

## **ISSUE 6: ENFORCEMENT**

### **Changes from the Draft to the Final EIS**

Tables 3.6.9, 3.6.11 and 3.6.12 were corrected to reflect changes to Alternative 7-M. Table 3.6.11 was reformatted to display trespass vulnerable acres by mountain range only. Data for each travel plan area for this table is available in the project file. Discussions regarding the proposed national OHV rule were changed to reflect the Final National OHV decision. Summaries of available law enforcement staffing on the forest were updated to reflect recent transfers or retirements.

### **Introduction**

During scoping for revision of the Gallatin National Forest Travel Plan, both during the benchmark phase in July 2002 and when the six draft alternatives were presented to the public in August 2003, numerous comments were received concerning the ability of the Forest Service to enforce travel management restrictions. There is wide skepticism among some users about the ability to make travel management restrictions effective, due to the perceived limited ability of the agency to enforce restrictions. The bulk of enforcement-related comments were tied to motorized uses of the Forest. Lack of enforcement seems to perpetuate additional illegal behavior and raises concern about increasing resource damage and social conflicts. Many respondents suggested that there is a need to include a thoughtful and thorough enforcement and monitoring strategy as an implementation tool to address this issue.

### **Affected Environment**

The 1.8 million acres of the Gallatin National Forest provide many challenges to law enforcement officials, ranging from minor infractions such as littering to serious situations like theft of timber and drug-related incidents. Managing burgeoning recreation use and related law enforcement issues proves to be a challenging and growing issue on the Forest. Travel management-related violations continue to grow, with an increasing trend in the number of violations written for trespass into closed areas, resource damage, etc. and an increasing number of incidents.

The Forest currently has a law enforcement staff of three full time law enforcement officers, one special agent, and a zoned supervisory law enforcement officer for the entire program for the east-side Forests zone. The full time law enforcement officers are located in Gardiner, Bozeman and West Yellowstone Montana. Personnel changes in the last year (retirement, transfer) have left several vacancies in the enforcement organization on the Gallatin. These officers may be called upon to assist with law enforcement duties elsewhere in the zone or nationwide for national emergencies, regardless of their duty stations, and so are not always available locally. In addition to this permanent enforcement staffing, the Forest typically has 15 Forest protection officers who have limited training and enforce mostly minor infractions during the course of their normal duties in other jobs. The Forest has one permanent part-time OHV ranger in West Yellowstone, and one full time recreation technician/snow ranger located in Cooke City, Montana, who, as Forest protection officers, spend a significant amount of their time on Travel Plan enforcement.

During the winter, an aggressive enforcement program is implemented in the Cooke City and Hebgen Basin areas. Throughout the winter, law enforcement officers from across the region rotate out of both areas to assist local Forest protection officers and recreation personnel manage busy snowmobile programs. In Cooke City, the emphasis is on visitor education and monitoring, and enforcing snowmobile trespass into the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness. In the Hebgen Basin, the emphasis is on visitor education, accident investigations, and enforcing trail speed limits. During the winter of 2005/2006, two seasonal winter rangers were hired and patrolled the heavy-use snowmobile areas of the Bozeman, Hegben Lake and Madison Ranger Districts. The funding for this project came through the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (MFWP) recreation trails grant program.

MFWP game wardens also have limited authority to enforce travel management restrictions on National Forest. State law allows wardens to cite anglers or hunters who have violated federal travel restrictions to hunt or fish. There are typically nine wardens with jurisdiction on the Forest.

The following two tables (Table 3.6.1 and Table 3.6.2) summarize recorded and documented incidents, violations notices and warning notices issued in 1998 and in 2003. It is important to note that not all incidents become officially recorded through the Law Enforcement and Investigations Management Attainment Reporting System. Only incidents where officers were provided factual data about a problem are recorded in this database. Many incidents that occur on the Forest go unrecorded. Incidents where an individual was given a warning notice or notice of violations are so noted. The column that describes the number of incidents shows the incidents where no ticket was issued or complaint filed. Often these are discovered after the fact and are simply noted to keep track of the issue. This data displays an increasing trend in the number of incidents, warnings and violations issued for motor vehicle-related types of violations between 1998 and 2003. An obvious jump in the number of violations observed against 36 CFR 261.55(d), which by special order limits trail vehicles to certain widths, lengths or other limitations, probably indicates a trend in two areas: speeding snowmobiles on groomed routes in the West Yellowstone area, and inappropriate OHV use of trails after the statewide OHV decision. In 2003, over 450 violations occurred in this category, compared to only 70 in 1998. The overall increase in the number of violations written and incidents observed between 1998 and 2003 may also be affected by having more officers on duty in 2003 than in 1998.

**Table 3.6.1 Gallatin National Forest 1998 violation summary data (Montana) from Law Enforcement and Investigations Management Attainment Reporting System.**

Description Of Violation	Offense Code	Warnings	Violations/Tickets: 100 Total: 584		
			Incidents	Violations/ Tickets	Total
Construction of roads, trails, or other facilities.	36 CFR 26110 A	2	2	0	4
Residential occupation of Forest Service land (homesteading).	36 CFR 26110 B	6	4	1	11
Abandoned property.	36 CFR 26110 E	0	4	0	4
Placing vehicle or other object as a safety hazard.	36 CFR 26110 F	0	1	0	1
Littering or failing to dispose of debris properly.	36 CFR 26111 B	1	7	3	11

