



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

June 2008



# Environmental Assessment

## Travel Management Project

### Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest

For Information Contact: Joan Marburger  
Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest Supervisor's Office  
1170 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
Park Falls, WI 54552  
715-762-5178

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



## Table of Contents

Background .....	2
The Roads Analysis Process .....	2
Terminology .....	3
Purpose and Need for Action .....	4
Public Involvement .....	5
General Public Involvement on Travel Management Planning to Date .....	5
Tribal Involvement .....	6
Issues .....	6
Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access .....	7
Non-Significant Issues .....	7
Issues Already Considered in the Development of the Forest Proposal .....	8
Alternatives, Including the Forest Proposal .....	9
Adaptive Management .....	9
Alternative 1 (No Action) .....	10
Current Travel Management-Related projects on the Forest .....	11
Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal) .....	13
Alternative 3 .....	14
Alternative Considered but Dropped from Further Analysis: Designate Only Current National Forest System Roads .....	15
Alternative Considered but Dropped from Further Analysis: Designate Additional Roads in the Most and Intermediate ATV Suitability Classes during the Fall Season. ....	16
Comparison of Alternatives: Resource Indicators .....	16
Environmental Consequences .....	16
Compliance Summary .....	16
Summary Comparison of the Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternatives by Issue. ....	19
Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access .....	19
Affected Environment: Wisconsin’s Motorized Recreation Supply & Demand .....	19
Summary of Environmental Consequences Significant Issue Not Enough Motorized Access .....	20
Summary Comparison of Cumulative Effects for the Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access .....	21
CNNF Travel Management Project ID Team Members .....	23
Consultation and Coordination .....	23
Federal, State, and Local Agencies .....	23
Tribes .....	23
Others .....	23

## Table of Tables

Table 1-1: Roads Analysis Process Ranking Criteria .....	6
Table 1-2: Alternative 1 (No Action) Summary .....	12
Table 1-3: Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal) Summary .....	14
Table 1-4: Alternative 3 Summary .....	15
Table 1-5: Resource Indicators .....	17

## Background

Dale Bosworth, the former Chief of the Forest Service identified unmanaged recreation, particularly the unmanaged use of off-highway vehicles (OHV) as one of four threats facing National Forests and Grasslands today. He believed that off-highway vehicles (OHV) were a legitimate use of the National Forest System, a use that should be managed carefully. Over the past few decades, the availability and capability of OHVs has increased significantly. The increase in OHV use affects soil, water, wildlife habitat, and other recreational visitors.

The USDA Forest Service Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012 states - *The condition of the land, recreation facilities, and transportation infrastructure, including off-highway-vehicle access, must be considered if we expect to preserve high-quality recreation experiences.*

Objective 4.3 of the strategic plan specifically states: *Improve the management of off-highway vehicle use.* The plan's performance measure for this objective is the percentage of National Forest System Lands covered by new motor vehicle use maps (MVUM).

The 2004 Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNNF or the Forest) Record of Decision (ROD), Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan)... *decided to restrict ATV access to designated trails and roads on both Forests and to prohibit cross-country travel to avoid the associated resource degradation.* In the ROD, the ATV issue was primarily a Chequamegon issue, since the Nicolet did not allow ATVs. The ROD designated the classified roads (now termed forest roads) on the Chequamegon as the roads where ATVs would be allowed.

Historically, the Chequamegon allowed both ATVs and highway legal vehicles on the open, known, unauthorized roads; while on the Nicolet, only highway legal vehicles were allowed. With the Forest Plan ROD decision, ATV use on the unauthorized roads was eliminated and only highway legal vehicles were allowed Forest-wide. In February 2005, the CNNF ATV Transition Plan was implemented to provide direction for ATV route designation, ATV trail designation, and ATV closures.

On November 9, 2005, the Forest Service published, in the Federal Register, Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule, with an effective date of December 9, 2005. This final rule is also referred to as the Travel Management Rule or TMR. This final rule revised the regulations regarding travel management on National Forest System lands to clarify policy related to motor vehicle use, including the use of off-highway vehicles. The rule requires designation of those roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicle use. Designations are made by class of vehicle and, if appropriate, by time of year. The final rule prohibits the use of motor vehicles off the designated system, as well as the use of motor vehicles on roads, trails and in areas that are not consistent with the designations. The Travel Management Rule also requires designated roads, trails, and areas be identified on a motor vehicle use map (MVUM), that will be available to the public and is to be updated annually. Upon publication of the MVUM it will be the responsibility of the individual to know where and when they can legally operate a motor vehicle. Existing authorities and orders regarding motor vehicle use remain in effect until publication of the MVUM.

## ***The Roads Analysis Process***

The objective of roads analysis process (RAP) is to provide decision-makers with critical information to develop road systems that are safe and responsive to public needs and desires, are affordable and efficiently managed, have minimal negative ecological effects on the land, and are in balance with available funding for needed management actions. (USDA FS 1999a) The RAP

report can be viewed or printed at the following links: [620-1 Roads Analysis](#), [620-1a Roads Analysis Appendix](#)

The RAP for this project provides information concerning specifically identified roads. The RAP also assists deciding officials in determining which, if any, unauthorized roads to add to the Forest transportation system, and/or designate motorized uses different from current approved uses on forest roads, and ensure that those decisions be informed by a science-based roads analysis. These decisions would be needed in order to ensure the Forest transportation system:

- Provides safe access and meets the needs of communities and forest users;
- Facilitates the implementation of the Forest Plan;
- Allows for economical and efficient management within likely budget levels;
- Meets current and future resource management objectives;
- Begins to reverse adverse ecological impacts, to the extent practicable.

## **Terminology**

**All Terrain Vehicle (ATV).** An engine-driven device which has a net weight of 900 pounds or less, which has a width of 48 inches or less, which is equipped with a seat designed to be straddled by the operator and which is designed to travel on three or more low-pressure tires. This also includes motorcycles that are designed to operate on two wheels, weigh 900 pounds or less, have a width of 48 inches or less, are equipped with a seat designed to be straddled by the operator and may or may not be street legal (Forest Plan).

**ATV Route.** The Forest Service definition of an ATV Route is a forest road that has been posted open for ATV use (Forest Plan). The Wisconsin definition of an all-terrain vehicle route is a highway or sidewalk designated for use by all-terrain vehicle operators by the governmental agency having jurisdiction as authorized under Wis state statute 23.33. (Wis state statute 23.33) The term ATV route in this document refers to Forest Service ATV routes.

