

# Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

## OVERVIEW OF CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT TO THE FINAL EIS

- Alternative B Modified has been added to the range of alternatives considered. Alternative B Modified was developed in response to public comments regarding a variety of site-specific concerns.
- Additional details about the collaborative process have been provided, as well as the addition of information related to the public comment period for the DEIS.
- The issues section has been re-formatted to aid in identifying the significant issues and the indicators used to display differences between effects of the alternatives have been added.
- Additional alternatives considered but dropped from further analysis have been incorporated.
- Rationale for selection of the Forest Service Preferred Alternative has been added in response to public comment.
- The Safety, Implementation, Maintenance, and Enforcement sections in Chapter 3 of the DEIS have been revised and moved to the Elements Common to All Alternatives section of this chapter. The Forest Service determined that these elements were not significant issues and represented managerial rather than environmental concerns. Consequently, they were revised and moved to this chapter.

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the public involvement for this process, identifies issues, and describes and compares five alternatives considered for management of motorized and non-motorized travel. A summary of effects by alternative is also displayed at the end of this chapter.

## 2.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

Public participation specific to the Beartooth Ranger District Travel Management EIS is summarized in this chapter. The summary describes the public involvement, identifies persons and organizations contacted during preparation of the EIS, and specifies time frames for accomplishing goals in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.6

Public involvement includes the necessary steps to identify and address public concerns and needs. The public involvement process assists agencies in: (1) broadening the information base for decision making; (2) informing the public about the Proposed Action and the potential long-term impacts that could result from the project; and (3) ensuring that public needs are understood by the agencies.

Public participation is required by NEPA at three specific points: the scoping period, review of the Draft EIS, and receipt of the Record of Decision.

**Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives**

Table 2-1 lists the public meetings conducted in conjunction with the process to date.

**Table 2-1. Summary of Public Meetings**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Date/Time</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
<b>Proposed Action Scoping Meetings</b>		
Billings, MT	February 9, 2004, 6:00 pm	49
Red Lodge, MT	February 10, 2004, 6:00 pm	52
Bridger, MT	February 17, 2004, 7:00 pm	54
Columbus, MT	February 18, 2004, 7:00 pm	32
Pryor, MT	April 26, 2004, 6:30 pm	6
Billings, MT	May 11, 2004, 6:30 pm	30
Lovell, WY	May 25, 2004, 6:30 pm	16
<b>Project Update Meetings</b>		
Red Lodge, MT	July 18, 2006, 7:00 pm	9
Bridger, MT	July 19, 2006, 7:00 pm	0
Billings, MT	July 24, 2006, 6:00 pm	20
Columbus, MT	July 26, 2006, 7:00 pm	9
Lovell, WY	July 27, 2006, 7:00 pm	3
<b>Collaborative Meetings</b>		
Billings, MT	January 20, 2007, 9:00 am	68
Billings, MT	February 10, 2007, 9:00 am	79
Billings, MT	February 24, 2007, 9:00 am	84
Billings, MT	March 10, 2007, 9:00 am	90
Billings, MT	March 24, 2007, 9:00 am	117
Billings, MT	March 31, 2007, 9:00 am	152
Billings, MT	April 14, 2007, 9:00 am	159
<b>DEIS Meetings</b>		
Billings, MT (Yellowstone Valley Audubon Society's Meeting)	October 15, 2007, 7:00 PM	~38
Red Lodge, MT	October 16, 2007, 6:00 PM	22
Bridger, MT	October 17, 2007, 6:00 PM	9
Lovell, WY	October 18, 2007, 6:00 PM	8
Billings, MT	October 22, 2007, 6:00 PM	50
Columbus, MT	October 23, 2007, 6:00 PM	13
Billings, MT (Families For Outdoor Recreation/Custer Partnership's Meeting)	November 1, 2007, 6:00 PM	~ 21