Summary for all Violations (not just those noted below):	Warnings: 92 Incidents: 392		Violations/Tickets: 100 Total: 584		
Description Of Violation	Offense Code	Warnings	Incidents	Violations/ Tickets	Total
Failure to dispose of all garbage.	36 CFR 26111 D	1	7	1	9
Blocking gates or restricting use of roads.	36 CFR 26112 D	0	5	1	6
Wreckless or careless operation of vehicles on roads.	36 CFR 26113 G	0	5	4	9
Use of vehicle off road causing resource damage.	36 CFR 26113 H	6	4	1	11
Off road vehicle violation of noise standard.	36 CFR 26113 D	0	0	0	0
Use of motorized vehicle in Wilderness.	36 CFR 26116 A	0	2	5	7
Use of bicycle or hang glider in Wilderness.	36 CFR 26116 B	0	1	0	1
Special order area closure violation – T&E species.	36 CFR 26153 A	0	3	0	3
Special Order road closed to certain vehicles.	36 CFR 26154 A	1	12	2	15
Special Order road closed to certain types of traffic.	36 CFR 26154 B	0	0	1	1
Violation of posted speed, weight limit, etc. on roads.	36 CFR 26154 D	0	35	9	44
Special order closure to any use of road.	36 CFR 26154 E	0	1	0	1
Careless or reckless operation of a vehicle on a road.	36 CFR 26154 F	0	1	0	1
Special order closure of trails.	36CFR26155A	0	3	0	3
Special order restriction of certain trail vehicles.	36CFR26155B	1	6	4	11
Special order closure of prohibited types of travel.	36CFR26155C	0	3	0	3
Operating a vehicle in violation of stated width, weight or other limitations.	36 CFR 26155 D	20	28	22	70
Special order area closure to vehicle travel off Forest Development Roads.	36 CFR 26156	1	10	2	13
Damaging natural features or other property of the US.	36 CFR 2619 A	2	47	1	50
Removing natural features or other property of the US.	36 CFR 2619 B	0	14	0	14

**Table 3.6.2 Gallatin National Forest 2003 violation summary data (Montana) from Law Enforcement and Investigations Management Attainment Reporting System.**

Summary for all Violations (not just those noted below):	Warnings: 494 Incidents: 657		Violations/Tickets: 327 Total: 1481		
Description Of Violation	Offense Code	Warnings	Incidents	Violations/ Tickets	Total
Construction of roads, trails, or other facilities.	36 CFR 26110 A	9	3	0	12
Residential occupation of Forest Service land (homesteading).	36 CFR 26110 B	6	6	4	14
Abandoned property.	36 CFR 26110 E	2	6	0	8
Placing vehicle or other object as a safety hazard.	36 CFR 26110 F	0	1	0	1
Littering or failing to dispose of debris properly.	36 CFR 26111 B	7	21	2	30
Failure to dispose of all garbage.	36 CFR 26111 D	5	6	1	12
Damaging and failing to repair any road or trail.	36 CFR 26112 C	1	0	0	1
Blocking gates or restricting use of roads.	36 CFR 26112 D	24	2	1	27
Use of vehicle off roads w/o valid license as required by state law.	36 CFR 26113 A	8	7	0	15
Operating a vehicle after dark w/o lights.	36 CFR 26113 C	25	4	7	36
Off-road vehicle violation of noise standard.	36 CFR 26113 D	0	0	0	0
Wreckless or careless operation of vehicles on roads.	36 CFR 26113 G	0	5	4	9
Use of vehicle off road causing resource damage.	36 CFR 26113 H	2	90	0	95
Use of vehicle off road in violation of state laws (registration).	36 CFR 25113 I	37	1	12	50
Use of motorized vehicle in Wilderness.	36 CFR 26116 A	0	58	17	75
Use of bicycle or hanglider in Wilderness.	36 CFR 26116 B	0	1	0	1
Special order area closure violation – T&E species.	36 CFR 26153 A	3	35	5	43
Special Order road closed to certain vehicles.	36 CFR 26154 A	0	5	1	6
Special Order road closed to certain types of traffic.	36 CFR 26154 B	2	0	0	2
Violation of posted speed, weight limit, etc. on roads.	36 CFR 26154 D	10	0	5	15
Special order closure to any use of road.	36 CFR 26154 E	0	1	0	1
Careless or reckless operation of a vehicle on a road.	36 CFR 26154 F	4	1	1	6
Special order closure of Trails.	36 CFR 26155 A	1	1	0	2
Special order restriction of certain trail vehicles.	36 CFR 26155 B	19	15	12	46
Special order closure of prohibited types of travel.	36 CFR 26155 C	0	0	0	0

Summary for all Violations (not just those noted below):		Warnings: 494 Incidents: 657		Violations/Tickets: 327 Total: 1481	
Description Of Violation	Offense Code	Warnings	Incidents	Violations/ Tickets	Total
Operating a vehicle in violation of stated width, weight or other limitations on trails.	36 CFR 26155 D	205	54	192	451
Shortcutting trail switchbacks.	36 CFR 26155 E	0	1	0	1
Special order area closure to vehicle travel off Forest development roads.	36 CFR 26156	22	159	17	198
Damaging natural features or other property of the US.	36 CFR 2619 A	2	22	1	25
Removing natural features or other property of the US.	36 CFR 2619 B	0	4	0	4

The current Travel Plan that governs use of roads and trails on the Gallatin National Forest is a confusing mix of regulations and special closures, a large number of seasonal restrictions and complex map legends and displays. The map is very difficult for some readers to understand and interpret. This situation contributes to innocent violations of travel restrictions. People honestly believe they are allowed to travel with their vehicle on a road or trail, when in fact that use is restricted in some way. The confusion over the maps and restrictions also contributes to violations that are more blatant; people simply give up trying to interpret the map and go where and how they choose. A number of additional restrictions and closures have been implemented since the map was last reprinted. Some restrictions are temporary and not reflected on the map, which creates more confusion and misunderstanding about what uses are permissible on the Forest. These temporary restrictions or closures are usually only posted at the appropriate Ranger District Office, and at the closure area/site/route. Postings at the site are subject to vandalism and theft, leaving the user uninformed about the new restriction.

Forest recreation professionals and law enforcement have noted enforcement hot spots for travel management violations in the last several years. There are a wide variety of reasons for these situations. A few examples include a high density of user-created routes, complex travel management regulations and mixed ownership, and high profile sensitive areas like congressionally protected Wilderness Study Areas. Some of these travel management hot spots on the Gallatin Forest include the Shields, Hyalite Canyon, areas within the Hyalite/Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area, Buck Ridge/Muddy Creek, the Taylor Fork and Cabin Creek Wildlife Management Area, Cooke City (Miller and Fisher drainages), Hebgen Basin, the East Bridger Range and the Bangtails. In several of these locations, a trend has been noted where summer motorized users will follow marked winter trails, even though no summer trail is established there, creating new unauthorized routes.

The Gallatin Travel Management Plan (1999) could be described as permissive in nature. That is, the map only shows prohibitions for areas or certain uses on roads and trails. All other areas not restricted were open to any mode of travel. In January of 2001, the Regional Forester decided to prohibit all cross-country motorized travel off existing or designated roads and trails (USDA 2001). The State of Montana and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) were also party to that decision. The decision applied to state, BLM and National Forest lands within Montana, and North and South Dakota. This decision amended all current Forest Plans in Montana National Forests.

