associated with designating the road for motorized mixed-use. The analysis is currently being prepared and the final results will be included in the Final EIS. Preliminary results are displayed in appendix C Motorized Mixed Use." ROC requested a copy of the preliminary engineering analyses, but was denied. We have no way to evaluate how you approached this task or what criteria were used to establish the rankings in Appendix C. Please explain why only 30.41 miles out of 785 miles (3.9 percent) of ML 3 roads were considered for combined use.

Without the completed engineering analyses, the public has no way of knowing how many of the 30.41 miles of proposed ML 3 combined use roads will be designated for non-highway legal vehicle travel until the FEIS is issued. The preliminary crash probability and crash severity rankings (moderate or high risk) in Appendix C may eliminate many of these roads for combined use. Except for the Lassen NF and STNF, all other forests have provided their draft engineering analyses for ROC to review when their DEISs were released. The fact that none of these analyses are final indicates the Region's mixed use policy cannot be implemented in a timely manner for the public to evaluate and comment on them. Engineering analyses require the concurrence of the Regional Engineer and his staff as well as approval by the California Highway Patrol. If the Regional Forester continues to adhere to the Region's mixed use policy, Forest Engineers will have to expend considerably more time and funds preparing combined use proposals that conform with Section 38026 CVC. With current budget constraints as well as staffing shortages, we doubt many roads will be forwarded to CHP. The two tier review/ approval process has created a serious bottleneck that the Regional Forester did not anticipate. We also doubt the CHP has the personnel or funds to review many of these analyses. ROC has yet to see an acceptable combined use assessment in any of the DEISs we have read that meets CVC requirements. ROC recommends the STNF reclassify many of Forest's unpaved ML 3 roads to ML 2 to allow mixed use and to reduce road maintenance costs. Most of these roads are single lane, slow speed roads (25 mph or less) with low traffic volumes and traffic service levels of B, C and D. Setting road maintenance levels and changing maintenance levels are administrative and not subject to NEPA. The Regional Forester's January 13th letter describes the steps for reclassifying passenger car roads to ML 2. He is encouraging Forest Supervisors to consider this action. Fire access has been used as one argument against re-classifying ML 3 roads to ML 2, high clearance roads. Fire access is very important, but ROC disagrees with this argument. Most fire engines are 4-wheel drive and designed to travel on just about any road, including cross-country travel. Fire access should seldom be used as a reason to keep roads at a higher maintenance level. Air tankers and helicopters are often the fastest way to initiate fire suppression efforts. If reclassification is not feasible, please analyze a new alternative that will designate all unpaved ML 3 roads for motorized mixed use, and prepare engineering judgments when the three criteria in FSH 7709.55,30.3 are met. (#152)

Public Concern # 499. The Forest Service should document which ML 3 to 5 roads have had motorized mixed use in the past and the volume of OHV use on those roads, explain why mitigations would not be effective if a road is not designated for motorized mixed use, and include all engineering reports in an Appendix to the FEIS. The FS should allow the public to review and comment on these analyses before they are finalized.

Response: Under the current STNF policies, state law and the CVC apply to ML 3, 4, and 5 roads so these are restricted to highway-legal vehicles only. Many comments persuasively argued that at least some of those routes may be safe for "mixed use" (allowing highway-legal, and non-highway-legal vehicles to use the same route at the same time). To better provide mixed use access and accommodate the associated public interest, a feasible subset of

passenger car road segments was identified that could potentially enhance the motorized recreation experience. In accordance with FS policy, an engineering analysis was conducted on each of these segments. These analyses consider the safety aspects of allowing various uses, including various vehicle classes, to utilize the same roadway. This analysis is summarized in Appendix C. Potential mitigation measures and the associated change in risk is presented in the documents. These reports documenting the analyses provide information to the STNF Forest Supervisor for consideration during decisionmaking. If the STNF Forest Supervisor believes that the crash risks can be mitigated to an acceptable level, then a decision can be made to designate a passenger car road for motorized mixed use. Nothing in this decision precludes subsequent actions with more detailed analyses and mitigations to further accommodate users. Completed reports are not decision documents; however, they do inform decisionmakers and are included in the project record. See Appendix C for a summary of the process and conclusions related to the motorized mixed use proposals.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Explain why mitigations would not be effective if a road is not designated for motorized mixed use. Include all engineering reports in an Appendix to the FEIS so the reader understands why some roads may not be recommended for non-highway legal vehicle travel. Document which ML 3-5 roads have had motorized mixed use in the past and the volume of OHV use on those roads. Provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on these analyses before they are finalized. (#152)

Public Concern # 500. The Forest Service should review final designations to provide a seamless transportation system if County Boards choose to designate mixed use on their unpaved roads and should disclose any collaboration with affected counties and adjacent forests.

Response: In many cases, roads that connect to county roads or private roads were already part of the NFTS for that reason. The process for ongoing management of the NFTS in Subpart A of the TMR will not preclude future revisions in the NFTS to respond to changes in county road management. If adjacent public road authorities choose to implement and provide combined use highways and other motorized mixed use roadways legally, in accordance with the CVC, the STNF has the opportunity to make future Travel Management decisions to better provide for user access.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Motorized Mixed Use on Other Public Roads through the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. A key objective of travel management planning is: "To coordinate travel planning and analysis on NFS lands with federal, state, county and other local governmental entities and tribal governments and to allow the public to participate in the designation of NFS roads, NFS trails, and areas on NFS lands for motor vehicle use." (FSM 7702, Objectives (effective 01/08/2009). Collaboration with other road management agencies is critical for the development of sound NF travel management plans. ROC is working with many counties to designate all unpaved county roads through NFS land for motorized mixed use unless an exception exists for public safety, past accidents, resource impacts, user conflicts or other considerations that cannot be mitigated. Our goal is to have an interconnected transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles using unpaved county and National Forest System (NFS) roads. If County Boards choose to designate mixed use on their unpaved roads, please review the STNF's final designations to provide a seamless transportation system for the riding public. Consistency with local plans such as county general plans or adjacent national forest plans is not discussed in the DEIS. The reader is unsure if the STNF collaborated with affected counties and adjacent national forests. Please include this information in the FEIS. (#152)

Public Concern # 501. The Forest Service should disclose mixed use accident statistics to substantiate a regional policy that prohibits motorized mixed use on thousands of miles of unpaved passenger car roads in California because of public safety.

Response: The FS is not aware of any statistical summary of accidents on mixed use roads. The purpose of the "mixed use" discussion is to avoid creating accident statistics by identifying a NFTS that is safe to use as described on the MVUM. If state law (CVC) requires roads designated as "highways" be limited to "highway-legal" vehicles, then authorizing use by vehicles that are not "highway-legal" creates a potential public safety issue for the FS. To address this, a qualified FS engineer prepared a Mixed Use Analysis (see project record) for all ML 3, 4, and 5 road segments with proposed changes to accommodate mixed use. The engineer provides all available pertinent

information in that analysis. The analysis process and results are summarized in Appendix C. Alternatives 4 and 5 include roads proposed for mixed use.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Public Safety on Mixed Use Roads: ROC asserts the Forest Service does not have enough mixed use accident data from Region 5 national forests to adopt a regional policy that prohibits motorized mixed use on thousands of miles of unpaved passenger car roads in California. We found Region 5's mixed use accident information does not substantiate the agency's concern about public safety. In the past 15 years, there have been 11 mixed use accidents on 41,501 miles of NFTS roads in California. Three accidents involved FS employees running into an OHV; one involved a County Deputy Sheriff hitting an OHV. The data does not indicate the road maintenance level where these accidents occurred. There have been no mixed use accidents on the STNF in the past 15 years (from Region 5 accident data). There is no accident information in the DEIS to support a prohibition of nonhighway legal vehicles on unpaved passenger car roads. Please provide this in the FEIS to validate the agency's concern about public safety on STNF roads..

"On low-volume roads, crash history is seldom a reliable indicator of significant safety problems. Accordingly, use common sense and judgment to determine safety deficiencies and the priority for corrective action." Based on the Forest Service Handbook and Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), low volume roads are any roads with less than 400 average daily traffic (ADT). Unless a traffic study has been completed, we believe all STNF ML 3 roads have less than 400 ADT. Accidents related to human factors (alcohol, medical emergency, reckless driving, etc.), weather, time of day or mechanical failure may have nothing to do with road safety. The occurrence of an accident is not necessarily an indictment of the road or the public safety risk. Keep in mind, dual sport bikes can still legally operate on ML 3-5 roads. Has the Region and STNF considered the safety risk of this use? It makes no sense to prohibit a green sticker dirt bike when a similar dual sport bike can use any road on the forest. Is the issue then the safety of minor operators? Please explain in the FEIS. ROC asserts all unpaved ML 3 roads should be open to all vehicle classes unless a rare exception exists for some road segments due to public safety, past accidents, resource concerns, user conflicts or other considerations that cannot be mitigated. The DEIS admits OHV use is low on the STNF. The Regional Forester should follow Forest Service national direction and the agency's own guidebook for analyzing mixed use on FS passenger car roads. (#152)

Public Concern # 502. The Forest Service should manage the risk to OHV users on NFS roads, not eliminate the activity or prohibit youth under 16 years from participating in OHV recreation.

Response: The STNF manages thousands of miles of high-clearance vehicle NFS roads (operational ML 2) that are open and available for non-highway-legal use by unlicensed operators. Operators are required and expected to comply with CVC OHV requirements on these roadways.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Minor Operators on Mixed Use Roads: The CHP, State Off-highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division and ROC share equal concern with the Forest Service over the safety of minors driving non-highway legal vehicles on NFTS or other public roads. However, we believe State requirements for minor operators are sufficient. This includes the provision to have a supervising parent or guardian with minor operators under age 14. The answer is not to eliminate this use, but to mitigate it in the best way possible. As an example, the FS does not prohibit hiking, mountain biking, skiing, snowboarding, rock climbing, hunting, firearm use, driving with street legal vehicles or other recreational activities on the national forests. There are risks associated with all of these sports and, yes, some fatalities. The Forest Service should manage OHV risk, not eliminate the activity or prohibit youth under 16 years from participating. (Even FS employees have motor vehicle accidents!) There are numerous safety training programs for youth offered by the State, vehicle manufacturers, state-wide OHV organizations, and local OHV clubs. If there are continued safety concerns, the FS should approach the California Highway Patrol and State OHMVR Division to determine if State safety requirements for minors need to be strengthened. In accordance with FSH 7709.59, 23, the STNF should impose temporary road closures for certain vehicle classes (i.e. OHVs) when commercial traffic is present, such as log haul during timber sales. This is an appropriate mitigation measure for public safety. Please explain in the FEIS why the STNF believes the operation of non-highway legal vehicles on ML 3-5 roads is a public safety concern when there have been no mixed use accidents on any forest road. The discussion on pages 492 to 494 is inadequate. (#152)

Public Concern # 504. The Forest Service should evaluate the loss of access on wildland fire suppression.

Response: Access for wildland fire suppression is one of the benefits of the transportation system. These benefits are weighed against the risks during the road analysis process (RAPs) conducted on a project-level basis. The recommendations of the existing project level RAPs are summarized in Appendix B - Past and Foreseeable Actions. RAP documentation can be found in the project record.

Sample Public Comment(s):

You will be cutting off access to areas that are susceptible to wild fire, preventing timely action. (#55)

Public Concern # 505. The Forest Service should not use suppression of wildland fires as an excuse to construct roads within IRA's.

Response: The question of policy regarding road construction for fire suppression or other catastrophic natural events is best addressed to Forest staff officers for fire management or roadless area management. Road construction and responses to catastrophic events is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

In any event, emergency conditions created by catastrophic natural events should not become a pretext for the construction of roads within America's Roadless Areas (#90)

Public Concern # 506. The Forest Service should exercise all existing public access rights on private lands where legal rights-of-way and/or other documents, including co-operator agreements, state that public access is allowed and:

A) should consider all existing routes across private land as public access unless the private property owner has taken affirmative steps to deny access and the FEIS should document these right-of-way issues;

B) should review routes that transect private property and have been brought forth by the public via site-specific suggestions during the DEIS comment period for consideration for designation using "acquired but undocumented rights".

Response: All roads with an existing right-of-way or easement allowing public use on private lands are clearly shown on the maps as NFTS roads. Although many private landowners allow recreational use of their lands, it is at the discretion of the landowner what public access, if any, occurs on their lands. The FS does not have the authority to dictate the use of private lands by private landowners within or adjacent to the Forest boundary, and does not have the authority to display any roads or trails without rights-of-way (ROW) on an MVUM or to direct the public to cross private lands where a ROW does not exist.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences. We want the agency to exercise all existing public access rights on private lands where legal rights-of-way and/or other documents including co-operator agreements state that public access is allowed. (#139)

Public Concern # 509. The Forest Service should evaluate access for mineral claims.

Response: Access for mineral claims is evaluated on a case-by-case basis when approving the Operating Plan for that mining claim.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Miners have a similar penchant for tearing up riparian zones for access. This should not be permitted, until a strike is made that a "reasonable and prudent miner" would develop a claim. (#46)

Public Concern # 493. The Forest Service should clarify who will be affected by this analysis and evaluate the impacts to all individuals, as it is not just OHV enthusiasts but all forest visitors that will be affected from the loss of motorized access to public lands.

Response: In general, motor vehicle access is part of the significant issues addressed in the alternatives. While the distinction between motorized access and motorized recreation opportunity is sometimes fuzzy, this analysis does address effects to both. Estimating the effects on all individual stakeholders is outside the scope of the analysis, however a variety of user groups and communities of interest are addressed. It is recognized that nonmotorized recreationists, dispersed campers, people driving for pleasure, and many others require access to pursue their chosen activities in the national forest. The Recreation and Socio-economic analyses in Chapter 3 discuss the effects on particular user groups.

As part of the Travel Management planning process, the Forest must address socioeconomic concerns as it would for any other resource area in the FEIS. Chapter 3 provides an in-depth analysis of the existing socioeconomic conditions within a five-county area, as well as an evaluation of the potential effects the selection of a Travel Management alternative may have on the local communities. A key element in this review is a consideration of local lifestyles, attitudes, beliefs, and values and how Travel Management planning on the Forest may affect the cultural identity of adjacent communities. Table 3.11-9 of the FEIS (page 516) details the activities of Forest visitors.

In their comments on both the Proposed Action and DEIS, members of the public expressed concerns that reflected a wide range of beliefs and values regarding motorized vehicle access to NFTS lands. Because of the divergence of opinion on use and management of the unauthorized routes, one alternative cannot possibly reflect the diverse beliefs and values held by members of the public. Maintaining access to publicly-identified destinations of value that provide unique recreational experiences on the STNF remains a prime objective of the Travel Management Plan. However, it is the Forest's goal to select the alternative that best represents this range of equally important concerns, including access to favorite destinations across the Forest, while continuing to protect the natural resources that make the STNF a truly unique and unsurpassed place.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The general public was initially supportive of this action, however now that the details of the plan have emerged, there is a very strong feeling that the public was misled as to the actual impacts this plan will impose not just on OHV enthusiasts, but upon all forest users. According to the DEIS, unless a road is an official National Forest Transportation System road, it is considered to be a cross-country route and therefore illegal to drive on unless it becomes designated. This means that all of the spur roads on our district will now be illegal to drive on. Virtually no one took this into consideration in the early stages of this process, and now it appears to the public that they will not be allowed to drive their trucks on spur roads to access firewood or park their trailer off a NFTS road during hunting season. Ironically, the people who have the most concerns are not OHV users. It is the majority of other forest visitors who use the public domain for dispersed camping, hunting, and harvesting of forest products. Whether it was intentional or not, there is major confusion about this management plan and who it affects. (#67)

Under assumptions specific to recreation analysis: The change from an open to cross-country travel condition to a cross-country travel prohibited condition will increase the availability of acreage for nonmotorized recreation as well as nonmotorized access to dispersed recreation activities The acreage was already there and available for non motorized use, this didn't change, the only net effect is decreased motorized use, and excluding the public from its land. (#85)

Public Concern # 510. The Forest Service should provide access to the STNF rather than developing a travel management plan that limits recreational opportunities and penalizes those that follow the regulations and:

A) should expand and not restrict motorized public access because recreational needs are increasing; use will not be concentrated; it will not increase maintenance costs; it is good for recreation, the economy, and the environment; and it increases public satisfaction.

Response: Unmanaged motor vehicle travel, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites. Compaction and erosion are the primary effects of motor vehicle travel on soils. Riparian areas and aquatic dependent species are

particularly vulnerable to motor vehicle travel. The increase in OHV use for recreation has a corresponding increase on impacts to natural and cultural resources. Restrictions on motorized public access are needed to protect these other important resources on the national forest.

The TMR is intended to protect these national forest resources, not to impose unreasonable restrictions on access or recreational activities. There are over 5,400 miles of designated motorized routes on the STNF and approximately 44,000 acres of designated areas within the margins of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir available for motorized use on the STNF in the Proposed Action. The Purpose and Need in Chapter 1 of the FEIS explains why the FS is publishing a MVUM that establishes a NFTS and prohibits cross-country motor vehicle travel off of designated routes (FEIS, page 2). Regulations already exist for the protection of natural resources from any activity including OHV use and damage. These have not been completely effective so a different approach is needed to protect the STNF resources. Also, federal regulations require the STNF to move forward with implementation of these actions. 36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261, and 295 Final Rule: Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use (November 9, 2005) requires designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle travel.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This DEIS aims to severely impact the use of OHV/ATVs, limit recreational opportunities, and make criminals out of unsuspecting visitors to the forest. The DEIS assumes that enforcement of the laws stemming from this Travel Management plan will be "... enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal Laws and regulations." Furthermore, it is anticipated there will be a high number of violations during the transitional period then a decline in violations after the public becomes aware of and complies with the rules (pg 58, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, DEIS). This is simply unacceptable. Like I stated earlier, this problem was created by the Forest Service and allowed to fester into a larger issue. Consequently the USFS has chosen a group of action alternatives that are extraneous, create more issues than they solve, and further impose restrictions on public use. The National Forests belong to the people. The following excerpt comes directly from the USDA Forest Service Website: "National Forests and Grasslands offer a diversity of outdoor opportunities. These lands are yours - to visit, to care for, but most of all, to enjoy." (http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation). (#167)

Subconcern # A
I am very concerned with the proposed closures of roads and trails to motorized access. The closures of many miles of roads and trails as proposed by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest will concentrate use, increase maintenance costs and reduce public satisfaction. The STNF proposals are bad for recreation, bad for the economy and bad for the environment! (#138)

Public Concern # 511. The Forest Service should only consider closures in areas where there are demonstrable direct conflicts, such as around campgrounds and within 100 yards of a watershed.

Response: If Alternative 1 was selected, certain areas could be closed by Forest Orders for public safety or resource concerns and addresses the commenter's concern. However, Alternative 1 would result in no change to the existing cross-country motor vehicle travel on the STNF and not meet the intent of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

To access many parts of the forest, the roads and trails must remain open. Many parts of this forest are very steep and rugged, motorized access is a staple for many of the public. Only consider closures in areas where a DIRECT conflict can be proven such as around campgrounds and within 100 yards of watersheds. (#85)

Public Concern # 513. The Forest Service should limit motorized access as it contributes to the degradation of natural places, should not build additional roads, and should implement the road closures.

Response: Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 all restrict motor vehicle travel to designated roads and trails, with the exception of below the high-water mark on the Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs. These restrictions were intended to reduce the impacts of cross-country motor vehicle travel on the natural resources. None of the alternatives propose construction of new roads, and road construction or closures are outside the scope of this

analysis. Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 propose adding some unauthorized routes to the NFTS as system roads and trails. In the FEIS Appendix B, identified 261.61 miles of roads to be closed, decommissioned, or abandoned on the STNF.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There are plenty of roads in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest and any more would contribute to the degradation of this beautiful natural place. (#143)

Please there is already too many roads in the Shasta-Trinity national Forest. It's about time that the Forest Service in my area (Shasta County) started to close ORV roads and trails, not add more. (#143)

Public Concern # 514. The Forest Service should develop a process to provide additional motorized access in the event mistakes are made with the proposed closures.

Response: The current proposal is just one of many in the STNF's continuing effort to manage the transportation system in a sustainable and cost-effective manner. Previous decisions may have reduced or added to the number of miles of NFTS roads and trails available for motor vehicle travel. These decisions have resulted in road closures, seasonal restrictions, and decommissioning of selected routes. This has been accomplished through vegetation management projects, watershed restoration projects, fuels treatment projects, trail construction projects and trail management decisions. Watershed analyses and the STNF RAPs were used to inform the decisions. All of these efforts have contributed to sustainable management of the STNF NFTS.

Ongoing efforts include: 1) project-specific efforts to reduce the impacts associated with system and unauthorized routes (see Appendix B for a list of present and reasonably foreseeable actions), 2) addressing impacts associated with the current NFTS through the Forest’s road operation and maintenance program, and 3) researching and correcting jurisdiction of roads and motorized trails in INFRA. Implementation of this project is only one step in the overall management of motor vehicle travel on the STNF.

The STNF would like to emphasize that this decision is just the first step in implementing the TMR and that continued collaboration will be necessary and desired to identify the minimum road system and to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The TMR at 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis

Sample Public Comment(s):

I agree there should be limitations, but there also must be some process to provide additional access in the event mistakes are made with the proposed closures. (#162)

Public Concern # 515. The Forest Service should assess road maintenance costs associated with OHV use, ensure funding is available for maintenance and enforcement of the proposed NFTS and any additional roads or trails, and should:

A) address the maintenance backlog of existing roads and trails and disclose how it will maintain additional roads and trails added to the system. The FS should include specific information on the condition of roads, percentages and miles of NFTS roads that currently meet their assigned road management objectives and maintenance standards, and disclose the environmental effects resulting from the gap in maintenance needs and anticipated annual maintenance budgets;

B) address road and trail maintenance affordability, including the STNF's projected out-year deferred maintenance need, breaking out implementation and mitigation/monitoring costs separately, and explain why the STNF's deferred road maintenance was $137,000,000 in the August 2008 NOI, but is now 58 percent higher in the June 2009 DEIS.

Response: The majority of the funding used to maintain the STNF's road system comes from appropriated dollars. Annually, the FS requests road maintenance funding to meet the current needs. However, the actual amount which is funded is decided by Congress. The national Law Enforcement and Investigation (LEI) budget is funded by appropriated funds from Congress to provide law enforcement services on the NFS lands. The Travel Management

program is one of many Forest programs to benefit from federal law enforcement funding. For the past few years, law enforcement funding has increased and that has translated into an increase in field law enforcement personnel.

The STNF considered and analyzed funding available for the administration and maintenance of the routes added to the NFTS in various alternatives (FEIS, Chapter 3.12, Table 3.12-8). However, it is impractical to use funding levels as the primary rationale for adding or not adding routes to the NFTS. This is true for a variety of reasons. First, funding comes from a variety of sources that can vary dramatically from year to year. Annual recurring maintenance funds alone are not the only (or even the primary) funding available for maintenance of ML 2 roads, such as those being added in this process. As described in the affected environment section of the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3.11 of the FEIS, many other funding sources are used. Additionally, careful prioritization of the roads that get maintained on various schedules allows the Forest to maintain roads at or above minimum standards without dramatically increasing deferred maintenance costs. Deferred maintenance activities are often funded through cyclical project-specific funding sources.

The FEIS addresses affordability in the Existing Condition section of Chapter 3.12. The deferred maintenance for out-years cannot be calculated. It would be the difference between the projected annual maintenance needs and the actual amount allocated for road maintenance. The road maintenance funding does not include the monitoring funds. The monitoring is included in the Forest administrative budget. The estimate of the deferred road maintenance in the Notice of Intent was calculated incorrectly. The estimate in the June 2009 DEIS was correctly calculated.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Economic Impact - Ability of the USFS to enforce the numerous restriction being proposed and its ability to properly maintain existing roads and trails let alone newly proposed roads and trails. (#100)

Subconcern # A
The DEIS fails to address the massive maintenance backlog of existing roads and trails, and fails to account for how it will maintain additional roads and trails added to the system. The STNF can't add any motorized routes without disclosing how they will be maintained, where the funds will come from, and how they will be enforced. (#91)

Subconcern # B
The DEIS is silent on how these goals and Manual direction will be met under the four action alternatives. In our September 18, 2008 response to the Notice of Intent, ROC requested you identify the significant issue of "Affordability" to develop the action alternatives. This recommendation was not included in the DEIS. While the Forest's budget deficit is acknowledged in the NOI, there is no attempt to deal with it in any of the alternatives. The DEIS states: "The National Forest System roads are designed, constructed, and maintained to provide access for the utilization and management of the national forest. The design and maintenance standards for these roads were developed to provide for public safety." ROC is concerned about the agency's liability due to the lack of maintenance on NFTS roads. "An estimate of the deferred maintenance for roads on the Shasta-Trinity National Forests is $216,885,117." Please explain why the Forest's deferred road maintenance was $137,000,000 in the August 2008 NOI, but is now 58 percent higher in the June 2009 DEIS. The Forests projected outyear deferred maintenance need is not described and should be included in the FEIS. Table 3.11-1 displays the Forests annual estimated road maintenance costs. The cost to maintain a ML 3 road is 20 times the amount to maintain a ML 2 high clearance road ($10,870 vs. $543.33 respectively). The annual maintenance cost for a ML 4 road is over 26 times more expensive than a ML 2 road. All alternatives require over $17.7 million annually to maintain the STNF?s road system to standard compared to an average annual road maintenance budget of $702,766.31 The cost to implement the travel management plan under Alternative 5 is an additional $379,342.32 (Please breakout implementation and mitigation/monitoring costs separately in the FEIS. The DEIS does not display the mitigation/monitoring costs under each alternative.) (#152)

Public Concern # 516. The Forest Service should leave roads open regardless of the maintenance costs.

Response: Decisions to close roads are generally made for resource protection reasons. During the roads analysis for projects, maintenance costs may be considered, but are generally not one of the criteria used for recommending closure. Decisions to leave roads open are based on the need for the road in meeting agency objectives. This analysis makes no decisions to either close or open roads, but rather whether or not to make limited changes to the existing NFTS, including additions of roads, trails, and areas. Maintenance costs are predicted for the routes considered for

addition in each alternative and is just one factor considered by the STNF Forest Supervisor when selecting routes to add to the MVUM

Sample Public Comment(s):

Why shut down a road because it will save a few dollars in maintenance? (#55)

Public Concern # 518. The Forest Service should address the opportunity to use volunteers to maintain roads because:

A) it encourages joint responsibility and eliminates the need to deny access and post signs;

B) by describing the current OHV volunteer program, it creates the potential for volunteers to assist with future maintenance.

Response: As stated in the preamble to the TMR, the STNF Forest Supervisor should consider the contributions from volunteers and other cooperators in deciding on which routes to allow motor vehicle travel. Appendix E (Law Enforcement) in the FEIS contains an implementation strategy which among other tasks identifies how the public can help with implementation and maintenance of the designated system, enforcement of the rules, and education of other Forest users. A number of other criteria also need to be taken into account when considering entering into volunteer agreements, including the consideration of the effects of route designation on national forest natural and cultural resources, public safety, provision of recreational opportunities, access needs, and conflicts among uses of NFS lands. It is also important to remember that this is the first year of an ongoing process. Once a NFTS has been established, we believe the TMR provides the flexibility to develop future volunteer relationships and we look forward to that opportunity where it aligns with the objectives of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
Spend the money, not putting up gates and hiring law enforcement, but organizing and working with volunteer groups on repairs, on the very roads you have concern about. Encourage joint responsibility, not by denying access and posting signs, but promoting safe and productive use of our natural treasures. (#83)

Subconcern # B
Please address the opportunity to use volunteers to maintain roads if they are designated for mixed use (e.g. remove vegetation encroachment). Describe your current OHV volunteer program and its potential to assist with the Forest's future road and trail maintenance through such programs as Adopt-a-Trail or Adopt-a-Road. (#152)

Public Concern # 519. The Forest Service should disclose the foreseeable cumulative and direct environmental impacts of the proposal to add roads to a system that it cannot afford to maintain to standard.

Response: The STNF's goal is to maintain 20 percent of the Forest's current road system to standard each year, although it is accruing deferred maintenance due to funding shortfalls. Deferred maintenance is required maintenance that can be deferred without loss of road serviceability, until such time as the work can be economically or efficiently performed. The direct and cumulative environmental impacts of each alternative, including those which propose adding roads to the system, can be found in the effects section for each resource in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There exists a sizeable amount of research and experience concerning the environmental and human safety consequences of road and motorized trail systems that are not maintained to standard. Much of this research has been done by Forest Service research personnel. For example, a search of FS research documents on the sediment impacts of roads found 78 research documents that are available electronically (see: http://www. treesearch.fs.fed.us/cgibin/texis/webinator/simplesearch_newsearch/?db=simplesearch&query=sediment+roads). The work of Leslie Reid and her collaborators is of particular relevance. Ms. Reid has focused on sediment production from roads and on cumulative impacts (including cumulative road impacts). The FS Research database has pages of Ms. Reid's work available on line (see:http://www.treesearch.fs. fed.us/cgibin/texis/ webinator/

simplesearch_newsearch/?query=Leslie+Reid&db=simplesearch&jump=30). Of special note is the empirical research Ms. Reid and collaborators have accomplished. These studies demonstrate conclusively that roads that do not receive adequate maintenance deliver sediment to streams. Sediment delivery occurs even on well maintained native surface and gravel roads that are used for heavy hauling. We conclude from the preponderance of empirical research and from experience on the ground that the decision to adopt a system that cannot be maintained to standard (due to the disparity between available and likely funding and the system's maintenance needs) will result in sediment mobilization and delivery to streams. Furthermore, adoption of the system will result in significant human safety risks and injury resulting directly and indirectly from the failure to maintain the system to standard. (#151)

Public Concern # 520. The Forest Service should consider and implement an alternative that closes un-needed system roads and reduces road density and maintenance.

Response: The scope of this forestwide motorized travel management analysis is confined to implementing Subpart B of the TMR (36 CFR Part 212) and as such, proposes only limited changes to the NFTS for vehicle type and season of use that respond to specific components of the Purpose and Need. The scope of this analysis does not include Subpart A of the TMR directing the identification of the minimum transportation system, which would require the evaluation of the entire NFTS as requested in this alternative. An alternative to evaluate the existing NFTS and close roads was considered by the STNF Forest Supervisor but eliminated from detailed analysis, as described in Chapter 2. The STNF regularly examines the transportation system in areas across the STNF while conducting project planning. A sample of these kinds of decisions are listed in Appendix B, Table B-6, which includes 261.61 miles of roads to be closed, decommissioned, or abandoned on the STNF. Subpart A of the TMR provides for ongoing review of the NFTS. The FS also uses project-level plans done under the NEPA and other planning efforts, such as watershed analysis, to document un-needed system roads.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Forest Service (USFS) has accumulated a road maintenance backlog estimated at $10 billion for the Nation's 155 National Forests and Grasslands. Current maintenance budgets are insufficient to meet current maintenance needs. Recent forest-wide condition surveys indicate that our current road maintenance funding only meets a small portion of the annual maintenance needs on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. Page 486 of the DEIS indicates that the deferred road maintenance backlog on the Shasta-Trinity is in the neighborhood of $216,885,117. Implementation of the proposed action (alternative 2) would increase the annual road maintenance budget on the Forest by $278,094 a year. (DEIS page 496). We do not understand how the agency intends to draw adequate funding for maintenance of thousands of miles of existing roads and motorized trails while simultaneously proposing user created additions to the motorized travel system in light of the existing and significant maintenance backlog. The USFS must consider in its current plan/EIS the closure and decommissioning of at least those roads that the agency identified in its Roads Analysis as having both low value and high risk. Key Watersheds, LSRs, Riparians Reserves, Botanical Areas, Wild and Scenic River Corridors, Port Orford Cedar watersheds, and Botanical Areas are logical high priority areas for reducing road associated ecological damage. The Forest Service must disclose the foreseeable cumulative and direct environmental impacts of its proposal to add roads to a system that it cannot afford to maintain to standard. (#118)

Public Concern # 521. The Forest Service should display the actual maintenance expenditures for recent years and modify the Table to reflect the true cost that the STNF expects to spend based on spending trends within the last 5 years. The table(s) should also display the cost associated with the different maintenance levels, thus allowing the FS to reevaluate roads maintained for passenger cars to reduce maintenance levels, where appropriate, in an effort to reduce the STNF's maintenance cost.

Response: Table 3.12-3 in the FEIS shows the past four years of funding and miles of maintenance accomplished by the STNF. The average road maintenance costs per mile by ML are shown in Table 3.12-1. When these roads were assigned MLs, appropriate criteria in FSM and FSH were utilized. Travel Management planning for roads and trails is found in FSM 7700 and further direction for roads is found in FSH 7709. Future analysis of the NFTS may include reviews of assigned MLs to determine if reclassification to a different ML would better achieve management objectives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Transportation Management. Road maintenance costs that were displayed for the STNF were derived from national cost averages. These costs do not reflect the true and realistic cost of road and trail maintenance that has been expended by the STNF. These costs were developed through the use of the national Infra data base that reflects only an estimate of what the agency would spend to maintain roads and trails. This table shows a very distorted and unrealistic picture of maintenance and affordability cost. We cannot expect that a significant increase in maintenance funding will be approved in the foreseeable future. The STNF needs to display the actual maintenance expenditures for the Forest in recent years and modify the table to reflect the true cost that the Forest expects to spend based on spending trends within the last 5 years. It is extremely important the Forest use realistic costs associated with Forest maintenance activities. We want the agency to address the issue of affordability using actual and local figures. We want the STNF to reduce their maintenance level 3 roads to maintenance level 2 to allow mixed use and to reduce road maintenance costs. Although we feel the figures shown are exaggerated and distort the true expenditure of Forest maintenance funds. The tables must display the cost associated with the different maintenance levels. This would show a significant difference in the cost of maintaining roads for passenger cars verses maintaining roads for high clearance vehicles. This point should be considered when making road management decisions regarding maintenance levels. We want the Forest to re-evaluate roads maintained for passenger cars to reduce maintenance levels, where appropriate, in an effort to reduce Forest maintenance cost. (#139)

Public Concern # 522. The Forest Service should remove the statement made under the "Summary of Effects Analysis across All Alternatives" in the Transportation Section of Chapter 3 of the DEIS, as it implies that road and trail maintenance funding would be expanded on unauthorized routes and open areas. This funding can only be utilized on designated roads, trails, and areas and therefore, is not allowed for use off the NFTS as defined in Alternative 1, thus the statement in the DEIS should be replaced with a statement that reflects the financial impact of Alternative 1.

Response: We believe that the following statement, found in the analysis of Alternative 1, is the basis for the commenter's comment: "The indirect effect is based on the assumption that if maintenance funding remains constant and use of NFTS roads and unauthorized roads and trails continues at current level, it is likely that the backlog of maintenance needs will continue to increase." This will be modified in the FEIS to remove the reference to unauthorized roads. Road maintenance funding is only spent on system roads and trails. The estimated cost of Alternative 1 is summarized in the FEIS Table 3.12-8.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Transportation Management, Environmental Consequences, Summary of Effects Analysis across All Alternatives, Alt. 1, Cumulative Effects. This section implies that road and trail maintenance funding would be expended on unauthorized routes and open areas. This funding can only be utilized on designated roads, trail and areas and therefore not allowed for use off the NFTS as defined in Alternative 1. We want this section removed from the DEIS and replaced with a statement that truly reflects the financial impact of Alternative 1. (#139)

Public Concern # 524. The Forest Service should develop a plan that designates route management objectives and determines the level of needed maintenance.

Response: As stated in the FEIS, FSM Sections 2350 and 7700 contain agency policy for management of the NFTS. The policy requires the development of trail management objectives (TMOs) and road management objectives (RMOs). The TMOs and RMOs document the purpose of each trail or road. The purpose for the trail or road sets the parameters for maintenance standards needed to meet user needs, resource protection, and public safety. Forest Service Handbook 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet RMOs for the road system and includes considerations for public safety.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There is another concern regarding rationale for elimination of routes from detailed study as stated in Chapter 2, page 45. The statement is that in order to bring a route into the NFTS it must be brought up to USFS standards for safety and resource protection. The cost of maintenance is also mentioned as a reason to eliminate routes from consideration. Without a conceptual plan and subsequent operational plan, no route management objectives can be developed. Therefore the standard or level of needed maintenance is undocumented and arbitrary. (#147)

Public Concern # 527. The Forest Service should develop options that reduce maintenance costs such as:

- **A) temporarily raising the operational ML of a road to provide more economical commodity haul (or for some other management purpose) and then lower the operational ML when the activity has ended;**
- **B) converting some ML 2 roads with low use to motorized trails to further reduce your maintenance costs;**
- **C) assigning MLs commensurate with use;**
- **D) closing ML 2 roads that provide no recreational opportunity and serve no administrative purpose;**
- **E) following the criteria in FSM 7715.5 for roads when assigning road maintenance levels, and provide actual traffic volume and vehicle classes using passenger car roads to justify road maintenance levels and traffic service levels in INFRA.**

Response: As stated in the FEIS, FSM Sections 2350 and 7700 contain agency policy for management of the NFTS. The policy requires the development of trail management objectives (TMOs) and road management objectives (RMOs). The TMOs and RMOs document the purpose of each trail or road. The purpose for the trail or road sets the parameters for maintenance standards needed to meet user needs, resource protection, and public safety. FSH 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet RMOs for the road system and includes considerations for public safety.

FEIS Table 3.12-6 includes details of the miles of roads currently being proposed for closure or decommissioning. The scope of this project does not include the need to undertake a comprehensive analysis of all existing ML 3, 4, and 5 roads in order to justify the appropriateness of their current ML. Future analysis of the transportation system may include reviews of assigned MLs to determine if reclassification to a different ML would better achieve management objectives.

Maintenance level 3 roads are generally surfaced with gravel or pavement to allow higher volumes of traffic and higher speeds. The higher maintenance costs for these roads are needed to protect the government's investment in these roads. Many of the roads used for commodity production are ML 2 roads. These roads are graded and improved by the operator to allow efficient hauling. Once the operations are complete, the roads receive maintenance, as needed, to keep them up to standard.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A-D
Options to prioritize STNF road maintenance efforts have not been considered. The STNF currently manages approximately 5,332 miles of NFS roads. The EIS states that the STNF's deferred road maintenance is currently estimated to be $216,883. The cost to maintain a ML 3 road is twenty times the amount to maintain a ML 2, high clearance road ($10,870 vs. $543 respectively). All alternatives require over $17.7 million annually to maintain the STNF's road system to standard. The Board is unclear how the STNF can meet their road maintenance goals with such a significant deficit. Resolution: Lower operational road maintenance levels to reduce the STNF's road maintenance costs. This will allow OHV operators to travel on these roads and provide connectivity for non-highway legal vehicles and reflects current vehicle use. (#145)

Public Concern # 528. The Forest Service should bring your road system in alignment with your projected annual road maintenance budgets by:

A) setting the operational maintenance level on all unpaved roads as ML 2;
B) beginning monitoring actual use according to accepted protocols for traffic surveillance to determine volume, distribution, and type of traffic actually flowing on Forest roads;
C) adjusting the operational ML up when passenger cars, recreational vehicles, or cars pulling trailers exceed 50 percent of the total traffic on individual roads and the ADT is at least 100.

Response: As stated in the FEIS, FSM Sections 2350 and 7700 contain agency policy for management of the NFTS (FEIS, page 539). The policy requires the development of trail management objectives (TMOs) and road management objectives (RMOs). The TMOs and RMOs document the purpose of each trail or road. The purpose for the trail or road sets the parameters for maintenance standards needed to meet user needs, resource protection and public safety. FSH 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet RMOs for the road system and including considerations for public safety.

Less than 117 miles of the existing NFTS are ML 3 native surface roads. None of the action alternatives under consideration add any ML 3, 4, or 5 roads to the system. A blanket reduction of all native surface roads to ML 2 to reduce maintenance costs is not possible, nor is it being considered. The road surface is not the deciding factor for determining whether it is legal to use OHVs/ATVs on the road. Federal regulations and state laws determine the type of vehicle that is authorized (16 USC 480, 36 CFR 212.5).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A-C
Absent traffic survey data, ROC highly recommends these steps to bring your road system in alignment with your projected annual road maintenance budgets: Set the operational maintenance level on all unpaved roads as ML 2; Begin monitoring actual use according to accepted protocols for traffic surveillance to determine volume, distribution and type of traffic actually flowing on STNF roads; Adjust the operational maintenance level up when passenger cars, recreational vehicles or cars pulling trailers exceed 50 percent of the total traffic on individual roads and the ADT is at least 100. (#152)

Public Concern # 529. The Forest Service should lower maintenance levels and allow mixed motorized use enabling them to apply for State OHV Trust Funds to help reduce maintenance costs.