**2.2.1 PUBLIC SCOPING**

Scoping is a process used to help identify specific areas of concern related to the proposal during the early portion of the detailed environmental analysis. The initial scoping document (see Project Record) for this project was sent on February 2, 2004 to approximately 91 individuals, government agencies, tribal governments, news media, businesses, and organizations that have shown interest in projects on the Custer National Forest, and in particular on the Beartooth Ranger District. This document provided information on the purpose and need for the project, described the proposed action, and asked for comments. A legal advertisement inviting comments was placed in the Billings Gazette (Billings, MT) on February 2, 2004. News releases were sent to local newspapers including Carbon County News, Clarks Fork Valley Press, Cooke City brochure, Yellowstone County News, Outpost, Bighorn County News, Stillwater County News, Lovell Chronicle, Powell Tribune, and Cody Enterprise. These media efforts helped to publicize the proposal and comment period. People were asked to comment within 30 days, which ended on May 1, 2004. Due to public response, the

comment period was extended to September 1, 2004. During this time approximately 200 additional documents were distributed. This project is also described on the Custer web page, which is found at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/custer/projects/index.shtml>.

Public meetings were held in multiple locations (see Table 2-1) in February 2004 to discuss the scoping document. A second set of public meetings were held in July 2006 to discuss process changes due to the 2005 Motorized Travel Management Rule, new members of the interdisciplinary team, and update project status and timelines (see Table 2-1). Attendance at these meetings ranged from no attendance to 60 individuals for a total of approximately 250 participants.

In response to these efforts, over 5000 letters, personal comments, or phone calls were received. Collaborative group session information was documented and reviewed. The analysis of electronic, written and verbal comments preliminarily identified several potential issues. Two of these issues were identified as significant issues and were used to formulate many elements of the alternatives.

**2.2.2 COLLABORATION**

The public scoping for this project indicated there were potentially irresolvable differing public value preferences related to road and trail management on the Beartooth District, especially the Pryor Unit. These preferences could generally be characterized as personal preferences for the amount of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities available. In an effort to determine if the community could reach any points of agreement about travel management planning on the District, seven collaboration meetings were held over a period of four months in early 2007 (see Table 2-1). The meeting objectives were to: provide opportunities for the public to hear various individual and group opinions; explore areas of common ground; provide resource and regulatory information; and potentially generate portions or all of a community collaborative alternative.

The attendance at the collaboration sessions ranged from 65 to 159 individuals. The attendees worked together during these seven half day sessions reviewing information and maps to identify points of agreement. Points of agreement were sought on motorized and non-motorized routes (both system and non-system), motorized and non-motorized areas, opportunities for new routes, and areas for over-snow machine operation. No specific collaborative alternative was developed, but some points of agreement on designating routes for public motorized use and routes for non-motorized use were reached. They are displayed in the following table. Because the roads and trails contained in the table represent points of agreement between the diverse parties interested in this project, each of these routes were included in all of the action alternatives.

**Table 2-2. Road and Trail Points of Agreement Identified During Collaborative Meetings.**

Route No.	Name	Type
15	East Rosebud	Non-Motorized
17	Phantom Creek	Non-Motorized
19	West Rosebud	Non-Motorized
2004	Hellroaring Creek	Motorized
2071	West Fork Rock Creek	Motorized
2072	West Rosebud	Motorized
2072A	Pine Grove Campground	Motorized
2072A1	Pine Grove Cg South Loop	Motorized
2072B	Pine Grove North Loop	Motorized

**Table 2-2. Road and Trail Points of Agreement Identified During Collaborative Meetings.**

Route No.	Name	Type
2072C	Emerald Lake Inlet	Motorized
2072D	Emerald Lake South Loop	Motorized
2085	Crooked Creek	Motorized
2091	Red Pryor Divide	Motorized
21	Grasshopper Glacier	Non-Motorized
2140	Picket Pin	Motorized
2140B	Iron Mountain	Motorized
2140B2	2140B2	Motorized
2177	East Rosebud	Motorized
21771	Boat Launch Parking	Motorized
2177A	Upper Sand Dune Picnic Area	Motorized
2177D	Jimmy Joe Campground	Motorized
2177E	Lower Sand Dune Picnic Area	Motorized
2308	Pryor Mountain Road	Motorized
2346	Lake Fork	Motorized
24	Stillwater Trail	Non-Motorized
2400	Stillwater Trailhead Rd	Motorized
2400A	Woodbine Cg Entrance Road	Motorized
2400B	Woodbine Cg First Loop Left	Motorized
2400C	Woodbine Cg Second Loop Left	Motorized
2400D	Woodbine Cg First Loop Right	Motorized
2400E	Woodbine Cg Second Loop Right	Motorized
2414	Benbow	Motorized
24141	Benbow Mill Dispersed Campsite	Motorized
241410	241410	Motorized
241410B	241410B	Motorized
24143	24143	Motorized
24148	Little Rocky Creek	Motorized
2415	Benbow Jeep Trail	Motorized
2421	Main Fork Rock Creek	Motorized
2476	Silver Run	Motorized
2846	West Fork Stillwater	Motorized
2850	Stockman Trail	Motorized
34	Horseshoe	Non-Motorized
43	Fish Lake	Non-Motorized
44	Rainbow Lakes	Non-Motorized
90	West Fork Stillwater	Non-Motorized
91	Pinchot Lake	Non-Motorized
97	Columbine Pass	Non-Motorized