The Montana/Dakota Statewide OHV decision (USDA 2001) was designed to halt the accretion of new user-created unauthorized motorized routes on public land. The decision states that if existing legal user-created routes were present at the time the decision was made, continued use of those routes was permissible so long as the vehicle using the route was able to fit entirely on the existing tread, and that use had been well established prior to January 2001. In practicality, this decision has been difficult for law enforcement to implement and enforce (J. Walker, US Forest Service, personal communication). Most Forests do not have a comprehensive inventory of user-created routes before January, 2001, and officers now have the burden of proving that violators created new routes when attempting to enforce the restriction. There were certainly some legitimate user-created routes on the Forest at the time of the OHV decision. Since the decision, new unauthorized routes continue to be established in some areas.

A serious situation that has complicated enforcement of travel regulations is the actual legal method by which those regulations or restrictions have been implemented historically. Travel restrictions are enacted through two means on National Forests: the 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 261 Subpart A (restrictions or general prohibitions), and the 36 CFR 261 Subpart B (prohibitions that are created through special order).

The subpart A prohibitions that apply to the use of roads and trails have historically dealt primarily with violations of applicable state laws that regulate licensing, noise, safe operation of vehicles, damaging roads or trails, interfering with road or trail use, under the influence of alcohol or drugs, careless or reckless operation or in a manner in which damages resources or wildlife (36 CFR 261.12 parts {a.} – {d.} and 36 CFR 261.13 parts {a.} – {i.}). These general prohibitions of the CFRs are considered “strict liability” prohibitions. This means that it is the National Forest user’s responsibility to know and adhere to these regulations without any additional notification or posting on the part of the agency. Recent changes to CFR regulations have added off-route motor vehicle travel to the Subpart A restrictions. See the expanded discussion below.

Most travel restrictions that historically prohibited some sort of travel on National Forests were implemented through the 36 CFR subpart B authority for special orders, specifically 36 CFR 261.53 (special closures), 36 CFR 261.54 (use of Forest development roads), 36 CFR 261.55 (use of Forest development trails) and 36 CFR 261.56 (use of vehicles off Forest development roads). These specific sections of the CFRs permit the agency to prohibit certain uses of roads and trails, to limit use to specific vehicle types and to prohibit off road travel.

The situation that exacerbates enforcement of these special order restrictions is the 36 CFR 261.51(a) and (b) requirement for posting of these prohibitions. 36 CFR 261.51 (a) states, “*Placing a copy of the order imposing each prohibition in the Offices of the Forest Supervisor and District Ranger, or equivalent Officer who has jurisdiction over the lands affected by the order AND* (emphasis added),” 35 CFR 261.51 (b) states, “*Displaying each prohibition imposed by an order in such locations and manner as to reasonably bring the prohibition to the attention of the public.*” The latter requirement becomes very problematic when attempting to post area closures or trail restrictions on the ground across large areas. The simple issue is that without adequate posting on the ground, special order restrictions are less enforceable (J. Walker, USFS, personal communication). Many court cases of this nature are lost because of inadequate posting and signing

in the field. Vandalism or destruction of posted prohibition signing is common, and is an effective method to negate or jeopardize the effectiveness of special order closures. Officers occasionally choose not to write a ticket to violators because of inadequate posting of the restrictions, a task that typically falls to understaffed District recreation and trails personnel.

On November 9, 2005 the USDA published a final rule to regulate OHV use on National Forests. This “Final Travel Management Rule; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicles” (sometimes referred to as the OHV Rule) changed the legal authority for regulating off-route travel of motor vehicles (Federal Register vo. 70, No. 216). The final rule modified regulations in 36 CFR 295 which historically governed the management of OHV’s on National Forests. In the process of modifying 36 CFR 295, the rule changed the enforcement authority for motor vehicle restrictions from 36 CFR 261 Subpart B: Special Orders to Subpart A: General Prohibitions section, making motor vehicle violations of the future a strict liability infraction. This simple change relieves the Agency of the burdensome posting/signing requirements of 36 CFR 261 Subpart B and authorizes map notification to be the enforcement tool of the future. The decision mandates that all National Forests complete a travel management review for summer motorized road and trail uses, identify the appropriate class of vehicles for use on specific roads and trails, and to specifically designate which routes are open to motor vehicles (including seasonal restrictions). Motor vehicle travel off those designated routes (cross country) will no longer be permitted unless it occurs in specifically managed and designated open areas. No action alternative in the Gallatin National Forest revised travel plan proposes to permit cross country travel in open areas. Implementation of the rule is completed once a Forest has completed travel management revision through a public process, and published a Motor Vehicle Use Map (36 CFR 212.56). The final rule also provided that over-snow vehicle travel could be managed under like provisions (36 CFR 212.81) and regulate the travel of those vehicles under 36 CFR 261 Subpart A. The provision in the final rule relative to over-snow vehicles does **not require** that those vehicles be restricted only to designated routes or open areas. The OHV final rule did not change the authority for restricting or prohibiting travel by pedestrians, mountain bikes or stock – those must still be regulated under the authority of 36 CFR 261 Subpart B – special order closure.

The Gallatin National Forest will implement the decisions made in this travel management plan under the provisions of 36 CFR 261.13 (Motor Vehicle Use) and 36 CFR 261.14 (Over snow vehicle use) for summer motorized vehicles, and for over-snow vehicles (snowmobiles). The required maps under 36 CFR 212.56 will be published after the Record of Decision appeal period. Special orders for proposed mountain bike and stock restrictions will also be published after the Record of Decision appeal period is finished.

This change in enforcement strategy and legal authority will greatly enhance the Agency’s ability to enforce regulations that control motor vehicle travel on National Forests. Several people commented during the DEIS comment period that violations of closures should have significant consequences. Violations of prohibitions found in 36 CFR 261 shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both pursuant to Title 16 of US Code Section 551. The typical fine for motorized vehicle violations is \$200 under 36 CFR 261.13 and \$150 for violations of 36 CFR 261.14.