**Cross-country travel.** The Travel Management Rule prohibits motor vehicle use off designated roads and trails (36 CFR 261.13). This is referred to as cross-country travel. The Forest Plan defines cross-country ATV use as – the use of ATVs off established roads, trails, or routes.

**Forest road or trail.** A road or trail wholly or partly within or adjacent to and serving the National Forest System that the Forest Service determines is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest System and the use and development of its resources (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1). Also referred to as system roads.

**Highway Legal Vehicle (HLV).** Any motor vehicle including the operator that is licensed or certified for general operation on public roads within the State (EM-7700-30, Guidelines for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use on National Forest System Roads, December 2005). Also referred to as street legal vehicles in this document.

**Maintenance Level (ML).** Defines the level of service provided by, and maintenance required for, a specific road, consistent with road management objectives and maintenance criteria (FSH 7709.58, Sec 12.3).

**Motor vehicle.** Any vehicle which is self-propelled, other than: (1) A vehicle operated on rails; and (2) Any wheelchair or mobility device, including one that is battery-powered, that is designed solely for use by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion, and that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area. (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1) A wheelchair is defined as, “a device

designed solely for use by a mobility impaired person that is suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area” (ADA title V Section 507(c) and FSM 2355.05 (12)). OHVs are not considered designed solely for use by a mobility impaired person nor suitable for indoor pedestrian use.

**Motor vehicle use map (MVUM).** A map reflecting designated roads, trails, and areas on an administrative unit or a Ranger District of the National Forest System (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1).

**National Forest System Road.** A forest road other than a road which has been authorized by a legally documented right-of-way held by a State, county, or other local public road authority (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1).

**Off-highway vehicle.** (OHV). Any motor vehicle designed for or capable of cross-country travel on or immediately over land, water, sand, snow, ice, marsh, swampland, or other natural terrain. (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1).

**Over-snow vehicle.** A motor vehicle that is designed for use over snow and that runs on a track or tracks and/or a ski or skis, while in use over snow (36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A, § 1).

**Unauthorized Road or Trail.** 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, Subpart A, § 1).

**The following vehicles and uses are exempted** from the TMR: (36 CFR Part 212 § 51 (a)(1-8)):

- (1) Aircraft;
- (2) Watercraft;
- (3) Over-snow vehicles;
- (4) Limited administrative use by the Forest Service;
- (5) Use of any fire, military, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle for emergency purposes;
- (6) Authorized use of any combat or combat support vehicle for national defense purposes;
- (7) Law enforcement response to violations of law, including pursuit;
- (8) Motor vehicle use that is specifically authorized under a written authorization issued under Federal law or regulations

## Purpose and Need for Action

The outcome of the USDA Forest Service Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest (CNNF) Travel Management Project is a designated system of roads and trails available for public motorized vehicle use on the Forest. The purpose of this project is only to determine (designate) which roads and trails will be included on the MVUM. This project would be in concert with the goals and objectives outlined in the Forest Plan. This project also complies with the Travel Management Rule.

This project considered only those forest roads and known unauthorized roads brought forward by public, governmental and internal comments. The Forest considered either adding or removing motorized use on these roads. Changing the current allowed use was also considered.

For instance, if a road currently allows ATVs and HLVs, the Forest could consider removing ATVs leaving HLVs allowed. Or, if a forest road only allowed HLVs, the Forest could consider adding ATVs in addition to the HLVs. All existing motorized trails will be displayed on the MVUM with no change in current use. This project does not include any physical closure of roads or construction of new roads or trails.

Future projects on each of the Ranger Districts will further move the Forest toward the goals, objectives and desired conditions as stated in the Forest Plan as well as move toward more balanced ATV access across the Forest. As these projects are accomplished they will be incorporated into the annual MVUM revisions.

## **Public Involvement**

### **General Public Involvement on Travel Management Planning to Date**

The TMR requires that the Forest Service provide for public participation in the process of designating roads and trails for motor vehicle use. Public involvement for the Forest began in November, 2006, with the publication of a brochure. Forest staff distributed this brochure to the public which contained information on the Travel Management Rule, the process the Forest would follow to implement the rule, and Forest Plan requirements. These brochures were provided to the District staff for local distribution. District staff placed them at game registration stations and other locations where the public would likely see them. Additionally, the brochures were available at all Forest offices. Forest staff began soliciting and accepting comments on the specific roads people were interested in being available or unavailable for motorized use.

Ten open house meetings were held during January and February of 2007. Two meetings were held on each Ranger District: one was for the general public, while the other was for local governments and Tribal members. The Forest also held meetings with Forest Service staff at this time to identify internal concerns and suggestions.

Following these open house meetings, Forest staff requested feedback on specific roads the public would like to be available or unavailable for motorized use. The comment period for initial road suggestions closed on April 15, 2007. A content analysis was subsequently conducted on the input received during the comment period. The content analysis revealed that the public and internal staff suggested 1,052 roads be considered for future motorized uses. Any unauthorized road the public or Forest Service staff did not suggest to designate motorized use on would automatically be made unavailable for motorized use upon this project's decision. Any forest road the public or Forest personnel did not suggest for a change in designated use, would automatically continue its existing use upon this project's decision.

The 1,052 identified roads were then evaluated with a RAP. The RAP included ranking criteria for resource risks and access values. Table 1-1 lists the ranking criteria.

In October 2007, five open house meetings were held at locations within each Forest District. Maps displaying an initial designated network representing the outcome of the RAP were presented to the public. The public submitted comments at the meetings, and afterwards commented on specific roads they would like considered available or unavailable for motorized use. The Forest received over 175 additional comments from the October open house meetings. Forest Service staff also considered comments from local community leaders and ATV organizations. These comments resulted in an additional 266 roads for consideration. With few exceptions, these roads have been ranked in the same manner as the original 1052 roads in the



RAP. Each was measured against the management category baseline set by the original risk/value analysis in the RAP. Opportunities, if not already determined, were identified for each road. Some of these roads were included in the Forest Proposal and some of them formed the basis of Alternative 3 (See the section titled Alternatives, Including the Forest Proposal).