The majority of the points of agreement identified by participants are on the Beartooth Unit. Less agreement about the preferred amounts of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities was reached in the Pryor Unit. The only points of agreement in the Pryor Unit consisted of Crooked Creek (#2085) and portions of Pryor Mountain Road (#2308) and Stockman Trail (#2850).

### **2.2.3 NOTICE OF INTENT**

A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register on July 25, 2007. The NOI identified that when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was distributed, the public would have a 45-day comment period from the date when the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Also, a news release was provided to local news media at the beginning of the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was made available to interested parties identified in the updated EIS mailing list.

### **2.2.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT FOR THE DEIS**

The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register October 5, 2007 which began a 60 day comment period (original 45 day comment period with a 15 day extension). News releases were provided to local news media at the beginning of the comment period. The DEIS was distributed to the public on September 24, 2007. The Forest conducted five public open houses and attended two interest group's meetings to provide information and encourage input on the DEIS (see Table 2-1). The public open house meetings included a brief overview of the DEIS and the process, and opportunities for the public to ask questions in a group setting and one-on-one with interdisciplinary team members and the District Ranger. In response to the comment period, the Forest received 513 comment letters, e-mails, and documented phone conversations on the DEIS. Three of the 513 letters were received after the deadline. Further information on commenters and substantive comments identified in the letters, e-mails, and phone conversations can be found in Chapter 4. A content analysis of the comments was conducted and response to comments is found in Chapter 5.

## **2.3 SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

One purpose of scoping is to identify the significant issues that should be analyzed in depth within an EIS (40 CFR 1501.7). The significant issues become the focus of the analysis and guide alternative development. All public scoping comments were considered by the interdisciplinary team and Responsible Official, and are documented in the project record.

As a result of reviewing and analyzing agency and public responses, the following significant issues were identified. These were used to develop the range of alternatives and are analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.

### **2.3.1 RECREATION**

**Concern about motorized recreation opportunities.** Reductions in the amount of routes available for motorized use could reduce the opportunities available for motorized recreation, reduce the opportunities to take motorized trips on routes that loop back to the starting point, and potentially increase motorized congestion. There are particular concerns with these motorized opportunities in the Pryor Unit. Alternative A was developed to respond to this issue.

Indicators:

- Acres in rural, roaded natural, and semi-primitive motorized ROS settings within the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

## Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

- Miles of motorized system roads and trails to be designated on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

**Concern about non-motorized recreation opportunities.** Increases in the amount of routes designated for motorized use could reduce the quality of non-motorized recreation experiences and reduce the opportunities for solitude, away from noise generated by motorize vehicles. There are particular concerns with these opportunities in the Pryor Unit. Alternative C was developed in response to this issue.

Indicators:

- Acres in semi-primitive non-motorized and primitive ROS settings within the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.
- Miles of non-motorized system trails within the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

**Concern about opportunities for off-highway vehicle operation.** The use of unlicensed off-highway vehicles on roads is not consistent with State of Montana motor vehicle laws. Designating roads (as opposed to motorized mixed use roads or motorized trails) would limit opportunities for off-highway vehicle use. This issue was used in designing Alternatives A, B, and B Modified.

Indicators:

- Miles of mixed use system roads in the project area.
- Miles of motorized system trails in the project area.