## Analysis Methodology

On January 15, 2003, a meeting was held with Gallatin District Rangers, law enforcement officers, and others to discuss the topic of law enforcement and travel management. An outline for an analysis method designed to rank each of the six alternatives relative to its “enforceability” was developed and is discussed below.

The analysis area is the entire Gallatin Forest. The analysis includes an assessment of where the combination of terrain, slope, vegetative cover and physical proximity to open roads and trails would be conducive to trespass into potentially closed areas. GIS analysis generated maps of areas vulnerable to trespass by summer and winter motorized users based on these parameters. Data is displayed numerically by mountain range.

This information, along with local law enforcement officers’ knowledge of trespass hotspots, was combined with a ranking of each alternative based on enforceability criteria (listed below) to determine a relative risk of trespass for each alternative. Alternatives with the highest cumulative score were deemed more enforceable than alternatives with a lower score.

The enforceability criteria scores were aggregated and displayed by mountain range, by alternative, to create an assessment of enforceability.

Factors that also could contribute to enforcement issues include signing, information/education efforts and state laws. Many of these are implementation issues that will be site specifically addressed after a travel management decision is made.

### Enforceability Criteria

- 1) Are there loop opportunities for motorized uses that provide a reasonable day opportunity, or just short segments of trails? *Ranking criteria: few loops = 1, many loops = 3.*
- 2) Are there spatially-separated loops or opportunities where there is no mix of user groups (e.g. separate loops for hikers and motorized users)? *Ranking criteria: no/few separated opportunities = 1, many separated opportunities = 3.*
- 3) Do area closures follow logical topographic or spatial boundaries? *Ranking criteria: illogical boundaries = 1, logical understandable boundaries = 3.*
- 4) Do trails/routes for certain uses dead-end where there is a significant change in travel management (or a restricted area) with no return or loop comeback? *Ranking criteria: numerous dead-ends = 1, limited dead-ends = 3.*
- 5) Is there a good spatial distribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities proximate to population centers? *Ranking criteria: limited mix within ½ hour drive = 1 wide range of opportunities within half-hour drive = 3.*
- 6) Is the mix of road and trail opportunities and restrictions overly complex and confusing to the public? *Ranking criteria: multiple types of restrictions = 1, simple clear restrictions = 3.*
- 7) Are there clusters of non-connected summer motorized trail routes along roads that are not also designated for trail vehicles that would tempt non-street-legal machines/drivers to use high standard roads to access nearby trail opportunities? *Ranking criteria: numerous unconnected clusters = 1, few unconnected clusters = 3.*



- 8) Are the legal opportunities for different uses clear, or could there be confusion about what uses are appropriate? *Ranking criteria: legal choices unclear = 1, clear legal choices = 3.*
- 9) Are motorized opportunities clustered topographically or spread out over large areas? *Ranking criteria: spread out = 1, clustered = 3.*

These criteria were developed primarily with summer motorized recreation in mind, though are applicable to winter use as well, with minor modifications.

## Comparison of Alternatives

The enforceability of each alternative is reviewed in this section, based on the above criteria and the GIS models of landscape vulnerability to trespass. It is impossible to predict the public's compliance rate with new travel regulations, though certain issues like the complexity of regulations and the clarity of permissible uses certainly has an effect on people's willingness and ability to comply. Therefore, this analysis focuses on the physical configuration of the travel alternatives (the mix of road and trail recreation opportunities) and the physical parameters of the landscape that would contribute to enforceability.

An intuitive review of each alternative was done to create the ranking provided in Table 3.6. 3 through Table 3.6.9, by comparing the summer motorized alternative maps and the winter maps to the criteria. The scoring is a result of an assessment of how well each alternative ranked against the criteria.

Alternative 1 represents the Forest's current travel map, without the Montana/Dakota Statewide OHV decision applied. In other words, cross-country travel would be permissible in legally open areas. Overall, Alternative 1 ranks poorly on the enforceability scale due to the complexity of regulations, lack of reasonable, defined loop opportunities for summer motorized uses and confusion over what uses are permissible on what routes. From the enforcement perspective, Alternative 1 would be a slight improvement over the current situation in that the gray area of legal OHV user-created routes would be gone. Either the user-created routes would be illegal if they existed in closed areas on the 1999 travel map, or cross-country travel would be permissible.

Alternative 2 more closely follows the 1999 travel map with the Montana/Dakota Statewide OHV decision applied to the Forest road and trail system. This alternative clearly displays whether four-wheeled trail vehicles are legal on the route under the OHV decision, or if use would be restricted to motorcycles only. It goes one step further than the OHV decision, by eliminating motorized travel on user-created routes, limiting all summer motorized use to designated routes only. This alternative would be substantially more enforceable than Alternative 1 (current condition). By having designated routes only, the confusion for both the public and law enforcement about appropriate uses is resolved. In addition, the gray area regarding the legitimacy of user-created routes is resolved. If a route is not designated, it is no longer open.

Alternatives 3 through 7-M all provide more enforceable travel management scenarios than does Alternative 1 or the current situation. There are differences in how well each alternative ranks against the criteria, but overall there are only minor differences between these alternatives from an enforceability perspective. Alternative 3, 4 and 7-M have more routes open to motorized uses or

mountain biking that either dead-end at closed areas (like Wilderness boundaries) or change use along the route from motorized to non-motorized, which create enforcement issues. Alternative 5 has fewer of these situations, but it provides worse spatial distribution of opportunities close to towns, and has fewer reasonable motorized loops or opportunities that would fulfill motorized users' recreation desires (see Issue 16: Recreation for a more thorough discussion of recreation opportunities, by alternative). Alternative 5 geographically clusters motorized opportunities better than Alternatives 3, 4 and 7-M.

In the case of Alternative 6, its score for enforce-ability is not truly reflective of how enforceable the alternative is, rather it is an indication of how much trespass would be anticipated. Forest law enforcement officials concluded that Alternative 6 would be the most enforceable alternative. It would provide clear direction on permissible uses and limit the complexity of closures and restrictions. It would also limit open summer motorized routes to smaller geographical areas, minimizing the amount of country that would need to be patrolled. However, it does not provide a broad mix of opportunities close to towns or motorized loops or routes providing satisfying opportunities for motorized trail users. The lack of motorized loops and longer routes would likely lead motorized users to trespass into restricted areas seeking longer opportunities. This would be a significant problem, although enforceable.