Response: Forest Service Handbook 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet road management objectives (RMOs) for the road system and including considerations for public safety. ML 3 roads are generally surfaced with gravel or pavement to allow higher volumes of traffic and higher speeds. The higher maintenance costs for these roads are needed to protect the government's investment in these roads. To support enforcement of the TMR, Region 5 Forest Recreation Programs have applied for and received grant dollars (Green sticker funding) from the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division Grants Program. These State funds are earmarked specifically for enforcement of OHV laws and regulations on the various Forests, which is performed primarily by Forest Protection Officers (FPO) and are not used for maintenance. Changing maintenance levels on existing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis. Motorized mixed use is proposed on particular segments of ML 3 roads as described in Appendix C.

Sample Public Comment(s):

When motorized mixed use is designated on a road in California, State OHV Trust Funds may be used to maintain the road. They will help reduce the STNF's backlog of road maintenance if the FS chooses to apply for these grants. This is another reason for lowering your maintenance levels and allowing mixed use. (#152)

Public Concern # 530. The Forest Service should consider the conversion of roads to trails and/or roads managed as trails, and reclassify ML 3, 4 and 5 roads as ML 2 roads to meet the demand for OHV recreation, reduce its maintenance backlog, and meet budget goals.

Response: Forest Service Handbook 7709.59 describes the maintenance management system the FS uses and the maintenance standards needed to meet road management objectives (RMOs) for the road system and includes considerations for public safety. ML 3 roads are generally surfaced with gravel or pavement to allow higher volumes of traffic and higher speeds. The higher maintenance cost for these roads is needed to protect the government's investment in these roads. Changing maintenance levels on existing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

All of the action alternatives fail to incorporate the conversion of roads-to-trails or roads-managed as a trail as a budgetary tool to help the Forest meet its fiscal goals. Also as ROC points out the Forest did not reclassify any level 3-5 roads as level 2 roads in an effort to meet the demand for OHV recreation, reduce its maintenance backlog, or meet budget goals. (#154)

Public Concern # 531. The Forest Service should decommission a significant percentage of the road system to:

A) allow adequate maintenance of important roads;
B) be consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the amended LRMPs;
C) reduce habitat fragmentation, disturbance and mortality to wildlife, and sedimentation of streams.

Response: The NFS roads are needed for the management and utilization of the national forest. The road system is analyzed during project planning to identify the benefit and risks associated with each road in the project area. Roads with a low benefit and high resource risks are then recommended for decommissioning or closing. The risks include criteria such as consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, wildlife considerations, and sedimentation concerns. Closing or decommissioning roads does reduce the amount of road to be maintained. Table 3.11-6 details the miles of roads currently being proposed for closure or decommissioning in other project planning efforts across the STNF. Decommissioning roads is outside the scope of this analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
There are thousands of miles of road on your forest, and you need to decommission a significant percentage of your road system so that you can adequately maintain important roads. (#109)

Subconcern # B
The Forest Service needs to decommission a significant percentage of the existing road system so that adequate maintenance of important roads will be possible. Decommissioning significant road mileage, not expanding the motorized travel system, is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the amended Forest Plans. (#111)

Subconcern # C
I am a biologist and have personally conducted a literature review of the ecological consequences of roads in our nation's forest. I am fully aware of the habitat fragmentation, disturbance and mortality to wildlife, sedimentation of streams, etc. caused by roads in the forest. We should be retiring forest roads not building new ones as our wild habitats suffer more and more the consequences of human activities. (#143)

Public Concern # 532. The Forest Service should not decommission a significant percentage of the road system because it precludes the public desire and request for motorized access, and if requested by the public, it needs to be addressed in this analysis.

Response: Decommissioning roads is outside the scope of this analysis. This analysis is focused on adhering to Subpart B of the TMR, by prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel; making limited changes to the NFTS by adding roads, trails, and areas; and assigning seasonal and vehicle class restrictions as needed. Providing motorized access is part of the Purpose and Need for this project and is met by all action alternatives.

Decommissioning decisions are made regular during project planning efforts across the STNF. The NFTS roads are needed for the management and utilization of the national forest. The road system is analyzed during project planning to identify the benefit and risks associated with each road in the project area. Roads with a low benefit and high resource risks are then recommended for decommissioning or closing. While motorized access is a benefit, it is often out-weighed by numerous resource concerns.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Travel Management on the Shasta Trinity National Forest. We object to the statement that some NFTS roads were decommissioned because it was determined that they were not needed for the foreseeable future. This decision precludes the public desire and request for motorized access and if requested by the public need to be considered in this analysis. (#139)

Public Concern # 533. The Forest Service should decommission and restore unauthorized routes; or at a minimum, list and prioritize unauthorized routes that require active management to address the significant resource issues.

Response: Decommissioning unauthorized routes is outside the scope of this analysis, although as noted in many of the effects analyses in Chapter 3, the prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel will result in the passive restoration of many miles of unauthorized routes. Decisions to decommission unauthorized routes are made regularly during project planning efforts across the STNF. Currently, there are approximately 58 miles of unauthorized roads, which have been recommended for decommissioning. A list of these roads can be found in Appendix B of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Plan for decommissioning and restoration of unauthorized routes that have known significant resource impairments. All action alternatives prohibit travel, rather than physical removal or restoration, on unauthorized routes. Therefore, the density of roads and trails at the watershed scale, and associated resource impacts, may not substantially change for a significant period of time due to the rate of natural restoration.

Recommendation: Where feasible, we recommend decommissioning and restoring unauthorized routes not designated for motorized vehicle use that have known significant resource impairments. At a minimum, the FEIS should list and prioritize, for future rehabilitation, the unauthorized prohibited routes that require active management to address significant resource issues. (#164)

Public Concern # 534. The Forest Service should identify roads in key watersheds containing threatened Coho salmon that can be decommissioned or re-engineered to reduce sediment impacts.

Response: All of the action alternatives would likely benefit aquatic biota by ending cross-country motor vehicle travel (FEIS, Table 3.15-4, page 589, Appendix M). However, the identification of, decommissioning, and re-engineering roads in key watersheds containing threatened Coho salmon is not a component of this project and is outside of the scope of this decision. Road management and maintenance is an action that occurs on the STNF through a variety of projects. The Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) is available for review upon request from the STNF or by visiting the Forest's website. This schedule contains a list of projects proposed to be implemented on the Forest including the project purpose.

The road system is analyzed during the RAPs to identify the benefit and risks associated with each road in a project area. If the project is in a key watershed for Coho salmon, then the risk criteria will reflect this. Roads with a low benefit and high resource risks are recommended for decommissioning or closing. Roads with a high benefit and a high resource risk are recommended for increasing the maintenance level to reduce the risk, or some other appropriate mitigation measure.

The IDT considered routes located in riparian reserves which could potentially affect Coho salmon. The resource risks of these routes were evaluated on a site-specific basis and in some cases, caused the routes to be eliminated from further study. Further details are included in Appendix G and in the Aquatics Analysis in Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Throughout much of the DEIS the Forest Service assumes that publication of the MVUM encouraging motorized use on proposed routes will not increase the environmental impacts of mapped routes. However, your colleagues in the Klamath National Forest (on page 261 of their Motorized use DEIS) acknowledge that "proposed additions to the NFTS could have increased use which may increase impacts". Currently many of the user-created routes are not illustrated on Shasta-Trinity Forest Service maps and are known of through word-of-mouth. The agency cannot contend that the foreseeable increase in motorized use on routes located in Riparian Reserves will not result in the cumulative sediment impacts listed above. If you map it, they will come. We recommend that a serious effort be made to identify roads in Key Watersheds containing threatened Coho salmon that can be decommissioned or re-engineered to reduce sediment impacts. Obviously high priority roads for treatment or decommissioning should not appear on the MVUM (#118)

Public Concern # 535. The Forest Service should complete a forestwide travel analysis of the transportation system and:

A) include a determination of the minimum road system, which would identify other roads for decommissioning and routes that are impacting resources, and would examine the economic and management capabilities of the STNF;

B) examine and strictly follow recommendations made in each watershed analysis.

Response: Conducting a forestwide travel analysis process is outside the scope of this decision. Travel analysis planning is required under 36 CFR 212 Part A - Administration of the Forest Transportation System. This Travel Management Plan is being done to comply with Subpart B of the TMR - Designation of Roads, Trails, and Areas for Motorized Vehicle Use, which does not require a travel analysis process. The STNF Forest Supervisor considered an alternative that would examine the entire existing NFTS but eliminated it from further study as described in Chapter 2.

In the travel analysis process, the evaluation of the benefits and risks associated with individual routes was used in this analysis to evaluate the unauthorized routes under consideration for addition to the NFTS. The scope of this analysis is forestwide, while the analyses completed during project planning is generally on a watershed basis and results in recommendations about the minimum road system in that watershed, along with recommendations for road closures, construction, or decommissioning. A list of the current recommendations for other planning efforts can be found in Appendix B of the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The Shasta-Trinity National Forest has not completed a Forest-wide science based travel analysis of the transportation system, which includes a determination of the minimum road system and identifies other roads for decommissioning, routes that are impacting resources, and an examination of the economic and management capabilities of the Forest. The current transportation system continues to allow motor vehicle use in ecologically and socially important roadless areas, Riparian Reserves, and in habitat containing sensitive plant and wildlife species. (#120)

Subconcern # B
Critical to the Forest-wide science-based travel analysis is the examination of recommendations made in each Watershed Analysis (WA). Roads have the most impact on all resources and need to be examined watershed by watershed; furthermore, the recommendations made in each WA need to be strictly followed. (#120)

Public Concern # 536. The Forest Service should allow road use at the public's own risk, whether the road is open or closed.

Response: The NFTS roads are needed to utilize and administer the Forest, and meet some of the Agency's many objectives. Public safety is one of the criteria used to determine the maintenance level for a road. If a road is deemed to be unsafe for the public to use, the FS may decide to close that road, which would be in the public's interest. In addition, roads are often closed to protect natural resources rather than for public safety, therefore allowing motorized vehicle travel on a closed road is very likely to damage natural resources.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We looked over your proposed closures on alternative's # 1 through 6, and feel you are wasting time and money, as you don't maintain them anyway. The winters around here close the roads with down trees, so just leave them alone. If someone wants to open them so be, no harm done. USE THE ROADS AT YOUR OWN RISK. (#68)

Public Concern # 537. The Forest Service should close NFTS or unauthorized roads and trails that cause damage and impact the resources.

Response: All of the action alternatives prohibit motorized vehicle travel off of the NFTS roads. This prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel will allow the passive restoration of many miles of unauthorized routes, as described in many resource analyses in Chapter 3. In addition, the screening process used when selecting routes to study in this project, evaluated routes for their potential risks to natural resources. Many routes were eliminated due to resource concerns (see Appendix G).

Closing NFTS roads is outside the scope of this analysis; however road closure decisions are made regularly in planning efforts across the STNF. Project analyses also examine unauthorized routes in the project area and the STNF Forest Supervisor may decide to actively close these routes. For example, Appendix B identifies approximately 58 miles of unauthorized roads which are proposed for decommissioning.

Sample Public Comment(s):

In the same vein, we question why the EIS will not analyze closing roads and trails that are causing resource damage. The EIS process is the proper time to conduct such an analysis. The forest is well aware that is had roads and trails in places where significant resource damage is occurring. These roads and trails should be closed and permanently removed from the NFTS. One of the most disturbing aspects of the proposed action is the failure to address closing any roads and trails, while stating those illegal roads and trails not authorized in the proposed action may be authorized at a later date. This suggests that ALL 5,085 illegal routes resulting in the addition of 1,198 miles of motorized access will be left for continued illegal use. This is unacceptable and we would suggest the current EIS is a complete waste of time and taxpayer expense. If an EIS is going to be developed, then a reasonable range of alternatives exploring the closure of roads/trails causing resource damage, as well as snowmobile use, must be part of the analysis. (#91)

Public Concern # 538. The Forest Service should institute a rain gauge-measured closure together with a drying time, rather than a closure solely based on arbitrary dates.

Response: An alternative that would use a rainfall-based wet weather closure plan for roads was considered but eliminated from detailed study. See Chapter 2 for a discussion of the merits and feasibility of date-based and weather-based closure plans.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The STNF DEIS Alternatives recommend various seasonal closures on a majority of OHV routes. As we all know watching the news reports, the weather can be very unpredictable. Basing road closures on the calendar will leave many weeks of access unavailable, even though there is very little impact because there is no current precipitation. I request that a rain gauge measured closure together with a drying time is a superior system to closure based solely on arbitrary dates. Many OHV areas in California already use this method to address unnecessary resource damage during wet weather. (#138)

Public Concern # 539. The Forest Service should include all trails and roads proposed for closure that have been constructed, reconstructed, or maintained with appropriated State funding, grants, and Green sticker funding, and designate them as part of the transportation system.

Response: This proposal is not intended to revisit previous decisions that resulted in the current NFTS. This proposal is narrowly focused on the addition and designation of roads, trails and areas for motor vehicle travel in accordance with 36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B, through publication of a MVUM (FEIS page 5). One of the primary objectives of designating a NFTS is so that funding can be directed to those designated routes that will be part of the

NFTS in the future. This effort is the first strategic planning exercise undertaken by the FS under the TMR with an objective of identifying a permanent motorized transportation system. Undoubtedly, there are routes that have received construction or maintenance funding in the past and will not be included in the NFTS. Conversely, there may also be routes added to the NFTS that have never had any expenditure of funds. Whether a road or trail has benefitted from the past expenditures of federal or state tax dollars, or license fees such as the "Green Sticker" program, it is not a criterion in the TMR for adding or closing a route.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We want the STNF to designate all trails and roads proposed for closure where appropriated funding, Grants, and Green Sticker funding were spent by the Forest for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails. We want these routes included in the final EIS as part of the transportation system because the Forest has recognized these routes as part of the transportation system through the expenditure of these funds and accepted use from the public. (#139)

Public Concern # 540. The Forest Service should reevaluate the differences in closure periods and follow the closure plan processes similar to other forests in Region 5, such as a user period of March 1 to December 31 with the flexibility of a Forest Order adjusting the use period as local conditions dictate should be the minimum season of use, and a wet-weather closure of one inch of rain in 24 hours, then close the area to wheeled travel for 48 hours, and then reopen.

Response: An alternative that would use a rainfall-based wet weather closure plan for roads was considered but eliminated from detailed study. See Chapter 2 for a discussion of the merits and feasibility of date-based and weather-based closure plans.

Sample Public Comment(s):

BRC is concerned the agency failed to functionally incorporate this important tenet in any action alternative as outlined in a previous comment letter. " ... If needed, BRC also supports the development and implementation of appropriate wet weather seasonal closures - based on specific rainfall amounts collected by NOAA approved rain gauges -to motorized and non-motorized use to reduce damage to trail and road beds. The unreasonably short riding season (July 10 to January 31 or August 2/16 to December 31/January 31) in the proposed action is confusing and does not make sense nor is the rationale articulated in the text or narrative of the NOI. Having ridden on the Forest for many years, the routes in question are often free of snow and are fully capable of handling casual OHV use during a dry winter. Conversely, some of those said routes are closed by early snow storms in late October or early November. Any wet weather closure plan should allow for native surfaced trails and roads to be open when soil conditions lack-of-rainfall permits. If a wet weather closure is needed, the implementing Forest Order should be for the shortest period of time rather than a longer time period. In NEPA, it is always easier to extend a short closure V. repealing a longer closure. BRC strongly suggests that if the Forest decides on a season of use based on factual concerns about weather conditions and that the closure period starts January 1 through March 31 with the Forest reserving the right to extend the closure based on actual weather or soil conditions." Other Forests including the Tahoe, Sierra, and Eldorado have shortened their closure periods based on public input. BRC strongly suggests that the agency make the same modifications. (#154)

Public Concern # 541. The Forest Service should explain how they will implement the "Seasons of Use" strategy so that it is easy to comply with and understand.

Response: The season of use for each route will be clearly shown on the Motor Vehicle Use Map.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Seasons of Use. Please describe in the FEIS how the STNF will implement your proposed "Seasons of Use" strategy so the public has a reasonable chance of understanding and complying with the new rules. It appears to be a law enforcement challenge. (#152)

Public Concern # 542. The Forest Service should reevaluate vehicle use where no old growth or spotted owl habitat are involved.

Response: Motor vehicle travel was evaluated across the entire STNF for this analysis. Habitat for all TES species was analyzed, as well as species of concern. Motor vehicle travel in habitat for federally threatened and endangered species is directed by the USFWS and the STNF LRMP, and is adhered to in this analysis with concurrence by the USFWS. Reconsideration of the seasonal closures to protect northern spotted owls adjacent to Trinity Lake, Iron Canyon Reservoir, and added routes resulted in the removal of those closures in the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Using the spotted owl as an excuse to restrict vehicle use in an area where no "old growth owl habitat" exists is ridiculous. Limiting motorized recreation in dry lake beds to "highway-legal" vehicles makes less sense. (#53)

Public Concern # 543. The Forest Service should reevaluate restricting access to areas containing habitat for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species and Survey and Manage Species to protect these species from harm caused by humans.

Response: The commenter's concern is for the protection of wildlife from humans who may wish to kill individual animals in an effort to eliminate the need for restricting management actions in particular areas. Management of habitat and populations of federally threatened and endangered species is directed by the ESA and is adhered to in this analysis with concurrence by the USFWS. Sensitive species are identified by the USDA Forest Service Regional Forester, and survey and management species for the STNF were identified during the development of the Northwest Forest Plan. The environmental effects of proposed additions of roads, trails, and areas within habitats for these species are disclosed in Chapter 3. The STNF Forest Supervisor will weigh the predicted environmental effects with the recreation benefit of each route, and select the combination of routes that provide adequate species protection while at the same time allowing for valuable motor vehicle access.

Sample Public Comment(s):

You don't have provision to prevent access to areas containing habitat for threatened, endangered, sensitive (TES) of Survey & Manage Species. (#46)

Public Concern # 544. The Forest Service should charge an annual use fee for use of NFS lands and allow users to volunteer to maintain trails.

Response: The FS does not charge a fee for access to public land; however the FS does have many programs where user fees are charged for special programs or services, and where volunteers perform trail maintenance. As stated in the preamble to the TMR, the STNF Forest Supervisor should consider the contributions from volunteers and other cooperators in deciding on which routes to allow motor vehicle travel. Appendix E (Law Enforcement) in the FEIS contains an implementation strategy which among other tasks, identifies how the public can help with implementation and maintenance of the designated system, enforcement of the rules, and education of other forest users. It is also important to remember that this is the first year of an ongoing process. Once a NFTS has been established, we believe the TMR provides the flexibility to develop future volunteer relationships and we look forward to that opportunity where it aligns with the objectives of the TMR.

Sample Public Comment(s):

If it is a matter of money, then have us pay an annual use fee for using forest service lands. Allow users to volunteer to maintain trails. I and many others that I know would be more than happy to get out there and maintain and repair trails. I currently have adopted a trail at a local National Recreation Area and volunteered many hours each year to building and maintaining multi use trails in the area. I have heard from many mountain bikers that their requests to do volunteer work on Forest Service Land have been denied. (#172)

Public Concern # 545. The Forest Service should eliminate and not expand unauthorized routes within the STNF's Inventoried Roadless Areas, Citizens Inventoried Roadless Areas, and critical fisheries habitat because the existing motorized route system is adequate and:
A) the FS needs to protect all resources and prevent the spread of noxious weeds.

Response: The FS recognizes that IRAs are important in that they provide remote recreation opportunities and values outside of designated Wilderness, including the opportunity for motorized recreation. Regulations do not prohibit motor vehicle travel within IRAs. The prohibition on cross-country motor vehicle travel in all of the action alternatives would be consistent with values associated with IRAs (FEIS, page 504). The IRAs were considered in this analysis under their inventoried boundaries which date from the Roadless Area Review and Inventory (RARE II) in 1976 and as described in Appendix C of the FEIS for the STNF LRMP. Effects to CIRAs by action alternatives were also analyzed; however CIRAs are not Forest designated management areas or under management guided by other FS policy.

Since the RARE II inventory, roads have been constructed within IRAs. In this FEIS, the IRAs were analyzed with present system roads in place. This was regarded as baseline for predicting environmental effects (36 CFR Part 294 Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule). Adding new routes in IRAs would be subject to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule and the consideration of the Secretary of Agriculture. Please refer to Sections 3.03 "Aquatic Resources and 3.08--Nonnative Invasive Plants" of the FEIS for details on the Proposed Action effects on noxious weeds.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I especially want to urge you to close and ban all unauthorized routes within official Forest Service Roadless Areas, as well as the many citizen inventoried and pending Roadless Areas. (#39)

Subconcern # A
Exclude all unauthorized routes to protect watershed, plants, and wildlife, especially TES species, and prevent spread of alien or noxious weeds. (#46)

Public Concern # 546. The Forest Service should allow unauthorized trails to be user-maintained.

Response: Unauthorized routes were not designed or constructed to meet standards for NFTS roads or trails and they often pose a threat to natural resources. Unauthorized routes were evaluated for risks and benefits during the alternative development process (see Alternative G). Routes with minimal resource risk that also have a recreation benefit were proposed to be added to the NFTS. Maintenance of trails selected for addition to the NFTS and designated on the MVUM may be maintained by users if such a collaboration is pursued with the FS. Volunteers are welcomed, appreciated, and provide many valuable services in promoting the Agency's mission and objectives.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Most of these unauthorized trails have been around for many years. Most are user maintained and would not need the forest service to maintain them. With guidance from the forest service, I am sure enough volunteers can be commissioned to maintain every inventoried trail on the map. The forest reclaims trails that have not had any use within 2 years, so if no one rides them they will disappear; only the popular trails will remain clear. Those trails can then be forest service maintained and most of the OHV community would be happy. (#85)

Public Concern # 548. The Forest Service should designate historic access routes for OHV recreation use when public input has requested these types of routes.

Response: Public input was considered when the unauthorized routes were analyzed. All routes requested by the public were evaluated by the IDT to determine resource risks and recreation benefits. Generally, routes that provided access to water or dispersed recreation, or formed a loop ride, and posed minimal risk to resources, were proposed to be added to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We want the STNF to designate historic access routes for OHV recreation use when public input has requested said routes. The DEIS is silent to our request. (#139)

Public Concern # 549. The Forest Service should consider maximizing the retention of as many existing unauthorized roads and trails where OHV activity is sought as a part of this process, and the establishment of the STNF transportation system.

Response: The FS considered an alternative that would add all or the majority of unauthorized routes to the NFTS. This alternative was eliminated from further study as described in Chapter 2. However, Alternative 5 was developed to maximize the number of requested routes proposed for addition to the NFTS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The prospect that some existing user-created routes that are well-suited for OHV opportunities will be "designated" post-FEIS/ROD after site-specific evaluation and public involvement is unrealistic. The future funding prospects, conflicted demands on staff resources, and the environmental requirements of such site-specific designations makes this unattainable. The general forest users and the OHV communities know this to be true and will not be placated by this remote prospect by the forest. They know that there are simply other more pressing demands on forest staff time and few funding avenues available. The forest should seriously consider maximizing the retention of as many possible existing roads and trails where OHV activity is sought as a part of this process and the establishment of a forest NFTS. Not doing so will be at the risk of losing significant credibility with the general public and community users at large. (#142)

Public Concern # 550. The Forest Service should display all unauthorized routes in Appendix A, provide site-specific rationale if any route is not proposed for designation, and explain why mitigation would not be effective.

Response: The methodology used to develop the Proposed Action and the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 and Appendix G. Further details, including the list of inventoried unauthorized routes and the routes requested by the public during scoping, are in project record. Each route was evaluated using a variety of screening criteria intended to select the routes with minimal negative effects to natural resources, while providing a benefit to the motorized recreation experience or access. Mitigation measures are proposed where the IDT determined they would be feasible and effective in minimizing negative effects to the resources. Many of the routes requested were existing NFTS roads and therefore, not within the scope of this analysis to either add (since they already part of the NFTS) or remove from the NFTS. Many of the remaining requested routes were eliminated from detailed study due to the screening criteria described in Appendix G and therefore, not part of the decision supported in this FEIS. See Chapter 2 and Appendices A, D, and L for mitigation measures proposed to specific routes.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Most unauthorized routes are inexplicably not proposed for designation. All of the alternatives propose to designate less than four percent of the 1,252 miles of "unauthorized routes" that were inventoried. The rest will be closed to motor vehicle travel. No explanation is provided for this broad rejection. These unauthorized routes provide recreation opportunities and should be delineated in the EIS. If they warrant improvements or resource mitigations, these steps should be set forth in the EIS. These routes could then be added to the Forest's motor vehicle use map (MVUM) when the mitigation work was completed. The total number of miles the public asked for is not listed nor is there any indication they were reviewed or what the outcome of the review was. Resolution: Display all unauthorized routes in Appendix A to the EIS. Provide site-specific rationale if any route is not proposed for designation. Explain why mitigation would not be effective. (#145)

Public Concern # 551. The Forest Service should clearly describe the context of the proposed route as the adverse effects from route designation are minor compared to the impacts from cross-country motor vehicle travel, which will now be prohibited.

Response: The impact of the additional routes to be designated under each alternative is displayed in each resource section of Chapter 3.

Sample Public Comment(s):

ROC believes the overall impacts from adding unauthorized routes is so minor, that when aggregated with other impacts occurring across the forest landscape (existing NFTS roads/trails, vegetation management, wildfires,

mining, grazing, etc.), they are imperceptible and discountable. These routes are already in place and are being used. Ground disturbance and other resource impacts have already occurred and will likely remain the same if designated. The adverse effects from route designation are minor compared to the impacts from cross-country travel, which will now be prohibited. Overall, the effects from designation are an improvement over the existing situation since most unauthorized routes will be closed to motor vehicle travel. Chapter 3, "Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences" section should clearly describe the context of the proposed route additions (15.56 to 106.12 miles) in light of all these other activities. (#152)

Public Concern # 552. The Forest Service should prohibit unauthorized roads into areas where there are guzzlers.

Response: Guzzlers are wildlife and cattle watering devices that catch and hold rainwater or spring water. The travel rule eliminates cross-country motor vehicle travel and establishes a NFTS. Routes that were proposed for addition to the system were screened to address resource concerns including wildlife. Guzzlers do not show up on any of the proposed additions as a wildlife concern. This information is found on the route cards in Appendix A. The TMR provides for an annual update of the MVUM as new information becomes available.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The OHV crowd should not be allowed to cut a road into the guzzlers and camp on them. It is a violation of 705c in the DFG code to camp over a guzzler/pond, but they should not force roads into them as well. (#46)

Public Concern # 554. The Forest Service should explain the methodology for how the routes in the Proposed Action and other alternatives were chosen, and after conducting a travel analysis on all routes, the FS should make route selections based on the EOs and TMR, with particular concern for the requirements to minimize damage to soils, watersheds, vegetation, wildlife, and other users.

Response: The methodology used to develop the Proposed Action and the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 and Appendix G. Further details are in the project record. The STNF earth science team considered all inventoried unauthorized routes when developing the Proposed Action and the IDT evaluated all routes requested by the public during the scoping period on the Proposed Action. Both teams used a variety of screening criteria in deciding which routes to bring forward for further study and which routes to eliminate. Criteria to identify risks to natural resources including soils, watersheds, vegetation, and wildlife, as well as benefits to recreation were used in the process. The effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives are described in Chapter 3, and include effects to non-motorized recreationists. This analysis focused on making limited changes to the NFTS as directed by Subpart B of the TMR, and so evaluation of all roads and trails in the existing NFTS is outside the scope of the analysis.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We have also provided comments related to the quality of the analysis in the DEIS. The DEIS impact analysis should provide a basis "a consistent methodology" for determining which routes in the unauthorized route inventory should be added to the system. This methodology should be used to choose which routes, if any should ultimately be added to the system. (#151)

Public Concern # 556. The Forest Service should comply with the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement as currently adopted and the TMR, which requires minimizing damage from motor vehicle travel on cultural resources, as the DEIS does not comply nor explain why it is proposing to allow cross-country motor vehicle travel over 44,000 acres of land below the high-water marks on Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir.

Response: Between publication of the DEIS and completion of the FEIS, the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement (PA) was amended to include specific instructions for mitigating impacts on lake bottom motorized recreation areas. Those changes were incorporated into the action alternatives. The action alternatives are consistent with the PA as amended. In this analysis, the STNF inventoried the cultural resources on the land below the high-water marks on Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake and Iron Canyon Reservoir. From this inventory, mitigation measures

and a strategy of adaptive management were developed for all cultural resources that could possibly be affected by motorized use below the high-water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoirs. Regular monitoring of sites is a part of this action (Appendix L, Cultural Resources Management). The mitigation measures described in Appendix L have been reviewed and approved by the State Historical Preservation Office (Motorized Recreation PA as amended in 2009). The FS is proposing to allow motor vehicle travel on 44,000 acres of lake bottom so that people may access other recreational opportunities provided by the lake margins.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The proposal to allow cross-country travel below lake high-water marks on the Shasta and Trinity Lakes and Iron Canyon Reservoir does not comply with the Motorized Recreation PA as currently adopted. Even if the Motorized Recreation PA is amended to accommodate an "adaptive management approach" to addressing the protection of cultural resources, the proposal to allow cross-country travel on over 44,000 acres of public land does not comply with the Travel Management Rule, which requires that the effects on cultural resources be considered, with the objective of minimizing damage, when designating roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use on National Forest lands(36CFR 212.55(a),212.55(b)(1)). (#151)

What is the purpose of adding 44,000 acres of open area below the high-water mark on Shasta and Trinity Lakes? (#153)

Public Concern # 557. The Forest Service should provide data on how ATV use has damaged cultural resource sites below the high-water mark at Trinity Lake.

Response: Within the Trinity Lake area, the STNF identified seventeen sites that have potential for effects to occur from motor vehicle travel. Site visits and records review indicate that ten of the sites are known to have adverse effects occurring from motor vehicle travel within the site boundaries. All seventeen sites will have Adaptive Management protection measures applied and will be monitored to determine the effectiveness of the protection measures (Motorized Recreation PA, 2006 as amended in 2009 for motorized use on lake bottoms). The remainder of the Trinity Lake cultural resources is in areas where the STNF's Heritage Resource Manager has determined effects to cultural resources will not occur. See Chapter 3 and Appendix L for more information on the existing condition of cultural resources at Trinity Lake.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The EIS also discusses the need to protect cultural resource sites, but fails to identify them or provide any data that ATV use has damaged any. As for the lakebed below the high-water mark, the argument about cultural resource is specious: if a site is so important, why was it flooded in the first place when the lake was created? Any alleged cultural resource sites below the high-water mark are regularly inundated with lake water, then sediment, then wave action, then drying out from the hot sun, then being exposed to sub-freezing temperatures and snow, then flooded again. What damage has been allegedly caused by ATV s? It is a question that cannot be answered. (#105)

Public Concern # 558. The Forest Service should permit ATV access below the high-water marks on Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir because:

A) lake bottoms are not spotted owl habitat and it will cause an opposite impact by forcing increased usage of the Forest above the high-water marks;
B) persons with disabilities and senior citizens need ATV's to facilitate daily activities;
C) special precautions can be given for protection of cultural resources, such as a speed limit could be established for areas below the high-water marks;
D) the purpose in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the BLM is to provide for public use and enjoyment and to manage the shore lands for access to the water, therefore restricting ATV access is not consistent with the MOU;
E) it would be detrimental to the local economy;
F) access to private in-holdings would be restricted as owners access their property by boat to their dock and then use ATVs to their cabin to unload supplies.

Response: This analysis studied the effects of designating open areas below the high-water marks on Shasta and Trinity Lakes (Alternatives 2, 4, and 5) and Iron Canyon Reservoir (Alternatives 4 and 5). Vehicle class restrictions

in Alternatives 2 and 4 would prohibit non-highway-legal motor vehicle use such as the use of ATVs. ATVs would be allowed under Alternative 5. Speed limits and other protection measures are proposed for the protection of cultural resources and are included in all action alternatives. Social and economic effects, including those on the elderly and persons with disabilities, of prohibitions of motor vehicle travel below the high-water marks on Shasta and Trinity Lakes are addressed in Chapter 3 and Appendix H. Seasonal restrictions for spotted owls have been removed from all routes and open areas The STNF considered a range of allowable uses in the alternatives that meet the objectives of the TMR, and we believe that the alternatives are consistent with the MOU because public use is continued under all alternatives while cultural resources are protected. Access is not eliminated in any alternative; however vehicle class restrictions may be in place, which are identified by the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement as being a necessary protection measure to protect cultural resources below the high-water marks.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There should not be any restrictions below the high water marks of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake and Iron Canyon Reservoir. These are excellent places for the use by highway legal and off-highway vehicles. (#134)

Subconcern # A
The dry lake bed has some areas that are good for off road use such as the river-sand areas and old roads and old town sites, like the old Trinity Center area on the North side of lake. The off road vehicle use is primarily during the summer on weekends. In 40 years I have seen maybe 1 owl and I don't believe it was a spotted owl. Since they like old growth trees, I am not sure what they would be doing on a dry dusty lakebed anyway. To regulate the area will be costly. The State and Federal agencies have no money to be monitoring this anyway. (#65)

Subconcern # B
We are now concerned about the effect the Motorized Travel Management Plan may have on our ability to use a mode of transportation to get to our boat dock during periods of low water levels in Shasta Lake. Most of us who use the home are elderly and it would be an impossible task to reach our docks without some mode of transportation. Presently, most of the travel to the docks by Silverthorn residences is with "golf carts". These vehicles do not cause any negative environmental effects on the landscape and they serve the purpose for those of us who are handicapped. I ask that you give special consideration to the Silverthorn area when you review the impact that any changes will have on our lives. (#58)

Subconcern # C
I also oppose the limitation of access by highway legal vehicles only, to the dry lake bed. Off Highway Vehicles is a growing hobby for many locals and tourists and is providing an upswing in our local economy. The OHV provide transportation to the lake and a fun ride about to see the scenery and when the lake refills, the tracks are erased.

We have many "older" residents in the Trinity Center area that use OHV (ATV's, and occasional golf cart) to access the lake and ride around. Most travel at a safe low speed and use common sense when riding. Dirt bike riders also need a place to ride. The offroad disturbance impacts to the dry lake bed would have no measurable impact on the NSO habitat either. Special precautions can be given for any cultural areas and a speed limit could be established for areas below the high water mark. (#76)

Subconcern # D
The EIS states (pg.42) that the rationale to eliminate ATV use on the lakebed below the high water mark is that such action is consistent with the MOU between the Bureau of Reclamation and the USFS pertaining to Trinity Lake. That rationale is completely and utterly false: the MOU was signed in 1964, nearly a decade before ATVs were invented! The MOU cannot be a basis to address ATV use since ATVs were not even contemplated at the time the MOU was executed. Moreover, the MOU expressly states the purpose of the agreement is to "provide for public use and enjoyment" and to "manage the shore lands for access to the waters ... " As a regular visitor to the shores of Trinity Lake (virtually every weekend in the summer and one weekend per month during winter), I have firsthand knowledge of the public's use and enjoyment of the lakeshore. In the literally hundreds of occasions I have been on the lakebed just north of Swift Creek, I've seen USFS personnel less than five occasions, so one must wonder on what data the EIS conclusions regarding public use are based. The vast majority of people using the lakebed below the high-water mark are recreational A TV riders. There are a few highway-licensed vehicles. There are virtually no pedestrians. The "rationale" is therefore meritless. (#105)

Subconcern # E
One other reason that I oppose its restriction is the loss of tourists who come her to ride and camp with their families. The economy of our small town depends on tourists for us to survive. If these people choose to go somewhere else so they can use their ATV's it would threaten our livelihoods. (#103)

Subconcern # F
As a cabin owner at silverthorn summer homes I use a truck or ATV to get my belongs to my boat so I can use it on Shasta Lake. The tract has a courtesy dock that I drive my truck to unload ice chests, and equipment. The dock where my boat is kept I use an ATV to drive down to the dock which can be 80-100 feet below the road. Our association grades and maintains these trails to the two docks. If we could not use these trails it would be impossible to use our boats. I could not tell if the forestry was approving these trails for use but I strongly encourage you to approve our tracts use of these trails. (#57)

Public Concern # 559. The Forest Service should maintain Trinity Lake at the high-water mark level to eliminate restricting ATV use below the high-water mark.

Response: The water level of Trinity Lake is managed by the Bureau of Reclamation to provide water for agriculture and other uses in the Central Valley of California. The FS has no authority to regulate the lake level. Requiring a full pool for eliminated ATV use would not be consistent with the purposes for which Trinity Lake is managed.

Sample Public Comment(s):

We do believe that all of this could be solved by keeping our Lake at a decent High Water Line. How come Whisky Lake is always high and our Lake is the first to get so Low? (#78)

Public Concern # 560. The Forest Service should prohibit ATV access below the high-water marks for Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, McCloud River, McCloud Reservoir, Iron Canyon Reservoir, and Iron Canyon Creek because of extensive resource damage from unauthorized trails and campsites.

Response: This analysis studied the effects of designating open areas below the high-water marks on Shasta and Trinity Lakes (Alternatives 2, 4, and 5) and Iron Canyon Reservoir (Alternatives 4 and 5). Vehicle class restrictions in Alternatives 2 and 4 would prohibit non-highway-legal motor vehicle use such as the use of ATVs. In addition, speed limit would be restricted (see Chapter 2 for alternative descriptions). The primary Purpose and Need for these restrictions in the reservoir open areas is to protect cultural resources. The environmental effects of existing motor vehicle travel below the high-water marks are examined under the Alternative 1 analysis in the resource sections in Chapter 3. Although the commenter has identified resource damage which is disturbing to see, the analyses show that the obvious effects left by activities such as mud bogging and other motor vehicle play is not causing significant harm to resources at this time. For example, the impacts to sediment deposits below the high-water mark are in the form of redistributing sediments already eroded and "in-place" within Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir (FEIS Chapter 3.02). Water quality would not be further impacted as these reservoir bottom sediments are already considered to be delivered to the receiving waterbody, so the displacement or redistribution of these sediments will not further impact water quality. See Chapter 3 for further information about the effects associated with motor vehicle travel in the reservoir open areas.

Sample Public Comment(s):

While State Board staff understand the need for a comprehensive travel management plan in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, staff is concerned that none of the alternatives included in the Draft EIS examine the prohibition of motorized access below the mean high water mark for certain reservoirs. More specifically, staff is concerned that motorized vehicle use is impairing the water quality of the McCloud River, McCloud Reservoir, Iron Canyon Reservoir, and Iron Canyon Creek. Recent studies as part of a collaborative effort to examine the licensing of the McCloud-Pit Hydroelectric Project Federal Energy Regulatory Commission #2106, suggests that vehicle use has resulted in extensive resource damage affecting the Project reservoirs and associated watersheds. In addition, user created OHV trails originating from project-related roads or campsites has resulted in serious erosion impacts. (#150)

Visual Resources

Public Concern # 1001. The Forest Service should remove the visual resources analysis from the DEIS because it is outside the scope of this analysis.

Response: Visuals or scenery is considered a valuable resource like any other on the Forest and the effects of a Proposed Action, such as implementing the TMR, was considered to be important, thus analyzed in the DEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Visual Resources. This section is completely outside the scope of this analysis and therefore this section and any analysis resulting from this section must be removed from this document and the final EIS. (#139)

Watersheds

Public Concern # 1002. The Forest Service should address the potential oil and gas contamination from motor vehicle travel below the high-water marks in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir.

Response: The FEIS was updated to include consideration of the effects of isolated and infrequent spills of petroleum products from motor vehicles onto reservoir bottom sediments in the proposed areas to be added. As stated in Chapter 3.02, it is not anticipated that these spills would be in volumes great enough to measure or cause changes in water quality within the reservoir. Any larger spills would be managed through the Forest Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasures Plan (SPCC) as required through the Forest BMP 2-12 (Chapter 3.02).

Sample Public Comment(s):

One of our concerns relates to opening access to lake areas below the high water mark. Many vehicles tend to leak oil and gasoline, that could then be introduced into the lake through rainfall and rising water levels. Does the DEIS adequately address the potential problem of water contamination from motor vehicle use? (#32)

Public Concern # 1003. The Forest Service should reassess existing and proposed NFTS routes that pose risks to watershed resources and:

A) minimize additions in areas that are prone to erosion or where water quality is impaired, in order to reduce impacts to aquatic species and riparian areas;
B) decommission and restore, rather than close seasonally, routes in riparian reserves or key watersheds that pose risks to watershed resources;
C) remove NFTS and unauthorized routes contributing to watershed degradation in order to meet LRMP and other regulatory direction;
D) include point source pollution at stream crossings.