**Concern about impacts on personal recreation experiences.** The interdisciplinary team and commenters recognized the potential for travel management changes to not only impact individual's personal experiences and connection to forest lands, but it also has the potential to increase or decrease conflict between forest users, particularly between motorized and non-motorized uses. The polarized nature of visitor preferences related to motorized vehicle use contributed to the development of Alternative B and Alternative B Modified as compromises between Alternative A and Alternative C which tend to favor one visitor preference over another.

**Concern about the impacts of noise from motorized recreation activities.** Commenters expressed concern about the potential increase of noise effects on non-motorized recreationist's experience due to the addition of motorized routes to the National Forest System.

Indicators:

- Acres in motorized and non-motorized ROS settings the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

### 2.3.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Concern about protection of archeological sites, traditional cultural properties and traditional practices.** Actions associated with designation, such as converting non-system routes to system routes, have the potential to adversely impact the scientific, traditional, cultural, and intrinsic values of archeological, cultural, and historic sites. In addition, proposed actions in the Pryor Unit could have an adverse effect to certain areas of traditional importance to the Crow Tribe. Components of Alternative B and Alternative B-Modified were developed in response to this issue.

Indicators:

- Number of sites potentially affected (directly and indirectly) on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.
- Number of cultural landscapes potentially affected on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.
- Number of traditional cultural properties potentially affected on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

## 2.4 OTHER ISSUES

The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act states that agencies should discuss, “only briefly issues other than significant ones” (40 CFR 1500.4[c]). The following issues were determined to not be significant issues because they did not drive development of alternatives or major components of alternatives, there were no significant effects associated with the proposed actions, or both.

### 2.4.1 WATER QUALITY, FISHERIES, AND AQUATICS

The action of adding routes to the system has the potential to influence water quality indirectly through on-site erosion and sediment delivery to streams. Actions can also influence water quality and channel processes as a result of improper route location. Minor components of Alternative B and Alternative B Modified were developed in response to this issue.

Indicators:

- Miles of actions that reduce risks on moderate and high risk routes within the project area.
- Miles of actions that increase risks on moderate and high risk routes within the project area.
- Effects determinations for listed Forest Service sensitive species and other species of concern.

### 2.4.2 WILDLIFE

Human use associated with system and non-system road and trail designation has the potential to disturb wildlife through noise and visual effects. Human use can disrupt activities such as foraging habits, resting location selection and duration, nesting, and denning. In addition, changes in road densities can affect the quality of wildlife habitat. The Forest Service identified and analyzed the effects of travel management alternatives on federally threatened, Forest Service sensitive, big-game and other wildlife species and their habitat. Minor components of Alternatives B, B-Modified, and C were developed to respond to wildlife concerns.

Indicators:

- Effects determinations for federally listed threatened or endangered species, Forest Service sensitive species, Custer National Forest management indicator species, and other species of concern.
- Canada lynx – Motorized Route Density within Lynx Analysis Unit by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.
- Gray wolf – Changes in Motorized Route Density from No Action by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

## **Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives**

- Grizzly bear – Percent secure habitat available outside the primary conservation area
- Wolverine – Motorized Route Density and Acres of refugia on the Beartooth Unit.
- Elk – Motorized Route Density and Percent secure habitat within elk habitat on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit
- Bighorn sheep – Acres of escape terrain and Acres of winter range within and outside motorized route buffer within bighorn sheep habitat on the District.
- General wildlife – Percent of land unit that is core wildlife habitat based on motorized and non-motorized routes on the Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

### **2.4.3 SOILS**

Adding routes to the transportation system on high and medium risk soils could increase the potential to compact, displace, or erode soils such that there is a loss of soil productivity. Dispersed vehicle camping associated with system changes has the potential to disturb soil crusts. Further discussion is available in the Soils section of Chapter 3.

Indicator:

- Miles of motorized and non-motorized routes by high/very high and medium erosion hazard rating on the District by the Beartooth and Pryor Unit.

### **2.4.4 VEGETATION**

Concerns have been expressed about the effects of designating routes on native and rare vegetation found on the District. Designation of additional system roads and trails, along with the associated dispersed vehicle camping, has the potential to cause ground disturbance that could lead to noxious weed establishment and/or encouraging spreading. Further discussion is available in Vegetation section of Chapter 3.