Winter uses are slightly different in their enforceability. All alternatives adopt an "open unless managed closed" scenario for snowmobiles. The number of acres closed to snowmobiles, either yearlong or seasonally, would be highest under Alternatives 5 and 6. These alternatives would likely create enforcement issues by substantially limiting the available legal snowmobile terrain over current condition. Under Alternatives 3 through 7-M, additional closures in areas currently being used by snowmobilers would likely lead to enforcement issues, at least in the short term until the new closures were accepted by the public.

Table 3.6. 12 through Table 3.6. 15 represent an assessment of the acres where snowmobile trespass is likely to occur, based on terrain features and lack of vegetative cover that prohibits snowmobile movement. The tables also display the number of acres within each closed area, by alternative, which would be vulnerable to trespass. It shows that Alternatives 5 and 6 would have the greatest number of acres closed to snowmobiling that are probable trespass terrain. Specific TPAs likely to be vulnerable to winter trespass in Alternatives 5 and 6 include: Cabin Creek, the southern portion of the Taylor Fork, Lionhead, the Bridger Ridge, Porcupine Buffalo Horn and the Gallatin Crest. Alternative 6 would shift the Cabin Creek/Taylor Fork area to a closed area for snowmobiles with a designated route (the Big Sky Snowmobile Trail). The wide, open terrain of these areas and their remoteness would make enforcing the area closure/designated routes extremely difficult.

Table 3.6. 10 and Table 3.6. 11 display analysis data about the vulnerability of the Forest to summer motorized trespass based on terrain, vegetation features and proximity to open summer motorized routes. These acre estimates do not include designated Wilderness, areas are already closed to motorized uses. The analysis shows that certain areas outside of Wilderness are more likely to be vulnerable to summer motorized trespass. The Madison Range, from Buck Ridge and the Yellow Mules south all the way to Hebgen Lake stand out as easy terrain for trespass. Other TPAs of concern include the Gallatin Crest, East Boulder Plateau, Cooke City, Bear Canyon, Porcupine Buffalo Horn, Fairy Lake, Gardiner Basin, Bangtails and North Bridgers.

Alternatives 2-6 all propose to implement seasonal restrictions on certain uses in the spring and fall. In these alternatives, all trail uses, except hiking and skiing, would be prohibited during spring break-up, the time when trails are freezing and thawing and very susceptible to damage from motorized trail vehicles, stock and mountain bikes. Alternative 7-M would somewhat follow this model, but spring restrictions for mountain bikes and stock would only apply to a dozen specific routes. There are currently no prohibitions or seasonal restrictions for recreational livestock use or bikes anywhere on the Forest outside of designated Wilderness. In the short term, trespass would be likely during this time under these alternatives.

Alternative 5 restricts the summer motorized season on trails in the Cabin Creek and Taylor Fork TPAs and the Porcupine Buffalo Horn, Gallatin Crest, and upper portions of Tom Miner Rock Creek TPAs to a very short season (July 15 to August 15). This situation would be more difficult to enforce than the closure under Alternative 6.

Alternatives 3 through 7-M also would include new prohibitions on stock and mountain bikes on some trails. Again, for the short term, trespass on closed routes would be likely until the public accepted the closures.

**Table 3.6. 3 Alternative 1 – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	2	2	2	3	3	2
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	2	2	2	1	2
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	1	3	2	2	2	2
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total for Mountain Range(s)	13	15	14	15	15	14
Total Score for Alternative	85					

**Table 3.6. 4 Alternative 2 - Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	1	2	1	2	2	1
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	2	2	2	2
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	1	2	2	2	1	2
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total for Mountain Range(s)	17	20	18	19	18	18
Total Score for Alternative	110					

**Table 3.6. 5 Alternative 3 – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	2	3	3	3	3	3
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	1	1	1	1	1	1
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	2	2	3	3	2	2
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	2	2	3	3
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	2	3	2	2	2	3
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	1	2	3	3	3	3
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Score for Mountain Range(s)	18	22	22	22	22	22
Total Score for Alternative	128					

**Table 3.6. 6 Alternative 4 – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	2	2	3	3	2	3
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	2	3	2	2	3	2
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	3	2	3	2
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	3	3	2	2	3	3
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	3	3	3	3	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	2	3	3	2	3	3
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Score for Mountain Range(s)	21	25	23	21	25	25
Total Score for Alternative	140					

**Table 3.6. 7 Alternative 5 – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	1	2	3	2	3	3
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	3	3	3	2	2	2
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	2	3	3	3	3	2
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	2	3	3	2
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	3	3	2	3	3	3
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	3	3	2	3	3
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	2	3	3	2	3	3
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Score for Mountain Range(s)	21	25	23	23	23	23
Total Score for Alternative	141					

**Table 3.6. 8 Alternative 6 – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	1	1	1	1	1	2
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	2	2	2	2	2	2
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	3	3	3	3
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	1	2	2	2	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	3	2	2	3	3	3
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Score for Mountain Range(s)	22	21	22	23	23	24
Total Score for Alternative	135					

**Table 3.6. 9 Alternative 7-M – Enforceability criteria ranking by mountain range.**

Enforceability Criteria	Score by Mountain Range (1 = worst, 2 = better, 3 = good)					
	Absaroka Beartooth	Bridger, Bangtail Mtns.	Crazy Mtns.	Gallatin Range	Madison Range	Henrys, Hebgen Basin
Motorized routes and loops that provide a reasonable opportunity?	3	2	3	2	2	3
Motorized uses clustered geographically or spread out?	2	2	3	2	2	2
Routes spatially separated for different uses?	2	3	3	3	3	2
Closures follow logical topographic or ownership boundaries?	2	3	2	2	3	3
Routes dead-end at closure boundaries or change uses?	3	3	3	2	3	3
Spatial distribution of opportunities within half-hour of towns?	2	3	3	3	3	2
Complex mix of regulations and closures?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Clusters of motorized trails along high standard roads?	2	3	3	2	3	3
Legal uses of routes clear to users?	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Score for Mountain Range(s)	22	25	26	22	25	24
Total Score for Alternative	144					

Table 3.6. 10 and Table 3.6. 11 represent a summary of a GIS analysis designed to assess the vulnerability of the Forest to cross-country trespass by motorized vehicles in summer. This assessment is based on physical parameters like slope, landforms and vegetative cover. The tables display the data two ways: first in aggregate, and second by number of acres that are within ¼-mile of a legally open route, by mountain range.

