
SUMMARY

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

MOTORIZED VEHICLE USE

ON THE ROGUE RIVER-SISKIYOU NATIONAL FOREST

*Douglas, Klamath, Jackson, Curry, Coos, and Josephine Counties in Oregon
Del Norte and Siskiyou Counties in California*

September 2011

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Motorized Vehicle Use on the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest (RRSNF) was dated December, 2009. The Record of Decision (ROD) for that FEIS was signed on December 3, 2009. Shortly thereafter, issues were raised through the appeal process that ultimately resulted in the withdrawal of the December decision and the beginning of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) that will address issues raised during the appeal process that require additional analysis or clarification. All major modifications and additions for each section will be framed within a box. Other minor corrections, explanations and edits have also been made; these minor edits are not identified by inclusion in a box. The major changes are focused on the following areas related to motorized vehicle use:

- clarified Purpose and Need statement;
- clarified dispersed camping;
- incorporated general cross-country travel closure into alternative 2;
- updated mitigation measures;
- revised analysis for issues related to
 - Water Quality
 - Soils
 - Potential Wilderness and other undeveloped areas
 - Natural Occurring Asbestos
 - Aquatics
 - Botany
 - Wildlife
 - Air Quality
 - Environmental Justice and Civil Rights disclosure
 - invasive pathogen (*Phytophthora lateralis*);
- added Wild and Scenic Rivers analysis; and
- map corrections.

The purpose of the DSEIS is to clarify issues, expand on analyses, provide additions, changes and corrections that are responsive to issues brought forth from an appeal of the FEIS; in addition, issues were identified internally as requiring modification. This *Summary* is intended as a brief overview of the site-specific analysis documented in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). The purpose of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to analyze and disclose the environmental effects associated with a Proposed Action and alternatives that would implement the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart B), to provide a designated and managed system of travel routes for wheeled motorized use, enact changes to reduce existing resource damage from wheeled motorized use, and reduce social impacts, user conflicts and safety concerns. This Summary does not present the depth of analysis contained within the complete text of the DSEIS; please consult the complete text for further detailed information¹.

¹ The format for this Summary is adapted from "Eight NEPA Questions" (8 questions any EA or EIS should readily answer), developed by Owen L. Schmidt, Attorney formerly with USDA, OGC Portland OR.

INTRODUCTION

Recreation is an important value and use of the Forest. Motorized and non-motorized recreation visitors share an interest in enjoying outdoor recreation in a natural environment. On November 9, 2005, the *Final Rule for Travel Management: Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use* (hereafter referred to as Travel Management Rule) was published in the Federal Register, affecting 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 212, 251, 261, and 295. The Rule revises several regulations to require designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use on National Forests and National Grasslands, and became effective in December 2005.

Highlights of the Travel Management Rule include the following: each National Forest or Ranger District will designate those roads, trails, and areas open to motorized vehicles; designation will include class of vehicle and, if appropriate, season of use for motor vehicle; once the designation process is complete, the rule will prohibit motor vehicle use off the designated system or use that is inconsistent with the designations; and decisions are to be made locally, with public input and in coordination with state, local, and tribal governments. The Travel Management Rule does not require reconsideration of all previous travel management decisions. Reconsideration of previous decisions would unnecessarily waste public resources, disregard public participation in the development of planning decisions and expand the scope of the Travel Rule beyond its intended purpose. The Travel Management Rule requires designation to be consistent with the applicable land management plans developed pursuant to the National Forest Management Act. Therefore, if a proposed designation is not consistent with the land management plan, the responsible official must either change the proposed designation or propose an amendment to the land management plan(s). Some land management plan amendments are proposed and considered in this analysis. The Travel Management Rule provides better opportunities for sustainable motorized recreation and access to the National Forest System (NFS); better protection of natural and cultural resources; increases public safety, and reduces use conflicts.

The Proposed Action is being carried forward in accordance with the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart B). In accordance with the rule and following a decision on this proposal, the Forest would publish a Motorized Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) identifying all Forest roads, trails and areas that are designated open for motor vehicle use by the public across the approximately 1.8 million acres of National Forest System lands in southern Oregon.

The MVUM shall specify the classes of vehicles and, if appropriate, the times of year for which use is authorized. It would also identify areas where parking for dispersed camping and day use would be allowed. The MVUM would be updated and published annually and/or when changes to the Forest's transportation system are made. Future decisions associated with changes to the MVUM may trigger the need for documentation of additional environmental analysis.