Indicators:

- Acres and Percent of potential vegetation impacts by high risk category for motorized and non-motorized routes on the District by Beartooth and Pryor Unit.
- Weed susceptible Acres within designated road corridor within the project area.
- Total weed infested Acres within motorized route potentially affected corridor.
- Effects determinations for listed Forest Service sensitive species and other species of concern.

### **2.4.5 INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREAS**

Actions such as route designation and converting non-system routes to system roads within inventoried roadless areas have the potential to affect the character and resources in those areas. Further discussion is available in the Inventoried Roadless Area section of Chapter 3.

Indicators:

- Miles of non-system routes within inventoried roadless areas proposed to be converted to system routes.
- Miles of system routes within inventoried roadless areas.



## 2.4.6 *ECONOMICS*

Proposed changes in motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities could reduce forest visitation, which could potentially diminish the economic contribution forest visitors make to communities in the vicinity of the District. This may also have an adverse impact on regional economies. Further discussion is available in the Economics section of Chapter 3.

Indicator:

- Estimated economic contribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities to local and regional economies.

## 2.4.7 *AIR QUALITY*

Encountering motorized use emissions and fugitive dust on Forest roads and trails could have an undesirable effect on the quality of a recreational experience. Odor generated by combustion engines, particularly two-cycle engines, can diminish a non-motorized users' quality of experience. Dust generated by vehicles or other uses, can diminish quality of experience for some recreationists. These effects are typically transitory in nature and not long lasting. There are typically good air dispersion characteristics and low inversion potential across the District. In addition, traffic is generally at lower speeds that result in less dust generation. Traffic is typically slower on Maintenance Level 2 roads, also known as high clearance vehicle roads and motorized trails, which are the majority of routes proposed for designation. For example, under the No Action Alternative, 70% (202 miles out of 286) are Maintenance Level 2 roads. These are also probably the routes with the most potential to have non-motorized use in the vicinity of them, since it is less likely for non-motorized users to be recreating on or along the higher speed Maintenance 3 and 4 roads.

There is concern that the addition of routes to the transportation system may lead to an adverse impact on air quality. Air quality across the District is considered good to excellent. All areas within and immediately adjacent to the District currently meet all state and federal air quality standards (Story, 2000; Story et. al., 2008; MTDEQ, 2005). The nearest area of non-attainment is Laurel, MT (approx. 30-50 miles N/NE) and concerns SO (2) levels. Implementation of any of the alternatives is expected to maintain air quality conditions due to 1) good dispersion characteristics across the District, 2) low inversion potential across the District, 3) low emissions from vehicles relative to other potential sources, and 4) reduced or equivalent route miles open to motorized vehicles under all alternatives compared to the existing condition. Compliance with State and Federal air quality standards would occur under all alternatives. Given this information, no further discussion of this issue is included in the FEIS.

## 2.5 **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL**

In response to agency and public issues, four action alternatives were developed. Alternatives A, B, C, and B Modified were analyzed in detail along with the No Action Alternative. A general description of each of the alternatives is provided below.

Table 2-6 (found at the end of the chapter) summarizes important features and rationale for each of the alternatives. Detailed information on the alternatives is displayed on the comparison maps (see Map Package) and in the route specific tables provided in Appendix C.

## **Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives**

Tables 2-7 through 2-10 (found at the end of the chapter) are intended to provide readers with comparative information about the alternatives that is not strictly focused on changes from no action. For the action alternatives, the figures in the tables represent the total miles available under each table category if that alternative is implemented. The figures used for the No Action Alternative represent the current miles for each of the categories listed.

### **2.5.1 ALTERNATIVE A**

Under this alternative, the recreation experience in slightly less than three-quarters of the Pryor Unit would have a motorized recreation experience emphasis based on Recreation Opportunity Spectrum criteria. OHV riders and drivers would find a diversity of terrain, as well as, quality of trails and roads to experience. OHV users would have multiple options for loop experiences, especially on Big Pryor Mountain. The primary use is expected to be families and groups out for day long rides of 20-60 miles, for sightseeing, picnicking, and non-technical riding. On weekends, riders could expect to encounter other groups of riders throughout the day. Hikers, bicyclists, and horseback riders using portions of the Pryor Unit, are likely to hear or see OHV's during portions of their travels.