Response: The scope of this analysis was limited to those routes considered for addition to the NFTS as per the TMR Subpart B (36 CFR 212). Existing NFTS routes will be analyzed as needed to meet the requirements of TMR Subpart A and through future STNF management projects. The initial list of routes to be added was screened to filter out the majority of unauthorized routes which pose impacts to aquatic species and riparian areas. These route screens included processes to exclude the addition of most routes that are adjacent to water quality impaired streams or are within watersheds with TMDL requirements (FEIS, Chapter 1, pages 9 and 10).

Unauthorized routes that are not included in the list of routes to be added will be subject to natural recovery processes. There are routes analyzed that intersect or cross riparian reserve areas. If necessary for resource protection, seasonal closures will be applied to these routes. Routes will be monitored and closed if necessary. Where site-specific reviews through monitoring, watershed analysis, or other project planning show a need to actively decommission an unauthorized route, the work will be accomplished as priorities and funding allow. This type of work is outside the scope of this analysis.

The initial route screening process (FEIS, Chapter 2, page 19) excluded routes with major resource concerns. Routes with known impacts to water quality or riparian reserves were generally not included in the alternatives.

The STNF works through the State Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) agreement concerning water quality and pollutants. Forest Service Region 5 is the designated Water Quality Management Agency (WQMA) for NFS lands in California. The Agency has developed and is implementing its Water Quality Management Plan, entitled Water Quality Management for National Forest System Lands in California. This plan, which is part of the State of California's Nonpoint Source Management Plan, outlines FS BMPs that have been certified by the State Water Board (Appendix D).

Sample Public Comment(s):

See Appendix D starting on page 317 of the comment letter. The Shasta-Trinity National Forest provides spawning habitat for many species including Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon and Rainbow Trout. For routes within Riparian Reserves/Key Watersheds that pose risks for watershed resources, we recommend decommissioning and restoration rather than seasonal closure (Appendix D). We also object to routes that lack infrastructure to prevent damage to water quality or stream structure. When an unauthorized route earns a Watershed High Resource Risk ranking and is within a Riparian Reserve or a Key Watershed, we recommend decommissioning and restoration, rather than seasonal closure (Appendix D). (#151)

Subconcern # A
Reduce routes and miles on roads in areas of existing water quality and listed species impacts, and in hydrologically sensitive areas, The DEIS states that the State of California has identified the South Fork of the Trinity River, the East Fork of the Trinity River, Trinity Reservoir, and Shasta Lake as having pollution levels or impacts that exceed State standards, particularly due to elevated levels of sediment and water temperature. Trinity River Watershed was judged to exceed the existing water quality standards necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the basin, particularly the cold water fishery. The South Fork of the Trinity River has an established total maximum daily load (TMDL) for sedimentation and water temperature. The TMDL calls for a 30% reduction in sediment load for the South Fork of the Trinity River and Hayfork Creek. The East Fork of the Trinity River from its headwaters to Trinity Reservoir, and Trinity Reservoir are both scheduled to have TMDLs completed by 2019. Shasta Lake is scheduled to have a TMDL completed by 2020. The DEIS also states that road densities within riparian reserves tend to be higher in the South Fork Trinity River and Hayfork Creek Watersheds. Because of this, it is particularly important to minimize the number of routes added to the NFTS in these areas. (#164)

Subconcern # B
As stated on page 124 of the DEIS, routes in hydrologically sensitive areas and on erosive soils have the potential to cause accelerated erosion and become a source for sediment delivery to stream channels, thereby reducing water quality. Hence we are extremely concerned by the proposal to add 4.41 miles of routes located in Riparian Reserves to the Forest Service road system (p. 171). Indeed, 18 route segments are located in Riparian Reserves directly adjacent to SONCC habitat on the Trinity River. (#151)

Subconcern # C
The DEIS includes a thorough discussion of the existing condition of the watersheds within the analysis area, including the fact that many of the watersheds and subwatersheds are approaching or over Threshold of Concern (TOC). The DEIS attempts to convince the public that it is "enhancing" the riparian resources under every action alternative, because the "no action" alternative has been so destructive to riparian resources. We do not believe that is sufficient. The Shasta-Trinity LRMP provides direction to protect and enhance riparian resources and "maintain and restore the sediment regime under which aquatic ecosystems evolved." The Shasta- Trinity NF should use this project as an opportunity to identify NFTS routes that are causing damage to riparian resources and, where feasible, close or reroute those routes. The DEIS identifies numerous riparian resources that are currently impacted by vehicle routes. These impacts include sedimentation from roads and trails, stream crossings where sedimentation occurs, pools filled with sediment, ongoing degradation and watersheds over TOC at least in part due to roads and trails. There is no indication that ending travel on unauthorized routes will correct these impacts, nor will adding unauthorized routes to the system. Only removing or re-routing both unauthorized routes and NFTS routes that are causing these impacts will meet these goals. (#151)

Public Concern # 1004. The Forest Service should reevaluate water quality and soil erosion issues as they relate to OHV use and trail sustainability to more accurately represent existing conditions because the analysis, rationale, and interpretations of regulatory direction are flawed and:

A) should delete the comment in the DEIS that says "user-created trails are eroded and in poor condition or have a high risk of accelerated erosion." This is conjecture that is not supported by any analysis or documentation in the DEIS. Many factors determine soil erosion risk including but not limited to soil type, percent of grade, use, and rainfall. All of these factors are extremely variable on the STNF and should be considered when developing erosion risk factors. The FS should reevaluate the unauthorized trails to truly reflect the risk of erosion and identify those routes that are deemed stable and routes that would require mitigation to eliminate erosion concerns and include the routes in the NFTS.

Response: The analysis displays the current conditions of the routes considered with the best available information at the time of the analysis. This information included route condition evaluation from field visits by FS Hydrologists, Soil Scientists, and Geologists. The analysis further includes information derived from analysis within the Forest boundaries completed by California State water quality specialists and EPA staff scientists. The analysis parameters were adjusted to compensate for OHV trail disturbance areas and locations. The analysis also integrated the expectation that BMPs for roads (including trails) would be implemented to reduce erosion and sedimentation to adjacent waterbodies (Chapter 3.02).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Watersheds. While we understand the importance of addressing water quality and soil erosion issues as they relate to OHV use and trail sustainability, we are concerned that the science, analysis, rationale, references materials, liberal interpretation of standard and guideline applications used in this section, are over reaching and result in a conclusion that fails to provide a fair representation of existing conditions. Below are examples that support this assertion.

1. BMP 4.7 is designed to be incorporated into a Forest OHV Plan, this DEIS does not develop a Forest OHV Plan. (See Purpose and Need)

2. We note an absence of determinations and analysis from protocol surveys to determine actual non-point source locations and cause.

3. The reference materials used as rationale for Analysis Methodology were not correlated with local ground conditions, vehicle capabilities and use rates. These references are suspect in representing effects that may be encountered on the STNF.

4. The application of the Detailed CWE assessment analysis model used for this DEIS fails to provide data that would truly display accurate changes in impacts. This model was designed to display effects of new ground disturbing activities such as timber sales and thinning projects through time.

5. Under Baseline (Current Condition) Cumulative Watershed Effects Analysis. We note there is an implied conclusion that there will be not be any maintenance performed on unauthorized routes for alternative 1. The STNF is not prohibited to perform any activity to correct resource concerns including maintenance. We want the STNF to strike any and all reference to this assertion. We note that the implied impacts due to the number of stream crossings do not represent the existing conditions. In addition, most (nearly 90%) of the unauthorized crossings are dry when used. We want the cumulative Effects analysis to be revised and adjusted where numbers of crossings affect a conclusion. (#139)

Subconcern # A
The agency has made an assumption that "users created trails are eroded and in poor condition or have a high risk of accelerated erosion". This is conjecture that is not supported by any analysis or documentation in the DEIS. Many factors determine soil erosion risk including but not limited to soil type, percent of grade, use and rainfall. All of these factors are extremely variable on the STNF and should be considered when developing erosion risk factors. We want the agency to strike this statement from the document, re-evaluate the user created trails to truly reflect the risk of erosion and identify those route that are deemed stable, and routes that would require mitigation to eliminate erosion concerns and include the routes in the NFTS. (#139)

Public Concern # 1005. The Forest Service should follow the recommendations of the watershed assessments in the analyses for this project.

Response: Decisions to construct, abandon, decommission, or close roads are made in project-level analyses as they occur across the STNF. Recommendations from previous, ongoing, or future watershed analyses and project analyses are being implemented or will be implemented on an individual project basis and were considered in the cumulative effects analysis for this planning effort (see the list of projects and road recommendations in Appendix B).

Sample Public Comment(s):

Recommendations made in each Watershed Analysis (WA) should be the basis for planning, and strictly followed. Roads need to be examined watershed by watershed. We object to brushing aside recommendations as we have seen on the South Fork Trinity in the Up-River portions. (#153)

Public Concern # 1006. The Forest Service should analyze stream crossings as point sources for pollutants including sediment and petroleum products.

Response: Stream crossings were analyzed in the FEIS and ranked in terms of their potential for erosion. Crossings in areas of High and Very High erosion soils were displayed due to their high potential for sediment delivery (FEIS, Chapter 3.02). Estimated average annual sediment delivery volumes for crossings and a discussion of the potential for impacts due to petroleum products are displayed in the FEIS in Chapter 3.02.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Designated trails and roads will discharge pollutants into waters of the United States through point source conveyances. Sediment is a pollutant, as are other contaminants such as petroleum products. The DEIS documents that these sources of pollution will reach waters of the United States through discrete point source conveyance. a. Stream crossings are point sources of OHV pollutant discharge. Stream crossings for OHV routes are point sources, as revealed in the Sierra National Forest Travel Management DEIS. "Stream crossings in particular have the potential to deliver increased runoff and sediment from the road, destabilize streambanks and affect channel function" (p. 233).

The Shasta-Trinity DEIS recognizes the direct discharge which is to occur from engineered and other stream crossings, as reflected by these statements: "The reductions in the number of stream crossings in the South Fork Trinity River Watershed and Hayfork Creek Watersheds are particularly beneficial in terms of improving water quality in these 303(d) watersheds" (p. 133). "Some of the greatest impacts to riparian areas stem from existing NFTS roads" (p. 116). 'There are also 292 stream crossing on unauthorized routes: these stream crossings are not designed or managed and are often prone to water quality impacts from sediment delivery" (p. 121). "Analysis for total maximum daily load has been completed on the South Fork of the Trinity River 4th code HUC (and particularly for the Lower and Upper Hayfork subwatersheds) which indicate that sediment from roading and other forest management activities is contributing to degraded water quality conditions" (p. 118). (#151)

Public Concern # 1007. The Forest Service should consider the effects of concentrated motorized use on soils.

Response: The soils analysis assumes moderate use for all added routes and high impacts for all added routes on highly erosive soils and within riparian reserves (Chapter 3.02). Moderate use was assumed due to the lack of information pertaining to future traffic levels by vehicle type. Therefore, the analysis utilized a moderate vehicle traffic level of use for the action alternative analyses.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Soil impacts are not only affected by the number of miles of high risk routes, but also the number of users. The analysis does not appear to have considered the number of miles traveled on particular routes. By reducing the number of available routes, it is probable that soil problems will actually increase due to the increased density of traffic on the limited routes. Conversely, if more routes are available for motorized use, traffic density will be decreased, prolonging required maintenance intervals. (#138)

Public Concern # 1008. The Forest Service should substantiate the soils conclusions with appropriate soil studies conducted by accredited soil scientists.

Response: The soils analysis and findings are founded on the consideration and assessment carried out by STNF and Forest Service TEAMS soil scientists and hydrologists. The location and current condition of the proposed routes were considered by the staff scientists and evaluated against their knowledge of roads and trails, road and trail generated erosion, and impacts to water quality. The data sources and methodology are described in Chapter 3 Watersheds and follows accepted protocols for environmental analysis and identification of thresholds. The analysis is underpinned by several accredited research studies in the earth sciences field, which are cited in the FEIS (Chapter 3, Section 3.02 and Chapter 4).

Sample Public Comment(s):

We also have serious reservations about a paragraph of this DEIS. The paragraph has the following statement; "Unmanaged OHV use has resulted in unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites. Compaction and erosion are the primary effects of OHV use on soils. Riparian areas and aquatic dependent species are particularly vulnerable to OHV use ". Please provide substantiation of the above statements regarding OHV use in final EIS with the appropriate soil studies done by accredited geologists. As described in NEPA; "Agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including the scientific integrity, of the discussion and analyses in environmental statements". Unless opinions regarding soil and geologic conditions are prepared and cited in an EIS by licensed and/or accredited professionals using methods that comply with accepted standards of care, they have no place in an EIS, nor basis in legal arguments. (Siskiyou Regional Educational Project vs. Rose, 87, F. Supp. 2d 1074, 1086 (D. Or. 1999) (#139)

Public Concern # 1021. The Forest Service should reevaluate the cumulative watershed effects analysis, utilizing data more accurate than that derived from the equivalent roaded acres methodology.

Response: The equivalent roaded acres methodology is the accepted cumulative effects model for Forest Service Region 5 (FSH. 2509.22).

Sample Public Comment(s):

We must draw attention to the reference and statement regarding the inability of the cumulative effects analysis using the Equivalent Roaded Acres (ERA) methodology, to be more detailed than tenths of a percent. This is evident in all summary tables and clearly presents two important facts. One, the results of the watershed affects are so minimal that they cannot be accurately analyzed, and two, there is no distinguishable difference between the action alternatives. In addition, utilizing an assumption that all unauthorized routes will have a footprint of 8? and similar impacts of forest roads that range from 12? to 24?, with cut and fill templates greatly skews the CWE results. Many of the unauthorized routes are of 50 inches or less and most follow the existing terrain with little to no cut and fill templates. We want the agency to re-evaluate the CWE analysis to include data that is more accurate and reflect the existing condition. This information alone shows that the STNF has failed to provide a viable range of alternatives as required by NEPA. Again, we ask the agency to create and select an alternative that better addresses public access by adding more motorized roads and trails. (#139)

Wildlife

Public Concern # 1000. The Forest Service should protect high value resources for aquatic, terrestrial, and botanical species; and human uses.

Response: One of the purposes of this action is to protect national forest resources from damage by cross-country motor vehicle travel (FEIS, page 2). All of the action alternatives are responsive to this need, and would benefit aquatic, terrestrial, and botanical species by prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel (FEIS, Table S-3, page ix). Human uses are a more subjective topic as it depends on the user's values to determine whether something is a benefit. Chapter 3 of the FEIS describes the environmental consequences of the various alternatives in detail.

Sample Public Comment(s):

I value non-motorized recreational opportunities on the Forest, especially in roadless areas larger than 1,000 acres, designated botanical areas, and in high value wildlife habitat including late-Successional Reserves and Riparian Reserves designated by the amended Forest Plans. Please protect these important resources from motorized recreational uses in your Travel Management Plan. (#111)

Public Concern # 1009. The Forest Service should reanalyze the effects of motorized trails on terrestrial and aquatic species based on:

A) sound local science;
B) differences in disturbance among different types of vehicles and routes;
C) use rates and speed;
D) location and time of year.

Response: In the FEIS, pages 185 and 186, the effects to terrestrial and aquatic species were analyzed using the best available science. For the most part, local research on use rates, specific vehicles or speeds on specific routes is unavailable. The University of Washington has conducted local research on the disturbance effects of off-road motorcycle use on northern spotted owls, but the data is still in the process of being analyzed and the results have not yet been peer reviewed. Soliciting local information and opinions from Forest users through this comment process provides another important source of local information.

As stated in the FEIS, Chapter 3.05 Wildlif, Assumptions Specific to Wildlife Analysis:

A, B, and C) All vehicle types or classes result in the same amount of disturbance effect to wildlife. Vehicle class restrictions on added roads and trails (including the proposals for ML 2 roads which would allow all vehicle classes) and the proposed motorized mixed-use on the existing ML 3 NFTS roads are not expected to have any detectable impact on wildlife. The disturbance, whether from an auto, truck, or ATV, is assumed to provide the same magnitude of impact for this analysis. Although each vehicle may have its own noise and use profile that could be different from any other vehicle, the available research does not allow us to usefully separate out these differences in a meaningful way. Our assumption is not that these vehicles produce the same amount or kind of noise, but that wildlife response to each of these disturbances (relative to the species and the individual variation we find in each species) will produce similar responses in individuals of each species. Similarly for use rate, speed, location and time of year. These are all relevant variables that may have differing effects on wildlife. However, without more specific information, we cannot meaningfully separate out these variables.

D) Winter activities using snowmobiles or other over-snow vehicles are outside the scope of this project analysis. The effects of cross-country use by snowmobiles were not analyzed. Location of a route is equal to disturbance effects from that route (i.e., assume all routes provide the same level of disturbance), unless local data or knowledge indicate otherwise

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under Direct and Indirect Effects General for Terrestrial Biota. This DEIS has not provided local science or studies relative to the STNF that support the impacts as stated in this section. We want the STNF to remove these assertions from the final EIS. This section also states; "It is expected that non-motorized use may occur on these unauthorized routes which would likely result in disturbance to mule deer. Some studies indicate that certain non-motorized activities (hiking, mountain bicycling, equestrian, etc.) could actually result in greater disturbance to mule deer. At any rate, the amount of disturbance caused by non-motorized use will depend on the type, intensity, timing and duration of the use." We believe that this statement is accurate and supported by this document as well but what is significant here is the agency acknowledges that impacts to non-motorized use are dependent on "type, intensity, timing and duration of the use." This is exactly what is needed to analyze the impacts of motorized use as well and is exactly what is missing from all wildlife analysis that are addressed in this document. We want the STNF to display the different impacts created resulting from location, use levels and time of year and reevaluate the conclusions found throughout this DEIS. (#139)

Subconcern # A
The agency has stated many times that the majority of literature, reviews and studies used to describe and analyze the interactions of wildlife are focused on roads and highways and not wildlife interaction with trails. These statements clearly show that the agency has no sound science or literature of which to analyze the effects of trails on

terrestrial and aquatic species. Any determinations of affects for terrestrial and aquatic species are purely conjecture, assertions and not supported by sound science. We want the agency to strike and remove any conclusions of effects as written, and provide sound local science to determine true effects. This analysis must take into account the existing footprint of the trail, its existing impacts, vehicle type and frequency of use. (#139)

Subconcern # B
Wildlife Analysis Assumptions. We challenge the validity of the assumptions listed. First, all vehicle types do not produce the same amount of disturbance. An example would be to compare a logging truck traveling 30 mph on a 2 lane aggregate road with an Average daily Traffic (ADT) count of 25 vs. a motorcycle or 4wd traveling less than 10 mph on a trail that has a footprint of 8 feet and an ADT of less than 2. Disturbance levels must take into consideration, road and trail widths, frequency of use and speeds. We want the agency to strike this assumption and re-evaluate the Wildlife Analysis to consider the factors listed above. The second assumption listed states that all routes will produce the same disturbance effects. We challenge this assumption as a designed road will have removed vegetation; including canopy cover, where as single and two track trails will meander around vegetation without requiring vegetation removal. Each trail will have varying degrees of disturbance based on location, vegetation type, trail width and frequency of use. We want the agency to strike this assumption and re-evaluate the Wildlife Analysis to consider the factors listed above. (#139)

Subconcern # C
This section sites references, studies, science, and conclusions that are as old as 1980s, outside the State of California, and are irrelevant to the STNF. Specific examples include; mortality rate studies, effects on wildlife from travel on highways and major road systems that have high speeds (greater than 50 MPH and ADT of 50 vehicles or higher). This section has not provided the science that addresses OHV traffic, use rates and speeds. We want all study comparisons and conclusions not designed to represent motorized travel on the STNF be removed from the final EIS. (#139)

Subconcern # D
Under Terrestrial Biota Indicators and Methodology by Action: These sections fail to describe what and how impacts are created based on numbers of miles of roads and routes in relation to wildlife and their locations. We want the STNF to display the different impacts created resulting from location, use levels and time of year and reevaluate the conclusions found in these sections. (#139)

Public Concern # 1010. The Forest Service should reevaluate the zone of influence and cavity dependent species analyses to address the potential loss of snags based on the real need and requirements for snag retention.

Response: Under this Proposed Action, road maintenance is required along NFTS routes. LRMP standard and guide C-16 allows for removal of hazard trees along rights-of-way; therefore, it is permissible to remove hazard trees along added routes. Although not all hazard trees are snags, snags along roadsides tend to be hazards. Snags are inherently less stable than live trees and are at greater risk for falling across the roadside.

The sole purpose of snag removal along roads and trails is to ensure public safety by identifying and removing those trees or snags most likely to present a risk to life or property. Although ML 3, 4, and 5 roads receive more traffic and are inherently more of a concern, it does not eliminate the possibility of hazards being identified on ML 1 or 2 roads as well. When identified, these hazards may be removed as well. There is a requirement to remove hazardous snags on ML 3, 4, and 5 roads. Although not required, snags on ML 1 and 2 roads may also be removed if principles of good stewardship and concern for the public deem it appropriate. Hazard trees that are felled in late successional reserves would not be removed. The STNF LRMP provides direction for snag retention only within timber harvest units in matrix lands. There is no requirement to retain snags along roads and trails.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Zone of Influence, (Snags and Downed logs). We challenge the validity of the Forest conclusion for snag retention and the potential loss of habitat caused by the loss of snags. The STNF claims that snags will be removed for public safety on all action alternatives. While this may be true for Maintenance Level 3-5 roads as they are subject to the National Highway Safety Act, it is not a valid requirement for Maintenance Level 1-2 roads and trails. Please refer to Forest Service Road Maintenance Manual and direction given by the Shasta Trinity Nevada Plan Amendment

regarding snags. We want the agency to re-evaluate the Zone of Influence analysis to address the potential loss of snags based on the real need and requirement of snags. (#139)

Public Concern # 1011. The Forest Service should reanalyze effects to wildlife taking into consideration that proposed routes are existing rather than new.

Response: The FS agrees that the proposed routes already exist and that there is some degree of use on them. These routes are kept open through consistent public use and are not considered part of the NFTS and do not currently receive any approved maintenance. The actions considered would add some portion of these unauthorized routes to the NFTS, or the system of currently authorized routes, and prohibit continued use of unauthorized routes. As such, the action considered is the addition of these routes to the NFTS and what effect the continued use of these routes would have on resources. Because four of the alternatives propose bringing routes into the NFTS, the analysis needed to reflect that change. Note that the documentation does not analyze the loss of vegetation that would have occurred when these routes were first established by the public. Their current condition and use is part of the baseline for the analysis. The analysis does reflect the future effects to vegetation as continued use prevents on-site re-growth. The current baseline of effects are those effects currently taking place on unauthorized routes. The assumptions used in the analysis of wildlife effects are documented in the FEIS, page 244.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This section describes routes and roads proposed in any action alternative as new meaning newly constructed where the true condition for these routes, there uses, their impacts are already included in the existing condition. We want this section to recognize this fact and reevaluate all analysis conclusions to reflect this use as existing and not a new action. (#139)

Public Concern # 1012. The Forest Service should follow the direction of the Sierra Nevada LRMP amendment allowing exemptions for activities including road maintenance and motorized use during wildlife limited operating periods.

Response: The STNF follows the direction outlined in the STNF LRMP. The Sierra Nevada Amendment does not apply to the STNF. The STNF LRMP allows for seasonal closures to protect FS designated sensitive species. Seasonal restrictions are applied to activities that may significantly disturb protected wildlife during critical periods of their life-cycle. By limiting activities during these critical periods, we hope to maintain viable populations of these species. If we can maintain viable populations of these species in the area, then we are able to allow some level of use during less critical periods in the species' life history. Appendix D further explains the purposes of seasonal restrictions. The LRMP requires seasonal closure for goshawks and bald eagles (FEIS, page 242). Where the Forest identifies that seasonal restrictions are no longer necessary (loss of habitat, surveys conclude that the species is not present, ground level review reveals errors in habitat typing, etc.), the Forest will ensure that we have an administrative mechanism available to remove the restriction.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The Sierra Nevada Plan Amendment allows for activities such as road maintenance and motorized vehicle use as exemptions during wildlife Limited Operation Periods. We want the STNF to remove this restriction where applied to motorized roads and trails. (#139)

Public Concern # 1013. The Forest Service should provide the science underlying the assumptions specific to the terrestrial biota analysis.

Response: Federal agencies are required to use the best available science in their decisionmaking. Where data is limited or the science is inconclusive, Agency personnel must document their assumptions and develop reasonable justifications based on the available research, and their professional training and experience. We must ensure that despite limited data or inconclusive science, that we took a hard look at the Proposed Action and that our decisions were based on sound rationale. Our rationale must document that our decisions are not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of the discretion usually granted a professional agency.

The assumptions listed in the terrestrial biota analysis are partially based on the available science and partially based on the methods of science. If we do not have sufficient data to meaningfully differentiate the effects of different variables, then we must develop assumptions, based on professional opinion and the range of the literature available, which best approximates the differences between these variables. To use one example, (although different vehicles may have different effect thresholds, and we could develop assumptions around those effect differences) the mix of uses actually found on-the-ground is so highly variable that any assumptions of differential effect between vehicles is likely to be swamped in the variability of use, location, timing and duration. Similar to the way a statistical average or a median represents the overall behavior of a variable, the common assumption of overall effect is our best approximation of these variables. Unlike a specific reference to a unique condition, these assumptions are largely based on a broader understanding of wildlife science and behavior. Where developed from a unique reference, that reference is cited. Otherwise, the bibliography in general, provides a starting place for further reading in this area and an understanding of our assumptions.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Under Assumptions Specific to the Terrestrial Biota Analysis: This document does not provide the science that supports these assumptions. We want any references to these assumptions removed from the final EIS. (#139)

Public Concern # 1014. The Forest Service should minimize disturbance to wildlife as a criterion to designating routes in order to meet the requirements of the TMR.

Response: The IDT used ranking criteria on a discipline basis (i.e., wildlife) to rate the predicted resource risks of the requested unauthorized routes. Routes were included for further consideration as additions to the NFTS or excluded from further consideration based on their composite risk ranking and their potential to provide a recreation benefit. The consideration of their risk ranking, the decision to include or exclude routes from recommendation, and the consideration of minimization techniques such as Limited Operating Periods are all mechanisms for minimizing the harassment and significant disruption of wildlife habitat. The effects of unauthorized routes on terrestrial species were specifically analyzed using the best available science.

Sample Public Comment(s):

While the analysis of wildlife resources may satisfy the requirements of NEPA to consider effects to wildlife and their habitat, it does not satisfy the requirements of the Travel Management regulations, which state that the responsible official must consider the effects "with the objective of minimizing harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitat." This deficiency is repeated throughout the Wildlife section of the DEIS and must be remedied. A science-based, landscape- scale travel analysis on all routes that adopted a minimum route system and recommended routes for decommissioning would likely satisfy the minimization requirements. Until that analysis is complete, the Forest should refrain from designating new NFTS routes in habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. The Forest has not shown how the proposed additions of motor vehicle routes minimizes disturbance to wildlife, or even defined the term "minimize." The Forest may not use the prohibition of cross-country travel to justify adding new motor vehicle routes by arguing that the ecological benefit of the former more than compensates for the ecological harm of the latter. The regulations are clear on this point: minimizing disturbance is a criterion for designating routes, per se. (#151)

Public Concern # 1015. The Forest Service should conduct site-specific surveys for TES species; and use proximity to nearby routes in the analysis for northern spotted owl in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir.

Response: Field survey data as well as GIS habitat analysis were used to analyze impacts to northern spotted owls and any sensitive species habitat and nest sites. These surveys included the perimeters and lake bottoms of Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir. The assumption of occupancy by a species based on habitat is inherently a more conservative approach to locating species. The northern spotted owl (NSO) baseline modeled the probability of occupancy based on the relationships of habitat types in any given polygon. In independent validation, the northern spotted owl baseline model predicted occupancy with more than 95 percent accuracy. Habitat maps are based on this relationship and are more likely to over-predict than under-predict occupancy. Although the NSO is unlikely to be found in unsuitable habitat, not all suitable habitat will be actually occupied. Given this bias, habitat analysis is sufficient for mapping out the likely use of these areas. It "errors on the side of the species" by being

more likely to assume occupancy when the habitat may not be occupied, thus increasing the area under specific concern for individual level effects.

Also, occupancy and breeding is variable in most of these species and a site that is occupied one year by a breeding owl pair, may be abandoned or used by a non-breeding pair or single in any other year. Because the use considered on these sites is long-term, it is better to focus on the overall potential for the site to harbor species rather than the actual occurrence in any given year or season. Site-specific results from the analysis of the proximity of routes to known spotted owl and sensitive species habitat and nest sites are shown in several of the tables in the Terrestrial Wildlife Section in the FEIS.

Sample Public Comment(s):

There is no indication in the DEIS that the STNF conducted comprehensive site-specific surveys of the placement of TES species and their proximity to nearby routes. (#91)

Habitat Areas - The USFS needs first to have field biologists determine the specific areas within each reservoir that has actual nesting activities for any of the fowl species referenced in the report. (#100)

Public Concern # 1016. The Forest Service should evaluate the effects of motorized use on northern spotted owl critical habitat because the DEIS:

A) has failed to distinguish between jeopardy to the species and adverse modification of critical habitat;
B) has not fully evaluated how motorized use in critical habitat will affect species recovery;
C) must consider and analyze the differences between the 2008 critical habitat designation that has been withdrawn and the 1992 critical habitat designation which has been reinstated.

Response: Under Alternatives 3 and 4, no routes exist within Critical Habitat. Modified Alternative 2 has 3 routes in critical habitat, but all were found to have “no effect” on principle constituent elements of critical habitat (FEIS Chapter 3.15, page 597)If any routes under any other action alternative are likely to affect principal component elements of Critical Habitat or the potential to produce those elements, then those alternatives would be subject to consultation with USFWS prior to implementation.

An “adverse modification” is any direct or indirect alteration to the principal component elements of designated critical habitat that appreciably diminishes the value of that habitat for both the survival and recovery of a listed species. Such alterations include, but are not limited to, alterations adversely modifying any of those physical or biological features that were the basis for determining the habitat to be critical. Similar to a Jeopardy determination, it is the USFWS that determines whether or not adverse modification would occur given a Proposed Action. It is the responsibility of the action agency to adequately describe and quantify the likely effects to critical habitat to enable the USFWS to determine if there is likely to be adverse modification or not. The FEIS does not need to distinguish between jeopardy to the owl and adverse modification to its critical habitat - those determinations are exclusively the responsibility of the regulatory agency. Should routes that affect the Principal Component Elements (PCEs) be placed within critical habitat, then the Forest would be required to consult separately on those effects with the USFWS. In a separate consultation, those effects to PCEs and how they would affect both survival and recovery of the northern spotted owl would be fully considered. The USFWS has agreed that, by using all of the Project Design Criteria developed under the December 27, 2006 concurrence for each of the Threatened and Endangered Species and Critical Habitat, route designation will meet “No effect” or “May Affect Not Likely to Adversely Affect” determination and that they would concur with these determinations on a programmatic basis. Forest consultation can tier to this programmatic consultation with no further consultation.

Critical habitat area designation was established by USFWS in 1992 and recently updated in 2008. Recently (April, 2009) the USFWS requested a federal judge to allow them to withdraw the 2008 designations. Due to the uncertainty of future designations, we will calculate Critical Habitat based on both designations until the issue is fully resolved by the USFWS. There is no need to take into the consideration the differences between the 2008 designation and the 1992 designation. Designation of Critical Habitat is the responsibility of the USFWS and its designation will not be affected by our project decisions. Our only responsibility is to analyze the effects of our

Proposed Actions on whatever version of Critical Habitat is finally selected by the courts and the USFWS - the other version (or versions) becomes irrelevant to the analysis at that point.

"Critical Habitat" is an administrative designation by the USFWS and does not signify a unique quality for the species. An individual of a species will respond similarly to suitable habitat inside or outside of critical habitat polygons. The analysis of critical habitat effects relies on the designation of principal component elements (PCEs) of the habitat, usually structural features such as trees of a certain size, type or structure. We affect Critical habitat when we affect existing PCEs or affect the capability of the site to develop these PCEs. Noise is not considered a principal component element and does not affect the analysis of critical habitat.

Sample Public Comment(s):

Subconcern # A
The DEIS fails to properly analyze whether the noise, disturbance and other negative impacts from motorized use will result in adverse modification to owl critical habitat, which in turn impedes recovery. Most importantly, by failing to distinguish between jeopardy to the species, and adverse modification to critical habitat, the DEIS ignores the recovery goal of critical habitat. See New Mexico Cattle Growers Assn). v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Serv., 248 F.3d 1277, 1283 & n. 2 (10th Cir.2001); Sierra Club v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Serv., 245 F.3d 434, 441-42 (5th Cir.2001); Gifford Pinchot Task Force v. United States Fish & Wildlife Serv., 378 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2004). (#91)

Subconcern # B
The DEIS states that Owls that are present within Critical Habitat would be impacted by continued use, and possible increased use, of routes that remain open. Critical habitat must be managed so that owls can expand into the area and for the ultimate recovery of the species. As previously stated, critical habitat is designated to provide not merely for species survival, but for species recovery. It does not appear that the STNF has fully evaluated how continued motorized use in owl critical habitat will affect the recovery of the Northern spotted owl. (#91)

Subconcern # C
Finally, the 2008 critical habitat designation was recently officially withdrawn by the USFWS and the 1992 critical habitat designation was reinstated. The FEIS must consider this new information and make changes accordingly. (#91)

Public Concern # 1017. The Forest Service should close proposed routes in northern spotted owl critical habitat until it can ensure there are no adverse modifications and that critical habitat is being managed for the recovery of the species.

Response: Under Alternatives 3 and 4, no routes are proposed for addition to the NFTS within Critical Habitat. In Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, 3 routes are in designated critical habitat, but all three were determined to have“No Effect” on principle component elements (PCE) of critical habitat (FEIS Chapter 3.15 – Wildlife page 597). Alternative 2 and 5 have routes proposed in designated critical habitat (FEIS Table 3.05-18, page 303; Table 3.05-38, page 338). If any routes in critical habitat that affect PCEs are selected under any action alternative, they would be subject to separate consultation with USFWS. The USFWS, not the Forest Service, is responsible for making determinations of adverse modification of critical habitat.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The STNF must remove those routes within Northern spotted owl critical habitat until it can ensure that critical habitat is being managed for the recovery of the species. We ask that maps be included with the FEIS that show all roads/trails in critical habitat, as well as LSR habitat. (#91)

Public Concern # 1018. The Forest Service should clearly explain why it proposes to increase NFTS road density in late seral reserves and northern spotted owl critical habitat.

Response: Routes were considered for addition to the NFTS in various alternatives because they were responsive to the need for access to motorized recreational opportunities. Late Successional Reserves and critical habitat designations cover hundreds of thousands of acres of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest and include some routes proposed for addition to the NFTS. Existing unauthorized routes are located in five different Late Successional

Reserves, nineteen spotted owl critical habitat units, and nine spotted owl core areas (FEIS page 284; Table 3.05-8, page 283). All of the action alternatives will significantly reduce effective road density in late-successional reserves and in designated critical habitat by the prohibition of motorized cross country travel on nearly 1.6 million acres of the Shasta Trinity National Forest (FEIS Table 3.05-41, page 352) Under Alternatives 3 and 4, no routes are added within Critical Habitat. In Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, 3 routes (U40N31D, TC1829, NRA1) are in designated critical habitat, but all 3 were determined to have "No Effect" on principle component elements of critical habitat (FEIS Chapter 3.15 – Wildlife, page 597; Wildlife BA). Alternative 2 and 5 have routes proposed in designated critical habitat (FEIS Table 3.05-18, page 303; Table 3.05-38, page 338). The environmental consequences of routes in critical habitat in alternatives 2 and 5are disclosed in Chapter 3.15-Wildlife. Route density expressed as absolute thresholds for late-successional species are not well understood. Therefore, route densities are presented to compare relative effects between the alternatives (FEIS, Table 3.05-41 page 352; 3.05-42 page 358; Figure 3.05-7, page 356). The unauthorized routes do not constitute a change to habitat, but are an existing condition where the vegetation-change impact has already occurred. Any proposed addition to the NFTS that adversely affected principle component elements of critical habitat would require consultation with the appropriate regulatory agency.

Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 would each add small amounts of carefully selected, currently used routes to the NFTS, while prohibiting the continued motorized travel on between 91 percent and 100 percent of existing unauthorized routes, as well as prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel where no open road exists. Motorized use in late successional reserves and critical habitat units will be reduced as a result of managing motorized recreation as proposed in the action alternatives. Passive restoration of non-system routes not added to the NFTS will improve late-successional habitat over time (FEIS, page 245, 298, 300, 305, 314).

Sample Public Comment(s):

It is unclear to us why the agency is proposing (via alternative 2) to increase system road density within LSRs and NSO critical habitat. The Northwest Forest Plan clearly recommends against new system roads within LSRs. Similarly, forest habitat fragmentation and disturbance from roads are known to reduce the habitat values of designated critical habitat for NSOs. Please do not encourage and codify additional motorized use in these key habitat areas. (#118)

Public Concern # 1019. The Forest Service should provide the science supporting increased buffer restrictions for bald eagle nest sites.

Response: Bald eagles are protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The USFWS National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines (USDI, 2007) provide management recommendations and are on the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List. A variety of human activities can potentially interfere with bald eagles affecting their ability to forage, roost, nest and raise young. Disturbance that negatively affects eagles is prohibited by both the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The USFWS recommends keeping distance between the activity and the nest, maintaining buffers around nest sites and avoiding certain activities during the nesting season. The recommended ***minimum*** buffer for OHV use is 660 feet adjacent to bald nests, however the lake bottom areas in question are open so sound and visual intrusion is evident. The USFWS guidelines also note a degree of uncertainty in their recommendations. The experience of the Forest Service managing eagle nest sites adjacent to Shasta Lake has been that a 0.5 mile buffer provides sufficient protection for breeding pairs to successfully reproduce. The Shasta Trinity National Forest LRMP requires restricted seasons of use around bald eagle nests, but it makes no specific recommendation for buffer size.

Sample Public Comment(s):

This section states: "The bald eagle guidelines do not provide protection provisions for general motorized use, but it does provide the following guidelines for off-road vehicle use. During the breeding season, do not operate off-road vehicles within 300 feet of the nest. In open areas, where there is increased visibility and exposure to noise, this distance should be extended to 660 feet. Habitat loss, fragmentation and edge effects: Roads may affect an animal's reproductive success. Productivity of Bald Eagles in Oregon and Illinois declines with proximity to roads and they preferentially nest away from roads. The reduced nesting success of eagles in proximity to roads may be more a function of the presence of humans than of the road itself (Trombulak and Frissell 2000). The riparian buffer is too small and does not adequately represent the area where bald eagles nests are found. They are usually around large

bodies of water not a 300 foot buffer to a stream; therefore, the ZOI used for bald eagle is ½ mile buffer around known nest sites." This Document has not provided the supporting science to increase the buffer restrictions of 1/2 mile for Bald Eagle Nest Sites. We want the STNF to remove this restriction and follow the guidelines determined by the LRMP. (#139)

Public Concern # 1020. The Forest Service should reduce road and stream crossing densities in areas that are high-value fish and wildlife habitat because they are two of the primary factors in habitat effectiveness.

Response: All of the action alternatives substantially reduce densities associated with unauthorized routes in high value habitat for fish (FEIS Table 3.03-3 page 191; Appendix M Aquatic Resources; Chapter 3.15 page 589) and wildlife (FEIS Table 3.05-41). There are no routes proposed for addition to critical habitat for northern spotted owls in Alternative 3 and 4. Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, has 3 routes in critical habitat for northern spotted owls, but all are "no effect" determinations. ESA consultation on proposed route additions concluded that proposed route additions either had "no affect" or were "not likely to adversely affect" ESA listed fish species or their habitats (Aquatics BA; FEIS page 202) . Alternatives considered for the project are also consistent with the Clean Water Act (FEIS 169) and the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the Forest Plan (FEIS page 170). Passive restoration of unauthorized routes not added to the NFTS will improve late-successional habitat over time (FEIS, page 245, 298, 300, 305, 314). Routes considered for addition to the NFTS are widely dispersed and would not substantially An analysis of the existing NFTS road and trail system of the STNF is outside of the scope of this project proposal.