**Table 3.6. 10 Total acres of high potential summer motorized trespass, by mountain range.**

Mountain Range	Acres High Trespass Potential
Absaroka Beartooth	54,335
Bridger Bangtail	44,166
Crazy	33,667
Gallatin	75,912
Henry	30,665
Madison	88,016

**Table 3.6. 11 Acres of high potential summer motorized trespass – within ¼-mile of an open motorized route, by mountain range.**

Mountain Range	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5	Alt. 6	Alt. 7-M
Absaroka Beartooth	49534	49633	49283	46695	45878	45878	48960
Bridger Bangtail	38653	38653	37871	35329	34953	34859	35724
Crazy	22975	22975	22757	21477	20736	19219	21588
Gallatin	48433	48433	48162	46224	40210	30086	41139
Henry	18159	18159	17912	17971	17408	16683	17408
Madison	77725	79062	80610	76020	75789	48416	76784
Forest Total	255478	256915	256595	243716	234975	195141	241602

It is important to note that while Alternative 1 shows a large number of acres within ¼-mile of an open route as vulnerable to trespass, some of those areas are legally open to cross-country summer motorized travel under this alternative. The figures portrayed in Table 3.6. 10 and Table 3.6. 11 have not been adjusted to account for the portions of the Forest that do not have cross-country travel restrictions in Alternative 1.

**Table 3.6. 12 Acres of desirable snowmobile terrain (accessible) within proposed closed areas, by mountain range, Alternatives 1 and 2.**

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 1		Alt. 2	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
<b>Absaroka Beartooth Mountains</b>						
AB Beartooth Plateau	65,670	46,510	46,510	0	46,510	0
AB Wilderness	517,975	217,565	217,565	0	217,565	0
Gardiner Basin	23,286	12,369	9,726	0	9,726	0
Cooke City	16,631	11,506	0	0	0	0
Deer Creeks	65,759	14,659	0	0	0	0
East Boulder	39,831	10,917	0	0	0	0

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 1		Alt. 2	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
Main Boulder	16,788	3,634	0	0	0	0
Mill Creek	69,916	22,296	1,986	0	4,794	0
Mission	10,010	1,638	359	0	359	0
Subtotal Acres	825,866	341,093	276,146	0	278,954	0
Bridger, Bangtail Mountains						
Bangtails	16,520	7,328	46	0	181	0
West Bridger North	23,158	7,034	0	59	0	59
West Bridger South	13,184	6,268	76	186	76	186
North Bridgers	15,026	3,194	0	1,688	0	1,688
Bridger Canyon	6,296	1,588	1,418	0	1418	0
Fairy Lake	14,811	1,906	0	381	0	381
Subtotal Acres	88,993	27,319	1,541	2,314	1,675	2,314
Crazy Mountains						
Shields	32,970	5,126	1,875	2,703	0	2,703
East Crazies	69,829	26,345	0	0	0	0
Ibex	12,781	2,160	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Acres	115,580	33,631	1,875	2,703	0	2,703
Gallatin Range						
Bear Canyon	10,716	1,324	34	0	34	0
Bozeman Creek	17,542	2,828	2,676	0	2,676	0
Gallatin Crest	106,086	22,873	3,313	0	3,313	0
Gallatin River Canyon	29,930	4,721	1,355	525	1,355	525
Gallatin Roded	57,329	13,073	424	0	424	0
Hyalite	20,281	2,796	84	0	84	0
Porcupine Buffalo Horn	53,891	11,004	4,327	2,328	4,327	2,328
Sawtooth	16,643	4,917	115	0	115	0
Tom Miner Rock	13,331	2,619	0	0	0	0
Yankee Jim Canyon	33,451	13,535	9,376	0	9,376	0
Yellowstone	17,595	3,522	1,995	0	1,995	0
Subtotal Acres	376,794	83,211	23,698	2,853	23,698	2,853
Henry's Mountains, Hebgen Basin						
Lionhead	56,692	18,591	7,835	0	7,835	0
South Plateau	39,174	7,704	0	0	1,875	0
Hebgen Lake Basin	47,059	39,048	1,241	56	1,241	56
Subtotal Acres	14,2924	65,342	9,076	56	10,951	56
Madison Range						
Cabin Creek	54,674	19,762	135	0	135	0
Taylor Fork	73,281	26,333	8,487	9,068	8,487	15,764
Cherry Creek	20,392	953	0	549	0	549
Big Sky	17,798	5,881	242	2,937	242	2,937
LM Wilderness Hilgards	33,341	17,913	17,913	0	17,913	0
LM Wilderness Monument	32,309	11,540	11,540	0	11,540	0
LM Wilderness Spanish Peaks	68,074	16,533	16,533	0	16,533	0
Subtotal Acres	299,869	98,915	54,850	12,554	54,850	19,250
Forest Total Acres	1,850,027	642,511	367,186	20,480	370,128	27,176



**Table 3.6. 13 Acres of desirable snowmobile terrain (accessible) within proposed closed areas, by mountain range, Alternatives 3 and 4.**