**Table 1-1: Roads Analysis Process Ranking Criteria**

Resource Risk Criteria	Access Value Criteria
Water quality	Hunting
Soils	Bough & firewood gathering
Heritage resources	Recreation
Resource protection-based management areas	Access to private in-holdings
Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive species habitats	Administrative access
Other wildlife needs	
Potential to spread invasive species	

***Tribal Involvement***

The Forest initiated communication with local Native American Tribal governments in January 2007. District Rangers coordinated the contacts and worked with interested tribal representatives throughout the process. Tribal representatives contacted included elected tribal officials, tribal natural resource staff and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers.

The following tribes were contacted in Wisconsin: Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Sokaogon Chippewa Community, Mole Lake Chippewa Tribe, St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Forest County Potawatomi Community, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Ho-Chunk Nation, Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, and Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians.

The following tribes were contacted in Michigan (MI) and Minnesota (MN): Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (MI), Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (MI), and Fond du Lac Chippewa Tribe (MN).

Individual members of the Voigt Intertribal Task Force and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission were also contacted.

***Issues***

The following issues are points of disagreement, debate, or dispute with the Forest’s proposal based on some anticipated effect. These issues are categorized as significant or non-significant issues.

Significant issues are those with a clear direct, or indirect, causal relationship with the Forest’s proposal. Non-significant issues are identified as those: (1) outside the scope of the proposal; (2) already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision; (3) irrelevant to the decision to be made; or (4) conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence.

### **Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access**

The Forest Service identified “not enough motorized access” as the only significant issue raised by the public. The public voiced several possibilities to increase motorized access on the Forest. These possibilities were included, when feasible, into an alternative to address the issue. Historically, the unauthorized roads were available to both ATV and HLV use on the West side of the Forest. The Forest Plan ROD eliminated ATV use from these roads on the West side of the Forest. The Forest Proposal would add approximately 200 miles of unauthorized roads for motorized use. The following three means of increasing motorized access were included in an additional alternative (labeled as “Alternative 3”).

#### *Provide more ATV routes on the East Side of the Forest*

The East side of the Forest has historically been closed to ATV use and many people requested to change this condition to allow ATV motorized recreation. Using comments from local community leaders and ATV riders, Forest Service staff considered designating some roads for ATV use on the East side of the forest. Again it should be noted that ATV routes and ATV trails will continue to be identified and evaluated through separate processes, several of which are on-going. **Indicator:** Miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest

#### *Provide increased access during the fall*

Hunters and people that collect boughs and firewood expressed a need for increased access to the Forest during the fall. To address this issue, a timeframe of September 15<sup>th</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> was considered for additional motorized access, and was included in Alternative 3. A review of the original RAP was conducted to identify potential roads that were made unavailable to motorized use for the protection of wildlife during critical spring nesting periods, but could be available for motorized use during the fall. Several of these roads were identified for fall access and included in Alternative 3. **Indicator:** Miles of roads opened seasonally.

#### *Provide increased access for recreation experience*

Many people that recreate with ATVs expressed a general concern for the lack of recreation opportunities currently available to them. **Indicator:** The miles of roads and trails open to ATV use across the entire Forest.

### **Non-Significant Issues**

The following non-significant issues were not carried forward in the analysis:

#### *Economic impact of motorized use to local communities*

Some people believed that designating more roads for ATV use around communities, and connecting communities, may bring an economic benefit. This issue was considered but determined to be non-significant because many of the roads around communities are roads for which the towns receive revenues from the state. The towns determine the type of motorized use on these roads. These roads are outside the scope of the project. The Forest recognizes the potential economic benefit to communities and local businesses. This issue can be addressed with the towns in the future through separate projects at the District level.

#### *Potential impacts of continued or increased ATV use on snowmobile trails*

People expressed a concern for the potential impact of ATV use on snowmobile trails. Snowmobile trails on the Forest are operated and maintained by local clubs in cooperation with

the respective counties. The Forest Service generally allows ATVs on the snowmobile trails on Forest land. General ATV seasonal use restrictions remain in place (March 15<sup>th</sup> – April 30<sup>th</sup>) as described in the current Forest Order R913-08-02.

Trail conditions vary significantly across the Forest. Snowfall amounts, spring break-up conditions and other factors can be used to decide type of vehicle and season of use. This issue was determined outside the scope of designating motorized use for this project. ATV use on snowmobile trails will be addressed through continued coordination at a local level between District Rangers and club representatives for the snowmobile trails.

### ***Issues Already Considered in the Development of the Forest Proposal***

#### *Reduce motorized access in general and ATV access specifically*

A few people commented on the desire to reduce motorized access in general as well as ATV access specifically. This issue was considered and addressed in the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3. Most of the following issue subsections also address reduced access through specific concerns.

#### *Potential impacts of continued motorized access to the elk herd on the Great Divide Ranger District*

This issue was considered in the development of the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3 for the following reasons:

- (1) In previous years, the Forest has issued a forest order to close roads during the critical elk calving season;
- (2) Every alternative considered for this project includes continued use of the seasonal elk calving closures. In 2009, the MVUM will incorporate this Forest closure order to control motorized use in elk calving areas.

#### *Potential impacts of continued or increased motorized use to old growth areas*

This issue was considered in the development of the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3:

- (1) Where continued or increased motorized use was considered, the IDT, through the RAP, avoided old growth areas where possible.
- (2) Many of the roads in old growth areas are Maintenance Level (ML) 1 roads and are unavailable for public use;
- (3) The unauthorized roads in old growth areas were proposed, for the most part, for no motorized use.

#### *Potential impacts of continued or increased motorized use on spruce grouse*

Spruce grouse habitat was considered in the development of the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3 as a resource risk criterion for limiting continued or increased motorized use. Unauthorized roads in spruce grouse habitat were, for the most part, proposed for no motorized use by the Forest IDT, thus impacts were avoided.

*Potential impacts of continued or increased motorized use to stream crossings, water quality, and soil erosion*

Stream crossings, water quality, and soil erosion were used as resource risk factors in the development of the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3. This issue was dropped from more specific alternative development based on adherence to Forest Plan standards and guidelines in these alternatives.

*Potential impacts of continued or increased motorized use on wolves*

The effect on wolves was used as a resource risk factor in the development of the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3, and was dropped from more specific alternative development because all alternatives would adhere to Forest Plan standards and guidelines.

*Providing motorized access to private property*

Access to private property through National Forest lands was addressed through the RAP by the Forest IDT . Any roads accessing private property that were identified or suggested by the public were included in the analysis for the Forest Proposal and Alternative 3.

