

Development Process Alternative D Modified

Introduction

Alternative D, as discussed in the 2002 FEIS, was developed in response to public comments requesting additional grizzly bear habitat security beyond what was provided by the *Interim Access Management Rule Set* (IGBC 1998a) (see 2004 project record: V20 D10 P10). In Alternative D in the 2002 FEIS, standards for Open Motorized Route Density (OMRD) (less than or equal to 17 percent), Total Motorized Route Density (TMRD) (less than or equal to 14 percent), and Core Area (CORE) (greater than or equal to 72 percent) were established based on the highest security levels documented in *Grizzly Bear and Road Density Relationships in the Selkirk Recovery Zone and Cabinet-Yakk Recovery Zone* (Wakkinen and Kasworm 1997) (see 2004 project record: V26 D9 P29). The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) began a detailed study of Alternative D in the 2002 FEIS; however, the standards could not be met in all BMUs (15 BMUs were unable to meet all three standards) since an insufficient number of roads existed under USFS jurisdiction (in some BMUs) to adequately reduce access to meet these standards. As a result, Alternative D in the 2002 FEIS was determined to be infeasible and was excluded from further detailed study (see 2002 FEIS, page 2-18).

Alternative D Modified Description Summary

Alternative D Modified is designed to provide OMRD, TMRD, and CORE standards by individual BMU that achieve the highest security parameters for bears (where possible), as identified in Wakkinen and Kasworm (1997). The conditions for OMRD (less than or equal to 17 percent), TMRD (less than or equal to 14 percent), and CORE (greater than or equal to 72 percent) were set for each BMU when possible to achieve within USFS jurisdiction (see attachment A footnote). In BMUs within USFS jurisdiction where it was not possible to achieve recommended levels (e.g. high county road miles outside USFS jurisdiction), habitat parameters were set at the highest level achievable, based on individual BMU moving windows (OMRD and TMRD) and buffering analyses (CORE).

Development Process

In 2008, the Responsible Officials directed the IDT to conduct additional environmental analysis that included the development of an alternative (in addition to the alternatives in the 2002 FEIS) that best met Wakkinen and Kasworm's highest levels of secure habitat (OMRD of less than or equal to 17 percent, TMRD of less than or equal to 14 percent, and CORE of greater than or equal to 72 percent in each BMU).

Alternative D was revisited and the Forests evaluated the habitat parameters (OMRD of less than or equal to 17 percent, TMRD of less than or equal to 14 percent, and CORE of greater than or equal to 72 percent in each BMU) in order to obtain the Wakkinen and Kasworm "highest secure habitat level for bears within USFS jurisdiction." The OMRD, TMRD, and Core Area were then determined by completing the following:

- The status (open, gated, closed) of every road and motorized trail within USFS jurisdiction (see Attachment A) was adjusted to maximize improvement of the grizzly bear habitat parameter values (OMRD, TMRD and CORE).

- A moving windows model analysis (see project record for analysis description) was then completed for every BMU to determine the highest value possible (within USFS jurisdiction) for OMRD and TMRD.
- A buffer model (0.31 miles) was then run for every BMU to determine the highest value possible (within USFS jurisdiction) for CORE.
- In BMUs where the standards (17, 14, and 72 in each BMU) could not be achieved, habitat parameters were set at the highest level achievable within USFS jurisdiction.
- The standards (17, 14, and 72 in each BMU) were utilized in those BMUs where the parameters could be met.

Prepared by: Wayne J. Johnson

ATTACHMENT A (prepared by Wayne J. Johnson):

Grizzly Bear Access Amendment Draft SEIS: Alt. D Modified Development and USFS Jurisdiction¹

Maximum Protection possible for Bears:

Alt. D Modified is designed to provide OMRD, TMRD, and Core Area standards, by individual BMU, that achieve the highest security requirements for bears as documented in Wakkinen and Kasworm (1997) (Core $\geq 72\%$; OMRD $\leq 17\%$; TMRD $\leq 14\%$) when possible within Forest Service jurisdiction. BMUs that can not achieve that level will have the habitat parameters set at the best level possible, within FS jurisdiction, with rationale documented on individual roads that can not be closed in the individual BMU Excel spreadsheets (see project record). Rationale is provided in the definition below.

All roads and motorized trails that are fully within Forest Service jurisdiction will be evaluated for potential to improve grizzly habitat conditions. Since the evaluation process is to determine IF a BMU can reach the Wakkinen and Kasworm high values, all roads that can be closed will be evaluated as if they are barriered to create Core Area. This approach is the most efficient way to examine all three parameters.

Roads that meet the definition below will **not** be considered for gating or barrier placement.

Definition:

Roads not available to close for grizzly bear habitat improvements (these roads will be considered open or gated based on existing status) are:

Roads that are NOT fully within Forest Service control. This includes:

- State Highways
- County roads on private land
- County roads with easements across National Forest Land
- Roads with an easement providing access or right of use (private landowner, Timber Company, utility, state, county, etc.)
- Roads with a special use permit providing for right to use the road (access to private land or other purpose).
- Roads that provide access to private lands, even though special use permit or easement is not in place.
- Roads under a cost share agreement (e.g. Plum Creek, State of Montana) have legal ability to close road but legal advice is to show roads as: if they are gated now...leave as gated. If open, leave as open.
- Roads listed under Revised Statute 2477 (road created with public funds prior to the creation of the National Forest). County would need to make an assertion that the road belongs to them. This statute is in compliance with the 1866 mining act to provide access across federal land to mining claims. (Unpatented claims we do not have to provide open road access.)

The following roads would be evaluated on a case by case basis. Some may only be gated but not barriered while others might be closed in manner that could create Core Area.

- Roads under permit to other Federal Agencies (e.g. BPA roads to access a powerline)

¹ **JURISDICTION:** Jurisdiction is the legal right to control and regulate the use of a transportation facility (23CFR 660.103 and FSM 7705). FSH 7709.59 CH. 20 Traffic Management (02/05/09): Roads on National Forest lands are under the control of the Forest Service, except for public roads established under the Act of July 26, 1866, private roads, roads for which the Forest service or the U. S. Department of Transportation has granted rights-of-way to private land owners or public road agencies, and roads whose use and rights pre-date the National Forest.