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 3		Alt. 4	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
<b>Absaroka Beartooth Mountains</b>						
AB Beartooth Plateau	65,670	46,510	46,510	0	46,510	0
AB Wilderness	517,975	217,565	217,565	0	217,565	0
Gardiner Basin	23,286	12,369	10,424	0	10,424	0
Cooke City	16,631	11,506	0	0	1,316	0
Deer Creeks	65,759	14,659	0	0	0	0
East Boulder	39,831	10,917	502	0	502	0
Main Boulder	16,788	3,634	29	0	29	0
Mill Creek	69,916	22,296	4,794	0	4,794	0
Mission	10,010	1,638	854	0	854	0
Subtotal Acres	825,866	341,093	280,677	0	281,993	0
<b>Bridger, Bangtail Mountains</b>						
Bangtails	16,520	7,328	181	0	181	0
West Bridger North	23,158	7,034	231	59	231	59
West Bridger South	13,184	6,268	6,268	0	6,268	0
North Bridgers	15,026	3,194	0	1,688	0	1,688
Bridger Canyon	6,296	1,588	1,588	0	1,588	0
Fairy Lake	14,811	1,906	314	381	314	381
Subtotal Acres	88,993	27,319	8,582	2,127	8,582	2,127
<b>Crazy Mountains</b>						
Shields	32,970	5,126	94	2,703	94	2,703
East Crazies	69,829	26,345	18,126	0	18,126	0
Ibex	12,781	2,160	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Acres	115,580	33,631	18,220	2,703	18,220	2,703
<b>Gallatin Range</b>						
Bear Canyon	10,716	1,324	2	0	64	0
Bozeman Creek	17,542	2,828	2,809	0	2,820	0
Gallatin Crest	106,086	22,873	11,826	0	19,455	0
Gallatin River Canyon	29,930	4,721	3,134	423	3,134	6
Gallatin Roded	57,329	13,073	0	0	424	0
Hyalite	20,281	2,796	2,662	0	2,797	0
Porcupine Buffalo Horn	53,891	11,004	3,776	2,328	3,776	0
Sawtooth	16,643	4,917	4,879	0	4,879	0
Tom Miner Rock	13,331	2,619	1,595	0	1,595	0
Yankee Jim Canyon	33,451	13,535	13,526	0	13,526	0
Yellowstone	17,595	3,522	248	0	712	0
Subtotal Acres	376,794	83,211	44,457	2,751	53,181	6
<b>Henrys Mountains, Hebgen Basin</b>						
Lionhead	56,692	18,591	12,532	0	13,428	0
South Plateau	39,174	7,704	1,875	0	1,875	0
Hebgen Lake Basin	47,059	39,048	1,241	56	1,241	56
Subtotal Acres	14,2924	65,342	15,648	56	16,544	56
<b>Madison Range</b>						
Cabin Creek	54,674	19,762	135	0	135	0
Taylor Fork	73,281	26,333	8,613	16,039	8,613	16,039

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 3		Alt. 4	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
Cherry Creek	20,392	953	904	0	904	0
Big Sky	17,798	5,881	923	2,937	2,507	3,047
LM Wilderness Hilgards	33,341	17,913	17,913	0	17,913	0
LM Wilderness Monument	32,309	11,540	11,540	0	11,540	0
LM Wilderness Spanish Peaks	68,074	16,533	16,533	0	16,533	0
Subtotal Acres	299,869	98,915	56,560	18,975	58,145	19,085
Forest Total Acres	1,850,027	642,511	424,144	26,612	436,664	2,3978

**Table 3.6. 14 Acres of desirable snowmobile terrain (accessible) within proposed closed areas, by mountain range, Alternatives 5 and 6.**

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 5		Alt. 6	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
<b>Absaroka Beartooth Mountains</b>						
AB Beartooth Plateau	65,670	46,510	46,510	0	46,510	0
AB Wilderness	517,975	217,565	217,565	0	217,565	0
Gardiner Basin	23,286	12,369	10,424	0	10,424	0
Cooke City	16,631	11,506	1,316	0	1,316	0
Deer Creeks	65,759	14,659	1,316	0	0	0
East Boulder	39,831	10,917	502	0	502	0
Main Boulder	16,788	3,634	290	0	29	0
Mill Creek	69,916	22,296	6,718	0	4,794	0
Mission	10,010	1,638	854	0	854	0
Subtotal Acres	825,866	341,093	285,493	0	281,993	0
<b>Bridger, Bangtail Mountains</b>						
Bangtails	16,520	7,328	0	0	181	0
West Bridger North	23,158	7,034	6165	0	231	59
West Bridger South	13,184	6,268	6,268	0	6,268	0
North Bridgers	15,026	3,194	26	3,110	0	1,688
Bridger Canyon	6,296	1,588	1,588	0	1588	0
Fairy Lake	14,811	1,906	990	916	314	381
Subtotal Acres	88,993	27,319	15,037	4,026	8,582	2,127
<b>Crazy Mountains</b>						
Shields	32,970	5,126	258	2,703	94	2,703
East Crazies	69,829	26,345	26,333	0	18,126	0
Ibex	12,781	2,160	1,121	0	0	0
Subtotal Acres	115,580	33,631	27,713	2,703	18,220	2,703
<b>Gallatin Range</b>						
Bear Canyon	10,716	1,324	66	0	64	0
Bozeman Creek	17,542	2,828	2820	0	2820	0
Gallatin Crest	106,086	22,873	21971	0	21,971	0
Gallatin River Canyon	29,930	4,721	3,357	6	3,446	0
Gallatin Roded	57,329	13,073	424	0	424	0
Hyalite	20,281	2,796	2,797	0	2,797	0
Porcupine Buffalo Horn	53,891	11,004	8,230	0	10,151	0

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 5		Alt. 6	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure	Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
Sawtooth	16,643	4,917	4,916	0	4,916	0
Tom Miner Rock	13,331	2,619	2,606	0	2,066	0
Yankee Jim Canyon	33,451	13,535	13,526	0	13,526	0
Yellowstone	17,595	3,522	712	0	712	0
Subtotal Acres	376,794	83,211	61,424	6	62,892	0
Henry's Mountains, Hebgen Basin						
Lionhead	56,692	18,591	13,428	182	13,609	0
South Plateau	39,174	7,704	2,076	0	3,962	0
Hebgen Lake Basin	47,059	39,048	6,505	132	6,581	56
Subtotal Acres	14,2924	65,342	22,008	314	24,152	56
Madison Range						
Cabin Creek	54,674	19,762	135	19,627	19,762	0
Taylor Fork	73,281	26,333	8,999	15,653	23,249	1,581
Cherry Creek	20,392	953	904	0	904	0
Big Sky	17,798	5,881	2,507	3,047	2,507	3,047
LM Wilderness Hilgards	33,341	17,913	17,913	0	17,913	0
LM Wilderness Monument	32,309	11,540	11,540	0	11,540	0
LM Wilderness Spanish Peaks	68,074	16,533	16,533	0	16,533	0
Subtotal Acres	299,869	98,915	58,530	38,327	92,408	4,628
Forest Total Acres	1,850,027	642,511	470,206	45,376	488,247	9,514

**Table 3.6. 15 Acres of desirable snowmobile terrain (accessible) within proposed closed areas, by mountain range, Alternative 7-M.**