Sample Public Comment(s):

The DEIS makes clear that road density and stream crossing density are two of the primary factors in habitat effectiveness for both aquatic and terrestrial species. Yet none of the action alternatives would substantially reduce road density or stream crossing density on the Forest. At a minimum, the Forest should seek to reduce road density and stream crossing density in areas that are of especially high value as fish or wildlife habitat. (#161)

Thank you for your comment and voting issue

Public Concern # 467. Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service received the following comment letters that contained comments that were unsupported opinion or a statement of fact with no stated request for action, and therefore, do not warrant further response: Letters 11, 20, 66, 84, 155, and 159.

Public Concern # 468. Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service received the following comment letters that contained comments that appeared to be a vote for particular alternatives but the comment period for the DEIS is not a vote-counting process; the most useful comments are those that are unique, substantially different, provide rationale, and suggest specific changes to the DEIS, and therefore, these comment letters do not warrant further response: Letters 14, 15, 47, 50, 65, 71, 89, 91, 93, and 99.

Response to Route- and Area-specific Comments

The Forest Service received numerous letters containing site-specific comments regarding various roads, trails, and areas. All routes that were requested during the public scoping period have been considered and are listed in Appendix G – Alternative Development. The Shasta-Trinity National Forest will consider any further route requests in future collaboration and project planning efforts as the transportation system and motor vehicle use map are updated. See the following table for the response to site-specific comments received by the public.

Table I- 3. Response to site-specific road, trail and area comments

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
13	87	Road 13 from road 19 north to 4n06 to cross over	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
13	89	Road 13 from the intersection of road 19 at the snowmobile park east to 4n06, it makes it convenient to cross from north to south.	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
13	93	Leave open a small section of road 13 at the intersection of the road 19 to 4n06.	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
13	99	Road 13 from the intersection of the road 19 at the snowmobile park east to 4n06, we use this area to cross from north to south.	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
19	87 89 99	Road 19 from road 13 to Hwy 97	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
19	93	Leave open road 19 from road 13 to Hwy 97	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
31	87 89 99	Road 31 to road 19	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
40n45	89 99	Road 40n45 from road 26 to road 17	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.
40n45	93	Leave open road 40n45 from road 26 to road 17	The commenter's road numbers do not match any roads in our database.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Backbone IRA and Devils Rock	118	Given that page 424 of the DEIS reveals that a mere 4.1% of user-created motorized routes are located within Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) why avoid user conflict and environmental degradation by encouraging ORV use elsewhere? Clearly the recreational needs of the ORV community can be met without designating the proposed routes in the Backbone and Devil's Rock IRAs. We are particularly concerned about potential impacts to Sensitive plants and Shasta Salamanders located in the Devil's Rock IRA. Please note that impacts to Sensitive plants and the Shasta Salamander from proposed motorized use in the IRA are not fully analyzed and disclosed in the DEIS.	Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, has no routes in IRAs. Under any action alternative, there are no routes within Backbone IRA that are also within Shasta Salamander habitat. The Botanical BA/BE was completed in compliance with NEPA and ESA standards. Impacts were analyzed in the Botanical BA/BE by location through the use of GIS. Route locations were overlaid with TES plant and noxious weed locations, and impacts were analyzed where they intersected as described in the FEIS (Chapter 3.07, page 398). Direct effects to non-native invasive species were assessed using an area of 30 feet. Indirect effects were assessed using the area from 31-100 feet. The route in question within the Devil's Rock IRA, SE194, does not have rare plants or non-native invasive species within 100 feet of the route. Therefore, the designation of this route would not result in effects to sensitive plants.
Castle Lake Road	174	The road that is USFS the last 1 1/2 mile to Castle Lake should be unpaved like it historically was. You should not have enlarged the parking area and should have left the road unpaved unmaintained past Methodist camp.	The Castle Lake Road is County Road 2M020 and is not considered in the Travel Management Plan.
Clear Creek	154	In BRC's July 10, 2007 and September 8, 2009 public comment letters, the concept of designating several "areas" for OHV use was suggested for inclusion into a pro-recreation alternative. The concept of designating several areas was also supported by Mr. Mitchell (see his Aug 12, 2009 letter). Those areas could have included, but are not limited to, the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and the Clear Creek area.	The concept of designating additional areas was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. The Forest decided that during this phase of the process, only adding routes to the NFTS will be considered, not designating OHV areas. The Forest may designate areas in the future. (FEIS, page 55).
Deer Mountain	114	It is not just my desire, but many others, that these roads remain open so that these public lands may be enjoyed by future generations.	The commenter is referring generally to roads in the areas of Mt. Shasta and east to Military Pass, Deer Mountain Road, and down to the town of Bartle. While some unauthorized routes in this area may not be designated for motorized use under this plan, there will still be an adequate road system for public access. The Forest Service will consider the transportation system on these areas as part of the ongoing management and revision of the NFTS.
Gumboot	174	The road up South fork should not be paved past Gumboot.	The paving of road 40N26 is not part of the Travel Management Plan.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Hayfork	154	In BRC's July 10, 2007 and September 8, 2009 public comment letters, the concept of designating several "areas" for OHV use was suggested for inclusion into a pro-recreation alternative. The concept of designating several areas was also supported by Mr. Mitchell (see his Aug 12, 2009 letter). Those areas could have included, but are not limited to, the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and the Clear Creek area.	The concept of designating additional areas was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. The Forest decided that during this phase of the process, only adding routes to the NFTS will be considered, not designating OHV areas. The Forest may designate areas in the future. (FEIS page 55).
Iron Canyon	170	The studies have also evaluated several user created roads along the shorelines of the reservoirs, specifically Iron Canyon reservoir, and recommendations may include closure and rehabilitation of those user-created roads to protect sensitive resources and reduce erosion, compaction and de-vegetation of the shoreline. Studies may indicate that specific designated parking areas and travel routes are necessary to provide limited access points to the water during low water conditions.	Thank you for the information on how the Shasta Trinity Travel Management Plan will affect the new FERC license to PG&E for project 2106.
Jones Valley	44	Please do not close access to these areas that local residents enjoy.	While some unauthorized routes in this area may not be designated for motorized use under this plan, there will still be an adequate road system for public access.
Lake Shastina	114	It is not just my desire, but many others, that these roads remain open so that these public lands may be enjoyed by future generations.	The commenter is referring generally to roads in the areas of Mt. Shasta and east to Military Pass, Deer Mountain Road, and down to the town of Bartle. While some unauthorized routes in this area may not be designated for motorized use under this plan, there will still be an adequate road system for public access. The FS will consider the transportation system on these areas as part of the ongoing management and revision of the NFTS.
McCloud Flat	93	Leave open McCloud Flats during mushroom season for cross country ATV.	The STNF is considered to be a heavily roaded Forest, providing ample opportunity for mushrooming without traveling cross-country. Therefore, designating areas for cross-country travel for mushrooming was not identified as part of the purpose and need for this project and is outside the scope of this project.
Military pass	114	It is not just my desire, but many others, that these roads remain open so that these public lands may be enjoyed by future generations.	The commenter is referring generally to roads in the areas of Mt. Shasta and east to Military Pass, Deer Mountain Road, and down to the town of Bartle. While some unauthorized routes in this area may not be designated for motorized use under this plan, there will still be an adequate road system for public access. The FS will consider the transportation system on these areas as part of the ongoing management and revision of the NFTS.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Moosehead Creek	161	Furthermore, we agree with the California Department of Fish & Game and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service that the STNF should provide “special protections” for the Forest’s sole remaining native inland salmonid, the McCloud River redband trout. For this reason, we strongly urge the STNF not to designate any new motorized routes which come within 150’ of any known or potential redband trout streams, including Moosehead Creek, Sheepheaven Creek, and Trout Creek.	All proposed routes with the potential to affect the McCloud River redband trout were analyzed. A Biological Evaluation conducted for this analysis finds that the proposals may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species. Trout creek is a tributary to Dry Creek Both are seasonal. Routes mc091, mc092, and mc098 are within 150 feet of Dry Creek just south of Trout Creek. Route mc098 is connected to mc097. These routes are proposed in Alternative 5 because the composite resource risk as determined by the IDT is not high enough to eliminate them from further study, and they provide a recreation benefit. The interdisciplinary evaluation of requested routes is in the project record.
Mt Dubakella	154	According to a BRC member club, the Redding Dirt Riders, they submitted 390 miles of motorcycle-only trails and 425 miles of ATV trails < 50 inches. Even the most recreation friendly action alternative (Alt.5) functionally closes almost 100% of those historic routes including the motorcycle only trail on Mt. Dubakella (Exhibit 3). Many of those routes are historic mining trails, logging skid roads, fuel breaks, narrow gauge railroad grades, and in some cases mapped "system" trails.	All routes requested during the public scoping period were considered for inclusion in the alternatives. The development of the alternatives consisted of a screening process that considered the resource risk and the recreation benefit of each route. Please see Appendix G for a complete explanation of the screening process and the criteria used in selecting routes for further study.
Mt Eddy	154	In BRC's July 10, 2007 and September 8, 2009 public comment letters, the concept of designating several "areas" for OHV use was suggested for inclusion into a pro-recreation alternative. The concept of designating several areas was also supported by Mr. Mitchell (see his Aug 12, 2009 letter). Those areas could have included, but are not limited to, the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and the Clear Creek area.	The concept of designating additional areas was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. The Forest decided that during this phase of the process, only adding routes to the NFTS will be considered, not designating OHV areas. The Forest may designate areas in the future. (FEIS page 55).
Mt Eddy	163	A glaring omission is open areas and trails in the Wildwood and Mt Eddy areas where many historical routes exist.	The concept of designating additional open areas where use is occurring was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. (FEIS page 55).
Mt Shasta	114	It is not just my desire, but many others, that these roads remain open so that these public lands may be enjoyed by future generations.	The commenter is referring generally to roads in the areas of Mt. Shasta and east to Military Pass, Deer Mountain Road, and down to the town of Bartle. While some unauthorized routes in this area may not be designated for motorized use under this plan, there will still be an adequate road system for public access. The Forest Service will consider the transportation system on these areas as part of the ongoing management and revision of the NFTS.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
North Trinity Lake	154	In BRC's July 10, 2007 and September 8, 2009 public comment letters, the concept of designating several "areas" for OHV use was suggested for inclusion into a pro-recreation alternative. The concept of designating several areas was also supported by Mr. Mitchell (see his Aug 12, 2009 letter). Those areas could have included, but are not limited to, the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and the Clear Creek area.	The concept of designating additional areas was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. The Forest decided that during this phase of the process, only adding routes to the NFTS will be considered, not designating OHV areas. The Forest may designate areas in the future. (FEIS page 55).
Pacific Crest	56	The area in question is south of the Pacific Crest Trail along a narrow dirt road that runs above the Scott Mtn. Campground and accesses two grassy areas before connecting back up with a main forest service road. The narrow dirt road is approximately 700 to 800 feet long and basically with little or no grade. The road in question runs from the parking area for the Pacific Crest Trail and the camp sites along the road are used frequently for all types of recreation. This area is especially used heavily during hunting seasons. Please leave the road in question and this area open to vehicle access, so the long used camp spots can continue to be accessed. I understand that the campground is on the Shasta Trinity but the area of my concern lies basically on the forest boundary.	The road in question is an unauthorized route TH2040. It is a 950 foot road that goes around a bend of 39N25Y. It is not a requested route that was considered in alternative development; however it could be considered in future planning efforts.
Pacific Crest	156	The PCNST traverses the Shasta-Trinity National Forest for over 150 miles and therefore crosses many Forest Service system roads. We greatly appreciate the Forest's proposal to prohibit cross country travel and we ask that the Forest pay special attention to limiting opportunities for illegal motorized use on the PCNST. The sheer number of system roads the Trail crosses allows for many potential access points by motorized and mechanized equipment. As PCTA's Regional Representative for Northern California and Southern Oregon, I am familiar with the PCNST on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest between Burney Falls State Park and Carter Meadows Summit. Therefore, I understand the complexities involved in managing the Trail through the checkerboard land ownership pattern that exists and the reality of restricting motorized access to the PCNST. That being said, we would ask that as the Forest moves forward in the planning process they consider strategies and techniques to restrict illegal use of the PCNST by motorized and mechanized equipment.	Managing use related to the existing NFTS and its effects on the Pacific Crest Trail are beyond the scope of this analysis, which is focused on prohibiting cross-country motor vehicle travel and evaluating additions of roads, trails and areas to the NFTS. Concerns regarding illegal motorized use on the PCNST should be brought to the attention of the Forest's law enforcement personnel; this letter has been forwarded to law enforcement for the commenter.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Pit 6 Powerhouse Road	170	Designated roads included in the following process include: Pit 6 powerhouse road-from Cove road to Pit 6 powerhouse. Under the re-license, studies have been conducted to evaluate the various resources associated with the project, including the road and travel system. Based on the data gathered, the Forest Service, Shasta-Trinity National Forest will be requesting some modifications (in the form of 4(e)conditions) to the existing facilities and road system to reduce erosion, provide for improved recreation use, protect sensitive resources, decommission some existing sites, and request the development of new sites. Final locations and designs have not been decided and will be subject to the ongoing collaboration with PG&E, California Dept. of Fish and Game, State Water Resources Control Board, USFWS, US Park Service and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.	Facilities and roads that are part of the FERC Relicensing of a hydropower facility are not affected by this process. Any road or facility that is part of the license would be governed by the terms of the license.
Port Orford	118	We were surprised that the DEIS did not discuss the impacts of unauthorized motorized routes on Port Orford Cedar populations or on the functioning of designated Botanical Areas. Is the agency proposing to designate routes within Botanical Areas or within watersheds containing Port Orford Cedar groves?	Botanical areas (under Special Interest Areas) were excluded from all action alternatives during the initial screening phase (see appendix G of the FEIS). Routes within botanical areas were excluded by law, regulation, and policy, or in areas with specific resource concerns. Due to this, there will be no effect from the project to botanical areas. The botanical BA/BE will be updated to explicitly state this. None of the proposed routes are located in Port Orford cedar communities.
R26	174	South fork, which Google earth says is WA Bar Road, and which I thought was #26, should not be maintained as well as it has been.	There is not enough information in the comment to identify the specific road.
R27n06f	23	Concerned about road 27N06F spur road that accesses his property (about 200yards). Prior to a gate being placed on the road 20 years ago he had problems with vandalism and people shooting at his cabin. Once you get down the road to his property the road ends, people turn around in the meadow and create resource damage. The main road 27N06 was rocked in the past, the road goes to Tomhead Mt Lookout, the spur that goes to his property is not rocked, has some slope as you go downhill, and traffic causes erosion and rutting. He is not sure if he needs to get a permit but feels the gate is needed for security and to reduce vandalism. He does some maintenance on the road. The spur road is along the Yolla Bolly wilderness boundary. Mentioned sensitive species concerns' grouse and fisher, meadow is a deer fawning area.	The road described in this comment is actually the 27N06 road. The 27N06D road accesses the Tomhead Lookout. The 27N06 road through the private parcel is a ML 2 road. The travel management plan is not changing maintenance level for system roads.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R28n35 **R30n22** **R30n24**	138	Furthermore, I noticed that some roads that were shown in the final inventory as system roads, but not included in the final alternatives. These include: 30N24, 30N22 and 28N35 (complete connection west of Rat Trap Gap).	Existing system roads were considered for limited motorized mixed-use proposals in Alternatives 4 and 5. The roads mentioned by the commenter were not selected for consideration in the alternatives. See Appendix C for a complete discussion of motorized mixed use.
R33067	27	I live on 33n67 rd and would like it to be closed to public travel off road.	Under Alternatives 2 through 5, motorized vehicle travel off of designated routes is prohibited.
R34n02	26	Route 34N02 and the associated A,B, and C on map 10, Alternative 2 - He has property in the Oak Run and Trinity areas and he wanted be sure access to his property was protected.	The Travel Management Plan will not restrict public use of the 34N04, or the A, B, or C spur roads.
R34n046	32	The dozer/trail leading from Panison Peak to the Gates Ranch, designated 3N046, would be unsuited for motorized travel due to the steepness of the grade and the need for permitted access through private property at the Gates Ranch. Suggest elimination of that road from the map.	Management of the National Forest System, including removing roads from the system, is considered under 36 CFR 212 Subpart A. This current round of planning addresses only 36 CFR 212 Subpart B. Subpart A analysis will be conducted in the future on a project by project basis.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R34n17 **R35n23** **R35n46** **R35n66** **R35n93** **R37n27y** **R37n34** **R37n38** **R37n66y** **R37n78a** **R37n93** **R37n93a** **R38n04y** **R38n11** **R38n81** **R83n53**	170	Designated roads included in the following process include: 34N17-from County road 6L005 to 35N46 (Hogback road). Under the re-license, studies have been conducted to evaluate the various resources associated with the project, including the road and travel system. Based on the data gathered, the Forest Service, Shasta-Trinity National Forest will be requesting some modifications (in the form of 4(e)conditions) to the existing facilities and road system to reduce erosion, provide for improved recreation use, protect sensitive resources, decommission some existing sites, and request the development of new sites. Final locations and designs have not been decided and will be subject to the ongoing collaboration with PG&E, California Dept. of Fish and Game, State Water Resources Control Board, USFWS, US Park Service and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.	Facilities and roads that are part of the FERC Relicensing of a hydropower facility are not affected by this process. Any road or facility that is part of the license would be governed by the terms of the license.
R34n46	74	It abuts the South end of the Gates Mountain and Pattison Peak trail/road. Shown as Route 3N46 on map 14. In my experience and estimation neither of these routes are suitable for highway vehicles. Until last year's fires they were scarcely suitable for foot and horse traffic. It is unclear to me how vehicles would get from these routes to a public road unless they turn around and return the way they came. Clearly. I would prefer that neither of these trails be open to any kind of vehicles. Perhaps you can explain to me what would happen when they reach my property line. Am I allowed to prevent them from crossing my property? Can the trails be posted "No Exit" ?	Route 3N46 is an existing ML2 route, classified for high clearance vehicle use, and is not maintained for passenger vehicles. However, concerns regarding route 3N46 fall out of the scope of this particular action. Management of the NFTS, including removing roads from the system, is considered under 36 CFR 212 Subpart A. This current round of planning addresses only 36 CFR 212 Subpart B. Subpart A analysis will be conducted in the future on a project by project basis.
R34n46	77	Comment: Road 36N46 is in the wrong place on the map, should be to the west. Has been in the correct location up to this time. Road shown is a jeep/horse trail then becomes a foot trail. Was improved some during last year's fires. Road goes through private property and does not have public right-of-way. Near Paterson Peak roadless area, road goes up Paterson Peak The correct road is steep and a rough road. Need to correct how it is shown on the map and no public access thru private lands.	Route 36N46 is an existing ML2 route, classified for high clearance vehicle use, and is not maintained for passenger vehicles. According to the STNF's road data, this particular route is also listed under private jurisdiction. The MVUM produced as a result of this process will correctly identify the location and extent of acceptable motorized routes. The MVUM will clearly communicate rules and regulations of motorized use as well.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R34n52y	138	To allow loop access instead of dead end trails, I propose maintaining the following roads as part of the inventory: 34N52Y, U34N34B, 34N64, U29N22B, U28N26, U29N55A (south of Dubakella Mtn.), U29N08E, TH2021 and JM97 to name a few.	The STNF's scoping process gathered input from the public on routes such as these for the purpose of creating loops as suggested. Alternative 5 offers the most miles and opportunities for such experiences. Other route additions can be considered in the future to improve the motorized recreational experience further.
R34n64	138	To allow loop access instead of dead end trails, I propose maintaining the following roads as part of the inventory: 34N52Y, U34N34B, 34N64, U29N22B, U28N26, U29N55A (south of Dubakella Mtn.), U29N08E, TH2021 and JM97 to name a few.	The STNF's scoping process gathered input from the public on routes they wanted to include for a variety of purposes, including creating loops as suggested. Alternative 5 offers the most miles and opportunities for loops as well. Other route additions, including the ones proposed in this comment, can be considered for addition to the NFTS in the future.
R38n82	34	At one time there were three gates on this N.F. road system to discourage public use of public lands. Now the property owners have upgraded the road and bridges into this area. Therefore, access is better and safer for public use. The existing road system and surrounding steep terrain limits any off road travel excursions. Therefore, the road ideally lends its self to vehicles less than 50" wide (ATV, Motor bikes) to access this beautiful area without causing damage to the resources.	Road 38N82 is an ML 1 road and is listed in the STNF's road inventory as closed, and re-opening for use was not considered under any alternative. As mentioned on page 5 in the DEIS by numbers 1 and 4: Key elements considered when developing the scope of the action were that previous decisions on the NFTS (including closing/opening roads), and access in regards to permits or leases etc. are exempt from designation under the TMR. Thank you for supplying this information in support of your comment.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R3n46	90	I request that to Route 3N46 be withdrawn from consideration as suitable for any type of vehicle, OHV or otherwise. All 5 proposed Alternatives designate Route 3N46 as NFS Road- Open to All Vehicles. As drawn on Map 14, this route runs south from Pattison Peak down the ridge between the West Fork Miners Creek and Gates Creek ending on private property at the Bar 717 Ranch. Route 3N46 traverses Township 4N, section 36 and Township 3N Sections 1, 12, 13, 14. Route 3N46 overlays the historic Pattison Peak Trail, used for over 100 years by residents and campers at the Bar 717 Ranch to access Corral Bottom, the Trinity River, and the Trinity Alps. During forest fires in the 1960's, the first mile of this trail, running northeast from the Bar 717 Ranch property within Section 14, was modified into a jeep trial to allow vehicle access to a ridge top heliport. The remainder of the trail, from the heliport to Pattison Peak, has always been an historic single-track foot and horseback trail, and has been designated as such on USGS quad maps. As drawn, Route 3N46 is shown traversing two private parcels that make up the Bar 717 Ranch. No easement exists for public access to, or along, FS Route 3N46. All five current OHV Travel Management Alternatives designate Route 3N46 as available for public access. To maintain such a designation would promote and encourage illegal trespass onto private property. Aside from being an historic trail and the issues of access/trespass, the northern 2.5 miles of the Pattison Peak Trail (what has been labeled FS Route 3N46, within Sections \ ,12, and Y, of 13, Map 14) arc not suitable for any type of wheeled vehicle travel. This route runs through the Pattison Peak Roadless Area. That portion of the historic Pattison Peak Trail is not, has not been, nor should ever be a road. The terrain is steep and highly erodible, with the trail often threading along narrow ridges, wide enough only for those on foot or horseback. This trail is not a road. Given the disparity between the conditions on the ground, and the expectation that route 3N46 would be suitable for "all vehicles", I can only conclude that the ' ground truthing' portion of the route designation process was never carried out for 3N46.	Route 3N46 is an existing ML2 route, classified for high clearance vehicle use, and is not maintained for passenger vehicles. Concerns regarding route 3N46 fall out of the scope of this particular action however. Management of the NFTS, including removing roads from the system, is considered under 36 CFR 212 Subpart A. This current round of planning addresses only 36 CFR 212 Subpart B. Subpart A analysis will be conducted in the future on a project by project basis.
R40n45	87	40n405 from 26 to 17	The commenter’s road numbers do not match any roads in our database.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R40n45	67	Their primary concern with the new Travel Management plan is that some of the dirt roads traditionally open to off-highway vehicles will be changed to highway-legal use only under this plan. The agency made an attempt (alternative 5) to allow some limited OHV use on "highway legal" dirt roads to give riders some measure of connecting from one set of roads to another, but even in the most liberal proposal, the plan is still too restrictive to meet the needs of OHV users. After careful scrutiny of the DEIS maps, I can see their point of concern. On our unit, some of the primary roads in question are: 40N45 between Road 26 and Road 17; Forest Route 31 between Ski Park Highway and Road 19; and 40N64, the road to the Toad Lake Trailhead. From the OHV perspective, these important connector and destination roads should be designated for all vehicles.	Roads or trails that are open to off-highway use already, and are a part of the existing NFTS, will continue to be open to such use under any alternative. No off-highway roads or trails are changed to highway legal use only under any alternative. Only use on unauthorized or non-NFTS routes will be affected. The STNF's scoping process gathered input from the public on routes they wanted to include and which road sections they would like changed in order to accommodate motorized mixed use. Alternative 5 offers the most miles and opportunities for motorized use. Other route additions or changes in road class to accommodate more motorized mixed use, including the ones proposed in this comment, can be considered for addition or change to the NFTS in the future.
R40n64	67	Most recreational OHV users that I have talked with indicate that they are not concerned with true cross-country travel, and in fact, prefer to stick to dirt roads to access the forest. Their primary concern with the new Travel Management plan is that some of the dirt roads traditionally open to off-highway vehicles will be changed to highway-legal use only under this plan. The agency made an attempt (alternative 5) to allow some limited OHV use on "highway legal" dirt roads to give riders some measure of connecting from one set of roads to another, but even in the most liberal proposal, the plan is still too restrictive to meet the needs of OHV users. After careful scrutiny of the DEIS maps, I can see their point of concern. On our unit, some of the primary roads in question are: 40N45 between Road 26 and Road 17; Forest Route 31 between Ski Park Highway and Road 19; and 40N64, the road to the Toad Lake Trailhead. From the OHV perspective, these important connector and destination roads should be designated for all vehicles.	Using a motorized vehicle on any unauthorized route (a route not in the NFTS) is considered cross-country travel. Roads or trails that are open to off highway use already, and are a part of the existing NFTS, will continue to be open to such use under any alternative. No off-highway roads or trails are changed to highway legal use only under any alternative. Only use on unauthorized or non-NFTS routes will be affected. The STNF's scoping process gathered input from the public on routes they wanted to include and which road sections they would like changed in order to accommodate motorized mixed use. Alternative 5 offers the most miles and opportunities for motorized use. Other route additions or changes in road class to accommodate more motorized mixed use, including the ones proposed in this comment, can be considered for addition or change to the NFTS in the future.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
R40n65	48	Currently, Road 40N65 is listed as a public road running through two privately own sections of land owned by the Charles Family Trust. The road is primarily used by Ski Park employees as a service road for maintenance along with the Forest Service Special Use permittees for work at the cell tower at the top of Gray Butte. We would like to request Road 40N65 to be classified as an "Administrative Use Road" therefore, restricting public access. The road should remain open for administrative use connected to the special use permittees, Forest Service, and ski park employees. It is important to recognize this road system does not border any National Forest lands, only the Charles Family Trust lands. Lastly, reclassifying the road as an Administrative Use Road is in the best interest of the public, for the security of the cell tower facilities, and the Ski Park facilities.	Management of the NFTS, including removing roads from the system, is considered under 36 CFR 212 Subpart A. This current round of planning addresses only 36 CFR 212 Subpart B. Subpart A analysis will be conducted in the future on a project by project basis.
R42n09	29	Use adjacent to road in this area compromises wetland function needed to maintain aquatic habitat for redband trout in Trout Creek. Also an archeology site is immediately south along road. Suggest developing alternative dispersed camping to northeast, away from sensitive areas. See map.	This route is not proposed in any of the alternatives. The nearest proposed route is six miles away and will have no effect on the sensitive areas described by the commenter. Developing dispersed sites is beyond the scope of this analysis.
R42n18a	151	Further, as acknowledged on page 172 of the DEIS, routes U35N05A and U42N18A both involved multiple stream crossings. This seems contrary to the goals of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.	Route U42N18A does have multiple riparian reserve crossings. These crossings occur on intermittent streams which drain from the slopes of Mt. Shasta. The soils underlying these crossings tend to be quite coarse and well armored. Infiltration capacities are high in these soils and displacement and movement of eroded soils tends to be limited. Therefore, erosion potential is low and the Forest does not expect that there will be any measurable impacts due to the use of these crossings. However, these crossings will be monitored for impacts to the stream channel and water quality. In the event that impacts to channel stability or water quality are found, the Forest will mitigate the impacts through crossing upgrades, seasonal closure, or permanent closure.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Rainbow Ridge	148	Right outside of the city limits of Mt. Shasta, there is an area known as Rainbow Ridge. This area, made up predominately of the Deer Creek drainage, offers excellent trails for OHV activity (Map 6, T40N R5W, centered around Section 24 and the immediate area). In the time that I have ridden these trails, there has been one "Hundred Year" storm and one "Fifty Year" storm, if I recall correctly. These trails receive very little maintenance by anybody (occasionally-me) and yet have survived very well. Considering the length of time this trail system has been in existence, the amount of travel usage, and the long term weathering, all without any formal maintenance. I think the sustainability of the system has been well established. I believe that the majority of the area was designated "Roaded Natural Recreation" during RARE II (Roadless Area Review and Evaluation). While being close to town, there is still no visibility or noise impact, since the canyon and ridge run northwest, isolating the trail system from town or any other recreational users. And since it is a box canyon with no through-roads there is no through traffic. This trail system is renowned for its single track (<30" tread width- 12" is consider ideal). As the original roads and trails have grown in, from declining use by wider vehicles, the experience has improved for motorcyclists and mountain bikers. It is a very enjoyable trail system, probably one of the best on the Forest. Please reconsider removing this trail system (and similar systems) from the Travel Management Plan. It would be major blow to the quality of life factor that makes living in Mount Shasta so enjoyable.	The scope of this analysis encompasses the entire STNF, excluding designated Wilderness areas and lands managed by other jurisdictions. Although we can not change the scope at this point in the analysis, the STNF is committed to further collaboration to build a road and trail network that provides the quality and experiences sought by motorized recreationists. The Travel Management regulations at 36 CFR 212.54 provide for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions, including the potential to add new routes following public involvement and site-specific environmental analysis.
Trinity River	9	Closed to Green Sticker vehicles, yet open to highway legal vehicles	The State of California administers the Green Sticker program. The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel does not close access to use of trails, roads, or areas on the STNF where off-highway vehicle use is acceptable. Operating unlicensed vehicles (which is common with most ATV's) in these areas on the STNF will still require a green sticker. The State of California requires that either a vehicle be licensed to operate (i.e, street legal vehicles) or have a green sticker (i.e., not street legal or unlicensed vehicle) when operating on any public lands within the state, to include Federal lands. A green sticker for non-highway legal motorized vehicles is not required if operating on private lands.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Trm1206 **Trm1210** **Trm1211** **Trm1213** **Trm1216** **Tse512** **Ttc1427** **Ttc319** **Tu42n15m** **Tu4n12d**	9	Unauthorized routes within Inventoried Roadless Areas and Citizen-Inventoried Roadless Areas proposed for addition to the NFTS	The policy within IRAs prohibits the construction of new roads or re-construction of existing roads (36 CFR Part 294 Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule). Therefore, management actions, including OHV use, that do not involve new road construction are allowed. The new prohibition on cross-country travel eliminates user-created routes, except those already existing that are brought into the NFTS. Under the action alternatives, increases to the NFTS of between 0.5 and 6.5% are proposed in 4 IRAs, to preserve traditional access for some forest users. All remaining unauthorized routes would be subject to closure. The remaining unauthorized routes are several times the length of the proposed addition. Modified Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative and Alternatives 3 and 4 have no route additions in IRAs.
Trout Creek	161	Furthermore, we agree with the California Department of Fish & Game and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service that the STNF should provide “special protections” for the Forest’s sole remaining native inland salmonid, the McCloud River redband trout. For this reason, we strongly urge the STNF not to designate any new motorized routes which come within 150’ of any known or potential redband trout streams, including Moosehead Creek, Sheepheaven Creek, and Trout Creek.	All proposed routes with the potential to affect the McCloud River redband trout were analyzed. A Biological Evaluation conducted for this analysis finds that the proposals may impact individuals or habitat, but will not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or species. Trout creek is a tributary to Dry Creek Both are seasonal. Routes mc091, mc092, and mc098 are within 150 feet of Dry Creek just south of Trout Creek. Route mc098 is connected to mc097. These routes are proposed in Alternative 5 because the composite resource risk as determined by the IDT is not high enough to eliminate them from further study, and they provide a recreation benefit. The interdisciplinary evaluation of requested routes is in the project file.
Tsfmu9	9	Riparian Reserve on fish bearing stream, MIS Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)	This route is proposed to be added in Alternative 5. It was identified that this route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to aquatic species of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Ttc1829	9	Within Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat, high resource risk, northern spotted owl nesting habitat, sensitive species *Harmonia doris-nilesiae* on route	This route is proposed to be added in Alternatives 2 and 5. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to SONCC Coho Salmon of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03 as well as in the Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE) for Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Sensitive Species That May be Affected by Motorized Travel Management for the STNF. This BA/BE can be found in the project record. In accordance with the ESA, the FS initiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding any routes which have been determined to may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect SONCC Coho Salmon. The route lies within 30-100 feet of a *Harmonia doris-nilesiae* population and also within critical habitat (1992 designation) for northern spotted owl. The effects to northern spotted owls and sensitive plants are disclosed in the wildlife and botanical resources sections in Chapter 3, respectively.
Ttc1829	161	A number of user-created routes proposed for inclusion in the NFTS are within riparian reserves. We strongly oppose designation of the following routes due to their potential adverse effects on SONC coho salmon and on fish-bearing streams.	This route is proposed to be added in Alternatives 2 and 5. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to SONCC Coho Salmon of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the DEIS in section 3.03 as well as in the Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE) for Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Sensitive Species That May be Affected by Motorized Travel Management for the STNF. This BA/BE can be found in the project record. In accordance with the ESA, the FS has initiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding any routes, which have been determined to may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect SONCC Coho Salmon.
Ttc507 **Ttc508**	9	Riparian Reserve on fish bearing stream, MIS Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)	This route is proposed to be added in Alternative 5. It was identified that this route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to aquatic species of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03.
Ttc851 **Ttc855** **Ttc856**	9	Riparian Reserve on fish bearing stream, MIS Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), northern spotted owl nesting habitat, S.Fork of Trinity River Key Watershed	This route is proposed to be added in Alternative 5. It was identified that this route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to aquatic species of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03.
Ttc860	9	Riparian Reserve on fish bearing stream, MIS Rainbow Trout (*Onocrhvnchus mykiss*), S. Fork of Trinity River Key Watershed	This route is proposed to be added in Alternative 5. It was identified that this route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to aquatic species of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Ttmc092 **Ttpc05**	9	Riparian Reserve on fish bearing stream, MIS Rainbow Trout (*Oncocrhynchus mykiss*)	This route is proposed to be added in Alternative 5. It was identified that this route accesses a river or lake for aquatic recreation opportunities. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to aquatic species of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03.
Tu29n05 **Tu29n22b**	154	BRC cites (and adopts by reference) the August 12,2009 comment letter submitted by retired Shasta Trinity NF recreation officer, Mike Mitchell. BRC representatives toured a number of routes in the Wildwood area with Mr. Mitchell while he was still employed by the agency. As noticed in the August 12 letter, the agency appears to have excluded a large number of "system routes" (that were on its 1969, 1987, and 1996 forest visitor maps) and identified them as "unauthorized routes" based on the following premise: (DEIS - Page 4, Chapter One) In 1997, the STNF populated the INFRA database by transferring the route data from the existing stand alone database to the corporate INFRA database. Since that time, the forest has been maintaining the INFRA database; documenting changes in the transportation system, correcting errors, and capturing deferred maintenance needs. Roads or trails with no record of being mapped or maintained for a specific use were not included in the NFTS. BRC believes the agency failed to review both public comments and comments from agency staff such as Mr. Mitchell about mapped routes such as Knob Peak 4WD Trail - U29N05 (Exhibit 1), the Dead Horse Ridge Trail - U29N22B (Exhibit 2) being system routes since they were on previous maps. Rather, the agency depended on a rather unreliable hit or miss process of if cartographers accurately transfer data from previous formats and information sets to new products.	The referenced unauthorized routes have not been added to the INFRA database and therefore are considered unauthorized routes in this analysis, although they do appear on the Forest's recreation map. The interdisciplinary team considered these routes for addition to the NFTS but eliminated them from study in an alternative as noted in Appendix G. Unlike the Forest's recreation map, the Motor Vehicle Use Map (to be published upon completion of this analysis) will illustrate only NFTS roads open to public motor vehicle travel. Also unlike the recreation map, the MVUM will be updated annually to illustrate ongoing updates to the NFTS.
Tu414a	9	Within Riparian Reserve of Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Coho Salmon occupied Critical Habitat high resource risk, willow flycatcher habitat/medium resource risk	This route is proposed to be added in Alternatives 2 and 5. A review of Appendix G will explain the process for selecting routes for further study. The effects to SONCC Coho Salmon of adding routes within Riparian Reserves were analyzed and are disclosed in the FEIS in section 3.03 as well as in the Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE) for Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Sensitive Species That May be Affected by Motorized Travel Management for the Shasta Trinity National Forest. This BA/BE can be found in the project record. In accordance with the ESA, the FS has initiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding any routes, which have been determined to may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect SONCC Coho Salmon.

Trail or Road# and Areas	Ltr#	Public Comment	Response to Comment
Wildwood	154	In BRC's July 10, 2007 and September 8, 2009 public comment letters, the concept of designating several "areas" for OHV use was suggested for inclusion into a pro-recreation alternative. The concept of designating several areas was also supported by Mr. Mitchell (see his Aug 12, 2009 letter). Those areas could have included, but are not limited to, the trail networks near Wildwood, Mt. Eddy, North Shore Trinity Lake/Skunk Flat, Hayfork, and the Clear Creek area	The concept of designating additional areas was considered when evaluating reasonable alternatives but was eliminated from detailed study. The Forest decided that during this phase of the process, only adding routes to the NFTS will be considered, not designating OHV areas. The Forest may designate areas in the future. (FEIS page 55).
Wildwood	163	A glaring omission is open areas and trails in the Wildwood and Mt Eddy areas where many historical routes exist.	This analysis did not propose changes to the roads and motorized trails currently included in the Forest's transportation system database (INFRA), with the exception of the maintenance level 3 road segments proposed for motorized mixed-use. The interdisciplinary team considered proposed routes and open areas in the Wildwood area if they were requested by the public during the scoping period for the proposed action. See appendix G for the process used to select and study routes. Chapter 2, "Alternatives Considered but Eliminated form Detailed Analysis," addresses the request for open areas. The Shasta-Trinity National Forest intends to continue conversation and collaboration regarding the need to provide motorized recreation and access through future planning efforts as they occur across the STNF.

Response to Attachments

The Forest Service received many comment letters that included attachments such as maps, references, route lists, and scientific literature. These attachments were distributed to the appropriate interdisciplinary team specialist for review, consideration, and response as they prepared the Final EIS. In some cases, the attachments serve to support the comments expressed in the commenter's letter rather than provide additional or new comments. In these cases, the attachments are noted below with the response, "Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments." Attachments providing new or opposing science, additional concerns, or new information were considered and are responded to below.