## **Alternatives, Including the Forest Proposal**

This section describes and compares the alternatives considered for the CNNF Travel Management Project. It includes a description and map of each alternative considered. This section also presents the alternatives in comparative form, sharply defining the differences between each alternative, and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and the public. Some of the information used to compare the alternatives is based upon the design of the alternative, and some upon the environmental, social, and economic effects of implementing each alternative.

### **Type of Vehicles Allowed**

The Travel Management Rule requires the Forest Service to specify the type of vehicle allowed on any given motorized road or trail on the unit. The Forest Plan currently distinguishes the availability of motor vehicle roads and trails between those open to highway legal vehicles (HLV) and those open to all-terrain vehicles (ATV) (motorcycles are included in the definition for an ATV). Utility-type vehicles, or UTVs, are not allowed on Forest roads and trails.

Under all the Alternatives in this project, the type of vehicles the public may operate on the Forest would not change: roads would be open to HLVs, ATVs, or both types of vehicles. The miles available for each type of vehicle or both types of vehicles are listed in a table for each Alternative.

### **Adaptive Management**

The following adaptive management features apply to all alternatives.

Given the requirement to update the Motorized Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) annually, the Forest proposes to continually receive public suggestions to either add or remove specific roads and trails to the designated network. These suggestions will supply the information needed to provide an accurate and effective map for public use. The process for how this will work is outlined below. The first MVUM is scheduled for publication in January 2009.

- Public suggestions may be submitted continually after January 2009 to either add or remove specific roads or trails to the designated network.
- Any suggestion received will be evaluated in the same manner as all the suggestions received thus far. The Roads Analysis Process developed for this project will be used to evaluate the resource risks in comparison to public value associated with each suggested road or trail. The suggested road or trail will also be referenced against the resource analysis disclosed in this EA to confirm there is no change in the analysis.
- To allow processing time for the next MVUM update, a window for evaluating public suggestions will be established. Any suggestions received prior to the closing date of the window will be considered for that year's MVUM update. Any public suggestions received after the closing date of the window will be considered for the following year's MVUM update.
- The Forest Service will post its annual evaluation results on the Forest's Internet website to display which roads were considered for addition to, or removal from, the MVUM.

### **Alternative 1 (No Action)**

*Alternative Map.* Maps of Alternative 1 (No Action) by Ranger District can be viewed or printed at the following links:

- [Eagle River Florence Ranger District](#)
- [Great Divide Ranger District](#)
- [Washburn Ranger District](#)
- [Medford Park Falls Ranger District  
Medford Landbase](#)
- [Medford Park Falls Ranger District  
Park Falls Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood Laona Ranger District  
Lakewood Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood Laona Ranger District  
Laona Landbase](#)

See Table 1-5 for resource indicators by alternative, and the miles of roads proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel by maintenance level for all alternatives. See Table 1-2 for a summary of miles of roads and trails proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel for the No Action alternative.

36 CFR Part 212 Sec. 50(b) states the responsible official may incorporate previous administrative decisions regarding travel management made under other authorities, including designations and prohibitions of motor vehicle use. These previous designations and prohibitions are the existing condition and can be designated without a new decision if no changes are proposed.

For the CNNF Travel Management Project, the existing condition (No Action Alternative) is motorized use that is currently occurring on the Forest and is outlined as follows:

- HLVs currently use any road that is not physically closed;
- Cross-country travel by any vehicle is prohibited;

- Forest roads and trails are closed to ATV use unless posted open with a sign. The roads open to ATVs are identified on ATV maps available at Forest Offices.
- General ATV seasonal use restrictions remain in place (March 15<sup>th</sup> – April 30<sup>th</sup>) as described in the current Forest Order R913-08-02.

### ***Current Travel Management-Related projects on the Forest<sup>1</sup>***

Several travel management-related decisions are forthcoming by District Rangers on the Forest according to the April-June 2008 Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). These projects were considered in the analysis.

Fish Trap Lake Area Snowmobile & ATV Trail Re-route – Categorical Exclusion: This project includes a trail re-route and rehabilitation. Decision memo October 2007.

Dead Horse ATV & Snowmobile Trail – Great Divide: Environmental Assessment. Trail Reroute out of Wild & Scenic River corridor East Fork of the Chippewa River. Decision expected in June 2008.

Sailor to Solberg ATV Trail Connection – Medford Park Falls: This project consists primarily of designating existing travel corridors for ATV use with some new construction. Decision expected in July of 2008.

Townsend to Forest/Oconto County Line Multiple Use Trail Connector – Lakewood-Laona: EA expected September of 2008. The project includes improvements and designation of a portion of the Nicolet State multi-purpose trail.

Challenge 4X4 Trail Restoration ANRI/El Paso Pipeline – Lakewood Laona District: This project includes restoration and repair of the ANRI/El Paso Pipeline trail that have been degraded by past use. This project is on hold.

Perkinstown ATV Trail Maintenance & Improvement – Medford-Park Falls: This project may include trail relocation and maintenance. This project is on hold.

Iron River Trail Categorical Exclusion – Washburn: This project includes trail relocation and widening. This project is on hold.

### **Season of Use Restrictions: No Action Alternative**

General ATV seasonal use restrictions will remain in place (March 15<sup>th</sup> –April 30<sup>th</sup>) as described in the current Forest Order R913-08-02.

### **Type of Vehicles Allowed: No Action Alternative**

The following table provides a summary of miles available for motorized use by type of vehicle in the No Action Alternative. The table lists the miles of roads available for motorized use by HLVs only, the miles of roads available for ATVs only, and the miles of roads available to both types of vehicles on the same road.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following projects appear on the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest April- June 2008 SOPA: [http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/nepaqtr/sopa/2008\\_3\\_sopa.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/nepaqtr/sopa/2008_3_sopa.pdf)

**Table 1-2: Alternative 1 (No Action) Summary**

ML Roads	Miles of Roads Open for HLVs only	Miles of Roads available for ATVs only	Miles of Roads Open to Both Vehicle Types	Miles of Trails Open to ATVs
1	0	2	0	
2	4,086	0	464	
3	22	0	20	
4	48	0	2	
5	13	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,169</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>318</b>

<sup>1</sup>This column contains all the forest roads and the known unauthorized roads.