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 7-M	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
Absaroka Beartooth Mountains				
AB Beartooth Plateau	65,670	46,510	46,510	0
AB Wilderness	517,975	217,565	217,565	0
Gardiner Basin	23,286	12,369	10,424	0
Cooke City	16,631	11,506	337	0
Deer Creeks	65,759	14,659	0	0
East Boulder	39,831	10,917	0	0
Main Boulder	16,788	3,634	0	0
Mill Creek	69,916	22,296	9,049	0
Mission	10,010	1,638	359	0
Subtotal Acres	825,866	341,093	284,244	0
Bridger, Bangtail Mountains				
Bangtails	16,520	7,328	80	0
West Bridger North	23,158	7,034	818	0
West Bridger South	13,184	6,268	512	0
North Bridgers	15,026	3,194	0	3,110
Bridger Canyon	6,296	1,588	1,588	0
Fairy Lake	14,811	1,906	650	916
Subtotal Acres	88,993	27,319	3,648	4,026

Travel Planning Area	Total Acres	Snowmobile-Accessible Acres	Alt. 7-M	
			Accessible Acres in Yearlong Closure	Accessible Acres in Seasonal Closure
<b>Crazy Mountains</b>				
Shields	32,970	5,126	292	2,703
East Crazies	69,829	26,345	22,918	0
Ibex	12,781	2,160	791	0
Subtotal Acres	115,580	33,631	24,001	2,703
<b>Gallatin Range</b>				
Bear Canyon	10,716	1,324	34	0
Bozeman Creek	17,542	2,828	2,820	0
Gallatin Crest	106,086	22,873	18,453	0
Gallatin River Canyon	29,930	4,721	3,624	6
Gallatin Roaded	57,329	13,073	424	0
Hyalite	20,281	2,796	2,284	0
Porcupine Buffalo Horn	53,891	11,004	8,924	0
Sawtooth	16,643	4,917	4,916	0
Tom Miner Rock	13,331	2,619	1,706	0
Yankee Jim Canyon	33,451	13,535	13,526	0
Yellowstone	17,595	3,522	3,529	0
Subtotal Acres	376,794	83,211	60,240	6
<b>Henry's Mountains, Hebgen Basin</b>				
Lionhead TPA	56,692	18,591	9,263	0
South Plateau TPA	39,174	7,704	1,891	0
Hebgen Lake Basin TPA	47,059	39,048	3,297	56
Subtotal Acres	14,2924	65,342	14,451	56
<b>Madison Range</b>				
Cabin Creek	54,674	19,762	135	0
Taylor Fork	73,281	26,333	13,765	12,508
Cherry Creek	20,392	953	904	0
Big Sky	17,798	5,881	923	2,937
LM Wilderness Hilgards	33,341	17,913	17,913	0
LM Wilderness Monument	32,309	11,540	11,540	0
LM Wilderness Spanish Peaks	68,074	16,533	16,533	0
Subtotal Acres	299,869	98,915	61,713	15,445
Forest Total Acres	1,850,027	642,511	448,297	18,210

## Implementation

The proposed Travel Plan involves changes in culture from historic access and freedoms on the Forest that some users enjoyed. A comprehensive plan for institutionalizing those changes is an important component for successful implementation of the new direction. The following is an outline of the educational and enforcement components of the plan, and the key steps, messages and actions needed to successfully ensure compliance and an understanding of a new travel management system. A comprehensive implementation strategy and action plan for education and enforcement will elaborate these topics at a future date.

## **Information and Education**

During the first several years of new travel management direction and regulations on the Forest, an aggressive information and education program will be paramount to the successful implementation of travel management changes. Key components of the information and education program include:

- 1) Provide user guides for all recreation activities through a wide variety of means, such as working directly with clubs, businesses, organizations, and individuals to share information about new travel management decisions.
- 2) Provide comprehensive information on permissible uses and restrictions on trails and roads via the Internet.
- 3) Providing formal educational presentations and programs targeting specific user groups (e.g., Leave No Trace practices for stock to local saddle clubs).
- 4) Emphasize the “share the trail” message through bulletin boards at trailheads, signing, and user guides where mixed uses will occur on the same route.
- 5) Saturate businesses, visitor centers, fairs, sporting goods shows with pamphlets and user guides on travel management changes.
- 6) Provide professional visitor contacts with Forest Service employees in the field.

## **Enforcement and Monitoring**

Field monitoring for compliance with new regulations and educating recreationists about changes will be an important component of implementation. Each Ranger District on the Forest currently provides field monitoring and compliance through their backcountry ranger, wilderness ranger, snow ranger and OHV ranger programs. Additionally, Forest law enforcement officers assist with monitoring and compliance. Future programs may need to rely more heavily on creative funds sources like grants and partnerships than solely on appropriated funds. The State of Montana has a viable grant program that can help fund information and education efforts for various trails programs, as do various other non-government organizations.

A Travel Plan implementation law enforcement strategy would be developed and tiered to the Gallatin Forest Law Enforcement Plan, which is updated every other year. The strategy would identify specific program area emphasis, personnel needs, program costs and possible fund sources. This is a 365-day a year program on the Forest, with enforcement issues associated with all recreation activities from mountain biking to snowmobiling.

## **Cumulative Effects**

The enforcement narrative describes a managerial situation as opposed to environmental effects; therefore, cumulative effects discussions are not relevant to this analysis.

## **Effects of Proposed Goals, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines**

In that the enforcement issue focuses on the managerial situation, and goals, objectives, standards and guidelines focus on physical parameters; they generally do not affect enforcement ability.

Several do have an effect and are listed below. These goals, objectives or standards would apply in Alternatives 2 through 7-M.

**Standard A-8** restricts summer motorized use to system trails, which will greatly improve officer's ability to handle trespass situations by clearly defining legal uses on routes and eliminating off-route and user-created route travel.

**Standard A-9** defines trail vehicles allowing officers to ticket inappropriate vehicle use on trails.

**Standard A-10** prohibits wheeled vehicles from traveling on groomed or marked snowmobile trails, allowing officers to address those potential trespass situations that degrade winter trail conditions.

**Standard A-11** prohibits snowmobile travel on groomed ski trails, allowing officers to address those potential trespass situations, protecting the quality of groomed ski trail experiences.

### **Consistency with Laws, Regulations, Policy, and Federal, Regional, State and Local Land Use Plans (including the Forest Plan)**

Enforcement is a managerial action designed to eliminate (or at least reduce) behavior that violates laws or regulations.