Table I- 4. Response to comment attachments

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
9	California is home to an amazing diversity of anadromous fish species, and contains the southern most runs of steelhead and salmon. Such species are excellent indicators of overall ecosystem health. California Trout commissioned UC Davis' Center for Watershed Sciences to write Salmon. Steelhead, and Trout in California: Status of an Emblematic Fauna (Moyle, et al 2008), and we have included a CD ROM version of this paper with these comments. Moyle tells us that 65% of these species are in danger of extinction with the next century.	Thank you for attaching the Moyle, et al 2008 document. It provides a concise recount of current and relevant information that shares conclusions regarding SONCC Coho salmon status and rational behind this ESU's current status. This information is similar to what is documented in the project evaluation files. Many references cited in this document can be found in the Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE) done for this project and submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service for consultation.
9	In 2003 scientists found OHVs to be the primary vector spreading noxious weeds in roadless areas (Best Management Practices for OHV Use on Forestlands, Switalski and Jones 2008, hard copy included with these comments). "Roadless areas maintain healthy soil, provide clean water, and act as a refuge for wildlife," (USDA 2000b; DellaSala & Strittholt 2002, cited in BMPs for OHVs)	The document provided best management practices (BMPs) for OHV use with respect to minimizing the spread of non-native invasive plant species (NNIS). Most of the BMPs listed are accepted practices; however they address activities beyond the scope of this analysis, such as closing roads and prohibiting camping. The FEIS proposes and analyzes the most feasible control measures and monitoring approach to minimize the spread of NNIS from motor vehicle travel on the proposed roads and trails. The noxious weed risk assessment was completed in compliance with NEPA and ESA standards. Specific mitigations for noxious weeds, including treatment of known sites, were listed in the DEIS, Appendix D, page D-26 table D-9. Overall, the project reduces the risk of noxious weed spread from the current condition by eliminating cross-country travel to include roadless areas. A full discussion of project effects on noxious weeds can be found in the Botanical BA/BE Appendix A: Noxious Weeds Risk Assessment. This document can be found in the project record and is summarized in the DEIS in Chapter 3.8.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
9	We are opposed to any addition of unauthorized routes within IRAs. We believe such additions would be in violation of USDA Secretary's Memorandum 1042-154, which is attached.	The FS recognizes that Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) are important in that they provide remote recreation opportunities including OHV use, without the activity restrictions of Wilderness. Regulations do not prohibit wheeled, motorized vehicle use within IRAs, nor do they require the closure of existing NFTS roads in IRAs. The travel management project is specific to unauthorized routes and did not analyze the effect, nor recommend actions, on existing system roads already within the IRAs. The prohibition on cross-country travel in all of the action alternatives would be consistent with values associated with IRAs (DEIS page 445). The IRAs were considered in this analysis under their inventoried boundaries, which date from the Roadless Area Review and Inventory (RARE II) in 1976 and as described in Appendix C of the FEIS for the STNF LRMP. Since the RARE II inventory, roads have been constructed within IRAs. In this DEIS, the IRAs were analyzed with present system roads in place. This was regarded as baseline for predicting environmental effects (36 CFR Part 294 Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Final Rule; see project file for roadless specialist report). Adding new routes in IRAs would be subject to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule and the consideration of the Secretary of Agriculture. No new routes are proposed for addition to the NFTS in IRAs.
9	We are also wondering if STNF is using NSO Critical Habitat Maps from 1992 or those from the 2008 regulations, which are currently in litigation?	Critical habitat area designation was established by USFWS in 1992 and recently updated in 2008. Recently (April 2009), the USFWS requested a federal judge to allow them to withdraw the 2008 designations. Due to the uncertainty of future designations, we calculated Critical Habitat based on both designations until the issue is fully resolved by the USFWS.
77	Attached is a Forest Map that shows the different location of the 34n46 road and a Noted area on Map 14	Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments.
81	Barring OHVs from dirt roads is eco-overkill by Record Searchlight Editorials posted July 26, 2009	Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments.
82	I echo comments in barring OHVs from dirt roads is eco-overkill By Record Searchlight Editorials Posted July 26, 2009	Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments.
85	Here is a copy of the text of a recent article in the Record Searchlight(Redding, Ca newspaper) http://www.redding.com/news/ 2009/jul/26/barring-ohvs-from-dirt-roads-is-eco-overkill/	Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments.
94	STNF Travel Management Off Highway Vehicle OHV Route Designation Project attachment	This is a screenshot of a website announcing the release of the Notice of Intent in August 2008, with numerous links to information regarding the travel management analysis, including FAQs, newspaper articles, press releases, and the Forest contact, Brenda Tracy. The commenter uses this attachment to support the content of her comments, such as quotes from the FAQs. Thank you for providing this in support of your comments.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
94	Project contact information; and questions and answers	This is a screenshot of information regarding the travel management process, background, and contacts. Thank you for providing this in support of your comments.
94	Letter The Honorable Dianne Feinstein United States Senate One Post Street, Suite 2450 San Francisco, CA 94105	The letter from the Regional Forester provides explanation, as requested by Senator Feinstein on behalf of a constituent, of how the STNF decided to address motorized access to dispersed camping in this Travel Management decision. Attachment provides insight into the decision making process.
118	Letter to Randy Moore, Regional Forester 12/18/08	The attachment included a letter that offers concern for the route designation process on the Tahoe National Forest; concern that a science-based analysis will not be performed when implementing the TMR. Any action, including designating routes or re-designation of routes requires going through the NEPA process.
118	Statement of Abigail Kimbell before the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee Concerning The USFS Fiscal Year 2010 Budget 5/12/09	The attachment included a nationwide budgetary statement that does not pertain to implementing Subpart B of the TMR on the STNF.
118	Status and Summary Report OHV Responsible Riding Campaign Lisa Marie Frueh Monaghan & Associates November 15, 2001	Thank you for providing this information in support of your comments.
118	Monaghan and Associates, a marketing research firm, conducted a 2001 study at the behest of the Colorado Coalition for Responsible OHV Riding, a coalition of off-road vehicle representatives, environmentalists and public officials. See Status and Summary Report; OHV Responsible Riding Campaign, attached hereto. Researchers surveyed Colorado off-road vehicle riders through a series of three focus groups. Monaghan and Associates found that the majority of off-roaders understand that staying on designated routes is “fundamental trail etiquette” and that going off trail is not “correct” off-road vehicle behavior. Id. at 11. The survey revealed, however, that regardless of this knowledge “as many as two-thirds of adult users go off the trail occasionally.” Id. A significant percentage of riders, 15-20%, admitted to frequently breaking the rules and riding off of legal routes often. Id. Survey participants also stated that “others” ride off-route and cause most of the damage. Id. at 7. “Many reluctantly admit to having gone off trail “a couple times” but felt that it is permissible if rarely done .... “just this one time. “Id. Tellingly, the report concluded: “In a “nutshell,” it is our premise that further information and education per se - will not result in substantial behavioral change.” Id. at 1.	The study presented by this commenter serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the DEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
118	Similar results were found in Utah. In 2002, the Utah Division of Parks & Recreation commissioned Utah State University to survey riders to determine their "OHV uses and owner preferences." The university conducted a telephone survey of 335 riders from a random sample of the 50,676 people who registered off-road vehicles with the state in 2000. See Fisher, Andrea L., Dale J. Blahna, and Rosalind Bahr, 2001; Off Highway Vehicle Uses and Owner Preferences in Utah. Logan, Utah. Utah State University, at iv, attached hereto. The Utah report reveals that an inordinate number of riders prefer to ride "off established trails." Of the ATV riders surveyed, 49.4% prefer to ride off established trails, while 39% did so on their most recent excursion. Of the dirt bike riders surveyed, 38.1% prefer to ride off established trails, while 50% rode off established trails on their most recent excursion. It should be noted that pro-ORV groups commissioned both of the studies cited above.	The study presented by this commenter serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the DEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Additionally, these data are ratified by two other recent reviews. In 2006, the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks received survey responses from 446 owners of registered off-road vehicles. See Lewis, M.S., and R. Paige. 2006: Selected Results From a 2006 Survey of Registered Off- Highway Vehicle (OHV) Owners in Montana. Responsive Management Unit Research Summary No. 21. Prepared for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, attached hereto. Among the full sample of respondents, almost a quarter, 23%, "never" or 'sometimes" comply with Montana's law against cross-country driving even though off-route riding has been illegal there since 2001. Over 28% "never" or 'sometimes" avoid riparian areas and wetlands, in violation of rules for federal and state public lands in Montana. Sixty-four percent of those surveyed have used an off road reported they never follow this guideline. And, 52 percent reported they follow this guideline sometimes. The majority of this hunting subset admits to illegally riding cross country " over 58% have traveled off of legal routes to retrieve downed game. In the context of the assumption that "education" will cure unlawful ORV behavior, this figure is notable to the extent that the survey found that "two-thirds of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting reported they have seen written materials (e.g., brochures, posters, articles, etc.) that address the topic of hunting and responsible OHV use." The survey concluded, therefore, that "most OHV owners in Montana have been exposed to a variety of safety and responsible use information." Regardless of this "education," the survey noted: OHV owners do not always follow important guidelines for responsible use when operating OHVs. For instance, about a third of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting disagree or strongly disagree that "OHV users should NOT travel off legal routes to retrieve harvested game." Only 42 percent of the respondents who have used an OHV when hunting reported they always follow this guideline. Nearly 7 percent	The study presented by this commenter serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the DEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
118	Echoing these findings are the results of a 2003 survey of Wisconsin ATV users. A study of "motivations and attitudes" by graduate student Robert A. Smail at the University of Wisconsin - Steven's Point included a survey of user preferences for riding and found nearly two-thirds of respondents prefer to ride off maintained trails. Robert A. Smail, July 2007, Wisconsin all-terrain vehicle owners: Recreational Motivations and Attitudes Toward Regulation, A Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree Master Of Science In Natural Resources Resource Policy And Planning College Of Natural Resources University Of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, copy obtained from author attached hereto. "Survey respondents were asked to indicate where they prefer to ride their ATV. Of the five possible choices, "On maintained trails" (28.5%) ranked third. The top choice was "On user created trails" (33.3%) followed closely by "Cross country, off trails and roads" (32.0%). In other words, 65.3% of all users prefer to ride off of maintained trails." Dr. Smail concluded that the survey results demonstrated that past orthodoxies premised on education and the assumed "positive peer-pressure" flowing from membership in established "rider clubs" are not adequate to generate trail-riding compliance, they had "no influence." Rather, "these results indicate that messages promoting responsible ATV riding or use will need to be reformulated and law enforcement will need to be increased in order to prevent resource damage and user conflict."	The study presented by this commenter serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Finally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") found a near universal disregard for motorized guidelines when the BLM experimented with a "voluntary off-road vehicle route system" in Nevada. The area in question serves as a refuge for the disappearing Sand Mountain Blue butterfly, a species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. A 2006 monitoring report compiled over a three-year period found that "98 percent of all existing routes continued to be used and new routes were created, indicating an ongoing expansion of habitat degradation." Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. 12-Month Finding on a Petition to List the Sand Mountain Blue Butterfly (Euphilotes pallescens ssp. arenamontana) as Threatened or Endangered with Critical Habitat. Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 84. See pages 24260-61, attached hereto. The study also found that "about 50 percent of all noncompliance points occurred at or near red carsonite posts installed to alert riders that travel was discouraged in areas behind the posts" to protect sensitive butterfly habitat. The cumulative impacts of such "noncompliance points" were four-fold as each discouraged route experienced multiple incursions. Id. The FWS noted that "high levels of noncompliance occurred from the onset of implementation of the voluntary system, and the number of incursions into habitat outside of the encouraged routes increased in 2006.	The study presented by this commenter serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
118	Providing a broader overview, in September 2007, the Izaak Walton League, one of the country's oldest conservation groups, released a study of state game and fish managers revealing that 83% of wildlife managers have seen "resource damage to wildlife habitat" caused by ORVs and 72% cited "disruption of hunters during hunting season" as another impact from ORVs. "Off-Road Vehicle Impacts on Hunting and Fishing, The Izaak Walton League of America, 2007, attached hereto as Attachment H, at 15 (available from: http://www.iwla.org/publications/ wilderness/OHVreport.pdf) Similarly, fully 60% of fisheries managers deemed ORV use to generate adverse impacts on riparian resources. Notably, 41% of wildlife and 50% of fisheries managers do not believe that current standards and protections adequately protect the resources they are responsible for with the perceived attitude of lawlessness playing a central role: "We have numerous rules and regulations, but many ORV riders have an attitude that they should not apply to them and many just ignore some rules because they want to ride someplace. It increases law enforcement effort and takes time from other areas." "There seems to be a misconception that just because you own a piece of equipment that can go almost anywhere, that you are entitled to go almost anywhere including public land dedicated to wildlife management. This needs to change." Further, ""They go where they please, when they please, if they please. Not all do this, but many do. They cause significant upland erosion as well as stream side and in-stream damage." "Many ORV riders seemingly have no conservation ethic or appreciation for habitat management or understanding of the damage they cause." Another said: "While there is regulatory ability, there is insufficient enforcement response capability to adequately respond to illicit ORV use."	The study "Collision Course" presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	In a closely tracking review on federal land managers, in December 2007, the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility ("PEER") released the first-ever survey of federal rangers" views on off-road vehicle issues. "Rangers for Responsible Recreation: Off-Road Vehicle Issues Survey of SW Law Enforcement Professionals - Bureau of Land Management (BLM) & Forest Service (FS), 2007, (available from: http://www.peer.org/docs/az/07_11_12_sw_le_orv_survey_results.pdf) Strikingly: " 91% of respondent rangers agree that "off-road vehicles present a significant law enforcement problem in my jurisdiction"; " More than half (53%) feel "off-road vehicle problems in my jurisdiction are out of control"; and " 74% say that off-road abuses "are worse than they were five years ago" while fewer than one in six (15.2%) believe the situation is improving. Moreover, the survey found that rangers believe their agencies are unequal to the task of controlling ORV abuse: "62% believe their agency is not "prepared to deal with the ORV problems we are experiencing"; and "78% do not think their department "devotes adequate resources to cope with ORV problems."	The study presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites. However, the study goes into law enforcement problems or issues, which are not the focus of implementing Subpart B of the TMR and does not support or change the analysis provided in that regard.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
118	Also attached is copy of an article published in the Washington Post. The report, entitled ""Off- Road Rage" Climbs as Trails Get More Crowded," was published on August 12, 2008 and appeared in section A at page 2. The report provides additional documentation of many ORV riders" unlawful "even violent "disregard of the rules and regulations applicable to ORV use on public lands.	The article presented by the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Statement of JACK GREGORY Special Agent in Charge, Retired, Southern Region U.S. Forest Service On Behalf of Rangers for Responsible Recreation and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Natural Resource Committee United States House of Representatives Hearing on The Impacts of Unmanaged Off Road Vehicles on Federal Land March 13, 2008	The statement presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	The Washington Post Off-Road Rage Climbs as Trails Get More Crowded 8/12/08	The statement presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Collision Course Off-Road Vehicle Impacts on Hunting and Fishing	The study "Collision Course" presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Rangers for Responsible Recreation Off-Road Vehicle Issues Survey of SW Law Enforcement Professionals Bureau of Land Management (BLM) & Forest Service (FS)	The study presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites. However, the study goes into law enforcement problems or issues which are not the focus of implementing Subpart B of the TMR and does not support or change the analysis provided in that regard.
118	Off Highway Vehicle Uses and Owner Preferences in Utah (Revised)	The study presented by this comment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Summary of Research Selected Results From a 2006 Survey of Registered Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Owners in Montana 7/2006	The study presented by this comment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
118	Federal Register /Vol. 72, No. 84 /Wednesday, May 2, 2007 / Proposed Rules	Page 7 of the attachment serves to illustrate effects of OHV use from a USFWS Study in Nevada. The finding presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites.
118	Testimony Regarding Off-Highway Vehicle Regulation Management on Public Lands Presented Before The United States Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources 6/5/08 Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association	The statement presented in the attachment serves to support the background statement on page 2 of the FEIS, which discusses how unmanaged motor vehicle use, particularly OHV use, has resulted in thousands of miles of unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation, and impacts to cultural resource sites. However, the study goes into law enforcement problems or issues which are not the focus of implementing Subpart B of the TMR and does not support or change the analysis provided in that regard.
132	Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Siskiyou asserting legal standing and formally requesting coordination with all federal and state agencies maintaining jurisdiction over lands and/or recourses located in Siskiyou County.	This resolution documents the County's position as an integral collaborative partner in travel management planning on the STNF. The resolution offers numerous legal citations and good reasons that the County should be involved in this analysis. The STNF has welcomed the collaboration and details of the public involvement activities with the County are described in Chapter 1, Public Involvement.
151	INFRA, the database used by the USFS to document and track its transportation system, is one of the few places where detailed information regarding the USFS road and trail system can be found. It is logical that this database be used as a starting point for travel planning. However, there are certain roads in INFRA that should not be listed as part of the baseline travel system. We have included in Appendix A an Excel spreadsheet of roads and trails in the INFRA transportation database (provided by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest on July 17, 2009) that have, at some point in the past, been determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate for long-term public motor vehicle travel. These routes should not be treated as open system routes merely because they exist on the ground or have been entered into INFRA. These routes should not appear on the MVUM without adequate justification and environmental analysis.	The commenter submitted a list of 5,154 road segments to exclude from the MVUM. Defining which categories of existing NFTS roads should or should not appear on the MVUM is beyond the scope of this analysis. The MVUM will only display roads and trails open to the public

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
151	In Appendix A, the Excel spreadsheet lists all roads that should NOT appear on the MVUM unless they have been analyzed as part of the Travel Management Planning process. The column labeled "Operating Maintenance Level" lists all of the roads that are labeled in INFRA as "basic custodial care (closed)" (defined as an intermittent service road closed to vehicular traffic). These roads should not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map because they are not currently open to motor vehicles. The column labeled "Service Life" lists all of the roads that are labeled in INFRA as "short term service" (defined as a road for short term use including temporary roads), "intermittent stored service" (defined as an intermittent service road closed to traffic), or "intermittent term service" (defined as a road closed to vehicle traffic between periods of use; the closed period must exceed one year). Roads in these categories were not constructed for long-term public motor vehicle recreation and should not appear on the MVUM without justification and environmental analysis. The column labeled "Objective Maintenance Level" lists all roads that are labeled in INFRA as "basic custodial care (closed)," "converted," or "decommissioned." These roads should not appear on the Motor Vehicle Use Map because the Forest has determined that their objective for these roads is to close them to motor vehicles.	The commenter submitted a list of 5,154 road segments to exclude from the MVUM. Defining which categories of existing NFTS roads should or should not appear on the MVUM is beyond the scope of this analysis. The MVUM will only display roads and trails open to the public

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
151	Attachment to letter: Predicting Impact of Noise on Recreationists. USFS San Dimas Equipment Development Center, April 1980.	The attachment is from a study by the Forest Service's own Equipment and Development Center focused on predicting impact of noise on recreation lands. In addition, it includes a method requiring supplemental software to use with ArcGIS. All of the action alternatives would reduce engine noise around roads and trails by ending motorized cross-country travel on unauthorized routes. The analysis also addresses the effects on "quiet" recreation. The method chosen was the number of acres within one half mile of an area where motorized use is allowed (designated roads, trails, and areas in the NFTS miles that would result under each alternative). This method was determined through a literature review of sound studies and reports listed in Chapter 4. In addition, this method could be performed and readily applied by the Forest recreation specialist utilizing existing GIS data. (FEIS Chapter 3.01) The commenter recommends adopting software that applies a noise propagation model based on the System for the Prediction of Acoustic Detectibility (SPreAD), a workbook published by the FS and EPA in 1980. On page iii, under Overview OROS and SPreaD, the workbook reads, "In a recreation situation, the acoustic impact of a sound depends on the measurable inherent characteristics of sound, the setting in which the sound is heard, and the individual attributes of the listener. If the acoustic impact upon the listener is negative enough, the sound may be categorized as noise." The approach used by the Forest assumes noise is generated from all motorized routes. Determining sound levels, in order to determine if sound becomes noise is not required. Sound sources, terrain, vegetation cover, weather, etc., are the type of attributes used to determine sound specific levels by SPreaD. Additionally, the Forest is attempting to analyze the effects of motorized noise over a large area. Page 5 of the SPreAD workbook under Noise in Recreation Areas states, "Consequently, standards for the loudness, repetitiveness, or duration of sounds in recreation environments should be established only in terms of specific situations." The last statement under the overview states, "Information obtained through SPreAD is only one of the many variables to be considered in the decision making process. As always, the knowledge, experience, and objectives of planners and managers must be taken into account, along with the input on the expectations and preferences of the user." The Introduction on Page 13 of SPreAD states, "A manager to use this method properly (the SPreAD method) must make field measurements and listen. The most sophisticated measurer of acoustic impact ever developed is the human ear. SPreAD can be helpful, but it must be used with good judgment and common sense." There are no Forest Plan standards for noise propagation that would require the level of analysis recommended by the commenter. With that in mind, the Forest chose a method that was simple in determining general effects of noise over a broad area and the Forest felt it better meets the purpose and need in determining effects to non-motorized recreation opportunities.
151	Spread-GIS: an ArcGIS toolbox for modeling the propagation of engine noise in the wild land setting. Sarah E. Reed, December 19, 2008.	The commenting organization provided a user's guide to the GIS modeling product discussed above.

Ltr#	Comment	Response to Comment
154	Dead Horse Ridge Trail U29N22B. Map attached to letter.	The attachment highlights a route that was not included as a route addition in the proposed action or an alternative; however it appears on the STNF's recreation map. This route is unclassified and not considered a system road. The IDT considered this route for addition to the NFTS but eliminated it from further study using the screening criteria described in appendix G. Unlike the STNF's recreation map, the MVUM will illustrate only NFTS roads open to public motor vehicle travel. In addition, unlike the recreation map, the MVUM will be updated annually to illustrate ongoing updates to the NFTS.
154	Knob Peak Trail U29N05. Map attached to the letter.	Please see the above response. The IDT also considered this route.
154	Mt Dubakella Trail Map and more trails identified in red on map attached to the letter.	The attachment highlights a route that was not included as a route addition in the proposed action. It is on a Forest Recreation map, but is unclassified, and not considered a system road. Only NFTS motorized routes will be illustrated in the published MVUM.

Letters from Federal, State, and Local Agencies

This portion of the appendix consists of copies of all comment received from Federal, State and local agencies in the following order:

United States Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (pages I-192 to I-193)

Shasta County Board of Supervisors (pages I-194 to I-198)

Siskiyou County, County Administrative Office, Natural Resource Policy Specialist (pages I-199 to I-204)

Resolution of the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors asserting legal standing and requesting coordination (pages I-205 to I-209)

Resolution of the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors regarding motorized access and travel of Federal lands (pages I-210 to I-211)

Trinity County Resource Conservation District (page I-212)

Trinity County Board of Supervisors (pages I-213 to I-214)

United States Environmental Protection Agency (pages I-215 to I-226)

Senator Dianne Feinstein (pages I-227 to I-228)

doioepc1478@aol.com
08/07/2009 09:16 AM

To comments-pacificsouthwest-shasta-trinity@fs.fed.us
cc rremillard@fs.fed.us
bcc
Subject Travel Management-Comments, ER 09/647

Please review the following report(s).

Audra Martin
Regional Environmental Intern
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
U.S. Department of the Interior, Region IX
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 520
Oakland, CA 94607-4807
(510) 817 - 1477 [voice]
(510) 419 - 0177 [fax]
doioepc1478@aol.com 09-647 DOI No Comment.doc

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Pacific Southwest Region
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 520
Oakland, California 94607

IN REPLY REFER TO:
ER09/647

Electronically Filed

7 August 2009

Robert Remillard
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002
Attn: Travel Management

Subject: Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Motorized Travel Management, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Trinity, Tehama, Shasta, and Siskiyou Counties, California

Dear Mr. Remillard:

The Department of the Interior has received and reviewed the subject document and has no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,

Patricia Sanderson Port
Regional Environmental Officer

cc:
Director, OEPC

RECEIVED

AUG 25 2009

TIME: 1600

Shasta County

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1450 Court Street, Suite 308B
Redding, California 96001-1680
(530) 225-5557
(800) 479-8009
(530) 225-5189-FAX

DAVID A. KEHOE, DISTRICT 1
LEONARD MOTY, DISTRICT 2
GLENN HAWES, DISTRICT 3
LINDA HARTMAN, DISTRICT 4
LES BAUGH, DISTRICT 5

August 25, 2009

J. Sharon Heywood
Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: Shasta-Trinity National Forest Travel Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments

Dear Supervisor Heywood:

Thank you for meeting with us on August 10 to discuss the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). We want to work with the Forest Service to provide ample motorized recreation opportunities and public access to the national forest. As we discussed, we feel that the EIS could better pursue these desired outcomes in several respects. We have the following concerns:

1. The DEIS does not adequately consider public use on National Forest System (NFS) routes and the county road system.

   Integration and collaboration with other road management agencies is critical for national forest travel management plans. The California Vehicle Code (CVC) permits mixed use on unpaved public roads. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has said so. Many of our county roads link with the Forest's unpaved maintenance level (ML) 3 and 4 "passenger car" road system. And yet, we understand that current regional policy prohibits non-highway legal vehicles on passenger car roads with a maintenance level or 3, 4, or 5. The Regional Forester cites the CVC to justify this prohibition. We see no foundation for this assertion. We consider the CHP's interpretation to be authoritative: mixed use is lawful and should be allowed.

   Unpaved county and NFS roads have long provided an interconnected transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles (OHVs). This provides loop opportunities for OHVs. Their safety record is very good. The Forest Service has not documented a single mixed use accident.

Resolution: The STNF's final designations should provide a seamless transportation system for the riding public. The California Vehicle Code governs OHV use on unpaved NFS roads, and should be recognized. Motorized mixed use should be routinely allowed on unpaved ML 3 and 4 roads. Any exceptions should be based upon sound engineering and documented in the EIS.

2. Most unauthorized routes are inexplicably not proposed for designation.

   All of the alternatives propose to designate less than four percent of the 1,252 miles of "unauthorized routes" that were inventoried. The rest will be closed to motor vehicle travel. No explanation is provided for this broad rejection. These unauthorized routes provide recreation opportunities and should be delineated in the EIS. If they warrant improvements or resource mitigations, these steps should be set forth in the EIS. These routes could then be added to the Forest's motor vehicle use map (MVUM) when the mitigation work was completed. The total number of miles the public asked for is not listed nor is there any indication they were reviewed or what was the outcome of the review.

Resolution: Display all unauthorized routes in Appendix A to the EIS. Provide site-specific rationale if any route is not proposed for designation. Explain why mitigation would not be effective.

3. The range of alternatives is inadequate.

   The proposed action alternatives in the EIS do not reflect the full range of options for environmental stewardship and public access. The four action alternatives all propose to designate less than five percent of the STNF's unauthorized routes. Cross-country travel is prohibited under all the action alternatives. No open riding areas are proposed. Long standing OHV use in areas such as Wildwood and Fenders Ferry Road areas will be prohibited pending future environmental analysis. Wildwood and Fenders Ferry Road areas are very popular with Shasta County residents.

   The prohibition of motorized mixed use on ML 3-5 roads, closure of greater than 95 percent of the STNF's unauthorized routes, and closure of all OHV areas will cumulatively create significant gaps in OHV circulation. Riders will be limited to short spur roads. Single track opportunities for motorcycles are very limited in all of the alternatives.

Resolution: Evaluate all miles of unauthorized routes that were recommended for designation by the public. Develop a sustainable OHV system that provides loops, challenge, variety, access to vistas and dispersed campsites, etc. Collaborate with the public and Shasta County in creating this system.

4. Routes intersecting private property are not shown on the alternative maps.

   There are many roads in the national forest that traverse private lands. The public has a right to pass by virtue of long standing public use. Such roads have inexplicably been removed from all alternative maps. This omission imparts the erroneous impression that there are major gaps in connectivity across private lands.

Resolution: All existing routes across private land should be considered for public access unless the private property owner has taken affirmative steps to deny access. The EIS should document these right of way issues.

5. Opportunities for dispersed camping and parking on the STNF will be significantly reduced.

   The EIS documents states that dispersed recreation sites are limited to one car length from the edge of the road or trail. People do not like to park next to the road because of dust, privacy and security. There is insufficient analysis in the EIS to explain why the STNF is closing so many dispersed sites to motor vehicles. In addition, parking for any purpose is restricted to one vehicle length from a designated route. None of the alternatives provide adequate trailhead or staging areas off designated routes for vehicles with equestrian or OHV trailers. Multiple users traveling together require much more than one vehicle length to park.

Resolution: Provide continued motor vehicle access to <u>all established dispersed recreation sites</u> unless there is no evidence of recent use. Allow motor vehicle access for other dispersed camping (separate from historically used campsites) within 100 feet of a designated road, trail or OHV area where feasible. Permit parking within 30 feet from any designated road, trail or open OHV area when it does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities. This is all consistent with Forest Service policy. Designate currently used staging areas on the Forest MVUM.

6. Options to prioritize STNF road maintenance efforts have not been considered.

   The STNF currently manages approximately 5,332 miles of NFS roads. The EIS states that the STNF's deferred road maintenance is currently estimated to be $216,883. The cost to maintain a ML 3 road is twenty times the amount to maintain a ML 2, high clearance road ($10,870 vs. $543 respectively). All alternatives require over $17.7 million annually to maintain the STNF's road system to standard. The Board is unclear how the STNF can meet their road maintenance goals with such a significant deficit.

Resolution: Lower <u>operational</u> road maintenance levels to reduce the STNF's road maintenance costs. This will allow OHV operators to travel on these roads and provide connectivity for non-highway legal vehicles and reflects current vehicle use.

7. Motor vehicle use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

   The proposed alternative proposes to add areas open to motor vehicle travel below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake to highway-legal vehicles only. Where is the research this decision is based on? Why is there a difference between highway-legal vehicles and OHVs? Ground pressures are generally greater with on-highway vehicles than OHVs. This needs to be changed to include OHVs.

In conclusion, Shasta County finds the EIS to be extensive in its objectives but disappointing in its delivery. A new action alternative is needed. The following elements are needed to properly bookend and balance environmental stewardship and public access:

a) Coordinate with all affected counties and the public to create a seamless transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles using both county and NFS roads (unpaved).

b) Recognize California Vehicle Code provisions for OHV use on unpaved NFS roads. Designate <u>all</u> unpaved ML 3 and 4 NFS roads for motorized mixed use unless engineering analyses demonstrate a need to do otherwise.

c) Provide a range of OHV opportunities such as single track trails and trails with different levels of difficulty.

d) Analyze <u>all</u> unauthorized routes commented on by public. Provide site-specific reasons for eliminating unauthorized routes from consideration in the FEIS.

e) Provide continued motor vehicle access to ten OHV riding areas until future environmental analyses are completed.

f) Provide motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites.

g) Allow parking for dispersed camping 100 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so.

h) Permit parking up to 30 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so.

i) Reduce the operational maintenance level of unpaved ML 3 and ML 4 roads to accommodate OHVs, consistent with available road maintenance resources and current vehicle use.

j) Allow OHV use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to submit our comments on the EIS. We share the Forest Service's goal to craft a travel management plan that protects forest resources, is affordable, and is acceptable to the public. By working together, we can get there. The current administration has said that governmental processes and actions will be open and transparent. The Forest Service's 2005 Travel Management Rule and the National Environmental Policy Act require coordination with other affected agencies. Forest Service collaboration has been minimal during the planning process.

The County shares the Forest Service's desire for resource protection and well-managed recreation programs. Please call Pat Minturn, Shasta County Public Works Director, at 225-5661 to schedule a meeting to discuss a new action alternative.

Sincerely,

GLENN HAWES, CHAIRMAN
Shasta County Board of Supervisors

GH/PJM/mlc

c: Sylvia Milligan, Chair
Recreation Outdoor Coalition
4000 Beacon Drive
Anderson, CA 96007-2962

Daphne Greene, Deputy Director
California Dept. of Parks & Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

"Ric Costales"
<rcostales@co.siskiyou.ca.us
>

08/24/2009 01:28 PM

To <comments-pacificsouthwest-shasta-trinity@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject Shasta-Trinity National Forest Motorized Travel Management DEIS Public Comment

To Whom It May Concern:

The attached are my comments on the Shasta-Trinity Motorized Travel Management DEIS.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ric Costales
Natural Resource Policy Specialist
County of Siskiyou
PO Box 750
201 4th St.
Yreka, CA 96097-0750
Phone: (530) 842-8012
FAX: (530) 842-8013

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally
privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use
or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communication Privacy act.
If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

Shasta-T Motorized Travel Mgmt Comment Signed Packet.pdf

COUNTY OF SISKIYOU

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Ric Costales, Natural Resource Policy Specialist
P.O. Box 750 ● 201 Fourth Street, Yreka, CA 96097
Phone: (530) 842-8012, Fax Number: (530) 842-8013
Email: rcostales@co.siskiyou.ca.us

August 21, 2009

J. Sharon Heywood, Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
USDA Service Center
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: Shasta-T Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Sharon:

Despite the substantial land base within Siskiyou County being managed by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, I have not heard from constituents about specific issues with regard to the Shasta-Trinity Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (MTM DEIS). Primarily, input I have received through my office and through Board of Supervisors presentations from the public has involved almost exclusively the Klamath National Forest (KNF). While no one has taken the time to actively engage the County on specific Shasta-T issues, my 35 years experience in Siskiyou County among its diverse citizens allows me to feel confident in extrapolating some of the KNF MTM DEIS-related activism to the Shasta-T. Given the vast amount of Shasta-T acreage involved and the complexities of the environmental considerations specific to each alternative, however, it is impossible for me to offer substantive comments at the detailed level. Nevertheless, certain widespread general concepts and sentiments exist and have been expressed that make it both legitimate and prudent to offer comments on your MTM DEIS.

Two of the prime goals of the MTM process are to ban “cross country” travel and to “manage” motorized travel. Also, the “No Action Alternative” does not fit the “purpose and need” of the rule. Thus, it is assured that in terms of amount of access, motorized users will be the big losers. The difference in the amount of loss is reflected in the range of alternatives. None of the available alternatives approaches even a reasonable fraction of acreage currently available to the various forms of motorized use and access.

It is not the magnitude of this loss that is the problem, as even the OHV community (perhaps the most “motor-intense” of the motorized access user-groups) acknowledges that many important environmental concerns preclude unrestricted motorized access on the majority of the Shasta-T management area. Rather, it is the process that apparently does not accommodate many of the legitimate concerns of motorized users. For example, the MTM process does not allow for suitable consideration of the needs of motorized “dispersed camping.” The responsible official determined that “dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of the surface of NFTS roads” should be eliminated from detailed study because it “would require extensive additional analysis,” and “it is not feasible for the Forest to complete the required site-specific analysis needed to implement a travel corridor.” Similar reasons were given for eliminating detailed study of other workable suggestions from motorized users. Clearly, the MTM process is on the fast track and unable to

accommodate the complexity and intensity needed to truly solve the challenges of motorized travel at this time.

The MTM process, then, must be viewed as simply the "first shot" at refining the management of motorized travel. The reasonableness of the proposal must be viewed in the light of this necessity. Also, it has been my perception that the majority of people offering opinions on this process seem to favor the maximum amount of motorized access that does not significantly impair environmental standards or that does not detract from the obligation to balance multiple uses of the National Forests. Thus, the following are my comments on the Shasta-Trinity MTM DEIS:

- Management of motorized travel on the Shasta-T NF is a prudent and reasonable goal. In making the transition from an unmanaged state, motorized travel will obviously be restricted to a much smaller level of access. How this occurs on federal land is a matter for the federal land management agency to decide. Siskiyou County is more than 62% federal with most of it managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS). In August of 2008, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution #08-153 (attached) asserting legal standing and formally requesting coordination with federal and state agencies. In response to the USFS MTM initiative, in November of 2008, Siskiyou County further adopted Resolution #08-186 (attached) regarding Motorized Access and/or Travel on Federal Lands in Siskiyou County. The intent of this latter resolution was to assist the USFS in federally mandated coordination with the County on the MTM effort.

  A key element of that Resolution states, "…*that before any road, trail or area on federal land is closed to motorized access and/or travel, all reasonable mitigations and alternatives should be explored in order to prevent closure…*" Essentially, within the context of prudent environmental protection and balancing multiple use, the County policy seeks to maximize motorized access.

  While federal law does not require the USFS to completely toe the line on such local government policies, it does generally require that the USFS "coordinate" with local government to insure that federal decisions are "as consistent as possible" with such locally expressed guidelines. While coordination between the County and the Shasta-T has been somewhat active, the level of achieving consistency could be greater in some areas. For example, many of the suggestions "dismissed from detailed study" can be reasonably mitigated and thus allow the USFS to accomplish their mandates while being consistent with the policies of local government.

  I am hopeful that further refinements of the Shasta-T management of motorized travel will help accomplish a higher level of consistency.

- As previously mentioned, the motorized component of dispersed camping is a source of major concern for Siskiyou County with the National Forests' MTM process. In the decision by the "responsible official" that nothing can be done within the MTM EIS process to accommodate the ability for people to pull a little way off the road to camp and get away from dust and traffic when conditions allow, the stage is set for a lot of needless heartache. This contusion won't simply be limited to forest users, but will extend to USFS law enforcement people who will have to inform "mom, dad and the kids" who are out on their family vacation that they are breaking the law. The idea that they are violators of the law when all they are trying to do is secure a little privacy and peace and quiet without having to huck all their camping gear away from their now-vandal-prone vehicle is not going to go down well with the public. It would seem that given such a public relations disaster, the "responsible official" could have somehow managed to address the "low hanging fruit" areas where detailed analysis is not needed. The McCloud flats are a perfect example of such areas of the Shasta-T where a programmatic response to the issue could be easily done.

- Due to the mutually acknowledged complications and shortcomings of the MTM approach and process, coordination discussions with Klamath National Forest (KNF) have often touched on the need to provide a relatively simple, expeditious and cost-effective approach to adapting the KNF's MTM rule. As well, these conversations have involved how this could help minimize "heartburn" among motorized users of the forest and, thus, enforcement aspects of MTM. The nature, if not the specifics, of these discussions certainly applies to the Shasta-T MTM DEIS.

  I am not sure where, if any place, in the Shasta-T DEIS there is any manifestation of something that would help achieve future consistency with the County's policy. Perhaps it would be best put in as an implementation strategy in "*Appendix E: Law Enforcement*." For example, since the Shasta-T clearly has an interest in minimizing every negative aspect of enforcement, it only makes sense to whittle down the need for an enforcement response. A major omission of the DEIS-listed ways to do this was a suggestion for the Shasta-T to move expeditiously on dealing with the problematic motorized access areas and issues.

  As a strategic response to implementation, the Shasta-T should aim to get the unreasonable, if unavoidable, bugs out of its MTM ASAP! Since everyone's interests are to be served by managing motorized travel, it is not only users that should be responsible for initiating needed changes. Shasta-T MTM DEIS needs to incorporate this concept beyond simply saying, "The process is open to changes."

- One area of the MTM DEIS that is problematic is in the issue of mixed use. This is particularly thorny for Siskiyou County as it, too, is having difficulty with the issue of mixed use on its roads. Currently, the County's "unofficial" policy is to leave action on a formal policy in abeyance until circumstances compel a response. While such a position tends to facilitate mixed use, the National Forests do not have this luxury. The lack of an official County mixed use policy doesn't give the Shasta-T much with which to be consistent. Thus, County Resolution #08-186 must serve as the best statement by which to inform my comments and seek consistency.

  Even in the most favorable alternative to motorized access in the MTM DEIS, much of the Shasta-T road system that could safely and ecologically support mixed use is left closed to OHVs. There are many reasons for this, some of the main ones subject to interpretation and controversy. The Shasta-T needs to present a more thorough analysis and explanation of how what were formally considered "roads" are now considered "highways," thus precluding mixed use. On the one hand, the Shasta-T cites the authority of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) to determine National Forest policy regarding mixed use. On the other, it completely ignores the CVC definition of what distinguishes a "road" from a "highway" for purposes of determining when mixed use is allowed. Most of the Shasta-T's ML 3 travelways would not be considered "highways" under the CVC definition and thus they would be open to mixed use. How the Shasta-T justifies what appears to be "picking and choosing" which parts of the CVC to which it is going to adhere needs more explanation. Further access to mixed use could also be done on some of the roads by temporary closure to OHVs during high use periods, logging contracts or other circumstances that don't facilitate mixed use at all times. Such a compromise is consistent with Siskiyou County's policy to mitigate, rather than eliminate, motorized uses.

- Finally, it cannot be denied that OHV use is by far the most impacted user group in the MTM process. The overall reduction in access on a per acre basis to this form of recreation must certainly be in excess of 90% with the elimination of "cross country travel." Responsible people and organizations within the OHV community readily acknowledge that the loss of much of this OHV accessible ground is prudent for environmental, safety and shared-use considerations. On the other hand, these users also feel that they are being deprived of much of this use unjustifiably or without sufficient attempt to analyze or mitigate impacts.

  I am solely responsible to the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors for maintaining an active involvement and a functional awareness for a multitude of issues and landscapes. With such breadth and a constantly

changing knowledge base attending each issue, there is no way that I can comment at the detailed level demanded of the Shasta-T's MTM DEIS. Instead, in such situations I have come to rely on other people and organizations with sufficient skill and background in the relevant issues. For purposes of this DEIS, that organization is the Recreation Outdoors Coalition (ROC). Attached are their comments. As an expression of substantive comments that reflect the concerns of many Siskiyou County citizens, I support a rigorous attempt by the Shasta-T to evaluate ROC's comments and incorporate them into the FEIS.

It is my hope that these comments will help provide some refinement of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's Environmental Impact Statement on Motorized Travel Management.