The need to move quickly to complete the designation process was recognized early and broad spectrums of interest groups support this goal. In order to expedite and avoid process gridlock, route and area identification was guided by the following considerations: For the RRSNF, this project's analysis has focused on the change from the current situation. A tightly focused process was developed, which includes a site-specific proposal that does not aim to solve all travel management issues at once. For example, this process does not analyze all existing system roads to make recommendations on road decommissioning. Travel analysis to identify the minimum road system is a separate process from this travel analysis for purposes of designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use (FSM 7712). Neither the regulations under 36 CFR 212.5 or agency directives contain a time frame for determining the minimum road system. The agency however, views this as important work that needs to be addressed within the next decade.

For the RRSNF, this project and its environmental analysis is documented in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The context and scale for conducting this NEPA analysis includes one Proposed Action at the scale of the entire Forest, including Forest-wide and site-specific Forest Plan Amendments. The Forest Supervisor is the Line Officer/Responsible Official for the forthcoming decision(s).

WHY IS THE ACTION BEING PROPOSED?

Former Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth prioritized actions to keep America's forests and grasslands healthy by restoring and rehabilitating damaged areas. One of four main ways is to manage impacts of motorized recreation vehicles by restricting use to designated roads, trails, or areas.

The *purpose* for action is to implement Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule. Motorized use is popular and an important form of recreation for many individuals, families, and groups. A designated and managed system is required by the Travel Management Rule to provide this use. Increased demand for motorized use, lack of designated areas/routes, has led to resource damage and social impacts, user conflicts, and safety concerns. In order to meet these objectives the following changes are needed:

- eliminate general cross-country travel by prohibiting all motorized access off existing, previously designated routes, and outside existing, previously designated areas where such use is not currently prohibited or otherwise restricted by past actions;
- improve public safety, by implementing Forest Service Regional policy to determine the suitability of continuing to allow for motorized "mixed" use (i.e. analyze those roads which currently allow for motorized "mixed" use under State Law)²;
- amend the Rogue River and Siskiyou National Forest Plans to restrict motorized access to designated routes consistent with the Travel Management Rule and to provide consistent direction for conflicting plan allocations that will allow historical use of travel routes where appropriate;
- make minor, limited changes to the National Forest Transportation System to preserve a diversity of unique motorized recreation opportunities (4X4 vehicles, motorcycles, ATVs, passenger vehicles, etc.) because implementation of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule will reduce motorized recreation opportunities relative to current levels; and
- establish conditions or provisions to allow motorized access for dispersed camping that are consistent with Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule.

WHAT WOULD IT MEAN TO NOT MEET THE NEED?

To not meet the need is defined by the No Action Alternative. As required by NEPA, a No Action Alternative is included and analyzed in this DSEIS as a baseline against which the Action Alternatives can be compared. Under this alternative the agency would take no affirmative action (no change from current management or direction). This means continued cross-country travel, continued use of unauthorized routes, and no change to the current NFS roads, trails and areas.

The No Action Alternative is not a proposal to add all of the unauthorized routes to the NFS. It is a proposal to 'do nothing' and maintain the 'status quo'. The 'status quo' would be the combination of all previous decisions by the Forest (allowing cross country travel, the creation of temporary roads associated with permits or other authorizations and any previous decisions associated with the NFS roads, trails and areas).

It is important to approach the No Action Alternative in this manner because it establishes an important benchmark for the assessment of impacts resulting from the existing condition, and largely forms the justification for the need for action since unacceptable environmental impacts are likely to continue or get worse. The No Action Alternative provides a benchmark for contrasting resource impacts and use conflicts with the Action Alternatives.

² Mixed use allows for both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles.

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing condition, as updated through December 2010, would continue. These existing routes on the Forest would primarily be used for public wheeled motor vehicle use. Cross-country travel and route proliferation would still occur in isolated areas on the Forest since it is not currently prohibited. Areas for dispersed activities would continue to be used by public wheeled motor vehicles primarily for the purpose of dispersed camping and parking. No changes would be made to the current National Forest transportation system and no cross-country travel prohibition would be put into place. The following table provides a Forest-wide summary of current conditions for roads, trails and areas:

ADDED:

Due to database errors, GIS coverage errors, and the Applegate McKee Legacy Roads Decision Notice implementation, road and trail mileages in the table below have been updated throughout this document to reflect the following:

- Total miles of NFS roads; change from 5,311 miles to 5,286 miles.
- Total miles of roads open to the public; change from 4,537 miles to 4,512 miles.
- Open roads that allow mixed use; change from 3,208 miles to 3,183 miles.
- NFS Trails that allow motorized use; change from 255 miles to 246 miles.