### Miles of roads and trails open to ATV use across the entire Forest

Alternative 1 includes 2 miles of roads open to ATV use only and 486 miles of roads open to both HLVs and ATVs. There are also 318 miles of trails open to ATV use. In addition, there are approximately 700 miles of ATV opportunities in the counties comprising and immediately surrounding the Forest. The following information on these 700 miles of ATV riding opportunities appears on the *Anything Wisconsin* website (March, 2008):

<http://www.anythingwisconsin.com/atvtrails.htm>

- Ashland County – Tri-Co Recreational Corridor. Approximately 62 miles through Ashland, Bayfield, and Douglas Counties.
- Bayfield County – 56 miles of trail from Port Wing to the Tri-Co Recreational Corridor.
- Florence County – over 150 miles of trails connecting to Marinette and Iron Counties in Michigan.
- Forest County – 8 miles of looped trail.
- Langlade County – 16 miles of Augustyn Trail and 38 miles of Parrish Highlands Trail.
- Marinette County – 160 miles that connect to Pembine, Dunbar, Goodman, and Florence Counties.
- Oconto County – The Dusty Trails ATV Club maintains approximately 110 miles of trails.
- Oneida County – 20 miles of Little Rice ATV Trail.
- Price Country – 60 miles Flambeau Trail System.
- Sawyer County – 46 miles (random); 38 miles in the Flambeau River State Forest; and 51 miles with the Tuscobia-Park Falls Trail.
- Taylor – 12 Camp 8 Trail miles.

### Miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest

There are currently 0.83 miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest.

Of the approximately 700 miles of ATV opportunities listed on the *Anything Wisconsin* website, approximately 500 miles occur in counties on the East side of the Forest.

## Miles of roads opened seasonally

There are 13 miles of roads designated seasonally for HLVs and 5 miles designated for both vehicle types (HLV and ATV).

## Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal)

*Alternative Map.* Maps of Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal) by Ranger District can be viewed or printed at the following links:

- [Eagle River Florence Ranger District](#)
- [Great Divide Ranger District](#)
- [Washburn Ranger District](#)
- [Medford Park Falls Ranger District  
Medford Landbase](#)
- [Medford Park Falls Ranger District  
Park Falls Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood Laona Ranger District  
Lakewood Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood Laona Ranger District  
Laona Landbase](#)

A list of the roads included in the Forest Proposal along with their proposed designation can be viewed at the following link: [620-2 TMR Road List](#). See Table 1-5 for resource indicators by alternative, and the miles of roads proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel by maintenance level for all alternatives. See Table 1-3 for a summary of miles of roads and trails proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel for the Forest Proposal.

This alternative represents the initial proposal revealed at the October 2007 open house meetings. As described under the Public Involvement section of this document, the RAP included ranking criteria for resource risks (water quality, soils, heritage resources, resource protection-based management areas, Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species habitats, other wildlife needs and the potential to spread invasive species) and access values (access for hunting, bough and firewood gathering, recreation, access to private in holdings, and administrative access).

### Season of Use Restrictions: Alternative 2

General ATV seasonal use restrictions will remain in place (March 15th –April 30th) as described in the current Forest Order R913-08-02.

### Type of Vehicles Allowed: Alternative 2

Table 1-3 provides a summary of miles available for motorized use by type of vehicle in Alternative 2. The table lists the miles of roads available for motorized use by HLVs only, the miles of roads available for ATVs only, and the miles of roads available to both types of vehicles on the same road.

### Miles of roads and trails open to ATV use across the entire Forest

Alternative 2 includes 9 miles of roads open to ATV use only and 452 miles of roads open to both HLVs and ATVs. There are also 318 miles of trails open to ATV use.



**Table 1-3: Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal) Summary**

ML Roads	Miles of Roads Open for HLVs only	Miles of Roads Open for ATVs only	Miles of Roads Open to Both Vehicle Types	Miles of Trails Open to ATVs
1	0	2	0	
2	1,543	7	428	
3	20	0	20	
4	46	0	2	
5	12	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,621</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>318</b>

### Miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest

Alternative 2 is the same as the No Action Alternative for this indicator. There are 0.83 miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest in Alternative 2. Of the approximately 700 miles of ATV opportunities listed on the *Anything Wisconsin* website, approximately 500 miles occur in counties on the East side of the Forest .

### Miles of roads opened seasonally

Alternative 2 is the same as the No Action Alternative for this indicator. There are 13 miles of roads designated seasonally for HLVs and 5 miles designated for both vehicle types (HLV and ATV).

## Alternative 3

*Alternative Map.* Maps of Alternative 3 by Ranger District can be viewed or printed at the following links:

- [Eagle River/Florence Ranger District](#)
- [Great Divide Ranger District](#)
- [Washburn Ranger District](#)
- [Medford/Park Falls Ranger District Medford Landbase](#)
- [Medford/Park Falls Ranger District Park Falls Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood/Laona Ranger District Lakewood Landbase](#)
- [Lakewood/Laona Ranger District Laona Landbase](#)

A list of the roads included in Alternative 3 along with their proposed designation can be viewed at the following link: [620-2 TMR Road List](#). See Table 1-5 for resource indicators by alternative, and the miles of roads proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel by maintenance level for all alternatives. See Table 1-4 for a summary of miles of roads and trails proposed to be open for HLV and/or ATV travel for Alternative 3.

Alternative 3 addresses the significant public issue of “not enough motorized access” through:

- Increased seasonal motorized access Forestwide (42 miles of roads opened seasonally for HLVs and 11 miles for ATV use from September 15th to December 31st for fall access);
- Designating 22 new miles of ATV routes and connections on the East Side of the Forest;
- Increased designated roads Forestwide for recreation experiences; specifically 24 miles of roads for both vehicle types.

**Season of Use Restrictions: Alternative 3**

Alternative 3 includes 42 miles of increased seasonal motorized access for HLVs (specific roads opened seasonally from September 15th to December 31st for fall access). General ATV seasonal use restrictions will remain in place (March 15th –April 30th) as described in the current Forest Order R913-08-02.

**Type of Vehicles Allowed: Alternative 3**

The following table provides a summary of miles available for motorized use by type of vehicle in Alternative 3. The table lists the miles of roads available for motorized use by HLVs only, the miles of roads available for ATVs only, and the miles of roads available to both types of vehicles on the same road.