Sincerely,

Ric Costales, Natural Resource Policy Specialist
County of Siskiyou

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE COUNTY OF SISKIYOU ASSERTING LEGAL
STANDING AND FORMALLY REQUESTING
COORDINATION WITH ALL FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES
MAINTAINING JURISDICTION OVER LANDS AND/OR
RESOURCES LOCATED IN SISKIYOU COUNTY

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County is a public unit of local government and a five member elected Board of Supervisors serves as its chief governing authority; and,

WHEREAS, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors is charged with supervising and protecting the tax base of the County and establishing comprehensive land use plans (including, but not limited to, the General Plan) outlining present and future authorized uses for all lands and resources situated within the County; and,

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County is engaged in the land use planning process for future land uses to serve the welfare of all the citizens of Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, approximately sixty-eight percent (68%) of lands in Siskiyou County are publicly owned, managed, and/or regulated by various federal and state agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the citizens of Siskiyou County historically earn their livelihood from activities reliant upon natural resources and land which produces natural resources is critical to the economy of Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, the economic base and stability of Siskiyou County is largely dependent upon commercial and business activities operated on federally and state owned, managed, and/or regulated lands that include, but are not limited to, recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits; and,

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County desires to assure that federal and state agencies shall inform the Board of Supervisors of all ending or proposed actions affecting local communities and citizens within Siskiyou County and coordinate with the Board of Supervisors in the planning and implementation of those actions; and,

WHEREAS, coordination of planning and management actions is mandated by federal laws governing land management, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 43 USC § 1701, and 43 USC § 1712, regarding the coordinate status of a county engaging in the land use planning process, and requires that the "Secretary of

SISKIYOU COUNTY
RESOLUTION
No. 08-153

the Interior [Secretary] shall . . . coordinate the land use inventory, planning and management activities . . . with the land use planning and management programs of other federal departments and agencies and of the state and local governments within which the lands are located"; and,

WHEREAS, the coordination requirements of Section 1712 provide for special involvement by government officials who are engaged in the land use planning process; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 sets forth the nature of the coordination required with planning efforts by government officials and subsection (f) of Section 1712 sets forth an additional requirement that the Secretary "shall allow an opportunity for public involvement" (including local government without limiting the coordination requirement of Section 1712 allowing land or resource management or regulatory agencies to simply lump local government in with special interest groups of citizens or members of the public in general); and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 also provides that the "Secretary shall . . . assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans" and gives preference to those counties which are engaging in the planning process over the general public, special interest groups of citizens, and even counties not engaging in a land use planning program; and,

WHEREAS, the requirement that the Secretary "coordinate" land use inventory, planning, and management activities with local governments, requires the assisting in resolving inconsistencies to mean that the resolution process takes place during the planning cycle instead of at the end of the planning cycle when the draft federal plan or proposed action is released for public review; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 further requires that the "Secretary shall . . . provide for meaningful public involvement of state and local government officials . . . in the development of land use programs, land use regulations, and land use decisions for public lands"; and, when read in light of the "coordinate" requirement of Section 1712, reasonably contemplates "meaningful involvement" as referring to ongoing consultations and involvement throughout the planning cycle, not merely at the end of the planning cycle; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 further provides that the Secretary must assure that the federal agency's land use plan be "consistent with state and local plans" to the maximum extent possible under federal law and the purposes of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and distinguishes local government officials from members of the general

public or special interest groups of citizens; and,

WHEREAS, the Environmental Protection Agency, charged with administration and implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), has issued regulations which require that federal agencies consider the economic impact of their actions and plans on local government such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the customs of the people as shown by their beliefs, social forms, and "material traits," it reasonably follows that NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the rural, land and resource-oriented citizens of Siskiyou County who depend on the "material traits" including recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits for their economic livelihoods; and,

WHEREAS, NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the customs, beliefs, and social forms, as well as the "material traits" of the people; and,

WHEREAS, it is reasonable to interpret NEPA as requiring federal agencies to consider the impacts of their actions on those traditional and historical and economic practices, including commercial and business activities, which are performed or operated on federally and state managed lands (including, but not limited to, recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits); and,

WHEREAS, 42 USC § 4331 places upon federal agencies the "continuing responsibility . . . to use all practical means, consistent with other considerations of national policy to . . . preserve important historic, culture, and natural aspects of our national heritage"; and,

WHEREAS, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (at 227, 1975) defines "culture" as "customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a group; the integrated pattern of human behavior passed to succeeding generations"; and,

WHEREAS, In 16 USC § 1604, the National Forest Management Act, requires the Forest Service to coordinate its planning processes with local government units such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, federal agencies implementing the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Outdoor Recreation Coordination Act (16 USC § 4601-1(c) and (d)) are required by Congress to consider local plans and to coordinate and cooperate directly with plans of local government such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, the coordinating provisions referred to in the resolution require the Secretary of the Interior to work directly with local government to resolve water resource issues and with regard to recreation uses of the federal lands, and,

WHEREAS, the regulations issued by the federal agencies in this resolution are consistent with statutory requirements of coordination and direct cooperation and provide implementation processes for such coordination and direction consideration and communication; and,

WHEREAS, the California Constitution has recognized Siskiyou County's authority to exercise its local, police and sanitary powers, and the California Legislature has recognized and mandated exercise of certain of those powers in specific statutes; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has mandated in Government Code Section 65300 that each county shall prepare a comprehensive plan, and stated legislative intent in Section 65300.9 that the county planning shall be coordinated with federal and state program activities, and has mandated in Section 65103 that county local plans and programs must be coordinated with plans and programs of other agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has stated its intent in Section 65070 that preparation of state and regional transportation plans be performed in a cooperative process involving local government; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has mandated in Section 65040 that the State Office of Planning and Research shall "coordinate, in conjunction with . . . local agencies with regard to matters relating to the environmental quality of the state"; and,

WHEREAS, in Water Code §§ 8125-8129, the California Legislature has placed planning for non-navigable streams within the authority of county supervisors, and since such planning activities must be coordinated with natural resource planning processes of federal and state agencies; and,

WHEREAS, in Streets and Highways Code §§ 940-941.2, the California Legislature has placed the general supervision, management, and control of county roads and highways - including closing such roads (Section 901) and removing and preventing encroachment of such roads and highways, and since planning and actions with regard to such roads by any federal or state agency must be coordinated with the county; and,

WHEREAS, in Public Resources Code § 5099.3, the California Legislature has mandated coordination by the state with Siskiyou County since it is a county "having interest in the planning, development, and maintenance of outdoor recreation resources

and facilities,"

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors does hereby assert legal standing and formally requests coordination status with all federal and state agencies maintaining jurisdiction over lands and/or resources located within Siskiyou County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board shall cause a copy of this Resolution to be transmitted annually to local, regional, state, and/or national offices of all federal and state agencies maintaining jurisdiction of lands and/or resources located within Siskiyou County and to all federal and state elected representatives serving Siskiyou County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is authorized and hereby directed to publish a copy of this Resolution in the Siskiyou Daily News, a newspaper of general circulation printed and published in Siskiyou County, California.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of August, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Overman, Erickson, Armstrong, Kobseff and Cook
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

Chair, Board of Supervisors
W.R. Overman

ATTEST:
COLLEEN SETZER, CLERK
Board of Supervisors
By
Deputy

G:\Share\RESOLUTN\Coordination with State and Federal Agencies 2008 RES.wpd

This instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.
ATTEST:
COLLEEN SETZER
County Clerk
of the State of California
In and for the County of Siskiyou.
By Wendy Deniz
Deputy

RESOLUTION OF THE SISKIYOU COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING MOTORIZED ACCESS AND/OR TRAVEL ON FEDERAL LANDS IN SISKIYOU COUNTY

WHEREAS nearly two-thirds of Siskiyou County is federal land; and

WHEREAS the ability to use and recreate on the federal lands in Siskiyou County is enjoyed by all citizens of the United States as well as the citizens of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS when the land in Siskiyou County was reserved by the federal government and became part of the National Forest system it was done with the understanding that the land would be open for the access, use and enjoyment of all citizens; and

WHEREAS, similar understanding exists relative to federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

WHEREAS it is through access, use and enjoyment that people are able to develop the appreciation for the value of federal lands that leads to the popular public support necessary to fund and manage the federal lands; and

WHEREAS the ease, simplicity and economy of motorized transportation make the federal lands accessible, useable and enjoyable to people who might not otherwise have the time, physical ability or finances to enjoy the benefits of the National Forests; and

WHEREAS virtually all uses of and access to the National Forests rely to some degree on motorized transportation; and

WHEREAS fishing, hunting, camping, nature-viewing, mining, wood-cutting, cattle-management and recreational Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) riding are among the uses that depend on motorized access; and

WHEREAS Reserve Statute 2477 has established certain rights of way on federal lands; and

WHEREAS all of these uses are important components of the custom, culture and economy of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS it is imperative to the continued enjoyment of federal lands by all user-groups that considerate, tolerant, environmentally reasonable management be applied to motorized access; and

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County can play a major role in helping shape a sound, workable approach to motorized access to federal lands within its boundaries,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors declares it to be the policy of Siskiyou County that all roads, trails and areas on federal land that were available to motorized access and/or travel as of the date of adoption of this Resolution should remain open to all forms of motorized travel, including snowmobiles and OHVs, unless sufficient environmental or other scientific justification exists for the closure of the road, trail or area; and

SISKIYOU COUNTY
RESOLUTION
No. 08-186

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Siskiyou County recognizes compatibility issues between motorized access and/or travel and other uses of the federal lands and understands and supports reasonable, prudent efforts by federal agencies and the public to find workable compromises satisfactory to all user groups; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that before any road, trail or area on federal land is closed to motorized access and/or travel, all reasonable mitigations and alternatives should be explored in order to prevent closure; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all federal agencies are required to coordinate with Siskiyou County at the earliest stage and throughout the development of any road, trail or area closure proposal.

Passed and adopted this November 18, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Overman, Armstrong, Kobseff and Cook
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: Supervisor Erickson
ABSTAIN: NONE

W.R. Overman, Chair
Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
Colleen Setzer, County Clerk

Deputy

Trinity County
Resource Conservation District

Post Office Box 1450 • One Horseshoe Lane • Weaverville, CA 96093

July 31, 2009

Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 AV Tech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002
Attn: Travel Management

Re: Shasta Trinity National Forest Motorized Travel Management Draft EIS

The Trinity County Resource Conservation District and Shasta-Trinity National Forest have been partners for many years, working closely on a wide range of projects. We have collaborated extensively, especially on the road network in the South Fork Management Unit and now as stewardship partners with the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in the Weaverville Community Forest.

We have been reviewing the Draft EIS and appreciated the opportunity to attend the Open House in Weaverville on July 14, 2009. While we understand the need for the Forest's efforts and commend you on the energy that has gone into the draft document, we have some issues and concerns we would like you to consider before moving forward with finalizing the EIS.

This forest-wide transportation management plan, as presented, is isolated from all of the other critical management issues for the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. For example, it has been extremely difficult to evaluate the alternatives in the DEIS in isolation from recreation, forest health/forest management objectives, watershed restoration or public safety needs. This has been further complicated by the use of presentation maps that excluded all Level 1 roads and mapping that ends abruptly at the boundaries with Six Rivers National Forest.

We'd like to suggest a possible solution to these deficiencies and what appears to be a lack attention to Forest uses in all of the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. Our experience has been that developing a comprehensive plan on a manageable scale, such as your Management Units, would help focus affected communities, user groups and potential project funders and partners on the issues and resource needs. We have heard that a model for this exists in the McCloud Flats or McArthur area and would like to explore this further with you, possibly beginning with the Weaverville Community Forest as a collaborative model on the west side of the Forest. This planning approach would facilitate adequate overlays of all of resource and user issues that affect, and are affected by, the transportation system to be evaluated in synergy not separately. It could take into account our role as the stewardship link between the National Forest and the local communities and help all of us help you to meet the Shasta Trinity National Forest's niche, which we understand is water and recreation.

As always I look forward to working with the Shasta Trinity National Forest staff at the local level and at the Supervisor's Office.

Sincerely,

Patrick M. Frost
District Manager

Cc: File

Telephone (530) 623-6004 • Fax (530) 623-6006 • www.tcrcd.net

TRINITY COUNTY
Board of Supervisors
P.O. BOX 1613, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093
PHONE (530) 623-1217 FAX (530) 623-8365

August 4, 2009

Travel Management
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
USDA Service Center
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Re: Comment – Motorized Travel Management
DEIS dated June 2009

With reference to the above Motorized Travel Management/Route Designation – Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the Trinity County Board of Supervisors have the following concerns and comments.

1. Season of Use Restrictions on Trinity Lake below the high water-mark is unnecessary and needs to be removed.

The apparent reason was to protect the Northern Spotted Owl critical habitat but a ground inspection would show this area around Trinity Lake (dry lake bed) is "**non suitable habitat**" for the NSO. These owls are forest-dwelling in large-diameter trees and high canopy cover. This overlay restriction does not make sense.

As for **disturbances**, State Highway 3 runs along the lake and contributory roads and trails have existed as long as the dam has been in and provide for public access to the lake for swimming, fishing, picnicking and hiking. Most vehicle travel, both highway legal and OHV, travel at a low rate of speed. Boats come and go, planes fly overhead and the effect on the NSO would be negligible. There is no data in the DEIS to support any other conclusion.

Implementation of this proposal would have a negative **economic** impact on our local tourism. No consideration was given to this impact.

Citizens have the **right** to use the National Recreation Area without irrational restrictions.

2. We also oppose access restriction to Highway legal vehicles only on the below high water mark for Trinity Lake.

JUDY PFLUEGER DISTRICT 1 | JUDY MORRIS DISTRICT 2 | ROGER JAEGEL DISTRICT 3 | HOWARD FREEMAN DISTRICT 4 | WENDY REISS DISTRICT 5

Off Highway Vehicles is a growing hobby for many locals and tourists and is providing an upswing in our local economy. The OHV provide transportation to the lake and a fun ride about to see the scenery and when the lake refills, the tracks are erased. Special precautions can be given for any cultural areas.

3. Closure of forest roads will restrict fire access. Given recent fire behavior, we believe it prudent to keep all potential access routes available in the event of a wild land fire.

Overall, we feel these sections need to revisited and unneeded restrictions be removed. The limited operating period restriction is based on assumptions with no data to support findings. There was no "on the ground" verification. Nothing has changed, basic condition remain the same. There will be no negative effect on the behavior, stress, or reproduction of the NSO, therefore we are recommending removal of seasonal operating limits, restriction of OHV use, and closure of routes that could be used for access to lightening fires.

We appreciate your reconsiderations.

Sincerely,

Wendy Reiss

WENDY REISS
Chairman

WR:jp:wt

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

August 25, 2009

J. Sharon Heywood
Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Shasta-Trinity National Forest Motorized Travel Management, Humboldt, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity Counties, CA (CEQ# 20090179)

Dear Ms. Heywood:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Our detailed comments are enclosed.

EPA commends the Forest Service for its efforts to address the many challenges inherent in developing a balanced Public Motorized Travel Management Plan that responds to recreational and resource management demands. We acknowledge that the Travel Management Plan process is a positive step in addressing resource impacts from motorized uses. The permanent prohibition of cross country travel off designated routes and implementation of seasonal restrictions on newly authorized routes to protect wildlife and reduce erosion will result in significant environmental benefits.

We commend the Forest Service on the data collection and analysis contained in the document. We have rated the DEIS as Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information (EC-2) (see enclosed "*Summary of Rating Definitions*") due to our concerns regarding the scope of the travel management planning process and potential effects on water and cultural resources. Additional information is necessary to fully describe monitoring and enforcement commitments, effects of climate change, and future planning for specific designated routes.

EPA is aware of the decision by the Pacific Southwest Region of the Forest Service to limit the scope of the travel management planning process to prohibition of motorized vehicle travel off designated routes, addition of existing unauthorized roads and trails to the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) so they may be designated for motor vehicle use, and changes in vehicle class and season of use. The rationale for the limited scope of this process is schedule constraints and limited funding and resources.

We acknowledge the constraints of funding and resources, and the current efforts to address NFTS maintenance requirements; nevertheless, we had hoped the Forest Service would take this opportunity to review and rationalize the NFTS, pursuant to Travel Management Rule direction to identify the minimum road system needed (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart A); to address known road-related resource impairments and use conflicts of both the existing NFTS and unauthorized user-created system; and to align the transportation system with maintenance and enforcement capabilities. We note a similar request has been made by Senator Feinstein (see attached letter) and Congress (H.R. 1105 Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 Conference Report).[1]

Route designations are only part of what is needed to reduce the ongoing adverse impacts to water quality and other resources from the NFTS. We continue to believe a more holistic approach to travel management planning, whereby route designations are guided by travel analysis, known locations of resource impairment, and prior determination of the minimum road system needed, would better serve the long-term interests of the public, Forest Service, and National Forest resources.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS. When the FEIS is released for public review, please send one hard copy and one electronic copy to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or Carolyn Mulvihill, the lead reviewer for this project, at (415) 947-3554 or mulvihill.carolyn@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Connell Dunning

for Kathleen M. Goforth, Manager
Environmental Review Office
Communities and Ecosystems Division

Enclosures:
Detailed Comments
Summary of Rating Definitions
Excerpt from H.R. 1105 Omnibus Appropriations Act
Letter from Senator Dianne Feinstein to Regional Forester, December 18, 2008

cc: Steve Thompson, California Operations, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Wilson, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (R1)
Gary Stacey, Regional Manager, Northern Region, California Department of Fish and Game

[1] H.R. 1105 – Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 Conference Report, Division E – Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, Page 1146, March 11, 2009.

EPA DETAILED DEIS COMMENTS – SHASTA-TRINITY NATIONAL FOREST MOTORIZED TRAVEL MANAGEMENT, HUMBOLDT, MODOC, SHASTA, SISKIYOU, TEHAMA, AND TRINITY COUNTIES, CA, AUGUST 25, 2009

Scope of the Alternatives Analysis

Provide information on the minimum road system needed and how this information was used to formulate the alternatives. The scope of the proposed action includes prohibition of motorized vehicle travel off designated routes, the addition of unauthorized user-created roads and trails to the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS), and the opening of areas below the high-water mark on Shasta and Trinity Lakes for highway-legal vehicles. The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) also states that unauthorized routes not included in this proposal are not precluded from future consideration for addition to the NFTS and inclusion on the Motor Vehicle Use Map. We commend the Forest Service on the surveying of unauthorized routes that it has conducted and the consideration of resource impacts in the selection of routes to add to the NFTS. However, we believe a holistic approach to travel management planning, whereby route designations are guided by travel analysis and prior determination of the minimum road system needed, would best serve the long-term interests of the public, Forest Service, and National Forest resources.

Recommendations:

The final environmental impact statement (FEIS) should describe the relationship of the information that was used to formulate the alternatives to the requirement to identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and administration of National Forest System lands (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart A, Section 212.5(b)). The FEIS should describe how the minimum road system needed will be identified pursuant to the requirements of the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart A).

The FEIS should describe the factors that would be used in the consideration of future additions of unauthorized routes. We recommend that such factors include travel analysis and identification of the minimum road system needed.

Expand the scope of the action to include current NFTS roads and trails with known impacts. The DEIS states that some of the greatest impacts to riparian areas stem from existing NFTS roads and that there are 203 miles of roads and trails within riparian reserve areas and 6,999 stream crossings (p. 116). The estimate of deferred road maintenance in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, based on the national sample, is approximately $217 million. EPA is concerned with the Forest Service's ability to adequately address road- and trail-related resource impairments, given the amount of existing deferred maintenance and limited availability of maintenance funds, and the current proposal to add additional miles of roads and trails to the NFTS. For this reason, we believe that the scope of this action should include current NFTS roads and trails with known impacts.

Recommendation:
We recommend the Forest Service expand the scope of this action to consider, for seasonal or permanent closure to public motorized use, current NFTS roads and trails with known resource impacts, particularly those located in riparian reserves and other sensitive resource areas.

Alternative Selection

Implement Alternative 4 or a modified Alternative 2 to minimize impacts to natural resources and roadless areas. The DEIS states that Alternative 4 would provide access for dispersed recreation and connections for loop rides, while also protecting natural resources and minimizing impacts to the nonmotorized recreation experience. While we recognize that Alternative 2 would add a small portion of the current unauthorized routes to the NFTS, EPA believes that Alternative 4 would better balance the interests of resource protection and recreation opportunities than the proposed action, Alternative 2.

Recommendation:
EPA recommends implementation of Alternative 4 or a modified Alternative 2, including avoidance of routes in late-successional reserves, riparian reserves, inventoried roadless areas, citizen-inventoried areas, key watersheds, habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, and other environmentally sensitive areas. We also support the proposed speed limit of 10 miles per hour for vehicles traveling in the areas below the high-water mark in Shasta and Trinity Lakes, included in Alternative 4, to minimize disturbance of lake bottom sediments and subsequent water quality impacts.

Water Resources

Reduce routes and miles on roads in areas of existing water quality and listed species impacts, and in hydrologically sensitive areas. The DEIS states that the State of California has identified the South Fork of the Trinity River, the East Fork of the Trinity River, Trinity Reservoir, and Shasta Lake as having pollution levels or impacts that exceed State standards, particularly due to elevated levels of sediment and water temperature. Trinity River Watershed was judged to exceed the existing water quality standards necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the basin, particularly the cold water fishery. The South Fork of the Trinity River has an established total maximum daily load (TMDL) for sedimentation and water temperature. The TMDL calls for a 30% reduction in sediment load for the South Fork of the Trinity River and Hayfork Creek. The East Fork of the Trinity River from its headwaters to Trinity Reservoir, and Trinity Reservoir are both scheduled to have TMDLs completed by 2019. Shasta Lake is scheduled to have a TMDL completed by 2020.

The DEIS also states that road densities within riparian reserves tend to be higher in the South Fork Trinity River and Hayfork Creek Watersheds. Because of this, it is particularly important to minimize the number of routes added to the NFTS in these areas.

We commend the Forest Service on proposing to close almost 95% of routes with severe erosion risk, but we encourage more than the 27% proposed reduction in erosion-prone unauthorized routes. We also encourage elimination of the remaining miles of unauthorized routes in hydrologically sensitive areas from addition to the NFTS. The amount of routes proposed for addition under Alternative 2 in hydrologically sensitive areas is either 2.8 miles as stated on page 121, or 6.45 miles as stated in Table 3.02-4 on page 125. Please clarify in the FEIS which figure is correct.

The DEIS also states that 18 routes proposed for addition under Alternative 2 are located in riparian reserves adjacent to known habitat areas and designated critical habitat for the threatened Southern Oregon/Northern California coho (SONCC) salmon. Three of these routes have direct access to SONCC salmon-occupied habitat and the use of these routes contributes to sedimentation in Trinity River.

Recommendations:
Reconsider designation of unauthorized routes and trails in areas of impaired waterbodies, existing high road densities, and erosion risk. If route designations in these areas continue to be proposed, the FEIS should include data that clearly demonstrates that additional routes in these areas would not contribute to continued or additional impairment under 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

We recommend reducing the number of routes and miles added to the NFTS that pass through hydrologically sensitive areas, or that are at risk of losing hydrologic function. In the FEIS, quantify the miles of routes reduced in each of these areas. Where feasible, we recommend elimination of routes with hydrologically connected segments. Clarify the amount of routes proposed in these areas under the preferred alternative.

We recommend elimination of routes adjacent to habitat areas for SONCC salmon from addition to the NFTS.

Demonstrate that the Preferred Alternative will contribute to the reduction of water quality impairment of Section 303(d) Clean Water Act listed water bodies and potential TMDL requirements. Pursuant to future TMDLs, the Forest Service may be obligated to meet temperature or sediment load reductions from dirt roads and trails.

Recommendations:
The FEIS should include data that demonstrates the Preferred Alternative will help contribute to the reduction of water quality impairment of Section 303(d) listed waterbodies.

We recommend the Forest Service consult the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding potential Forest Service obligations to meet required sediment or temperature reductions. If such load reductions may not be achieved, than additional Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures should be considered and incorporated into the Preferred Alternative to

meet current and potential future TMDL requirements. See http://epa.gov/owow/nps/unpavedroads.html for a Recommended Practices Manual for Maintenance and Service of Unpaved Roads.

Cultural Resources

Minimize and mitigate impacts to priority heritage sites and other cultural resources. The DEIS states that all routes proposed for addition to the NFTS and with "greater than light use" will require survey prior to a project decision being signed. Alternative 2 has six routes in or near priority heritage sites, which would require amendment of the Forest Plan to allow addition of those routes. Alternatives 3 and 4 have no routes proposed for addition in or near priority heritage sites.

Recommendation:

EPA recommends that information from past and future required surveys be used to determine addition of routes. We recommend that addition of routes in or near priority heritage sites be minimized. Where routes will be added, we recommend aggressive methods, including barriers and vegetative screening, to protect cultural resources that may be impacted. We also recommend aggressive enforcement of vehicle and speed restrictions in proposed open lake areas to minimize potential impacts to cultural resources within those areas.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Do not add routes on land containing naturally occurring asbestos. Disturbance of rocks and soils that contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), such as serpentinite soils, can result in the release of asbestos fibers to the air and exposure to the public. Asbestos is a known human carcinogen and represents a potential human health risk for those exposed while using roads or trails where it occurs.

Recommendations:

Any routes on serpentinite soils proposed for addition should be tested for the presence of NOA. If NOA is present, we recommend these routes not be added to the NFTS. If such routes are added to the NFTS, the FEIS should provide the rationale for their addition and include data to demonstrate that these routes would not significantly increase the risk of adverse health effects. The FEIS should also verify whether Alternative 2 includes any proposed routes near serpentinite rock formations, as the text on page 510 and Tables 3.12-1 and 3.13-2 indicate that it does not, but the text on page 519 states that it does.

For heavily-used existing NFTS and unauthorized roads and trails on land "most likely" to contain NOA, we recommend assessing the potential for exposure to elevated levels of NOA. This information should be provided in the FEIS. We recommend prohibition of public motorized use and closure of roads and trails where monitoring indicates the potential for significant NOA exposure. The Forest should post signs informing visitors that NOA is present, what the risks are, and how visitors can avoid exposure. These measures should be incorporated into the preferred alternative and committed to in the Record of Decision (ROD).

Climate Change

Address climate change and its potential effects on proposed route designations. The DEIS does not consider the effects of climate change on route designations. A number of studies specific to California have indicated the potential for significant environmental impacts as a result of changing temperatures and precipitation.[2] Climate change effects and the need to adapt to climate change are emerging issues which should be considered in this action. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled, "Climate Change: Agencies Should Develop Guidance for Addressing the Effects on Federal Land and Water Resources" [3] (August 2007), federal land and water resources are vulnerable to a wide range of effects from climate change, some of which are already occurring. A change in the timing and quantity of precipitation may increase the vulnerability of native surface roads and trails to erosion and sedimentation. Roads and their use also contribute to species stress through habitat fragmentation, increased disturbance, introduction of competing invasive species, and increased fire risk; which may further exacerbate species' ability to adapt to the changing climate.

Recommendations:

The FEIS should include a discussion of climate change and its potential effects on the Forest as they relate to route designation decisions and the final NFTS. Of specific interest are potential cumulative effects of climate change and the NFTS on the connectivity of wildlife and threatened and endangered species habitat, air quality, water quality and quantity, fire management, invasive species management, and road maintenance.

We recommend the discussion include a short summary of applicable climate change studies, including their findings on potential environmental effects and their recommendations for climate change adaptation and mitigation measures.

Monitoring and Enforcement

Develop, describe, and implement a Travel Management Plan Monitoring and Enforcement Strategy. It is important that wildlife protection, vegetation management, and erosion control goals be achieved to minimize the potential adverse effects of the Travel Management Plan. We believe the public and decision makers would benefit if a strategy is developed that includes specific information on funding, monitoring and enforcement criteria, thresholds, and priorities.

Recommendations:

We recommend development of a detailed Travel Management Plan Monitoring and Enforcement Strategy. Such a strategy should include specific information on monitoring and enforcement priorities, focus areas (e.g., issues, specific locations), personnel needs, costs, and funding sources. We recommend the FEIS demonstrate that the proposed monitoring and enforcement strategy is adequate to assure that motorized vehicle use will not violate access restrictions or exacerbate

[2] For example: Draft 2009 Climate Action Team Biennial Report to the Governor and Legislature. See internet address: http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/publications/cat/index.html.

[3] http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-07-863

already identified road-related resource impacts. We recommend the monitoring and enforcement strategy be periodically updated (e.g., annually or biennially).

Describe enforcement of seasonal restrictions and closure of unauthorized routes. The DEIS states that seasonal restrictions would apply to certain routes and to the lake areas to protect wildlife and reduce erosion. EPA commends the Forest Service on these proposed restrictions. For the Travel Management Plan to adequately protect natural resources, the Forest Service must ensure the enforceability of the designated route network. Research regarding OHV use has demonstrated that signs and barriers are not always effective in closing roads and trails or in reducing impacts and protecting forest resources.[4] We are concerned with the enforceability of proposed seasons of use periods and closure of unauthorized routes.

Recommendation:
We recommend the FEIS describe in detail how seasonal restrictions and route closure will be enforced and what enforcement approaches have been successful. EPA encourages the Forest Service to consider enforcement as a significant issue driving the design and analysis of alternatives for motorized travel management.

Plan for decommissioning and restoration of unauthorized routes that have known significant resource impairments. All action alternatives prohibit travel, rather than physical removal or restoration, on unauthorized routes. Therefore, the density of roads and trails at the watershed scale, and associated resource impacts, may not substantially change for a significant period of time due to the rate of natural restoration.

Recommendation:
Where feasible, we recommend decommissioning and restoring unauthorized routes not designated for motorized vehicle use that have known significant resource impairments. At a minimum, the FEIS should list and prioritize, for future rehabilitation, the unauthorized prohibited routes that require active management to address significant resource issues.

[4] "Learning to Live with Off-Highway Vehicles: Lessons Learned from the Dixie National Forest" presented at the "Proceedings of the Fourth Social Aspects and Recreation Research Symposium," San Francisco State University, Aaron K. Divine and Pamela E. Foti, 2004.

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

"Category 1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.

1224 - Shasta-Trinity National Forest

[House Appropriations Committee Print]

~~"Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009"~~

(H.R. 1105; Public Law 111–8)

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

CONTENTS, DIVISION E

	Page
Legislative Text:	
Title I—Department of the Interior	1047
Title II—Environmental Protection Agency	1071
Title III—Related Agencies	1076
Title IV—General Provisions	1092
Explanatory Statement:	
Title I—Department of the Interior	1099
Title II—Environmental Protection Agency	1125
Title III—Related Agencies	1144
Title IV—General Provisions	1151

Comparisons:

Appropriations, 2008	+40,226,000
Budget estimate, 2009	+160,268,000

The detailed allocation of funding by program, activity and subactivity is included in the table at the end of this section of the statement. In addition, the bill also includes the following specific funding levels and directions:

Inventory and Monitoring.—Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 of the funds provided for the Threat Assessment Centers program is for the NASA Stennis Space Center in Mississippi to acquire remote sensing data to inventory and monitor Federal and non-Federal lands as authorized by Title IV of Public Law 108–148, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act.

Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness.—The bill provides the fiscal year 2008 funding level, plus fixed costs, plus an increase of $10,000,000. The Committees on Appropriations expect that each individual National Forest or Grassland will comply fully with all travel management regulatory requirements, particularly the science-based analysis in 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1), the identification of unneeded roads in 36 CFR 212.5(b)(2), and the criteria for designation in 36 CFR 212.55(a) and (b). The Committees expect the Forest Service to identify priorities, and associated resource requirements, to fully comply with the regulatory requirements of 36 CFR 212.5(b) (1) and (2).

Forest Products.—The bill provides the budget request of $322,666,000 plus an increase of $10,000,000. The requested funds should be allocated as stipulated in the President's budget, following the Northwest Forest Plan. The funding increase should be used for those forests not covered by the Northwest Forest Plan that have budget shortfalls and capacity for additional, successful work.

The Service should consider all contract methods for implementing fuels reduction projects proposed on the Sierra and Sequoia National Forests, including the Kings River, Sugar Pine, Frog, and revised Ice projects, including stewardship contracting authority provided under Section 323 of Public Law 108–7, and utilize available agency funding to accomplish these multiple objectives.

Vegetation and Watershed Management.—The bill supports the budget request to continue leafy spurge eradication on the Dakota Prairie Grasslands in conjunction with the Service's local partners. There is also a $500,000 increase within available funding to remediate hazardous materials and other natural resource damage caused by drug cultivation on national forest lands; these funds should be distributed to support high-priority restoration needs following drug eradication activity.

Law Enforcement Operations.—The bill provides $135,500,000 for law enforcement operations. The Service is expected to use the increase above the request to fund uncontrollable costs, continue efforts to increase the eradication of marijuana from national forest lands and maximize the number of interagency drug enforcement operations conducted with Federal and non-Federal partners. In particular, funding for counterdrug operations on the Daniel Boone

DIANNE FEINSTEIN
CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND
ADMINISTRATION - CHAIRMAN
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0504
http://feinstein.senate.gov

December 18, 2008

Randy Moore, Regional Forester
Pacific Southwest Region
USDA Forest Service
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592

Dear Regional Forester Moore:

I am writing regarding the Forest Service's current efforts to implement the Travel Management Rule and designate routes in California's National Forests that are accessible to motorized traffic, including off-highway vehicles.

It is my understanding that the Tahoe National Forest plans to add roads to the existing motorized route system and publish a route system map cataloguing the roads open for public motor vehicle use.

I am concerned, however, that as part of the effort for designating the route system the Forest Service did not consider a process for removing existing system roads that may be unneeded or damaging to the environment. I believe that adding routes to the system without a science-based analysis of existing roads or plan to de-designate unneeded roads is misguided, particularly given the $169 million road maintenance backlog in the Tahoe National Forest.

I am also concerned that the Tahoe National Forest plans to publish a route system map, which may leave the public with the impression that all roads present on the map will be permanently open to motorized vehicle access -- unless the public is simultaneously notified of a process to identify and remove unneeded roads. Without a caution that system maps may be subject to further review, it could be difficult for the Forest Service to remove roads that are found to threaten public safety, cause environmental damage or conflict with other forest uses in the future.

As the Forest Service continues with travel management plans in California, I request that the Agency to complete comprehensive analyses of existing system roads in each National Forest and develop a process for identifying and removing unneeded

roads prior to publishing route system maps. This level of analysis will help ensure that the Forest Service can afford to maintain a National Forest system that provides public access for motorized recreation while minimizing environmental impacts.

I look forward to being updated on your progress toward designating motorized travel systems in California's National Forests. Best regards.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

DF:jw:db

Appendix J: Public Uses (Roads) White Paper

Topic

- Forest road management and maintenance strategies to meet public and Forest Service access and resource protection needs using limited funding sources.
- Impact of adding unauthorized roads under the Travel Management Rule.

Introduction

The definition of a forest road is "Any road wholly or partially within, or adjacent to, and serving the National Forest System (NFS) and which is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest System is a "Forest Road" (Title 23, Section 101 of the United States Code). The Shasta-Trinity National Forest (NF) road network facilitates forest management, provides access to diverse recreational opportunities, and contributes to the rural transportation infrastructure of interspersed private lands for resource management. At the same time, agency and public awareness of the environmental costs and risks associated with forest roads and attendant activities is increasing. As the agency's emphasis has shifted from commodity production to ecosystem health, the forest road system needs to be analyzed, managed and maintained to minimize environmental impacts and reduce costs, while providing sufficient access for public and agency needs. This paper will provide background information and management strategies being employed to meet these objectives.

Shasta-Trinity National Forest Road System

State and county roads stretch across the Shasta-Trinity NF and serve large tracts of federal land. Some of these county roads are also designated as Forest Highways, making them eligible under the Federal Lands Highway Program for disaster relief and major renovation funds. The Forest facilitates management of these roads, but jurisdiction for their repair and maintenance lies with State and county road agencies. Shasta-Trinity National Forest System (NFS) roads, under Forest Service jurisdiction, branch off from these state and county roads as arterial, collector and local roads.

National Forest System (NFS) roads are not public roads in the same sense as roads that are under the jurisdiction of State and county road agencies. These roads are not intended to meet the transportation needs of the public at large. Instead, they are authorized only for the use and administration of national forest lands. Although generally open and available for public use, that use is at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Through authorities delegated by the Secretary, the Forest Service may restrict or control traffic to meet specific management direction.

NFS roads are categorized using the following system:

Maintenance Level 5: Roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally double lane paved facilities, or aggregate surface with dust abatement. This is the highest standard of maintenance. There are no Maintenance Level 5 roads on the forest.

Maintenance Level 4: Roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate speeds. Most are double lane aggregate surfaced. Some may be single lane. Some may be chip sealed or dust abated.

Maintenance Level 3: Roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are lower priorities. Typically these roads are lower speed, single lane with turnouts. Some may be fully surfaced with aggregate base or native material.

Maintenance Level 2: Roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passenger car traffic is allowed but discouraged. Use by the public is unrestricted. Traffic is normally minor; consisting of a combination of administrative, permitted, dispersed recreation, or other specialized use. Non-traffic generated maintenance is minimal. Typically these roads have a native surface.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads are closed year-round, but some intermittent use may be authorized. When closed, they must be physically closed with barricades, berms, gates, or other closure devices. When closed to vehicular traffic, they may be suitable and used for non-motorized uses, with custodial maintenance.

The current Shasta-Trinity NF transportation system encompasses 6,611.14 miles of roads in all maintenance levels (Table J-1). These numbers reflect the National Forest System Roads as they were recorded in the INFRA corporate database on January 15, 2010. As such, it is a snapshot of the road system on that date. The INFRA database is a dynamic database that changes as road information is updated by project level decisions, implementation of those decisions, and routine data cleanup typical of any large database.

Table J-1. Road Mileage on the Shasta-Trinity NF by Maintenance Level (1/15/2010)

Maintenance Level	Miles
Level 1	1449.60
Level 2	4013.24
Level 3	834.46
Level 4	313.84
Level 5	0
Total Miles:	**6611.14**

Road Maintenance Terminology

Maintenance needs on NFS roads are categorized and quantified in several ways that must be understood to make sense of cost data and projected annual and deferred maintenance needs being reported at the national level. Common terms used in this paper are defined here.

Traffic Generated & Non-Traffic Generated Maintenance: Traffic generated maintenance needs are those associated with the use of a road, such as rutting of the roadbed caused by traffic during wet weather. In general, as use on a particular route increases, so does the traffic-generated maintenance needs. Non-Traffic generated maintenance is independent of the use of a road. For example, the growth of tree limbs and brush creates a maintenance need, but the growth is independent of the volume of traffic the road receives.

Annual Maintenance: This term refers to the expected annual maintenance required on roadways and roadsides based on the Maintenance Level assigned to the road. The actual amount of maintenance required depends on numerous factors such as amount and type of road use, time of year of road use, surface type, soil type, surface grade, climatic conditions, road location and level of service. Annual maintenance estimates include many work items that are not done yearly, but are annualized. For example, the aggregate surfacing on a mile of level 3 road may last 15 years and cost $90,000 to replace. This equates to a simple annualized cost of $6,000 per mile.

Deferred Maintenance: The Forest Service uses the term Deferred Maintenance which is defined as "Maintenance that was not performed when it should have been or when it was scheduled and which, therefore, was put off or delayed for a future period." Deferred maintenance costs include those needed to repair, rehabilitate, replace, or decommission a road.

Using the example above, if the surfacing is completely worn, the deferred maintenance is $90,000 per mile for replacement. Deferred maintenance needs can be reduced through a number of different actions and strategies, as discussed below.

Safety & User Related Maintenance: This term refers to activities that protect the public and agency employees and allow use of the road for the intended purpose. Examples include installation of warning devices (such as stop or bridge abutment signs); pothole patching on a level 4 road; maintaining surface and brush clearance for passenger car access to developed recreation sites; maintaining access for fire suppression initial attack equipment; or maintaining access for forest health project planning and implementation.

Resource Protection Related Maintenance: These activities preserve the road prism for its intended use and minimize erosion and sediment delivery to aquatic systems. Examples include ditch and culvert cleaning; maintaining rolling dips to prevent stream diversion; or surface blading to remove wheel ruts that concentrate runoff.

Stormproofing & Aquatic Passage: These projects reconstruct a road using various techniques to minimize chronic and storm related resource damage, reduce future maintenance costs, and restore aquatic passage at stream crossings. Stormproofing includes out-sloping the road surface to the maximum extent possible and eliminating associated inboard ditches and cross drains; installing larger culverts and/or lowering the grade through stream crossings to reduce fill volume and prevent diversion; installing rolling dips on moderate road grades to minimize road surface erosion; armoring fills with rock to reduce erosion should they be overtopped; or completely replacing earth fills with rock. Aquatic passage involves replacing a pipe culvert with an open bottom culvert or bridge to restore the natural stream bottom.

Deferred Maintenance Backlog

The Shasta-Trinity National Forest's transportation system has developed over the past 100 years, generally in response to public access and resource extraction needs. The current inventory shows over 6,600 miles of road, with 83 percent in MLs 1 and 2, and only 17 percent in MLs 3 and 4. Road maintenance budgets have declined over the past decade, and the Forest's internal capability to maintain roads has been reduced with loss of maintenance personnel and equipment. In Fiscal Year 2007 the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's total deferred maintenance backlog was calculated to be $201.6 million for all forest roads, maintenance levels 1-5.

These national estimates for deferred maintenance require some explanation. The deferred maintenance figures were generated using a national formula based on random sampling (less than 0.2 percent miles of system roads nationwide for 2009) and standard maintenance prescriptions. It is a useful tool for tracking national trends and producing auditable outputs, but was never intended for use at the forest level, nor is it considered to be statistically valid at this scale. In general, the nationally derived figures tend to be slightly higher than actual local costs.