Table S-1. Alternative 1 (No Action - Current Condition) Summary

Roads and Trails	Current Condition
Total NFS Roads	5,286 miles
NFS Roads "open" to the public	4,512 miles
Open roads that allow mixed use	3,183 miles
Open roads that prohibit mixed use	1,329 miles
Total NFS Trails	1,199 miles
NFS Trails that allow motorized use	246 miles
Total area open to cross country travel	274,670 acres ³

Under this alternative, the Travel Management Rule would not be implemented, and no MVUM would be produced. The No Action Alternative is not designed to meet the Purpose and Need for action. It would not enact site- specific Plan Amendments for the Boundary Trail and therefore does not provide consistent direction via the Forest Plans. Wheeled motor vehicle travel by the public would not be limited to designated routes. Unauthorized routes would continue to have no status or authorization as NFS roads or trails. Existing closures and orders would continue.

The complete DSEIS document includes a map packet containing four large maps. These maps display current conditions and proposed changes by alternative for roads and trails that **allow** motorized vehicle use on the five Ranger Districts on the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest (Powers, Gold Beach, Wild Rivers, Siskiyou Mountains, and High Cascades).

ADDED:

An errata sheet will accompany these maps that will identify mapping corrections and updates between publishing the FEIS and this DSEIS.

³ Areas open for cross-country travel were identified through GIS mapping of the Siskiyou and Rogue River Land and Resource Management Plan allocations, congressionally designated areas, and Forest closure orders.

WHAT ACTION IS PROPOSED?

The Forest Service has a Proposed Action when the agency agrees to move forward with the proposal to authorize, recommend, or implement an action (CFR 1508.23). The following is a summary of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action (Alternative 3) is discussed in detail in DSEIS Chapter II. The Proposed Action would function to implement the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart B), and provide a designated and managed system.

It would also provide changes to reduce existing resource damage from motorized use, and reduce social impacts, user conflicts and safety concerns. Other functions of the Proposed Action are to establish a framework that the Forest used to initiate the NEPA process, facilitate meaningful public comment, and serve as a basis for identification of the issues.

The Proposed Action (**Alternative 3**) is based on the Forest's Travel Analysis process and focuses on the change from the current condition. It aims to strike a balance for various forms of motorized use by identification of sustainable motorized use opportunities that reduces resource impacts, and implement the Travel Management Rule. Based on the stated Purpose and Need for action and as a result of the recent Travel Analysis process, under the Proposed Action (Alternative 3), the Forest proposes to:

- Enact Forest Plan Amendments to make the plans consistent with the Travel Management Rule. Two separate Forest Plans guide the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.
- Enact site-specific level Forest Plan Amendments to make the plans consistent with current and historical motorized use on the portions of the Boundary Trail and portions of the Game Lake, Lawson Creek, Lower Illinois, and Silver Peak Hobson Horn Trails.
- Formally designate approximately 4,505 miles of roads where passenger vehicles would be allowed to travel.
- Formally designate approximately 3,197 miles of road where mixed use would be allowed. Mixed use is defined as designation of a National Forest System (NFS) road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles.
- Authorize designation of two motorized trail segments to provide loop route opportunities (approximately 2 miles).
- Authorize conversion of approximately 12 miles of NFS level 1 roads to motorized trails to maintain a portion of the currently used travel routes for motorized opportunities.
- Designate two areas where off-road motorized use is allowed. This includes continued use of the Woodruff area near Prospect and the development of an additional area near Willow Lake. Both areas are located on the High Cascades Ranger District and total approximately 25 acres where motorized cross-country travel would be allowed.
- Prohibit public motorized use on approximately 7 miles of NFS level 2 roads and 31 miles of trail currently open in order to minimize or reduce resource damage.
- Prohibit motorized use on 774 miles of NFS level 1 roads.
- Prohibit all other cross country motorized travel outside of the play areas described above (i.e. closure of 274,670 acres).

Under the Proposed Action, many of roads, trails and areas that are currently part of the Forest Transportation System and are open to wheeled motorized vehicle travel would remain designated for such use. The Proposed Action was designed to take into account past patterns of OHV use on the Forest as well as other public motor vehicle use.