**Table 1-4: Alternative 3 Summary**

ML Roads	Miles of Roads Open for HLVs only	Miles of Roads Open for ATVs only	Miles of Roads Open to Both Vehicle Types	Miles of Trails Open to ATVs
1	0	2	0	
2	1,587	18	451	
3	20	0	20	
4	45	0	3	
5	12	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>318</b>

**Miles of roads and trails open to ATV use across the entire Forest**

Alternative 3 includes 20 miles of roads open to ATV use and 474 miles of roads open to both HLVs and ATVs. There are also 318 miles of trails open to ATV use on the Forest. This alternative also includes 22 new miles of roads on the East Side of the Forest for ATV use.

**Miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest**

There are 22 new miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest in Alternative 3.

**Miles of roads opened seasonally**

There are 42 miles of roads opened specifically in the fall season for HLVs and 11 miles open to ATVs to allow additional motorized access for fall activities in Alternative 3.

**Alternative Considered but Dropped from Further Analysis: Designate Only Current National Forest System Roads**

One alternative considered, but dropped from further analysis would designate only current forest roads for public motorized use. Implementing this alternative would designate approximately 1,954 miles of roads for motorized use (HLVs and ATVs).

This alternative was not fully analyzed because the Deciding Official chose to be more responsive to public suggestions and concerns and include the roads identified by the public during public scoping for consideration in the RAP. The Forest IDT reviewed the roads brought forward by the public for potential resource damage and other concerns; the roads that met the Forest Plan objectives and other requirements were added to the Forest Proposal (Alternative 2) and Alternative 3.

### ***Alternative Considered but Dropped from Further Analysis: Designate Additional Roads in the Most and Intermediate ATV Suitability Classes during the Fall Season.***

Another alternative considered but dropped from further analysis would designate additional unauthorized roads that occur within the most and intermediate ATV suitability classes for public motorized use during the fall season (September 15<sup>th</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup>). This alternative was considered in response to the significant issue “not enough motorized access” and the request for additional fall access.

The ATV suitability classes are areas of the Forest that have been determined to be either least, intermediate or most suitable for motorized recreation. These suitability classes were identified based on an interdisciplinary approach and considered the effects of motorized recreation on threatened and endangered plant and animal species, soil and slope characteristics, wolf pack locations, potential Landscape Analysis and Design sites, potential Alternative Management Areas, streams, lakes, and archeological sites. (Final Environmental Impact Statement to accompany the Forest Plan, pg. 3-227)

This alternative was dropped from further analysis after the Forest IDT identified the potential for resource damage and non-compliance with the Forest Plan and other requirements from continued motorized use on these unauthorized roads. The Deciding Official also considered the financial impact to the Forest of maintenance required to meet Forest Service road standards for resource protection.

### ***Comparison of Alternatives: Resource Indicators***

Table 1-5 shows a comparison of the three Alternatives by resource indicators.

## **Environmental Consequences**

The following sections contain information on the environmental consequences including the compliance summaries with links to the detailed resource reports, the direct and indirect effects, as well as the cumulative effects of the CNNF Travel Management Project. The resource indicators listed in Table 1-5 are discussed in these sections and in the detailed resource reports.

### ***Compliance Summary***

The environmental consequences of all of the alternatives for the CNNF Travel Management Project meet the requirements of the Travel Management Rule (including 36 CFR 212, 251, 261, and 295), Forest Plan standards and guidelines, the intent of Executive Orders 11644 and 12898, and other laws, regulations and other requirements to which the Forest subscribes related to the project.

**Table 1-5: Resource Indicators**

	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2 (Forest Proposal)	Alternative 3
<b>Miles of road open to ATV <u>only</u> use in the CNNF</b>	2	9	20
<b>Miles of Trail Open for ATV Use</b>	318	318	318
<b>Fall Access<sup>1</sup></b>	None provided	None provided	42
<b>Miles open to ATV use: East Side of the Forest</b>	None provided	None provided	22
<b>ML Road Miles Open to Highway Legal Vehicles Only</b>			
ML 1	0	21	24
ML 2	4,086	1,543	1,587
ML 3	22	20	20
ML 4	48	46	45
ML 5	13	12	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,169</b>	<b>1,621</b>	<b>1,664</b>
<b>Miles of Road Open to Both Vehicle Types</b>	486	450	474
<b>Total Road Miles Available for Motorized Use</b>	<b>4,657</b>	<b>2,080</b>	<b>2,158</b>
<b>Miles of Unauthorized Roads to be added as National Forest System roads</b>	2703 <sup>2</sup>	203	262
<b>Resource Indicators</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>
Elk: Miles of road open to all motorized use within ¼ mile of calving areas	53	20	21
NNIS: Miles of road newly opened to ATV use	Not applicable	58	84
NNIS: Miles of road within 100 feet of NNIS sites	674	415	428
Timber Wolf: Miles of road open to any motorized use within wolf pack territories.	3096	1508	1544
Fassett's Locoweed: Roads open to any motorized use within 200 feet of the high water mark of lakes with known occurrences.	One	None	None
Miles of road open to all motorized use in high risk soils	265	108	108
Miles of road newly open to ATV use within ATV Resource Suitability Map Areas			
Most Suitable	157	149	157
Intermediate Suitability	238	229	248
Least Suitable	90	90	86
Number of stream crossings of roads open to any motorized use	413	183	188

<sup>1</sup>Miles of road open to motorized use from September 15 to December 31 which are unavailable to motorized use during the rest of the year.

<sup>2</sup>These are known existing unauthorized roads and as part of the No Action alternative they were not evaluated through the RAP.