Forest Strategy for Road Maintenance

Shasta-Trinity NF line officers regularly make decisions about which roads to maintain or improve, and to what standard, in order to protect resources and minimize costs. These maintenance decisions, coupled with road projects such as stormproofing, fish passage construction, and decommissioning, can have the effect of reducing future road maintenance needs. These actions are accomplished through carefully targeted maintenance planning, and aggressive pursuit of funding opportunities. The Forest has requested and received additional funding from several sources for road restoration and design projects in the last decade.

Annual Maintenance

Road managers consider a number of factors in deciding when, where and on what to spend annual maintenance funds. Every road does not need or receive maintenance every year, nor is every type of maintenance task completed when a road is maintained. There are no expectations by Forest managers that every mile of every Forest road will be passable every year. A description of the Shasta-Trinity NF

transportation system by maintenance level follows. Typical annual road maintenance activities include grading, ditch cleaning, culvert cleaning/replacement, debris removal, and roadside brushing.

Maintenance Level 5: There are no Maintenance Level 5 roads on the forest.

Maintenance Level 4: These are mostly chip sealed roads or paved roads that require annual care and significant mission and safety related maintenance every few years. These roads make up less than 5 percent of the system. They service campgrounds, major trailheads, river accesses, administrative sites or are forest arterials. These roads receive moderate traffic volumes and most are not driven in winter due to facility seasonal closures and snow cover. The majority of these roads receive the critical maintenance necessary to preserve the surfacing. Drainage is substantially maintained and sediment run-off is negligible.

Maintenance Level 3: These roads make up 13 percent of the system and typically have either an aggregate or a native surface. In many cases, the aggregate surfacing was originally placed for the purpose of withstanding heavy use during logging operations. The road surfaces are generally hard, stable and rough, but are passable with most passenger cars. These roads are graded as necessary for proper drainage, for safety concerns such as severe wash boarding, and for user comfort.

Maintenance Level 2: These roads make up 61 percent of the system. The majority of these roads have a native surface and are only maintained as needed to support Forest projects or provide access to lookouts or recreation facilities; therefore, many may not see any maintenance for several years. In some cases, roads may become impassable due to rocks or down trees. When needed, maintenance activities typically consist of debris removal and roadside brushing, surface grading and drainage maintenance. The amount of brushing required can be substantial, depending on location and the last time it was done. Spot aggregate surfacing is only used to stabilize soft areas. By designing a maintenance scheme focused on roads needed specifically for project or recreation access, we can effectively utilize our maintenance budget on the highest-priority needs.

Maintenance Level 1: These roads make up 22 percent of the system. Normal practice is to place these roads into self-maintaining hydrologic storage using a combination of water bars, rolling dips and pulling culverts. Closure devices utilized include gates, berms, and guardrail barricades. Generally no maintenance is typically performed except to check the closure device.

Change in Operational Maintenance Level

When roads no longer warrant or receive the type of use for which they were designed, the road manager may recommend that the road's maintenance level be reduced. For example, in many cases on the Forest, ML 3 roads support little traffic, and may be subject to rocks, woody debris, encroaching vegetation and uneven surfaces. Over the past decade a number of ML 3 roads have been reduced to ML 2, and drainage function (rather than passenger comfort) has become the primary objective. These roads are then

prioritized for maintenance with the rest of the ML 2 roads. Annual maintenance needs are reduced, and the dollar values assigned to these roads as part of the deferred maintenance backlog are also reduced.

Stormproofing, Decommissioning & Aquatic Passage

Stormproofing opportunities are evaluated at the watershed level typically on maintenance level 1 through 3 roads, to reduce the need for drainage maintenance and to prevent catastrophic soil loss during significant storm events. Hundreds of miles of have been stormproofed over the past several years using grants and/or special funding sources. Additional stormproofing projects are planned for 2010 and beyond.

Decommissioning is analyzed at the watershed level through the appropriate project-level environmental documentation. It may be as simple as taking a naturally revegetated road with no erosion issues off the system, or it may involve major reconstruction to remove culverts and fills, followed by aggressive outsloping to restore the original hillside contour to the extent possible. All decommissioned roads and associated deferred and annual maintenance costs are removed from the transportation system corporate database.

The forest has completed 10 major aquatic organism passage projects since 2004, with one or two more scheduled for 2010 and others awaiting funding. The projects typically replace a culvert with an open bottom arch or a bridge that greatly reduces the fill volume in the stream and meets the 100 year storm flow. These projects do more than enhance aquatic habitat – they reduce the potential for culvert blockage and subsequent heavy sedimentation from loss of fill. In some cases, the old culvert was near the end of its useful life, so the replacement structure reduces future maintenance needs.

Adding Roads to the System

A logical question when proposing to add new roads to the transportation system is that of affordability. The ongoing efforts described in this paper are aimed at providing a sustainable transportation system to meet a range of access needs and protect natural resources. The unauthorized roads being proposed for addition to the system under the Travel Management EIS have for years provided access to dispersed recreation opportunities, and connections between NFS roads. These routes are short in length and have not received Forest Service maintenance in the past.

Summary

- Management of the Forest road system has changed from an emphasis on commodity extraction to resource protection.
- The Shasta-Trinity NF is working towards the minimum road system to meet agency and public uses.
- National maintenance cost models were not intended to be used at the Forest level

- The Forest road management program is focused on safety and resource protection while aggressively seeking to leverage maintenance funds through grants and special programs.
- Strategies to reduce annual and deferred maintenance costs include:
    - Prioritizing maintenance of ML 2 roads on project, resource and recreation-related access needs
    - Downgrading maintenance levels where possible without compromising user needs.
    - Focusing on watershed level stormproofing and decommissioning to enhance resource protection and reduce future maintenance needs.
- Proposed road additions under the Travel Management EIS will have a relatively minor impact on the road maintenance program.

Appendix K: County Interests and Coordination

The following correspondence is from local county governments received during both scoping and the DEIS comment period. The Forest has considered these comments in their NEPA process in order to arrive at the selected alternative.

- Shasta County Board of Supervisors: K-3 to K-7
- Les Baugh, District 5, Shasta County Board of Supervisors: K-9
- Glenn Hawes, District 3, Shasta County Board of Supervisors: K-11 to K-12
- Siskiyou County Administrative Office, Natural Resource Policy Specialist: K-13 to K-17
- Resolution of the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors Asserting Legal Standing and Formally Requesting Coordination: K-19 to K-23
- Resolution of the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors Regarding Motorized Access on Federal Lands: K-25 to K-26
- Trinity County Board of Supervisors: K-27 to K-28

RECEIVED

AUG 25 2009

TIME: 1600

Shasta County

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1450 Court Street, Suite 308B
Redding, California 96001-1680
(530) 225-5557
(800) 479-8009
(530) 225-5189-FAX

DAVID A. KEHOE, DISTRICT 1
LEONARD MOTY, DISTRICT 2
GLENN HAWES, DISTRICT 3
LINDA HARTMAN, DISTRICT 4
LES BAUGH, DISTRICT 5

August 25, 2009

J. Sharon Heywood
Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: Shasta-Trinity National Forest Travel Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments

Dear Supervisor Heywood:

Thank you for meeting with us on August 10 to discuss the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). We want to work with the Forest Service to provide ample motorized recreation opportunities and public access to the national forest. As we discussed, we feel that the EIS could better pursue these desired outcomes in several respects. We have the following concerns:

1. The DEIS does not adequately consider public use on National Forest System (NFS) routes and the county road system.

   Integration and collaboration with other road management agencies is critical for national forest travel management plans. The California Vehicle Code (CVC) permits mixed use on unpaved public roads. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has said so. Many of our county roads link with the Forest's unpaved maintenance level (ML) 3 and 4 "passenger car" road system. And yet, we understand that current regional policy prohibits non-highway legal vehicles on passenger car roads with a maintenance level or 3, 4, or 5. The Regional Forester cites the CVC to justify this prohibition. We see no foundation for this assertion. We consider the CHP's interpretation to be authoritative: mixed use is lawful and should be allowed.

   Unpaved county and NFS roads have long provided an interconnected transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles (OHVs). This provides loop opportunities for OHVs. Their safety record is very good. The Forest Service has not documented a single mixed use accident.

Resolution: The STNF's final designations should provide a seamless transportation system for the riding public. The California Vehicle Code governs OHV use on unpaved NFS roads, and should be recognized. Motorized mixed use should be routinely allowed on unpaved ML 3 and 4 roads. Any exceptions should be based upon sound engineering and documented in the EIS.

2. Most unauthorized routes are inexplicably not proposed for designation.

   All of the alternatives propose to designate less than four percent of the 1,252 miles of "unauthorized routes" that were inventoried. The rest will be closed to motor vehicle travel. No explanation is provided for this broad rejection. These unauthorized routes provide recreation opportunities and should be delineated in the EIS. If they warrant improvements or resource mitigations, these steps should be set forth in the EIS. These routes could then be added to the Forest's motor vehicle use map (MVUM) when the mitigation work was completed. The total number of miles the public asked for is not listed nor is there any indication they were reviewed or what was the outcome of the review.

Resolution: Display all unauthorized routes in Appendix A to the EIS. Provide site-specific rationale if any route is not proposed for designation. Explain why mitigation would not be effective.

3. The range of alternatives is inadequate.

   The proposed action alternatives in the EIS do not reflect the full range of options for environmental stewardship and public access. The four action alternatives all propose to designate less than five percent of the STNF's unauthorized routes. Cross-country travel is prohibited under all the action alternatives. No open riding areas are proposed. Long standing OHV use in areas such as Wildwood and Fenders Ferry Road areas will be prohibited pending future environmental analysis. Wildwood and Fenders Ferry Road areas are very popular with Shasta County residents.

   The prohibition of motorized mixed use on ML 3-5 roads, closure of greater than 95 percent of the STNF's unauthorized routes, and closure of all OHV areas will cumulatively create significant gaps in OHV circulation. Riders will be limited to short spur roads. Single track opportunities for motorcycles are very limited in all of the alternatives.

Resolution: Evaluate all miles of unauthorized routes that were recommended for designation by the public. Develop a sustainable OHV system that provides loops, challenge, variety, access to vistas and dispersed campsites, etc. Collaborate with the public and Shasta County in creating this system.

4. Routes intersecting private property are not shown on the alternative maps.

   There are many roads in the national forest that traverse private lands. The public has a right to pass by virtue of long standing public use. Such roads have inexplicably been removed from all alternative maps. This omission imparts the erroneous impression that there are major gaps in connectivity across private lands.

Resolution: All existing routes across private land should be considered for public access unless the private property owner has taken affirmative steps to deny access. The EIS should document these right of way issues.

5. Opportunities for dispersed camping and parking on the STNF will be significantly reduced.

   The EIS documents states that dispersed recreation sites are limited to one car length from the edge of the road or trail. People do not like to park next to the road because of dust, privacy and security. There is insufficient analysis in the EIS to explain why the STNF is closing so many dispersed sites to motor vehicles. In addition, parking for any purpose is restricted to one vehicle length from a designated route. None of the alternatives provide adequate trailhead or staging areas off designated routes for vehicles with equestrian or OHV trailers. Multiple users traveling together require much more than one vehicle length to park.

Resolution: Provide continued motor vehicle access to <u>all established dispersed recreation sites</u> unless there is no evidence of recent use. Allow motor vehicle access for other dispersed camping (separate from historically used campsites) within 100 feet of a designated road, trail or OHV area where feasible. Permit parking within 30 feet from any designated road, trail or open OHV area when it does not cause damage to national forest resources or facilities. This is all consistent with Forest Service policy. Designate currently used staging areas on the Forest MVUM.

6. Options to prioritize STNF road maintenance efforts have not been considered.

   The STNF currently manages approximately 5,332 miles of NFS roads. The EIS states that the STNF's deferred road maintenance is currently estimated to be $216,883. The cost to maintain a ML 3 road is twenty times the amount to maintain a ML 2, high clearance road ($10,870 vs. $543 respectively). All alternatives require over $17.7 million annually to maintain the STNF's road system to standard. The Board is unclear how the STNF can meet their road maintenance goals with such a significant deficit.

Resolution: Lower <u>operational</u> road maintenance levels to reduce the STNF's road maintenance costs. This will allow OHV operators to travel on these roads and provide connectivity for non-highway legal vehicles and reflects current vehicle use.

7. Motor vehicle use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

   The proposed alternative proposes to add areas open to motor vehicle travel below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake to highway-legal vehicles only. Where is the research this decision is based on? Why is there a difference between highway-legal vehicles and OHVs? Ground pressures are generally greater with on-highway vehicles than OHVs. This needs to be changed to include OHVs.

In conclusion, Shasta County finds the EIS to be extensive in its objectives but disappointing in its delivery. A new action alternative is needed. The following elements are needed to properly bookend and balance environmental stewardship and public access:

a) Coordinate with all affected counties and the public to create a seamless transportation system for non-highway legal vehicles using both county and NFS roads (unpaved).

b) Recognize California Vehicle Code provisions for OHV use on unpaved NFS roads. Designate <u>all</u> unpaved ML 3 and 4 NFS roads for motorized mixed use unless engineering analyses demonstrate a need to do otherwise.

c) Provide a range of OHV opportunities such as single track trails and trails with different levels of difficulty.

d) Analyze <u>all</u> unauthorized routes commented on by public. Provide site-specific reasons for eliminating unauthorized routes from consideration in the FEIS.

e) Provide continued motor vehicle access to ten OHV riding areas until future environmental analyses are completed.

f) Provide motor vehicle access to all historically used dispersed recreation sites.

g) Allow parking for dispersed camping 100 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so.

h) Permit parking up to 30 feet from a designated route when it is feasible to do so.

i) Reduce the operational maintenance level of unpaved ML 3 and ML 4 roads to accommodate OHVs, consistent with available road maintenance resources and current vehicle use.

j) Allow OHV use below the high-water mark at Shasta Lake.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to submit our comments on the EIS. We share the Forest Service's goal to craft a travel management plan that protects forest resources, is affordable, and is acceptable to the public. By working together, we can get there. The current administration has said that governmental processes and actions will be open and transparent. The Forest Service's 2005 Travel Management Rule and the National Environmental Policy Act require coordination with other affected agencies. Forest Service collaboration has been minimal during the planning process.

The County shares the Forest Service's desire for resource protection and well-managed recreation programs. Please call Pat Minturn, Shasta County Public Works Director, at 225-5661 to schedule a meeting to discuss a new action alternative.

Sincerely,

GLENN HAWES, CHAIRMAN
Shasta County Board of Supervisors

GH/PJM/mlc

c: Sylvia Milligan, Chair
Recreation Outdoor Coalition
4000 Beacon Drive
Anderson, CA 96007-2962

Daphne Greene, Deputy Director
California Dept. of Parks & Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

This page intentionally left blank

Shasta County

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Les Baugh, District 5

1450 Court Street, Suite 308B
Redding, California 96001-1680
(530)225-5561
(800)479-8009
(530)225-5189-FAX

September 19, 2008

Travel Management Team
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: OHV Route Designations

Dear Travel Management Team:

Shasta County is suburban and rural in character. Residents appreciate the outdoors, and the varied recreational opportunities that our region affords. For many of my constituents, recreating involves Off-Highway Vehicles ("OHVs"). This motorized recreation offers family and social recreational opportunities for folks of all ages and walks of life. It's part of what makes Shasta County the wholesome family community that it is.

As you are aware, OHV recreation requires room to roam, with connecting trails and support facilities. Such a trail system exists in Shasta County, spread across public and private roads and lands. It is my hope that this system be maintained in its present form, and enhanced.

The Recreation Outdoor Coalition ("ROC") is a group of local OHV enthusiasts. They share an ardent appreciation for their sport. Many of the ROC members are my constituents, and so I have had occasion to get to know them. Much to my concern, they have recently shared with me their grave concerns, regarding continued OHV access to public lands. On September 18, 2008, the ROC sent a comment letter to your office regarding proposed route designations on Forest Service lands. I have reviewed this document. I find it to be a reasonable and constructive treatise on the use of OHVs on federal land. I wish to express my solidarity with the OHV community, and my fervent hope that an acceptable compromise on the OHV issue may come to pass.

As a potential model, I would suggest that the Forest Service consider the County's oversight of the County road system. Per the Vehicle Code, our County presently permits OHVs on all unpaved County roads. The County is also receptive to Combined Use on paved roads, with CHP consultation and upon demonstration of utility. These arrangements have served well. Most of our roads cross private property, often without formal easements. Nevertheless, these roads enjoy land tenure, through legal concepts of prescription and Implied Dedication. Inholdings are thus not a problem for continuity of roads and trails.

In summary, I would encourage the Forest Service to take an open and pragmatic approach to OHV route designations, as proposed in the ROC letter. If you have any questions, please give me a call at 225-5561.

Very truly yours,

LES BAUGH
Supervisor, District 5
County of Shasta

LB/PJM/mlc

This page intentionally left blank

Shasta County

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Glenn Hawes, District 3

1450 Court Street, Suite 308B
Redding, CA 96001-1680
(530) 225-5557
(800) 479-8009
(530) 225-5189-FAX

October 2, 2008

Travel Management Team
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: OHV Route Designations

Dear Travel Management Team:

Shasta County is suburban and rural in character. Residents appreciate the outdoors, and the varied recreational opportunities that our region affords. For many of my constituents, recreating involves Off-Highway Vehicles ("OHVs"). This motorized recreation offers family and social recreational opportunities for folks of all ages and walks of life. It's part of what makes Shasta County the wholesome family community that it is.

As you are aware, OHV recreation requires room to roam, with connecting trails and support facilities. Such a trail system exists in Shasta County, spread across public and private roads and lands. It is my hope that this system be maintained in its present form, and enhanced.

The Recreation Outdoor Coalition ("ROC") is a group of local OHV enthusiasts. They share an ardent appreciation for their sport. Many of the ROC members are my constituents, and so I have had occasion to get to know them. Much to my concern, they have recently shared with me their grave concerns, regarding continued OHV access to public lands. On September 18, 2008, the ROC sent a comment letter to your office regarding proposed route designations on Forest Service lands. I have reviewed this document. I find it to be a reasonable and constructive treatise on the use of OHVs on federal land. I wish to express my solidarity with the OHV community, and my fervent hope that an acceptable compromise on the OHV issue may come to pass.

As a potential model, I would suggest that the Forest Service consider the County's oversight of the County road system. Per the Vehicle Code, our County presently permits OHVs on all unpaved County roads. The County is also receptive to Combined Use on paved roads, with CHP consultation and upon demonstration of utility. These arrangements have served well. Most of our roads cross private property, often without formal easements. Nevertheless, these roads enjoy land tenure, through legal concepts of prescription and Implied Dedication. Inholdings are thus not a problem for continuity of roads and trails.

In summary, I would encourage the Forest Service to take an open and pragmatic approach to OHV route designations, as proposed in the ROC letter. If you have any questions, please give me a call at (530) 225-5561.

Sincerely,

Glenn Hawes
Supervisor, District 3
County of Shasta

COUNTY OF SISKIYOU

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Ric Costales, Natural Resource Policy Specialist
P.O. Box 750 ● 201 Fourth Street, Yreka, CA 96097
Phone: (530) 842-8012, Fax Number: (530) 842-8013
Email: rcostales@co.siskiyou.ca.us

August 21, 2009

J. Sharon Heywood, Forest Supervisor
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
USDA Service Center
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Subject: Shasta-T Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Sharon:

Despite the substantial land base within Siskiyou County being managed by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, I have not heard from constituents about specific issues with regard to the Shasta-Trinity Motorized Travel Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (MTM DEIS). Primarily, input I have received through my office and through Board of Supervisors presentations from the public has involved almost exclusively the Klamath National Forest (KNF). While no one has taken the time to actively engage the County on specific Shasta-T issues, my 35 years experience in Siskiyou County among its diverse citizens allows me to feel confident in extrapolating some of the KNF MTM DEIS-related activism to the Shasta-T. Given the vast amount of Shasta-T acreage involved and the complexities of the environmental considerations specific to each alternative, however, it is impossible for me to offer substantive comments at the detailed level. Nevertheless, certain widespread general concepts and sentiments exist and have been expressed that make it both legitimate and prudent to offer comments on your MTM DEIS.

Two of the prime goals of the MTM process are to ban “cross country” travel and to “manage” motorized travel. Also, the “No Action Alternative” does not fit the “purpose and need” of the rule. Thus, it is assured that in terms of amount of access, motorized users will be the big losers. The difference in the amount of loss is reflected in the range of alternatives. None of the available alternatives approaches even a reasonable fraction of acreage currently available to the various forms of motorized use and access.

It is not the magnitude of this loss that is the problem, as even the OHV community (perhaps the most “motor-intense” of the motorized access user-groups) acknowledges that many important environmental concerns preclude unrestricted motorized access on the majority of the Shasta-T management area. Rather, it is the process that apparently does not accommodate many of the legitimate concerns of motorized users. For example, the MTM process does not allow for suitable consideration of the needs of motorized “dispersed camping.” The responsible official determined that “dispersed vehicle camping within 100 feet of the surface of NFTS roads” should be eliminated from detailed study because it “would require extensive additional analysis,” and “it is not feasible for the Forest to complete the required site-specific analysis needed to implement a travel corridor.” Similar reasons were given for eliminating detailed study of other workable suggestions from motorized users. Clearly, the MTM process is on the fast track and unable to

accommodate the complexity and intensity needed to truly solve the challenges of motorized travel at this time.

The MTM process, then, must be viewed as simply the "first shot" at refining the management of motorized travel. The reasonableness of the proposal must be viewed in the light of this necessity. Also, it has been my perception that the majority of people offering opinions on this process seem to favor the maximum amount of motorized access that does not significantly impair environmental standards or that does not detract from the obligation to balance multiple uses of the National Forests. Thus, the following are my comments on the Shasta-Trinity MTM DEIS:

- Management of motorized travel on the Shasta-T NF is a prudent and reasonable goal. In making the transition from an unmanaged state, motorized travel will obviously be restricted to a much smaller level of access. How this occurs on federal land is a matter for the federal land management agency to decide. Siskiyou County is more than 62% federal with most of it managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS). In August of 2008, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution #08-153 (attached) asserting legal standing and formally requesting coordination with federal and state agencies. In response to the USFS MTM initiative, in November of 2008, Siskiyou County further adopted Resolution #08-186 (attached) regarding Motorized Access and/or Travel on Federal Lands in Siskiyou County. The intent of this latter resolution was to assist the USFS in federally mandated coordination with the County on the MTM effort.

  A key element of that Resolution states, "…*that before any road, trail or area on federal land is closed to motorized access and/or travel, all reasonable mitigations and alternatives should be explored in order to prevent closure…*" Essentially, within the context of prudent environmental protection and balancing multiple use, the County policy seeks to maximize motorized access.

  While federal law does not require the USFS to completely toe the line on such local government policies, it does generally require that the USFS "coordinate" with local government to insure that federal decisions are "as consistent as possible" with such locally expressed guidelines. While coordination between the County and the Shasta-T has been somewhat active, the level of achieving consistency could be greater in some areas. For example, many of the suggestions "dismissed from detailed study" can be reasonably mitigated and thus allow the USFS to accomplish their mandates while being consistent with the policies of local government.

  I am hopeful that further refinements of the Shasta-T management of motorized travel will help accomplish a higher level of consistency.

- As previously mentioned, the motorized component of dispersed camping is a source of major concern for Siskiyou County with the National Forests' MTM process. In the decision by the "responsible official" that nothing can be done within the MTM EIS process to accommodate the ability for people to pull a little way off the road to camp and get away from dust and traffic when conditions allow, the stage is set for a lot of needless heartache. This contusion won't simply be limited to forest users, but will extend to USFS law enforcement people who will have to inform "mom, dad and the kids" who are out on their family vacation that they are breaking the law. The idea that they are violators of the law when all they are trying to do is secure a little privacy and peace and quiet without having to huck all their camping gear away from their now-vandal-prone vehicle is not going to go down well with the public. It would seem that given such a public relations disaster, the "responsible official" could have somehow managed to address the "low hanging fruit" areas where detailed analysis is not needed. The McCloud flats are a perfect example of such areas of the Shasta-T where a programmatic response to the issue could be easily done.

- Due to the mutually acknowledged complications and shortcomings of the MTM approach and process, coordination discussions with Klamath National Forest (KNF) have often touched on the need to provide a relatively simple, expeditious and cost-effective approach to adapting the KNF's MTM rule. As well, these conversations have involved how this could help minimize "heartburn" among motorized users of the forest and, thus, enforcement aspects of MTM. The nature, if not the specifics, of these discussions certainly applies to the Shasta-T MTM DEIS.

  I am not sure where, if any place, in the Shasta-T DEIS there is any manifestation of something that would help achieve future consistency with the County's policy. Perhaps it would be best put in as an implementation strategy in "*Appendix E: Law Enforcement*." For example, since the Shasta-T clearly has an interest in minimizing every negative aspect of enforcement, it only makes sense to whittle down the need for an enforcement response. A major omission of the DEIS-listed ways to do this was a suggestion for the Shasta-T to move expeditiously on dealing with the problematic motorized access areas and issues.

  As a strategic response to implementation, the Shasta-T should aim to get the unreasonable, if unavoidable, bugs out of its MTM ASAP! Since everyone's interests are to be served by managing motorized travel, it is not only users that should be responsible for initiating needed changes. Shasta-T MTM DEIS needs to incorporate this concept beyond simply saying, "The process is open to changes."

- One area of the MTM DEIS that is problematic is in the issue of mixed use. This is particularly thorny for Siskiyou County as it, too, is having difficulty with the issue of mixed use on its roads. Currently, the County's "unofficial" policy is to leave action on a formal policy in abeyance until circumstances compel a response. While such a position tends to facilitate mixed use, the National Forests do not have this luxury. The lack of an official County mixed use policy doesn't give the Shasta-T much with which to be consistent. Thus, County Resolution #08-186 must serve as the best statement by which to inform my comments and seek consistency.

  Even in the most favorable alternative to motorized access in the MTM DEIS, much of the Shasta-T road system that could safely and ecologically support mixed use is left closed to OHVs. There are many reasons for this, some of the main ones subject to interpretation and controversy. The Shasta-T needs to present a more thorough analysis and explanation of how what were formally considered "roads" are now considered "highways," thus precluding mixed use. On the one hand, the Shasta-T cites the authority of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) to determine National Forest policy regarding mixed use. On the other, it completely ignores the CVC definition of what distinguishes a "road" from a "highway" for purposes of determining when mixed use is allowed. Most of the Shasta-T's ML 3 travelways would not be considered "highways" under the CVC definition and thus they would be open to mixed use. How the Shasta-T justifies what appears to be "picking and choosing" which parts of the CVC to which it is going to adhere needs more explanation. Further access to mixed use could also be done on some of the roads by temporary closure to OHVs during high use periods, logging contracts or other circumstances that don't facilitate mixed use at all times. Such a compromise is consistent with Siskiyou County's policy to mitigate, rather than eliminate, motorized uses.

- Finally, it cannot be denied that OHV use is by far the most impacted user group in the MTM process. The overall reduction in access on a per acre basis to this form of recreation must certainly be in excess of 90% with the elimination of "cross country travel." Responsible people and organizations within the OHV community readily acknowledge that the loss of much of this OHV accessible ground is prudent for environmental, safety and shared-use considerations. On the other hand, these users also feel that they are being deprived of much of this use unjustifiably or without sufficient attempt to analyze or mitigate impacts.

  I am solely responsible to the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors for maintaining an active involvement and a functional awareness for a multitude of issues and landscapes. With such breadth and a constantly

changing knowledge base attending each issue, there is no way that I can comment at the detailed level demanded of the Shasta-T's MTM DEIS. Instead, in such situations I have come to rely on other people and organizations with sufficient skill and background in the relevant issues. For purposes of this DEIS, that organization is the Recreation Outdoors Coalition (ROC). Attached are their comments. As an expression of substantive comments that reflect the concerns of many Siskiyou County citizens, I support a rigorous attempt by the Shasta-T to evaluate ROC's comments and incorporate them into the FEIS.

It is my hope that these comments will help provide some refinement of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest's Environmental Impact Statement on Motorized Travel Management.

Sincerely,

Ric Costales, Natural Resource Policy Specialist
County of Siskiyou

This page intentionally left blank

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE COUNTY OF SISKIYOU ASSERTING LEGAL
STANDING AND FORMALLY REQUESTING
COORDINATION WITH ALL FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES
MAINTAINING JURISDICTION OVER LANDS AND/OR
RESOURCES LOCATED IN SISKIYOU COUNTY

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County is a public unit of local government and a five member elected Board of Supervisors serves as its chief governing authority; and,

WHEREAS, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors is charged with supervising and protecting the tax base of the County and establishing comprehensive land use plans (including, but not limited to, the General Plan) outlining present and future authorized uses for all lands and resources situated within the County; and,

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County is engaged in the land use planning process for future land uses to serve the welfare of all the citizens of Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, approximately sixty-eight percent (68%) of lands in Siskiyou County are publicly owned, managed, and/or regulated by various federal and state agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the citizens of Siskiyou County historically earn their livelihood from activities reliant upon natural resources and land which produces natural resources is critical to the economy of Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, the economic base and stability of Siskiyou County is largely dependent upon commercial and business activities operated on federally and state owned, managed, and/or regulated lands that include, but are not limited to, recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits; and,

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County desires to assure that federal and state agencies shall inform the Board of Supervisors of all ending or proposed actions affecting local communities and citizens within Siskiyou County and coordinate with the Board of Supervisors in the planning and implementation of those actions; and,

WHEREAS, coordination of planning and management actions is mandated by federal laws governing land management, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 43 USC § 1701, and 43 USC § 1712, regarding the coordinate status of a county engaging in the land use planning process, and requires that the "Secretary of

SISKIYOU COUNTY
RESOLUTION
No. 08-153

the Interior [Secretary] shall . . . coordinate the land use inventory, planning and management activities . . . with the land use planning and management programs of other federal departments and agencies and of the state and local governments within which the lands are located"; and,

WHEREAS, the coordination requirements of Section 1712 provide for special involvement by government officials who are engaged in the land use planning process; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 sets forth the nature of the coordination required with planning efforts by government officials and subsection (f) of Section 1712 sets forth an additional requirement that the Secretary "shall allow an opportunity for public involvement" (including local government without limiting the coordination requirement of Section 1712 allowing land or resource management or regulatory agencies to simply lump local government in with special interest groups of citizens or members of the public in general); and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 also provides that the "Secretary shall . . . assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans" and gives preference to those counties which are engaging in the planning process over the general public, special interest groups of citizens, and even counties not engaging in a land use planning program; and,

WHEREAS, the requirement that the Secretary "coordinate" land use inventory, planning, and management activities with local governments, requires the assisting in resolving inconsistencies to mean that the resolution process takes place during the planning cycle instead of at the end of the planning cycle when the draft federal plan or proposed action is released for public review; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 further requires that the "Secretary shall . . . provide for meaningful public involvement of state and local government officials . . . in the development of land use programs, land use regulations, and land use decisions for public lands"; and, when read in light of the "coordinate" requirement of Section 1712, reasonably contemplates "meaningful involvement" as referring to ongoing consultations and involvement throughout the planning cycle, not merely at the end of the planning cycle; and,

WHEREAS, Section 1712 further provides that the Secretary must assure that the federal agency's land use plan be "consistent with state and local plans" to the maximum extent possible under federal law and the purposes of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and distinguishes local government officials from members of the general

public or special interest groups of citizens; and,

WHEREAS, the Environmental Protection Agency, charged with administration and implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), has issued regulations which require that federal agencies consider the economic impact of their actions and plans on local government such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the customs of the people as shown by their beliefs, social forms, and "material traits," it reasonably follows that NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the rural, land and resource-oriented citizens of Siskiyou County who depend on the "material traits" including recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits for their economic livelihoods; and,

WHEREAS, NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on the customs, beliefs, and social forms, as well as the "material traits" of the people; and,

WHEREAS, it is reasonable to interpret NEPA as requiring federal agencies to consider the impacts of their actions on those traditional and historical and economic practices, including commercial and business activities, which are performed or operated on federally and state managed lands (including, but not limited to, recreation, tourism, timber harvesting, mining, livestock grazing, and other commercial pursuits); and,

WHEREAS, 42 USC § 4331 places upon federal agencies the "continuing responsibility . . . to use all practical means, consistent with other considerations of national policy to . . . preserve important historic, culture, and natural aspects of our national heritage"; and,

WHEREAS, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (at 227, 1975) defines "culture" as "customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a group; the integrated pattern of human behavior passed to succeeding generations"; and,

WHEREAS, In 16 USC § 1604, the National Forest Management Act, requires the Forest Service to coordinate its planning processes with local government units such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, federal agencies implementing the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Outdoor Recreation Coordination Act (16 USC § 4601-1(c) and (d)) are required by Congress to consider local plans and to coordinate and cooperate directly with plans of local government such as Siskiyou County; and,

WHEREAS, the coordinating provisions referred to in the resolution require the Secretary of the Interior to work directly with local government to resolve water resource issues and with regard to recreation uses of the federal lands, and,

WHEREAS, the regulations issued by the federal agencies in this resolution are consistent with statutory requirements of coordination and direct cooperation and provide implementation processes for such coordination and direction consideration and communication; and,

WHEREAS, the California Constitution has recognized Siskiyou County's authority to exercise its local, police and sanitary powers, and the California Legislature has recognized and mandated exercise of certain of those powers in specific statutes; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has mandated in Government Code Section 65300 that each county shall prepare a comprehensive plan, and stated legislative intent in Section 65300.9 that the county planning shall be coordinated with federal and state program activities, and has mandated in Section 65103 that county local plans and programs must be coordinated with plans and programs of other agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has stated its intent in Section 65070 that preparation of state and regional transportation plans be performed in a cooperative process involving local government; and,

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has mandated in Section 65040 that the State Office of Planning and Research shall "coordinate, in conjunction with . . . local agencies with regard to matters relating to the environmental quality of the state"; and,

WHEREAS, in Water Code §§ 8125-8129, the California Legislature has placed planning for non-navigable streams within the authority of county supervisors, and since such planning activities must be coordinated with natural resource planning processes of federal and state agencies; and,

WHEREAS, in Streets and Highways Code §§ 940-941.2, the California Legislature has placed the general supervision, management, and control of county roads and highways - including closing such roads (Section 901) and removing and preventing encroachment of such roads and highways, and since planning and actions with regard to such roads by any federal or state agency must be coordinated with the county; and,

WHEREAS, in Public Resources Code § 5099.3, the California Legislature has mandated coordination by the state with Siskiyou County since it is a county "having interest in the planning, development, and maintenance of outdoor recreation resources

and facilities,"

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors does hereby assert legal standing and formally requests coordination status with all federal and state agencies maintaining jurisdiction over lands and/or resources located within Siskiyou County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board shall cause a copy of this Resolution to be transmitted annually to local, regional, state, and/or national offices of all federal and state agencies maintaining jurisdiction of lands and/or resources located within Siskiyou County and to all federal and state elected representatives serving Siskiyou County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is authorized and hereby directed to publish a copy of this Resolution in the Siskiyou Daily News, a newspaper of general circulation printed and published in Siskiyou County, California.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of August, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Overman, Erickson, Armstrong, Kobseff and Cook
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

Chair, Board of Supervisors
W.R. Overman

ATTEST:
COLLEEN SETZER, CLERK
Board of Supervisors
By
Deputy

G:\Share\RESOLUTN\Coordination with State and Federal Agencies 2008 RES.wpd

This page intentionally left blank

This instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.
ATTEST:
COLLEEN SETZER
County Clerk
of the State of California
In and for the County of Siskiyou.
By Wendy Deniz
Deputy

RESOLUTION OF THE SISKIYOU COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING MOTORIZED ACCESS AND/OR TRAVEL ON FEDERAL LANDS IN SISKIYOU COUNTY

WHEREAS nearly two-thirds of Siskiyou County is federal land; and

WHEREAS the ability to use and recreate on the federal lands in Siskiyou County is enjoyed by all citizens of the United States as well as the citizens of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS when the land in Siskiyou County was reserved by the federal government and became part of the National Forest system it was done with the understanding that the land would be open for the access, use and enjoyment of all citizens; and

WHEREAS, similar understanding exists relative to federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

WHEREAS it is through access, use and enjoyment that people are able to develop the appreciation for the value of federal lands that leads to the popular public support necessary to fund and manage the federal lands; and

WHEREAS the ease, simplicity and economy of motorized transportation make the federal lands accessible, useable and enjoyable to people who might not otherwise have the time, physical ability or finances to enjoy the benefits of the National Forests; and

WHEREAS virtually all uses of and access to the National Forests rely to some degree on motorized transportation; and

WHEREAS fishing, hunting, camping, nature-viewing, mining, wood-cutting, cattle-management and recreational Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) riding are among the uses that depend on motorized access; and

WHEREAS Reserve Statute 2477 has established certain rights of way on federal lands; and

WHEREAS all of these uses are important components of the custom, culture and economy of Siskiyou County; and

WHEREAS it is imperative to the continued enjoyment of federal lands by all user-groups that considerate, tolerant, environmentally reasonable management be applied to motorized access; and

WHEREAS, Siskiyou County can play a major role in helping shape a sound, workable approach to motorized access to federal lands within its boundaries,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors declares it to be the policy of Siskiyou County that all roads, trails and areas on federal land that were available to motorized access and/or travel as of the date of adoption of this Resolution should remain open to all forms of motorized travel, including snowmobiles and OHVs, unless sufficient environmental or other scientific justification exists for the closure of the road, trail or area; and

SISKIYOU COUNTY
RESOLUTION
No. 08-186

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Siskiyou County recognizes compatibility issues between motorized access and/or travel and other uses of the federal lands and understands and supports reasonable, prudent efforts by federal agencies and the public to find workable compromises satisfactory to all user groups; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that before any road, trail or area on federal land is closed to motorized access and/or travel, all reasonable mitigations and alternatives should be explored in order to prevent closure; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all federal agencies are required to coordinate with Siskiyou County at the earliest stage and throughout the development of any road, trail or area closure proposal.

Passed and adopted this November 18, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Overman, Armstrong, Kobseff and Cook
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: Supervisor Erickson
ABSTAIN: NONE

W.R. Overman, Chair
Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
Colleen Setzer, County Clerk

Deputy

TRINITY COUNTY
Board of Supervisors
P.O. BOX 1613, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093
PHONE (530) 623-1217 FAX (530) 623-8365

August 4, 2009

Travel Management
Shasta-Trinity National Forest
USDA Service Center
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Re: Comment – Motorized Travel Management
DEIS dated June 2009

With reference to the above Motorized Travel Management/Route Designation – Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the Trinity County Board of Supervisors have the following concerns and comments.

1. Season of Use Restrictions on Trinity Lake below the high water-mark is unnecessary and needs to be removed.

The apparent reason was to protect the Northern Spotted Owl critical habitat but a ground inspection would show this area around Trinity Lake (dry lake bed) is "**non suitable habitat**" for the NSO. These owls are forest-dwelling in large-diameter trees and high canopy cover. This overlay restriction does not make sense.

As for **disturbances**, State Highway 3 runs along the lake and contributory roads and trails have existed as long as the dam has been in and provide for public access to the lake for swimming, fishing, picnicking and hiking. Most vehicle travel, both highway legal and OHV, travel at a low rate of speed. Boats come and go, planes fly overhead and the effect on the NSO would be negligible. There is no data in the DEIS to support any other conclusion.

Implementation of this proposal would have a negative **economic** impact on our local tourism. No consideration was given to this impact.

Citizens have the **right** to use the National Recreation Area without irrational restrictions.

2. We also oppose access restriction to Highway legal vehicles only on the below high water mark for Trinity Lake.

JUDY PFLUEGER DISTRICT 1 | JUDY MORRIS DISTRICT 2 | ROGER JAEGEL DISTRICT 3 | HOWARD FREEMAN DISTRICT 4 | WENDY REISS DISTRICT 5

Off Highway Vehicles is a growing hobby for many locals and tourists and is providing an upswing in our local economy. The OHV provide transportation to the lake and a fun ride about to see the scenery and when the lake refills, the tracks are erased. Special precautions can be given for any cultural areas.

3. Closure of forest roads will restrict fire access. Given recent fire behavior, we believe it prudent to keep all potential access routes available in the event of a wild land fire.

Overall, we feel these sections need to revisited and unneeded restrictions be removed. The limited operating period restriction is based on assumptions with no data to support findings. There was no "on the ground" verification. Nothing has changed, basic condition remain the same. There will be no negative effect on the behavior, stress, or reproduction of the NSO, therefore we are recommending removal of seasonal operating limits, restriction of OHV use, and closure of routes that could be used for access to lightening fires.