Where possible, routes creating connections between popular use areas were included so that OHV and highway-licensed motor vehicles could ride from one area to another. These routes provide all-purpose access for destination travel, driving for pleasure, hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, such as, travel to dispersed camping locations, specific features or destinations, or unique motorized recreation experiences, while directing OHV use onto routes where there is available mileage and connections to other routes open to OHVs.

Under the Proposed Action, approximately 4,505 miles of road and 229 miles of trail would be open to motorized use. Table S-2 below summarizes and compares the Proposed Action to the current condition.

In the DSEIS, maps displaying specific aspects of Alternative 3 are presented.

Table S-2. Alternative 3 (Proposed Action) Summary

Roads and Trails	Current Condition	Proposed Action	Change
Total NFS Roads	5,286 miles		
NFS Roads "open" to the public	4,512 miles	4,505 miles	-7 miles
Open roads that allow mixed use	3,183 miles	3,197 miles	+14 miles
Open roads that prohibit mixed use	1,329 miles	1,309 miles	-14 miles
Total NFS Trails	1,199 miles	1,213 miles	+14 miles
NFS Trails that allow motorized use	246 miles	229 miles	-17 miles
New trails authorized		2 miles	
Authorized conversion of ML1 road to trail		12 miles	
Total area open to cross country travel	274,670 acres	2 OHV "Play" Areas totaling 25 acres	

ARE THERE OTHER ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD MEET THE NEED?

Alternative 2 would designate the current condition with Plan Amendments that would close all roads, trails and cross-country travel unless designated open to be consistent with the Travel Management Rule, and enact site-specific route Plan Amendments to make current use consistent with the Forest Plans. This alternative would implement actions consistent with the Travel Management Rule with no change to the current system of NFS roads, trails and designated areas. This alternative is similar to the No Action Alternative since it represents no change with respect to the existing NFS facilities or "baseline" transportation system. It is designed to assess the consequences of implementing the Travel Management Rule with no changes to the current system of roads, trails, and designated areas.

To implement the Travel Management Rule, general cross-country travel would be prohibited. The continued use of unauthorized routes would not be allowed, and there would be no changes to the current system of NFS roads, trails and designated play areas. Alternative 2 would maintain the 'status quo' and would be the combination of all previous decisions by the Forest, except allowing cross-country travel. (i.e. previous decisions associated with the NFS of roads, trails and designated play areas). Areas for dispersed activities would continue to be used by public wheeled motor vehicles primarily for the purpose of dispersed camping and parking.

Under Alternative 2, the existing condition, as reflected in the Forest route inventory and updated through December 2010, would continue. These existing routes on the Forest would primarily be used for public wheeled motor vehicle use. This alternative is also designed to be responsive to Scoping comments received in the fall of 2008 in which many people expressed concern about the possible loss of motorized opportunities.

Alternative 4 was developed to address Scoping resource issue concerns through some reduction in motorized use over current conditions and proposes a reduction in motorized use when compared to Alternative 3. It would also implement the Travel Management Rule with Plan Amendments to allow consistency with the Travel Management Rule and current inconsistent Forest Plan direction.

This alternative is designed to be responsive to Scoping comments received in fall of 2008. Many people were concerned about possible effects to Botanical Areas, serpentine soils (and associated meadows, fens, and bogs), water quality, and spread of invasive non-native species. Based on the stated Purpose and Need for action and as a result of the recent Travel Analysis process, Alternative 4 proposes to:

- Enact Forest Plan Amendments to make the plans consistent with the Travel Management Rule. Two separate Forest Plans guide the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.
- Formally designate approximately 4,469 miles of roads where passenger vehicles would be allowed to travel.
- Formally designate approximately 3,155 miles of road where mixed use would be allowed. Mixed use is defined as designation of a National Forest System (NFS) road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles.
- Designate one area where off-road motorized use would be allowed. This would include continued use of the Woodruff area near Prospect on the High Cascades Ranger District.
- Prohibit motorized public access on approximately 43 miles of ML 2 roads currently open in order to minimize or reduce resource damage.
- Prohibit motorized use on approximately 114 miles of trails currently open in order to minimize or reduce resource damage and user conflicts.
- Prohibit motorized use on 774 miles of NFS level 1 roads.
- Prohibit all other cross country motorized travel outside of the 15 acre Woodruff OHV play area (i.e. closure of 274,670 acres).