All alternatives comply with USDA Forest Service regulations, 36CFR219.27 (a) and Forest Plan direction pertaining to the soil resource. Alternatives 2 and 3 reduce public motorized transportation on high risk soils by 157 miles or 59%, from Alternative 1. About 94-95% of the roads in each of the three alternatives are on low to moderate risk soils. For more detailed

information regarding the soil resource, see the full soil resource report at the following link: [5201 Soils](#)

All alternatives comply with the Forest Plan, state and federal law, and Executive Order 13112 with respect to the issue of non-native invasive species (NNIS). Alternative 2 reduces the potential spread of NNIS more than the other alternatives. For more detailed information regarding NNIS, see the full NNIS report at the following link: [5301 NNIS](#)

All alternatives comply with Forest Plan and Regulatory direction for hydrologic resources. The Forest Proposal most closely meets the direction by reducing the most roads open to motor vehicle use in areas sensitive for water resources. It has the lowest number of stream crossings, miles in Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) and miles in wetland when compared to the other alternatives. Alternative 3 also makes substantial progress toward Forest Plan direction but contains slightly more roads in sensitive areas. Alternative 1 (No Action) would leave nearly double the mileage of roads open to public motor vehicle use than the other alternatives. Alternative 1 (No Action) has the highest number of stream crossings, miles in RMZ and miles in wetland of all alternatives and would not help achieve the Forest Plan aquatic desired conditions as well as Alternatives 2 and 3. For more detailed information regarding the hydrology resource, see the full hydrology resource report at the following link: [5601 Hydrology](#)

All alternatives comply with Forest Plan and Regulatory direction for sensitive plant and animal species. Implementation of any of them would not result in loss of viability of any Federally-listed species or agency-identified sensitive species (Regional Forester Sensitive Species) and is therefore consistent with the Endangered Species Act, the National Forest Management Act and Forest Service Manual Direction (section 2672). For more detailed information regarding sensitive plant and animal species, see the full biological evaluation at the following link: [5401 Biological Evaluation](#)

Tribal representatives did not identify, or communicate, to Forest District Rangers any adverse effects to tribal populations associated with the CNNF Travel Management Project. The Forest County Potawatomi Community brought forward a list of roads for consideration for access to their tribal lands. These roads were included in the RAP.

The Forest RAP included a risk analysis for cultural resource protection. Criteria in the RAP were developed in a manner that reflected direction in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended (P.L. 89-665; 80 Stat. 915; 16 USC 470). Section 106 of the act requires that federal agencies consider the effects of their undertakings on properties listed or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The RAP applied cultural resource criteria as one component of the risk analysis on the existing road system. This project does not include elements of new construction or ground disturbance; only existing travel corridors were considered. There will be no effect on recorded cultural resources.

For detailed information regarding the recreation and social consequences, see the full recreation and social report at the following link: [5501 Recreation & Social](#)

## **Summary Comparison of the Direct and Indirect Effects of Alternatives by Issue.**

### **Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access**

#### **Affected Environment: Wisconsin's Motorized Recreation Supply & Demand**

There are approximately 244,000 registered ATVs in Wisconsin, which is four times the number registered since 1993 (NHAL 2008). 23.4% of the population (959,400 people) use ATVs and 18% of the population participates in operating a vehicle off-road (SCORP, 2004). ATVs are permitted at the State of Wisconsin Richard I Bong Recreation Area, two state forests and seven state trails (DNR Board meeting, 2006). A USTM study estimates 9,000 miles of roads/trails available in the State for ATV use (Waalén, 2006) and a Wisconsin DNR report in 2004 estimates 5,555 miles of roads or trails available (SCORP). In addition, 29 of 72 counties in Wisconsin provide ATV trails on county owned or managed lands (DNR Board meeting, 2006).

“Increasing ATV usage and associated impacts” is considered a recreation issue in all but the Mississippi River Corridor (defined by the State SCORP) region of the State of Wisconsin and is the recreation issue identified most frequently in all regions (SCORP: 5-10). “More ATV usage opportunities” is identified only as a recreation need in the Southern Gateways region of the State and a supply shortage for ATV trails was identified only in the Great Northwest region (SCORP 5-21).

#### **Miles of roads open to ATV use across the entire Forest**

There are 318 miles of trails open to ATV use on the Forest. Forest roads are closed to ATV use unless posted open with a sign. The roads open to ATVs are identified on ATV maps available at Forest Offices. The MVUM would replace these maps.

According to the *Anything Wisconsin* website in March, 2008, there are over 700 miles of ATV riding opportunities in counties surrounding the Forest.

<http://www.anythingwisconsin.com/atvtrails.htm>

#### **Miles of Roads Available for ATV Use by ATV Suitability Class**

There are currently 90 miles of road available for ATV use in areas classified as least suitable and 238 miles in the intermediate class. 157 miles of road are currently available for ATV use in the most suitable class.

#### **Miles of roads opened seasonally**

There are currently no miles of roads or trails managed on the Forest specifically to provide seasonal motorized recreation opportunities; current seasonal restrictions relate to the protection of Forest resources.

#### **Miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest**

There are currently 0.83 miles of roads open to ATV use on the East Side of the Forest (Himley Lake Connector).

The information listed on *Anything Wisconsin* website indicates that there are about 500 miles of ATV opportunities available in the counties comprising the East side of the Forest.

## **Summary of Environmental Consequences Significant Issue Not Enough Motorized Access**

All action alternatives comply with the Forest Plan and the Travel Management Rule for motorized use. The following paragraphs explain the compliance finding and provide interpretation of the environmental and social effects for consideration by the Deciding Official in regards to the "not enough motorized access" issue and other issues associated with the project.

### **The Forest Plan and ATV Suitability Map**

The Forest Plan requires consistency of motorized recreation with general management area direction, standards, and guidelines. The RAP includes analysis criteria that insure compliance with Forest Plan requirements. Please see Table 1-1.

The Forest Plan also provides a guideline for new miles of trails designated open for motorized use within the least suitable category established in the ATV Suitability Map (see Forest Plan pg. 2-28 and map packet to the Final Environmental Impact Statement).

[http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/final\\_forest\\_plan/maps/ATV\\_Suitability\\_sm.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/cnnf/natres/final_forest_plan/maps/ATV_Suitability_sm.pdf). The Forest Plan does not provide a threshold for a minimum or maximum number of miles in any of the three suitability categories, and therefore the interpretation of the environmental effects focuses on a relative comparison of Alternatives with the ATV Suitability map categories.

There is not a substantial difference between the three alternatives in terms of miles designated within each ATV suitability category (See Table 1-5). Alternatives 1 and 2 show 90 miles designated in the least suitability category and Alternative 3 includes 86. Assuming the least suitability category is the most critical in terms of resource protection; Alternative 3 would be the most consistent with Forest Plan goals for resource protection in the designation of roads for motorized use by designating four less miles in the least suitability category. Alternatives 1 and 2 show 157 miles in the most suitable category indicating that the two alternatives are equally consistent with Forest Plan direction for providing motorized recreation use opportunities.