We appreciate your reconsiderations.

Sincerely,

Wendy Reiss

WENDY REISS
Chairman

WR:jp:wt

Appendix L: Cultural Resource Management

Mitigation and Monitoring

Field surveys conducted after publication of the DEIS resulted in updates and corrections to data such as number and locations of cultural resources, protection measures assigned, and effects conclusions for particular routes. The number of cultural resources in the open areas below the high-water marks were incorrectly displayed in the DEIS and are now corrected.

In addition, an amendment to the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement (PA) was completed which directs the management of cultural resources below the high water marks of the reservoirs. Resource protection measures studied in the DEIS were replaced with those developed in the amendment (see Table L - 6), which are specifically designed to protect cultural resources in the unique setting of areas below the high water mark, as discussed below.

Routes

The Motorized Recreation PA Appendix B details the standard resource protection measures. These measures provide mitigations to address any project effects on cultural resources from the proposed routes. Table L - 2 details protection measures by route. Any actions that cannot be mitigated utilizing the standard resource protection measures would require California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) consultation prior to the project decision. Procedures for monitoring historic properties are contained in the main body of the Motorized Recreation PA section IV and in the PA-appendix C. The procedures are detailed below.

Lake Bottoms

An amendment to the Motorized Recreation PA (PA-appendix E) has been added to specifically address issues with the lake bottom use areas. This amendment to the PA contains “Measures for Protecting Historic Properties” which are in addition to those listed in the PA-appendix B. In the lake bottom areas, primary protection measures will be vehicle speed limitations, restrictions on vehicle class, and area closures. These protection measures are progressively more restrictive; and will be implemented based on adaptive management (described below). In addition, all measures from the PA are available and used as appropriate and as directed by the HRM (for example, barriers as noted in Table L - 6). Monitoring in the lake bottoms will focus on those historic properties at greatest risk.

The following are the primary site protection measures for all lake bottom sites listed in Table L - 6. In addition, several cultural resources (3 in Shasta Lake, 9 in Iron Canyon Reservoir) will have barriers applied upon designation of the areas.

Table L-1. Primary site protection and monitoring measures

Site Protection Measures			Low Water Monitoring
First	**Second**	**Third**	
Speed limit restriction	Vehicle class restriction (combined with first measure in alternatives 2, Mod. Alt. 2, and 4)	Area closure and consultation with SHPO	Annually, and as detailed in the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement.

If monitoring reveals that adverse effects are occurring or likely to occur, additional protection measures already approved in the programmatic agreement will be considered prior to area closures.

Adaptive Management of Cultural Resources

The Motorized Recreation PA, including the amendment addressing motor vehicle use in the reservoir open areas, allows for the use of adaptive management to effectively protect cultural resources. The PA identifies adaptive management as "protocol that proceeds through stages managed to reduce or eliminate any effect" that includes monitoring, education, signage, and closure in a sequential process. The PA adds speed limits and vehicle class restrictions as standard protection measures in the reservoir open areas, stating, "Speed limits provide a means to reduce activities that pose a risk to cultural resources (e.g. mud bogging) and can be used by law enforcement to reduce risk. Speed limits may be employed, as well as restricting use to highway legal vehicles (excluding ATVs and dirt bikes for example)." In applying these approved protection measures to at risk cultural resources using adaptive management, the STNF will implement initial protection measures, monitor for impacts and effectiveness, and modify the protection measures to respond to the impacts if necessary. This is a flexible approach necessary to protect cultural resources that are exposed with receding waters and to respond to impacts as they are discovered through regular monitoring.

Adaptive management requires the identification of the adjustment(s) that may be made when monitoring during project implementation indicates that the action is not having its intended effect, or is causing unintended and undesirable effects. Monitoring schedules are required to inform the responsible official whether the action is having its intended effect. (36 CFR 220.7(b)(2)(iv)).

For the protection of **at risk** cultural resources in the reservoir open areas, the STNF will monitor the cultural resource sites annually if they are exposed, and record conditions with a determination of whether or not there is a change to any part of the site related to or contributing to the eligibility of the site for the National Register of Historic Places. If adverse effects are evident or likely to occur then further protection measures identified in the PA would be employed. If the protection measures identified in the PA are not successful or feasible, then it may be necessary to close the area and conduct site evaluations and mitigation. This determination will be made in consultation with SHPO.

The Motorized Recreation PA also requires monitoring to detect condition change at the sites on routes added to the NFTS, and additional standard protection measures (or closures) would be applied if site conditions were found to have deteriorated.

Potential resource protection measures include:

- Standard Resource Protection Measures (appendix B of the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement) as appropriate.
- Speed limit restrictions
- Vehicle class restrictions
- Closing areas as needed while appropriate protection measures (but currently not available in the programmatic agreement) are developed and implemented in consultation with SHPO.

Key to "Recommendation" Fields

Note: References in the following discussion are to the Programmatic Agreement Among the USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region, USDA Forest Service Intermountain Region's Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Designating Motor Vehicle Routes and Managing Motorized Recreation on the National Forests in California.

Avoid: No activities may take place within site boundaries, or within established buffer zones (appendix B I(A)). Buffer zones should be implemented where the undertaking will affect setting quality, and setting is an important attribute of the site (appendix B I(A)(2)).

Linear Protection: All crossings of the site by personnel and/or equipment should be at a point where the integrity of the site has already been compromised. This is likely to be true at any point where a road or trail crosses the linear feature. Crossings should be made at a right angle to the feature, and the number of crossings should be minimized by project activities. Traffic is to be directed into these designated crossing areas (appendix B I(A)(3)).

Padding: Non-archaeological material may be placed on the site surface to prevent a loss of site integrity. The material may not impact the archaeological deposits, may not intermix with the archaeological deposits, must be easily distinguishable from the archaeological material, and must be easily removed to allow future access to the archaeological deposits (appendix B II(A)(2).

Barriers: Barriers should be placed on the route such that motorized vehicles cannot depart from the route and impact the site. These barriers may include either fencing or nonintrusive materials, such as boulders (appendix B II(A)(3)).

Use controls: Usage of the area should be regulated by temporary closure, limited access, signage, or an adaptive management strategy (appendix B II(4)).

Vegetative Screening: Vegetative screening may be used as natural fencing to achieve management objectives while integrating with the natural environment (appendix B II(5)). This screening is primarily intended to reduce site visibility to motorized vehicle users, such that they are not likely to access the site area outside of the designated route.

In addition to the above measures; speed limits, vehicle class restrictions, and area closures have been approved by SHPO for protection of cultural resources located below the high water marks in reservoirs (appendix E of the Motorized recreation PA). While not defined in the PA, these measures will be implemented in Shasta Lake, Trinity Lake, and Iron Canyon Reservoir as follows:

Speed Limit Restriction: Speed limits provide a means to reduce activities that pose a risk to cultural resources (e.g. mud bogging) and can be used by law enforcement to reduce risk. See chapter 2 for more information. All alternatives proposing designation of reservoir open areas also propose a speed limit: 15 mph in alternative 2, and 10 mph in alternatives 4 and 5.

Vehicle Class Restrictions: The proposed open areas are not intended to be used by vehicles for hill climbing, jumping, fast turns, high speed, etc., but to provide access to recreation activities on the lake shore while conserving natural and cultural resources. Alternatives 2 and 4 include only highway-legal vehicles to minimize the likelihood of vehicles primarily designed for off-road uses being operated in a manner that is inconsistent with resource protection. Alternative 5 allows all vehicle classes.

Closure: Area closures are recommended if effectiveness monitoring of cultural resources indicate that the integrity of sites is diminishing due to motor vehicle use. Closures will be enforced while appropriate protection measures are developed in consultation with SHPO.

Table L-2. Heritage mitigations by route

Route ID	Was Field Visit Necessary?	Recommendations	
		Primary	Secondary
PM2004	No	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
UT29N30HA	Yes	None Required	n/a
PM2004	No	Linear Protection	Vegetative Screening
PM216	Yes	None Required	n/a
PM304	Yes	None Required	n/a
RM1036	No	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
RM1036	No	Linear Protection	n/a
SW256	Yes	None Required	n/a
SFMU13	Yes	None Required	n/a
SFMU4	Yes	None Required	n/a
SW256	Yes	None Required	n/a
SFMU13	Yes	None Required	n/a
SW256	Yes	None Required	n/a
SW234	Yes	None Required	n/a
SW256	Yes	None Required	Vegetative Screening
SFMU13	Yes	None Required	n/a
TRMU5	Yes	Barriers	Monitor within two years
TRMU6	Yes	Barriers	Monitor within two years
JM244	No	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
SE314	Yes	None Required	n/a
SE477	Yes	Drop Route	n/a

Route ID	Was Field Visit Necessary?	Recommendations	
		Primary	Secondary
SE476	Yes	Drop Route	n/a
UOHV01X	No	None; site is NRHP ineligible	n/a
U42N15K	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N15M	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N15MC	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N18A	No	None Required	n/a
U42N18AA	No	None Required	n/a
U42N18B	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N73A	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N73AA	No	Linear Protection	n/a
U42N84C	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE006	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE007	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE019	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE022	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE540	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE542	No	Linear Protection	n/a
WE039	Yes	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
U42N18B	No	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
U42N18A	Yes	None Required	n/a
U42N15J	Yes	None Required	n/a
U42N15K	No	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
WE540	Yes	Linear Protection	Vegetative Screening
WE542	Yes	Barriers	Vegetative Screening
U42N15MC	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA073	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA345	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA345	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA284	Yes	Linear Protection	n/a
EA073	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA345	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA345	Yes	Linear Protection	Monitor within two years
EA333	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA339	Yes	Linear Protection	n/a
U40N50A	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA339	Yes	Linear Protection	n/a
EA334	Yes	Linear Protection	Monitor within two years
EA474	Yes	None Required	n/a
EA475	Yes	Linear Protection	n/a
U40N13D	Yes	None Required	n/a
U40N13D	Yes	None Required	n/a
U42N15K	Yes	None Required	n/a
U42N73A	Yes	None Required	n/a

Forest Plan Prescription XI cultural resources in or near proposed routes are assigned resource protection measures as approved in the PA. Table L - 3 lists the routes which may affect these sites, and the assigned protection measures. For two routes with no effective protection measures in the PA, consultation with SHPO is required prior to designation, if the routes are selected.

Table L-3. Routes in or near LRMP heritage resources management prescription XI sites

Route Number	Protection Measure
SE314	None required, as route will not affect the site.
SE476	No effective protection measures available in the Motorized Recreation PA. Consultation with SHPO required.
SE477	No effective protection measures available in the Motorized Recreation PA. Consultation with SHPO required.
SFMU13	Place barriers to protect site integrity outside of existing route.
SW256	Place barriers to protect site integrity outside of existing route.
U42N18A	Use vegetative screening to protect site integrity outside of existing route.
U42N18B	Place barriers to protect site integrity.

Monitoring

Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement Monitoring Provisions

Section IV. Monitoring

A. Forests shall conduct monitoring as necessary to ensure that prescribed Standard Resource Protection Measures are effective.

1. Monitoring standards for undertakings where management measures are not required for the protection of historic properties:

   Most undertakings that do not require management measures for protection of historic properties will not be monitored. The following circumstances are exceptions where monitoring of such projects will be considered or undertaken.

   a) When undertakings change during implementation because of unforeseen circumstances, and these changes then require adoption of Standard Resource Protection Measures for previously identified historic properties, monitoring shall be required if HRMs determine that information is inadequate to determine whether these measures are appropriate. Monitoring might be appropriate if proposed activities are near some types of historic properties or traditional cultural properties of importance to Native Americans, or if the effectiveness of identified protection measures is problematic. Monitoring may be necessary during and/or after these undertakings.

   b) When historic properties are discovered during implementation of undertakings, monitoring shall occur as early as possible to determine whether the historic properties may be affected by proposed activities, and whether the use of Standard Resource Protection Measures is appropriate. Monitoring frequency will be determined by HRMs.

2. Monitoring standards for undertakings where management measures are required for the protection of historic properties:

   a) Forest HRMs, or qualified heritage professionals delegated by the HRMs, shall determine schedules and requirements for any monitoring. Permanent records shall be completed for all monitoring events, and shall be kept on file at applicable Forest Supervisor's Offices. Inspection by the SHPO may be performed during or after undertakings with advance notice and arrangement between the SHPO, the HRM, and the Forest Supervisor.

   b) When Standard Resource Protection Measures have not been implemented as prescribed, and activities have occurred that may have affected identified historic properties, then monitoring is required.

      i) If undertakings have not been completed when HRMs receive notification that prescribed protection measures have not been followed, then all activities in the immediate vicinity of the historic properties shall be suspended until heritage resource professionals examine the properties and HRMs recommend appropriate measures that will protect the historic properties. The need for additional consultation will also be determined by HRMs before resumption of any suspended activities. If the properties have not been affected, and Standard Resource Protection Measures can be effectively employed for the remaining implementation, then HRMs may decide that the undertakings may resume without further consultation. If historic properties may have been affected, consultation will be initiated in accordance with Stipulation VII. Forest Annual Reports shall describe all instances where Standard Resource Protection Measures were prescribed but were either not implemented or not fully implemented, and the measures taken to ensure subsequent protection of historic properties.

      ii) If undertakings have been completed when HRMs receive notification that prescribed protection measures have not been followed, then field inspections of respective historic properties will be initiated as soon as possible, and the provisions of Stipulations VII.A.2 and VII.A.3 shall be followed. The circumstances surrounding Forest failure to use prescribed protection measures and the actions taken by Forests in the aftermath of such failure will be described in Annual Reports.

      iii) If HRMs determine that use of Standard Resource Protection Measures may not provide adequate protection to historic properties because of the nature, scope, frequency, and/or duration of certain types of recurrent undertakings, monitoring in a manner prescribed by HRMs will be carried out to verify that protection measures are adequate.

B. Monitoring for Identification of Historic Properties

1. Where no known historic properties exist in APEs following inventory, but uncertainty remains about the possible presence of historic properties because of observation limitations, information from the literature review, sensitivity models, or other sources (e.g., oral history), monitoring may be employed during implementation of undertakings if recommended by HRMs. The purpose would be to ensure that unidentified historic properties, if present, are not irretrievably lost, damaged, or destroyed. If any properties are identified and found to be affected, the provisions of Stipulation VII shall be followed.

2. System routes should be periodically monitored to determine if ongoing motorized recreation uses, changes in use, or maintenance activities have the potential to affect historic properties. Priority for monitoring should be placed on system routes not subject to previous consultation under Section 106 of the NHPA. If the potential for effects is identified, HRMs may require inventory, pursuant to stipulation III.C, to identify historic properties that may be adversely affected.

C. Monitoring for Effects

Forest HRMs, or qualified professionals delegated by HRMs, may determine if monitoring is necessary to identify on-going adverse effects or resource protection measures that may minimize adverse effects.

1. Where monitoring indicates effects are ongoing, develop appropriate resource protection or treatment measures (e.g., barriers, fencing, trail reroutes, padding, signing, site mitigation, etc.) to minimize effects. Implement treatment measures.

Within two years, assess the need for either continued monitoring or change in resource protection measures to ensure adverse effects are minimized or eliminated.

From Appendix C of the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement

Monitoring of Historic Properties

Within one year of designating routes, national forests in Region 5 and the Humboldt-Toiyabe NF in Region 4 shall develop and implement monitoring plans that focus on identifying at-risk historic properties, or those historic properties that appear to be threatened or may be affected by motor vehicle system use. Where there is uncertainty regarding the risks or threats to historic properties associated with the use or maintenance of routes, or where it is unclear whether previous disturbances or effects might be ongoing, periodic monitoring should provide information needed to assess site condition and identify appropriate protection or management measures.

At a minimum, Monitoring Plans should include the following elements:

1. Develop monitoring plans based on levels of use, types of resources, potential risks, and anticipated effects.

2. Concentrate monitoring on those resources where effects are clearly identified (e.g., erosion, down cutting, rutting, off-trail tracks, etc.), and where historic properties may be at-risk. All at-risk historic properties in designated routes shall be monitored over a two-year period following designation. In the third year, Forests may reassess the need to continue monitoring at-risk historic properties, and adjust monitoring objectives and frequency accordingly.

3. Annually monitor at least 10% of the not at-risk historic properties within medium to heavy-use routes. At least 5% of the not at-risk historic properties within light to low use routes and specifically defined areas will be monitored annually. After three years, Forests may revise monitoring plans if results indicate that certain types of properties or routes no longer require prescribed monitoring. If so indicated, monitoring thereafter may be subsumed under the Motorized Recreation PA.

4. Where monitoring indicates effects are ongoing, develop appropriate resource protection or treatment measures (e.g., barriers, fencing, trail reroutes, padding, signing, site mitigation etc.) to minimize or eliminate effects. Monitor the effectiveness of any resource or treatment measures implemented for two years. After two years, assess the need for continued monitoring.

Table L-4. Heritage monitoring interval

Route Number	Required Monitoring
EA073	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
EA333	
EA334	
EA339	
EA345	
EA512	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
EA514	
EA514B	
EA515	
EA516	
EA523	
EA530	
EA531	
EA532	
EA532A	
EA532B	
EA535	
EA537	
IV001	
IV002	
IV003	
IV004	
IV005	
IV006	
IV006	
IV007	
IV007	
IV008	
IV009	
IV010	
IV011	
IV012	
IV013	
IV014	
IV015	
IV016	
IV017	
IV018	
IV020	
IV021	
JM244	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
JM44	
MC090	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
PC025	
PC026	
PM047	
PM048	
PM052	
PM2004	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
PM211	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
PM216	
PM304	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
RM090	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
RM1036	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light. monitor for effects annually for two years, then as directed by Heritage Resource Manager

Route Number	Required Monitoring
RM1101	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
RM1206	
RM1210	
RM1211	
RM1212	
RM1213	
RM1216	
RM145	
RM146	
RM1603	
RM720	
RM737	
RM789	
RM790	
RM791	
RM792	
RM793	
SE314	
SE476	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
SE477	
SE512	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
SFMU13	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
SFMU4	
SFMU9	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
SW234	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
SW256	
TC1427	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
TC1451	
TC1451A	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
TC1462A	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
TC1489	
TC1491	
TC507	
TC508	
TC828	
TC851	
TC855	
TC856	
TC857	
TC860	
TRMU5	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
TRMU6	
U27N02G	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
U29N28C	
U29N28D	
U29N31H	
U29N33B	
U29N73E	
U29N73G	
U30N36B	
U33N51F	
U35N05A	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
U40N13D	
U40N50A	
U414CA	

Route Number	Required Monitoring
U42N15D	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
U42N15DA	
U42N15H	
U42N15J	
U42N15K	
U42N15KA	
U42N15M	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
U42N15MC	
U42N15N	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
U42N15NA	
U42N15NB	
U42N18A	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light. monitor for effects annually for two years, then as directed by Heritage Resource Manager
U42N18AA	
U42N18B	
U42N26C	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
U42N26E	
U42N73A	
U42N73AA	
U42N73B	
U42N84C	Monitor for effects once within two years, then as determined by Heritage Resource Manager.
U42N84CA	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
UT29N30HA	
UT29N30HAB	
WE006	
WE007	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light. monitor for effects annually for two years, then as directed by Heritage Resource Manager
WE019	
WE022	
WE039	
WE040	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
WE043	
WE067	
WE072	
WE540	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light. monitor for effects annually for two years, then as directed by Heritage Resource Manager
WE542	Monitor route for use level. Conduct cultural survey, if use level greater than light.
WE545	

Monitoring of Historic Properties

Appendix E of the Motorized Recreation Programmatic Agreement discusses the monitoring requirements for cultural resources located below the high water mark in reservoirs. This document was developed and is approved by the State Historic Preservation Officer. The document is part of the project record, and is hereby incorporated by reference into this analysis. The following information is from appendix E of the programmatic agreement.

Monitoring cultural resources below the high water marks in reservoirs, as on land routes, should be focused on those historic properties greatest at risk. Monitoring of cultural resources will occur annually if the sites are exposed. Archaeological sites in reservoirs are also threatened by reservoir fluctuation effects, most prominently erosion. During reservoir construction, sites are usually stripped of vegetation. Annual and seasonal fluctuations can also severely erode sites, leaving surface areas exposed to

motorized use. These effects may require more frequent monitoring of motorized use than would otherwise be the case.

Motorized use in reservoirs is usually associated with recreational activities and access. The summer, when reservoirs are drawn down, is the time of most intensive use. As reservoirs recede, shoreline camping and recreation moves accordingly. Motorized use and associated recreation in cultural resources can be extremely degrading if the sites are not properly protected. Since most protection measures can only be implemented after water recedes, frequent and timely monitoring can focus efforts where sites are most at risk.

Results of monitoring often will need to be shared with law enforcement personnel. Some of the protection measures used in reservoirs such as area closures and speed limits will require Forest Orders enforced by law enforcement. In some cases, where violations of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) occur, law enforcement support is critical. Effective monitoring will identify situations where ARPA enforcement is needed.

In the following tables, Table L-5 lists effects to and management of cultural resources by route. Table L-6 lists effects and management for the lake-bottom sites grouped by effect.

Table L-5. Potential effects to, and management of, cultural resources by route

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
EA073	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA073	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA284	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
EA333	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA334	I, C	n/a	n/a	Linear Protection Monitor within two years	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA339	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA339	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA345	I, C	Route starts at site 488 boundary and site 537 alignment, but does not cross either, will not affect spur 220H, may affect spur 220P by slightly disturbing a portion of the spur	Negligible	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA345			Negligible	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA345			Negligible	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA345			Negligible	Linear Protection Monitor within two years	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
EA472	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
EA473	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
EA474	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
EA475	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
EA495	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA512	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA514	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA514B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA515	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA516	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA523	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA530	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA531	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA532	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA532A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA532B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
EA535	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA537	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
EA593	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU		yes	yes	
IV001	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
IV004	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
IV005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
IV006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
IV007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV008	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV009	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV010	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV011	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV013	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV014	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV015	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV016	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV017	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV018	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV020	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
IV021	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
JG30	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
JG31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
JM244	D, I, C	This road and many other trails cross the site, causing possible erosion, artifact collection or displacement and other disturbance	Moderate	Barriers	Vegetative Screening		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
JM25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
JM44	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	NRA	yes		yes	
JM72	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
MC090	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
MC091	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC092	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC097	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
MC098	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC102	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC104	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC105	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC106	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC110	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
MC115	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU			yes	
NRA1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
NRA2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
NRA3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
PC025	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
PC026	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
PM047	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
PM048	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
PM052	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
PM2004	D, I, C	Road passes directly into site	Moderate	Barriers	Vegetative Screening		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
PM2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
PM211	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
PM216	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
PM304	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
PM702	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
RM090	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes	yes	yes	yes
RM1036	D, I, C	Road passes directly through site	Moderate	Barriers	Vegetative Screening		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
RM1036	D, I, C		Moderate	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
RM1101	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
RM1206	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
RM1210	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
RM1211	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
RM1212	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU		yes	yes	
RM1213	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
RM1216	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
RM1226	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
RM145	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
RM146	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
RM1603	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
RM706	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
RM720	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
RM737	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
RM789	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU		yes	yes	
RM790	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU		yes	yes	
RM791	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU		yes	yes	
RM792	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU		yes	yes	
RM793	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
SE194	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
SE314	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
SE416	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
SE476	D, I, C	Segment runs right through site 201 and it is about 50 m across to 378; the Wheeler Ranch sites are large, complex, multi-component properties with considerable remaining data potential	Major	No effective protection measure in PA	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	
SE477	D, I, C		Major		n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	
SE508	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
SE512	D	Road and site intersect	Minor	Barriers	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
SFMU13	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
SFMU13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
SFMU13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
SFMU17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SFMU18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SFMU4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
SFMU5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SFMU6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
SFMU7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SFMU9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
SW234	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SW256	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SW256	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SW256	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
SW256	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TC1004	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
TC1098	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
TC1238	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
TC1249	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
TC1427	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1451	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1451 (2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1451A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1462A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1489	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC1491	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC1829	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TC319	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TC349	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TC507							light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	
TC508	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC828	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	
TC838	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TC851	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC855	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC856	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC857	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC860	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
TC899	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
TRMU2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	
TRMU3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	
TRMU5	D, I, C	Portion of road lies directly on site	Moderate	Barriers Monitor within two years	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	TRMU	yes		yes	
TRMU6	D, I, C	Portion of road lies directly on site; possible erosion, down-cutting, rutting, displacement, disturbance	Moderate	Barriers Monitor within two years	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	TRMU	yes		yes	
U1B005A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U1S39B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U27N02G	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	
U29N28C	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	
U29N28D	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U29N31H	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
U29N33B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
U29N73E	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
U29N73G	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
U30N27S	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U30N29E	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U30N36B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU			yes	yes
U31N02Q	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
U33N51F	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	TRMU		yes	yes	
U34N26DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
U34N26DAA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
U35N05A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU	yes		yes	
U35N85A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	
U36N35AA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
U36N35AB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
U40N13D	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U40N13D	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U40N35A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U40N50A	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U40N84AA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U40N84B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU		yes	yes	
U40N88XCB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U40N88XE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	
U40N91YA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U414A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U414C	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U414CA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U414D	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U414F	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U414FA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	TRMU	yes		yes	yes
U41N18A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U41N18AA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		> light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U41N18AAD	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	
U41N55D	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	
U41N55E	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
U42N15D	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15DA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15H	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15J	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU			yes	
U42N15K	D, I, C	Runs right through the middle of the site; no effect to spur	Moderate	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15K	D, I, C		Moderate	Barriers	Vegetative Screening									
U42N15K	light	yes	deferred	smmu										
U42N15K	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15KA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15M	D, I, C	Runs along a portion of site	Minor	Linear Protection	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU			yes	
U42N15MC	D, I, C	Runs right through site	Moderate	Linear Protection	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU			yes	
U42N15MC	None	n/a	n/a	None Required	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU			yes	
U42N15N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15NA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N15NB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N18A	D, I, C	Could cause increased erosion	Minor	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU	yes		yes	
U42N18A	D, I, C		Minor	None required	n/a	Yes	light	yes	deferred	SMMU	yes		yes	
U42N18AA	D	Crosses RR grades, possible erosion	Negligible	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
U42N18B	D, I, C	Road passes through site, possible erosion, displacement, and other disturbance	Moderate	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N18B	D, I, C		Moderate	Barriers	Vegetative Screening	Yes	light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N26C	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
U42N26E	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU		yes	yes	
U42N73A	I (possible)	May be impacted by camping	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N73A	None	n/a	n/a	None required	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N73AA	D	Site 252 is only crossed	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N73B	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U42N84C	D	Crosses RR grades	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		> light	yes	priority completed	SMMU			yes	

Route ID	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Prescription XI	Use Level	Survey Required?	Survey Type Required	Unit	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5	Mod Alt. 2
U42N84CA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
U4N12D	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	
U4N12L	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
U4N12LA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SFMU	yes		yes	yes
UOHV01X	I (possible)	Route starts right at site boundary	Negligible	None; site is NRHP ineligible	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
UOHV02J	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
UOHV18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	NRA	yes		yes	yes
UOHV50A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
UOHV50C	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	no	n/a	SMMU	yes		yes	yes
UT29N30HA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	
UT29N30HAB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SFMU	yes		yes	
WE006	D	Abuts the RR grade	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE007	D	Abuts the RR grade	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE019	D	Negligible	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE022	D	Crosses RR grades	Negligible	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE039	D	Crosses site boundaries	Minor	Barriers	Vegetative Screening		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE040	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE043	D	Crosses RR grade site 252	Negligible	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE067	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE072	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE540	D, I, C	Erosion, displacement, and other disturbance likely	Major	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE540	D, I, C		Major	Linear Protection	Vegetative Screening		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE542	D (possible)	Some erosion	Minor	Linear Protection	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE542	D (possible)	Some erosion	Minor	Barriers	Vegetative Screening		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	
WE545	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		light	yes	deferred	SMMU			yes	

Table L-6. Potential effects to, and management of, lake-bottom sites grouped by effect

Lake/	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Alt 2		Alt 4		Alt 5			Mod Alt 2	
				Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 3	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2
Iron Canyon Reservoir												
9 Sites	D, I, C	Vehicle use directly on site	Major	n/a	n/a	Barriers 10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	n/a	n/a
Shasta Lake												
62 Sites	D, I, C	Vehicle use directly on site	Major	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures
1 Site*	D, I, C	Vehicle use directly on site	Major	Barriers 15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures
2 Sites	D, I, C	Vehicle use directly on site	Major	Barriers 15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	Barriers 15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures
33 Sites	None	N/A	N/A	None required: No motorized vehicle use observed								
63 Sites	None	N/A	N/A	None required: No access by motorized vehicle								
8 Sites	None	N/A	N/A	None required: Ineligible to the NRHP								
31 Sites	None	N/A	N/A	None required: Below BOR fluctuation zone								

Lake/	Type of Effect	Nature of Effect	Severity of Effect	Alt 2		Alt 4		Alt 5			Mod Alt 2	
				Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2	Protection Measure 3	Protection Measure 1	Protection Measure 2
Trinity Lake												
1 Site	D, I, C	Moderate	N/A	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures
96 Sites	None	N/A	N/A	None required: Site not observed-below water								
7 Sites	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures
Trinity/Squirrel Flats												
9 Sites	D, I, C	Impacts from vehicle use are known; site at risk.	Major	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	10 mph speed limit	Restrict to highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures	15 mph speed limit Highway legal vehicles only	From PA if appropriate, or area closures

*Prescription XI site

Appendix M: Comparison of Alternative 2 and Modified Alternative 2

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Aquatic Resources				
	Miles of unauthorized routes open for motor vehicle use within or adjacent to aquatics resources – Forest-wide.	4.41	4.3	-0.1 negligible change
	Number of routes open for motor vehicle use with documented disturbances from motor vehicles that resulted in damage to aquatic resources – Forest-wide	0	0	no change
	Density of routes open for motor vehicle use potentially affecting aquatic TES - 7th field watershed	1.3	1.3	no change
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use within riparian habitat including meadows, and stream banks - Forest-wide	13.1	12.99	-0.11
	Routes open for motor vehicle use within habitats of known or historically occupied TES aquatic biota (SONCC)	15	9	-6 routes
Herpetological Resources				
Cascade frog	Miles of all NFTS routes in occupied or suitable habitat	498.8	497.5	-1.3 mile
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		4,141.3	4,140.9	-0.4 miles
Western pond turtle		2,740.0	2,733.4	-6.6 miles
Shasta salamander		274.0	273.9	-0.1 miles
Southern torrent salamander		564.3	563.7	-0.6 mile
Cascade frog	Miles of routes added to the NFTS within occupied or suitable habitat.	2.0	0.66	-1.34 mile
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		24.0	23.7	-0.3 mile
Western pond turtle		17.0	10.4	-6.6 miles
Shasta salamander		1.1	1.0	-0.1mile
Southern torrent salamander		0.8	0.3	-0.5 mile

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Cascade frog	Number of acres impacted from routes added to the NFTS within occupied or suitable habitat	3.8	1.0	-2.8 ac
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		45.8	45.0	-0.8 ac
Western Pond turtle		32.5	20.0	-12.5 ac
Shasta salamander		2.1	2.0	-0.1 ac
Southern torrent salamander		1.6	1.0	-0.6 ac
Cascade frog	Added acres open to motor vehicle use below the high water mark within occupied or suitable habitat	0	0	0
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		188.0	188.0	0
Western pond turtle		0	0	0
Shasta salamander		0	0	0
Southern torrent salamander		0	0	0
Cascade frog	Number of stream crossings (perennial and intermittent) on routes added to the NFTS within occupied or suitable habitat	2	1	-1
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		26	22	-4
Western pond turtle		8	8	0
Shasta salamander		1	0	-1
Southern torrent salamander		21	1	-20
Cascade frog	Percent of occupied or suitable habitat impacted by added routes	0.4	0.1	-0.3
Foothill Yellow-legged frog		0.5	0.5	0
Western pond turtle		0.6	0.3	-0.3
Shasta salamander		0.4	0.3	-0.1
Southern torrent salamander		0.1	0.05	-0.05

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Wildlife				
	Acres Open to Motor Vehicle Use and miles of Unauthorized Routes Within Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat	See Chapter 3.05 -Wildlife		
	Density of Roads, Motorized Trails and Open Routes for Habitat Effectiveness Density of added motor vehicle routes.			
	Miles of Motorized Routes to Measure Potential Disturbance			
	Number of Sensitive Sites Within ½ mile of Added Routes for Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species			
	Zone of Influence [Amount of a Species (or Species Group's) Key Habitat that is influenced by Motorized Routes]			
Inventoried Roadless Areas				
	Miles of routes added for public motorized use within IRAs and CIRAs	IRAs: 0.23 CIRAs: 2.38	0	IRAs: -0.23 CIRAs: -2.38
	Average change in density of routes available for motorized use within IRAs and CIRAs (miles per square mile)	IRAs: + 0.015 CIRAs: +0.09	IRAs: 0.0 CIRAs: +0.07	IRAs and CIRAs: Decreased density
	Number of perennial stream crossings in IRAs and CIRAs	0	0	no change
	Miles of routes added within ½ mile of IRAs and CIRAs	IRAs: 4.17 CIRAs: 7.26	IRAs: 0.92 CIRAs: 4.14	IRAs: -3.25 CIRAs: -3.12
Geology				
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use within either active mass wasting zones, debris slides, avalanches, torrents or inner gorges	0.0	0.0	No change
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use within 100 feet of caves or lava tubes	0.0	0.0	No change
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use within geological special interest areas	0.0	0.0	No change
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use traversing areas underlain by serpentinite rock formations	0.0	2.10	+2.10
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use within the McCloud and Hosselkus limestone formations	0.0	0.0	No change

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Air Quality				
	Miles of roads and motorized trails crossing areas underlain by serpentinite bedrock and soils.	0.0	2.10	+2.10
	Acres of open areas underlain by serpentinite bedrock and derived soils.	0	0	No change
	Miles of roads and motorized trails crossing serpentinite available to non-highway-legal vehicles	0	2.10	+2.10
	Miles of roads and motorized trails available for public motorized use within one mile of Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Class I Airsheds.	0.3	0.0	-0.3
Recreation Resources				
	Semi-primitive non-motorized area ½ miles from motorized routes	Meets Semi Primitive – Motorized ROS expectation	Meets Semi Primitive – Motorized ROS expectation	None
	Roaded natural areas less than ½ miles from motorized routes	Meets Roaded Natural ROS expectation	Meets Roaded Natural ROS expectation	None
	Impacts of motorized recreation on nonmotorized recreation: areas within ½ miles of motorized routes	52,655 acres of area within ½ miles of proposed additions	43,141 acres of area within ½ miles of proposed additions	- 9,514 acres of area where motorized noise can be anticipated
	Road miles available by class	Hwy Legal High Clearance 4wd (36.51) Dual Sport Hwy Legal Motorcycle (36.51) Non-Hwy Legal 4wd (36.51) Non-Hwy Legal ATV (36.51) Non-Hwy Legal Motorcycle (36.51)	Hwy Legal High Clearance 4wd (21.32) Dual Sport Hwy Legal Motorcycle (21.32) Non-Hwy Legal 4wd (21.32) Non-Hwy Legal ATV (21.32) Non-Hwy Legal Motorcycle (21.32)	- 15.19 miles of road.

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
	Trail miles available by vehicle class	Hwy Legal High Clearance 4wd (0) Dual Sport Hwy Legal Motorcycle (7.69) Non-Hwy Legal 4wd (0) Non-Hwy Legal ATV (6.25) Non-Hwy Legal Motorcycle (7.69) (7.69 miles of motorized trail proposed)	Hwy Legal High Clearance 4wd (5.12) Dual Sport Hwy Legal Motorcycle (14.34) Non-Hwy Legal 4wd (5.12) Non-Hwy Legal ATV (13.09) Non-Hwy Legal Motorcycle (14.34) (14.34 miles of motorized trail proposed)	+ 6.65 miles of motorized trails
	Open areas	44,047	44,047	0
	Quality of trail experience	Marginal quality as measured by trail miles added	Improved quality due to increase in trail miles added	+6.65 miles of motorized trails
Visual Resources				
	The extent to which the proposed NFTS falls within the retention and partial retention VQOs (number routes traversing landscapes that are to remain natural to near-natural appearing in character).	Retention – 15 route additions Partial Retention – 0 route additions	Retention – 6 route additions Partial Retention - 8 route additions.	Less route additions within ½ mile of sensitive travel corridors with Partial Retention VQO.
	Number of key viewsheds (sensitive travel corridors) that are or have the potential to be affected by motor vehicle travel	26 analyzed, none affected	26 analyzed, none affected	None

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Cultural Resources				
	Degree to which the integrity of historic property values are diminished	Potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to 15 sites/RR grades may diminish their integrity	Potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to 8 sites/RR grades may diminish their integrity	There are 7 fewer sites/RR grades
	Number of historic properties within the APE (30 meters on either side of route) of unauthorized routes or below the high-water marks of the reservoirs at risk from ongoing use.	There are 15 historic properties (13 sites and 2 RR grades) known along the alternative 2 routes.	8 (6 sites and same 2 RR grades)	7 sites less along the modified routes
	Average number of historic properties per acre at risk if new routes or areas are created.	There is one site/RR grade per 25.5 acres of surveyed routes.	There is one site/RR grade per 28.4 acres of surveyed routes.	Approx. 11% lower known site/RR grade density along the modified routes.
Botanical Resources				
	Number of threatened, endangered and sensitive plant, lichen, bryophyte or fungi species sites within 100 feet of unauthorized routes (direct effects within 30 feet, indirect effects up to 100 feet)	10	13	+3
	Acres of threatened, endangered and sensitive plant, lichen, bryophyte or fungi species within 100 feet of unauthorized routes (direct effects within 30 feet, indirect effects up to 100 feet)	18.83	26.76	+7.93
	Miles of routes open for motor vehicle use with threatened, endangered and sensitive plant, lichen, bryophyte or fungi species present within 100 feet of the route	2.29	5.33	+3.04
	Number of routes open for motor vehicle use with threatened, endangered and sensitive plant, lichen, bryophyte or fungi species present within 100 feet of the route	2	5	+3

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Non-native Invasive Species				
	Miles of routes added for public motor vehicle use within or adjacent to noxious weed sites	6.0	2.4	-3.6
	Number of routes added for public motor vehicle use within or adjacent to noxious weed sites	9	6	-3
	Acres of noxious weed sites within 100 feet of a proposed route	51.01	32.34	-18.69
	Total number of noxious weed occurrences within 100 feet of a proposed route	10	7	-3
Transportation				
Public Safety: Motorized Mixed Use	Miles of roads added to the NFTS	36.51	21.32	-15.19
	Miles of motorized use trails added to the NFTS	7.69	14.34	+6.65
	Miles of Motorized mixed-use (MMU) on high clearance roads (ML 2) on the NFTS	4,253.0	4,237.81	-15.19
	Miles of Motorized mixed-use (MMU) on passenger car roads (ML 3) on the NFTS	0	21.31	+21.31
	Miles of Motorized mixed-use (MMU) consistent with the CVC on the NFTS	4,253.0	4,237.81	-15.19
	Miles of Motorized mixed-use (MMU) not consistent with the CVC on the NFTS	0	0	0
Affordability	Annual Maintenance Costs	$17,737,411	$ 17,738,944	-$1,533
	Implementation Costs for NFTS Additions	$278,094	$278,961	+$867

Resource	Measurement Indicator	Proposed Action	Modified Alt 2	Change from Proposed Action
Watersheds				
	Miles of routes in Riparian Reserves (Hydrologically sensitive areas)	2.80	2.85	+0.05
	Miles of routes in riparian reserves on High or Very High Erosion Soils	0.80	0.45	-0.35
	Number of Stream Crossings high erosion potential High and very high MEHR	2	2	No change
	Routes with high runoff potential Hydrologic Function Class	5.8	9.7	+3.9
	Recovery potential of unauthorized Routes MEHR	8%	8%	No change
	Density of route miles in HUC 7 watersheds	182 7th code HUCs would have at least a 10 percent long-term decrease in road density	182 HUCs would have at least a 10 percent long-term decrease in road density	No change
	Miles of routes proposed in key watersheds with TMDL	6.45	13.8	+7.35
Socio-economics				
	In general, the differences between the Proposed Action and Modified Alternative 2 do not represent a major deviation from the original Proposed Action in terms of socioeconomic effects. Although there are some clear differences between the two alternatives that could result in a change in the effects for certain users, the changes would occur at a small scale. Effects at this scale may not be estimated at the county or forest-wide level. On average the effects from Modified Alternative 2 would remain within the bounds of those described under the original Proposed Action with no clearly measurable differences.			