Under Alternative 4, approximately 4,469 miles of road and 132 miles of trail would be open to motorized use. Table S-3 below summarizes Alternative 4 and compares it to the current condition.

In the DSEIS, maps displaying specific aspects of Alternative 4 are presented.

Table S-3. Alternative 4 Summary

Roads and Trails	Current Condition	Alternative 4	Change
Total NFS Roads	5,286 miles		
NFS Roads "open" to the public	4,512 miles	4,469 miles	-43 miles
Open roads that allow mixed use	3,183 miles	3,155 miles	-28 miles
Open roads that prohibit mixed use	1,329 miles	1,357 miles	+28 miles
Total NFS Trails	1,199 miles	1,199 miles	0 miles
NFS Trails that allow motorized use	246 miles	132 miles	-114 miles
New trails authorized		0 miles	
Authorize conversion of ML1 road to trail		0 miles	
Total area open to cross country travel	274,670 acres	Woodruff "Play" Area totaling 15 acres	

Alternative 5 is an additional alternative developed as a result of analysis documented in the Draft EIS and public comments to the Draft EIS. Alternative 5 combines elements of the Proposed Action (Alternative 3) and Alternative 4. This alternative addresses the Public Scoping resource issues through some reduction in motorized use over current conditions and proposes a slight reduction in motorized use over Alternative 3. It would also implement the Travel Management Rule with Plan Amendments to allow consistency with the Travel Management Rule and currently inconsistent Forest Plan direction.

Based on the stated Purpose and Need for action and as a result of the recent Travel Analysis process, Alternative 5 proposes to:

- Enact Forest-wide Plan Amendments to make the plans consistent with the Travel Management Rule. Two separate Forest Plans guide the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.
- Enact project-level Forest Plan Amendments to make the plans consistent with current and historical motorized use.
- Formally designate approximately 4,505 miles of roads where passenger vehicles would be allowed to travel.
- Formally designate approximately 2,999 miles of road where mixed use would be allowed. Mixed use is defined as designation of a National Forest System (NFS) road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles.
- Authorize designation of one new motorized trail (Penn Sled) to provide loop route opportunities (approximately 1.5 miles).
- Authorize conversion of approximately 10 miles of NFS ML 1 roads to motorized trails.
- Designate one area where off-road motorized use would be allowed. This would include continued use of the Woodruff area near Prospect. This area is located on the High Cascades Ranger District.
- Prohibit motorized use on 774 miles of NFS level 1 roads.
- Prohibit public motorized use on approximately 7 miles of ML 2 roads and 37 miles of trail currently open in order to minimize or reduce resource damage.
- Prohibit all other cross country motorized travel outside of the 15 acre Woodruff OHV play area identified above (i.e. closure of 274,670 acres).

Under Alternative 5, approximately 4,505 miles of road and 221 miles of trail would be open to motorized use. Table S-4 below summarizes Alternative 5 and compares it to the current condition.

In the DSEIS, maps displaying specific aspects of Alternative 5 are presented.

Table S-4. Alternative 5 Summary

Roads and Trails	Current Condition	Alternative 5	Change
Total NFS Roads	5,286 miles		
NFS Roads "open" to the public	4,512 miles	4,505 miles	-7 miles
Open roads that allow mixed use	3,183 miles	2,999 miles	-12 miles
Open roads that prohibit mixed use	1,329 miles	1,506 miles	+12 miles
Total NFS Trails	1,199 miles	1,211 miles	+12 miles
NFS Trails that allow motorized use	246 miles	221 miles	-25 miles
New trails authorized		1.5 miles	
Authorize conversion of ML1 road to trail		10 miles	
Total area open to cross country travel	274,670 acres	Woodruff "Play" Area totaling 15 acres	

WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES?

This section summarizes environmental effects and consequences linked with implementing the Action Alternatives, or the No Action Alternative, considered and analyzed in detail. The following tables portray outcomes for each alternative in terms of the physical, biological, economic, and social direct, indirect and cumulative effects on the human environment, in regard to the Significant Issues, and Other Issues (see DSEIS Chapter I).

Significant Issues as used in this environmental analysis are those that are used to evaluate alternatives, affect the design of component proposals, prescribe mitigation measures, and/or describe important and variable environmental effects. They are significant because of the extent of their geographic consequence, the duration of the effects, or the intensity of interest or resource conflict. Other Issues, as used in this analysis, differ from Significant Issues in that they often describe minor and/or non-variable consequences. The following tables briefly describe the consequences for each of the alternatives, in terms of Significant and Other Issues.