### **The Travel Management Rule: Type of Vehicles Allowed**

The Travel Management Rule requires that the roads available for motorized use be designated by type of vehicle. The CNNF Travel Management Project complies with this requirement because under all the Alternatives, roads would be open to HLVs, ATVs, or both types of vehicles. Each alternative defines the roads available by vehicle type.

The No Action Alternative clearly provides the most motorized recreation use opportunities for HLVs. There are approximately 2.5 times more miles of road available for HLVs in Alternative 1 (4,169 miles) than either Alternative 2 (1,621 miles) or Alternative 3 (1,664 miles). The No Action Alternative also provides the most motorized use opportunities for ATVs with 486 miles of roads and 318 miles of trails.

### **The Travel Management Rule: Seasonal Restrictions**

The Travel Management Rule requires that the roads available for motorized use be designated, if appropriate, by time of year. All the Alternatives for the CNNF Travel Management Project include motorized access restrictions to protect natural resources appropriately during spring break-up and wildlife breeding seasons.

In terms of overall miles of road available for motorized use opportunities September 15<sup>th</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> (for hunting and gathering seasons) the No Action Alternative provides the most motorized recreation opportunities.

### **Summary Comparison of Cumulative Effects for the Significant Issue: Not Enough Motorized Access**

There are direct effects from implementing the alternatives for the CNNF Travel Management Project to recreation motorized use opportunities and this section discusses the overall, or cumulative, effects. The spatial boundary for cumulative effects includes the eleven Wisconsin counties comprising the Forest; the rationale for this boundary is based on a reasonable distance of motorized recreation opportunities available to someone living in the area or traveling to the Forest.

The temporal boundary includes the projects related to travel management since implementation of the Forest Plan and the April-June 2008 Forest SOPA. The rationale is that motorized recreation opportunities are discussed in depth in the Forest Plan Environmental Impact Statement and that the current Forest SOPA provides a reasonable list of expected Forest projects related to motorized vehicle use.

The Forest's corporate Geographic Information System (GIS) database includes information regarding motorized recreation use on roads and trails from past and reasonable future projects listed on the Forest SOPA; this information is listed on the existing condition (Alternative 1).

The cumulative, overall impact to motorized recreation use opportunities in the "Northwoods" of Wisconsin relates primarily to those motorized recreation use opportunities available on non-federal lands in the eleven counties surrounding the Forest. Many counties and towns update the availability of roads and trails for public motorized use frequently, if not annually. The Forest cooperates with local governments and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and considers the comprehensive recreation opportunities available to the public. This interconnected relationship of jurisdictions provides a forest user many opportunities for motor vehicle recreation. Many of the available designated roads and trails are not located within just one jurisdiction, but are a combination of Forest Service, Wisconsin DNR, county, and township roads and trails to provide an interconnected network of travel opportunities.

However, given the frequency that counties and towns update their road and trail availability, the Forest Service does not maintain accurate and up-to-date records of the motorized use of roads and trails outside Federal jurisdiction. The *Anything Wisconsin* website lists approximately 700 miles of ATV opportunities for use in the counties surrounding the Forest, with about 500 of those miles close to the East side of the Forest.

The Wisconsin DNR recently conducted a feasibility study to create trails for ATV use in the Northern Highland-American Legion (NHAL) State Forest in Vilas, Oneida, and Iron Counties. The NHAL does not currently have any designated ATV trails. On April 23, 2008, the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board accepted the DNR's recommendation that the Oneida/Vilas ATV Trail Alternative and the Iron County Trail Alternative within the NHAL not be considered further.

In conclusion, the cumulative effects of implementing the CNNF Travel Management Project, in addition to the direct effects already discussed, are difficult, if not impossible, to calculate exactly for recreation motorized use opportunities for highway legal vehicles, given the lack of information (and frequently changing information) on the availability of motorized use on roads



managed under non-federal jurisdiction. Implementing Alternative 2 or 3 would reduce the motorized recreation opportunities on the Forest by approximately 2,500 miles. The Forest Service recognizes that the State of Wisconsin, counties, townships, or other governmental or private land owners do not have the land base or financial resources to create new motorized recreation opportunities that could accommodate the demand for any displaced motor vehicle users when the 2,500 miles of motorized opportunities on the Forest would be no longer available under Alternatives 2 and 3. However, it is anticipated that use patterns will shift because of the Forest Service designating a network of road and trails for motor vehicle use. Yet, accurate monitoring data is not available to specifically determine likely changes in recreation use patterns if the 2,500 miles were no longer available. Possible outcomes may include increased motorized use on the roads and trails that remain available, illegal use on closed roads and trails, and displacement of users to Michigan, Minnesota or other locations.

For ATV riding opportunities, the addition of 22 miles of routes included on the East Side of the Forest (84 total new miles across the Forest) in Alternative 3 would represent a comparatively small increase in recreation opportunities to the over 700 miles available in the eleven Wisconsin counties listed on the *Anything Wisconsin* website while Alternative 2 would add 58 miles.

## **CNNF Travel Management Project ID Team Members**

Joan Marburger: Project Coordinator; Public Scoping and Comments

Lisa Whitcomb: IDT Leader and Project Manager; Recreation; Social; Economic; Environmental Justice

Dave Hoppe: Soils

Dale Higgins: Hydrology

Matt St. Pierre: Threatened, Endangered, & Sensitive Species; Wildlife

Marjory Brzeskiewicz: Non-Native Invasive Species

Dave Campbell & Mike Miller: Transportation

Mike Harnois: Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Mary Rasmussen: Tribal Liaison; Chequamegon-Nicolet, Ottawa, and Hiawatha National Forests

Mark Bruhy: Heritage Resources

Suzanne Flory: Media and Legislative Affairs

William Johnson: Public Involvement

## **Consultation and Coordination**

The Forest Service consulted the following individuals, federal, state, and local agencies, Tribes and non-Forest Service persons during the development of this environmental assessment.

### ***Federal, State, and Local Agencies***

See project record.

### ***Tribes***

The following tribes were contacted in Wisconsin: Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Sokaogon Chippewa Community, Mole Lake Chippewa Tribe, St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Forest County Potawatomi Community, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Ho-Chunk Nation, Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, and Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians.

The following tribes were contacted in Michigan (MI) and Minnesota (MN): Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (MI), Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (MI), and Fond du Lac Chippewa Tribe (MN).

Individual members of the Voigt Intertribal Task Force and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission were also contacted.

### ***Others***

See project record.