Table S-5. Comparison of Alternatives - Significant Issues

Significant Issues	Indicator	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3 (Proposed Action)	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Water Quality and Erosion	Miles of open roads closed to public use	No change	No change	7 miles	43 miles	7 miles
	Miles of motorized trails closed to motorized use	No change	No change	31 miles	114 miles	37 miles
Botanical Areas and Special Plant Habitats	Acres of cross-country travel allowed	274,670 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres
	Miles of motorized trails closed to motorized use within Botanical Areas	No change	No change	4 miles	11 miles	6 miles
Public Safety	Change in traffic density on open roads and trails	No change	No change	Slight increase	Slight increase	Slight increase
	Miles of road where mixed use is allowed	3,183miles	3,183 miles	3,197 miles	3,155 miles	3,160 miles
Motorized Opportunities	Change in miles of roads and trails open to the public	No change	No change	-24 miles	-157 miles	-32 miles
	Miles of open roads	4,512 miles	4,512 miles	4,505 miles	4,469 miles	4,505 miles
	Miles of motorized trails	246 miles	246 miles	229 miles	132 miles	221 miles
Roadless Character within Inventoried Roadless Areas	Miles of motorized trails within IRAs	94 miles	94 miles	72 miles	0 miles	64 miles
	Acres of cross-country travel allowed within IRAs	30,170 acres	30,170 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres

Table S-6. Comparison of Alternatives - Other Issues

Other Issues	Indicator	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3 (Proposed Action)	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Soils – Site Productivity	Areas where cross-country travel would be allowed.	No change to the current condition. Cross-country travel would be allowed on 274,670 acres	Would prohibit cross-country travel			
Aquatic Conservation Strategy	Consistency with ACS Objectives	N/A	All of the Action Alternatives would be consistent with the 9 Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives at the site scale and all watershed scales			
Air Quality – Vehicle Emissions	Change in the current level of vehicle emissions	No change	Alternatives 2, 3, 4, or 5 would result in an insignificant change in vehicle emissions			
Air Quality – Dust and Asbestos	Change in the current level of dust and asbestos	No change	Alternatives 2, 3, 4, or 5 decrease disturbance due to closure of cross-country travel and removal of selected travel routes per alternative			
Fire Risk	Change in the risk of human-caused fires	No change	Slightly reduces risk by eliminating cross-country travel			
Listed Plants	Effect to listed plant species	No change	Effects would be reduced by closure of cross-country travel	Though actions may impact individuals, but not likely to adversely affect species or critical habitat, elimination of cross country travel reduces effect over Alternative 1		
Invasive Non-native Plants	Potential change in spread of invasive non-native plants	No change	Closure of cross-country travel would have a potential to reduce spread	Would reduce the potential for spread by limiting motorized use on some trails and roads	Would reduce the potential more than Alternative 3 for spread by limiting motorized use on more trails and roads	Would reduce the potential for spread by limiting motorized use on some trails and roads similar to Alternative 3

Other Issues	Indicator	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3 (Proposed Action)	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Invasive Pathogens	Compliance with current direction	Alternative 1: Current high risk sites would remain due to cross-country travel; Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5: There would be reduction in high risk due to elimination of cross-country travel. All alternatives would comply with State and Federal laws regarding <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i> .				
Terrestrial Wildlife Listed Species	Determination for listed species	N/A	Effects to the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet due to disturbance could occur under all action alternatives and would result in a “may effect, not likely to adversely affect (NLAA)” determination			
Management Indicator Species	Harassment to big game (deer and elk) within winter range areas	No change	Potential decrease due to elimination of cross-country travel	Harassment potential would be decreased due to the reduced potential for noise and human activities through the elimination of cross-country travel and the reduction in the amount of roads open to the public		
	Effects to other MIS	No change	None of the action alternatives would result in substantial direct or indirect adverse effects to other Management Indicator Species			
Other Rare or Uncommon Species	Effects to other rare or uncommon species	No change	Reduced potential due to closure of cross-country travel	Due to the potential disturbance from noise associated with passenger vehicle and OHV traffic, alternatives may impact but not adversely impact these species		
Fisheries and Aquatic Species	Determination for listed species	N/A	None of the action alternatives would result in measurable direct or indirect effects to fisheries resources at the watershed or subwatershed scale			
Visuals	Attainment of visual quality objectives	No change	No change is expected from cross-country travel closure	The reduction of roads and trails would not substantially change the attainment of visual quality objectives		
Sound Level	Change in use conflicts related to sound	No change	Potential decrease due to closure of cross-country travel	Slight decrease in potential use conflicts related to sound	Moderate decrease in potential use conflicts related to sound	Slight decrease in potential use conflicts related to sound
Mining Access	Affect to access for prospecting, locating, or developing mineral resources.	Selection of any alternative would not affect access that is reasonably incident to mining. However, alternatives that are more restrictive on vehicle travel would result in a higher degree of administration to determine if access is reasonably incident and necessary for the stage of mineral activity				

Other Issues	Indicator	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3 (Proposed Action)	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Enforcement	Change in ability to enforce compliance with Federal law	No change	Amendment of the Forest Plan and publication of the Motor Vehicle Use Map would increase the ability to cite those who cause resource damage			
Cultural Resources	Increase in risk to heritage sites	No change	The reduction of cross-country travel would further limit access to existing and yet undiscovered sites			
Climate Change	All alternatives considered with this proposal were identified to have minor cause-effect relationships to greenhouse gas emissions or the carbon cycle, and were determined to be of such a minor scale at the global or even regional scale, that the direct effects would be meaningless to a reasoned choice among alternatives					
Designated and Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers (Added between FEIS and DSEIS)	Protect or enhance outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs)	No Change	Potential for enhancement of ORVs due to closure of cross-country travel	Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 would have a slight potential to enhance ORVs by eliminating cross-country travel		
				Slightest potential for enhancement to ORVs from reduction in motorized roads and trails	Most potential for enhancement to ORVs from reduction in motorized roads and trails	Potential for enhancement to ORVs from reduction in motorized roads and trails

CAN ADVERSE EFFECTS BE MITIGATED?

Specific mitigation measures have been developed for the Action Alternatives analyzed in detail. These include appropriate measures as defined by NEPA Regulations at 40 CFR 1502.14(f) and 1508.20. Additional measures incorporated into the Action Alternatives emphasize applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines. These mitigation measures would reduce, rectify, avoid, eliminate, and/or compensate the potential resource impacts as required by 40 CFR 1508.20. Mitigation measures common to all of the Action Alternatives are described in DSEIS Chapter II.

WHAT FACTORS WILL BE USED IN MAKING THE DECISION BETWEEN ALTERNATIVES?

In addition to and concurrent with attainment of Purpose and Need, the response of the alternatives in relation to the identified Significant and Other Issues will be used as important decision factors (see above). No one element of Purpose and Need or Issues will be used to make the decision, rather, they will be reviewed together with an assessment of tradeoffs to make the final decision, documented in a forthcoming Record of Decision, complying with Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities (36 CFR 215).

For Forest Plan Amendments, the regulations require the decision-maker (the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest Supervisor) to determine whether the proposal would result in a significant change to the Forest Plans based on an analysis of the goals, desired conditions, objectives, guidelines and other contents of the Plan. If the amendment is determined not significant, then the Forest Supervisor may implement the amendment following appropriate public notification and satisfactory completion of (in this case concurrent) NEPA procedures.

WHAT MONITORING IS NECESSARY?

Monitoring is a required element of all Action Alternatives and would be carried out according to a detailed Monitoring Plan for authorized use and/or development activities. This Monitoring Plan would be developed specifically to the activities contained in the ROD, and be specific to the action(s) and area(s) where authorized actions would occur.

Project activities should be monitored during and after implementation of management actions to ensure that design features and mitigation measures are implemented as specified. Monitoring is also proposed to evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities, including standard practices and mitigation measures, in achieving desired outcomes.

WHICH ALTERNATIVE IS THE PREFERRED?

NEPA requires that the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) identify the agency's Preferred Alternative or alternatives, if more than one exists. The "agency's preferred alternative" is the alternative (or alternatives) which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical and other factors. The concept of the "agency's preferred alternative" is different from the "environmentally preferable alternative," (an element documented in a Record of Decision); although in some cases they may be both. A Preferred Alternative is identified so that agencies and the public can understand the agency's orientation.

The Forest Supervisor of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest has identified **Alternative 5** as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative would implement the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212 Subpart B), and provide a designated and managed system, provide changes to reduce existing resource damage from motorized use, and reduce social impacts, user conflicts and safety concerns, and is the preferred course of action.