Recreationists' experiences in the Beartooth Unit are not expected to be appreciably different than the No Action Alternative.

Alternative A would propose to designate public motorized use on the majority of routes (system and non-system) identified during the 1999-2000 inventory. The only roads that would not be designated for public motorized use under this alternative would be those identified for administrative uses, those that the Forest Service does not have a legal right-of-way for use, and one road that has revegetated and no longer exists (see Table 2-2 for more information on these).

This alternative approximates the existing condition (e.g. use of existing system and non-system routes). The majority of routes not included in this alternative (32 of 34 miles) represent routes for which the Forest Service has no legal right-of-way for public access (access is only via private lands). Technically, these routes are not currently part of the existing motorized network of routes available for legal public use.

This alternative largely reflects the motorized road and trail elements of an alternative submitted by the Custer Partnership, a coalition of area groups interested in this project, including Families for Outdoor Recreation, Treasure State ATV, and other individuals. Other elements in the group's proposal were not included in Alternative A because they were outside the scope of the analysis (e.g. construction) or were not consistent with guidance related to the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule (e.g. designation of roads with no legal right-of-way).

### **2.5.2 ALTERNATIVE B**

OHV recreationists would find multiple motorized loop opportunities in the Pryor Unit for year-round use under this alternative – approximately two-thirds of the unit would be in motorized settings. In addition, several seasonal, high-elevation loops would be available for their use during the June 15-April 15 season of use for the Pryor Unit. Vehicle operators would find many choices for day-long rides during the majority of the year that offer a diversity of terrain, but may find it slightly more difficult to find these opportunities from April 15-June 15.

Hikers and horseback riders would find large areas or “enclaves” in the Pryor Unit with very little motorized use, including portions of Big Pryor Mountain, Punchbowl, and Lost Water Canyon. These areas would expand dramatically in size during the time of year when motorized use is prohibited at higher elevations (April 15-June 15). Recreationists could expect to take day-long hikes or horseback rides without hearing or seeing OHVs during the April 15-June 15 period; but may have a little more difficulty finding this type of experience the remainder of the year.

Pack and saddle stock users could still expect to find many opportunities for riding and camping in the Beartooth Unit, and could expect to use the Meyers Creek and Lodgepole Creek areas without hearing or seeing motorized use.

Motorcyclists could expect to have opportunities to ride in both the Beartooth and Pryor units, but would not find opportunities for single track motorcycle experiences.

This alternative specifically addresses key resource concerns identified through internal and external scoping by not designating routes for public motorized use where concerns exist (see below). This alternative identifies slightly less motorized routes than no action for designation, but more than Alternative C.

The primary resource concerns that are addressed by this alternative include:

- In Alternative B, the Dryhead Vista Loop (Road #2308B) would not be designated for public motorized use or administrative use, and would be converted to a non-motorized system trail. Forest visitors would be able to access the vista through non-motorized means. This action is being proposed to minimize impacts to traditional cultural practices in the area that are easily disturbed by motorized vehicle access and/or vandalism.
- The 300 foot access to dispersed camping allowance would not apply to the Main Fork of Rock Creek (Road #2421). Dispersed vehicle camping would continue to be allowed, but measures would be used to limit the expansion of existing sites and the creation of new sites to minimize impacts on cultural and natural resources.
- Portions of routes where cultural resources are of concern were removed from designation consideration due to potential of continued site degradation and vandalism. (See route specific information in Appendix C.)
- Portions of routes where soil and water resources are of concern were removed from designation consideration due to unacceptable erosion with little opportunity for engineered drainage without extremely high investment. (See route specific information in Appendix C.)
- Meyers Creek (Trail #27) and Lodgepole (Trail #22) trails were proposed not to be designated for motorized travel in favor of non-motorized opportunities and wildlife habitat emphasis.
- Season of use designations on roads above approximately 8,000 feet elevation to minimize road and resource damage during spring breakup or thawing of frozen soils and snow melt.

## Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

### 2.5.3 ALTERNATIVE C

Under this alternative, the majority of the Pryor Unit would have larger areas or “enclaves” with very little motorized use. Approximately half of the unit would be in motorized settings and half in non-motorized settings. Recreationists could expect that some effort would be required to walk or ride to certain destinations – for example Bear Canyon, King Canyon, and the Punchbowl area – and certain activities, such as hunting, could be expected to require more effort to find game. There would be multiple opportunities to walk or ride a horse or mountain bike without seeing or hearing OHVs on adjacent ridges. You might encounter the occasional motorized vehicle being utilized for weed spraying or grazing permit administration on roads and trails identified for administrative uses.

Recreationists accustomed to dispersed vehicle camping would find less opportunities and fewer desirable sites for this activity since fewer motorized routes would be designated and access to dispersed vehicle camping sites within 300 feet of motorized routes would not be allowed under this alternative.

Pack and saddle stock users could still expect to find many opportunities for riding and camping in the Beartooth Unit, and could expect to use the Meyers Creek and Lodgepole Creek areas without hearing or seeing motorized use.

Motorcyclists could expect to have opportunities to ride in both the Beartooth and Pryor units, but would not find opportunities for single track motorcycle experiences.

The Pryor Unit portion of this alternative basically reflects the alternative proposed by the Pryors Coalition, a coalition of groups including the Eastern Wildlands Chapter of the Montana Wilderness Association, Yellowstone Valley Audubon Society, Our Montana, Inc., The Frontier Heritage Alliance, and Beartooth Back Country Horsemen. However, not every element of the proposal has been included in the alternative analyzed for this project. The primary difference is exclusion of the game retrieval season of use for Punchbowl Road (see Section 2.5.4 for more information).

### 2.5.4 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The No Action Alternative consists of designation of the existing system roads<sup>1</sup> on the District. This is different from Alternative A (existing condition) which proposes to designate both existing system and non-system routes. This No Action Alternative largely reflects the set of system roads identified in the 1987 Travel Plan along with modifications that have been made to the system since 1987. The No Action Alternative also includes the existing vehicle types and seasons of use currently in force on the District (see Table 2-6 for details).

---

<sup>1</sup> The decision to use existing system roads as the foundation for no action stems from 2005 Motorized Travel Rule guidance, including the following:

- The *Travel Management: Designated Routes and Areas for Motorized Use* guide prepared by the Forest Service to aid in implementing the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule affirms that the starting point for travel analyses is the current network of system roads.
- The *Motor Vehicle Route and Area Designation Guide* (version 111705) states, “There is no need to initiate a NEPA process to designate those NFS roads, NFS trails, and areas on NFS lands that are already managed for motor vehicle use where that use will continue unchanged, or to retain existing restrictions on motor vehicle use.”

Designation of the existing network of system roads would not require any further NEPA and represents the starting point for any proposed changes to the routes or areas available for public motorized use. Based on this information, no action was determined to be designation of the existing system roads and trails.

### **2.5.5 ALTERNATIVE B MODIFIED (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative B was modified in response to the public and internal comments to create Alternative B Modified. Alternative B Modified contains many of the same elements as Alternative B and would provide many of the same types of experiences. The elements of Alternative B Modified that are different from Alternative B described in the Table 2-5, and provided in further detail in Appendix C.

### **2.5.6 ELEMENTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES**

#### **2.5.6.1 Public Safety**

The primary focus of public safety associated with route designation is related to mixing licensed and unlicensed vehicle use on District roads and trails. Commenters expressed an interest in having opportunities to operate unlicensed vehicles, while others have expressed safety concerns with permitting this activity. The 2005 Motorized Travel Rule lists public safety as one of the general criteria to be considered during the designation of roads, trails and areas. The Forest Service believes that both mixed motorized use roads and motorized trails are legitimate and appropriate uses of the national forests.

Public safety on Forest roads and trails depends on many factors including the condition of the facility, speed traveled, type of vehicles, human factors like driver expectations, and environmental factors such as weather, noise, and/or visual distractions. National Forest System roads are designed primarily for use by highway-legal vehicles (motor vehicles that are licensed or certified for general operation on public roads within the State) such as a passenger car or log truck. Motorized mixed use is defined as designation of a National Forest System road for use by both highway-legal and non-highway-legal motor vehicles. Currently all roads on the District require the use of highway-legal vehicles. No roads are currently designated as motorized mixed use.

Designating National Forest System roads for motorized mixed use involves safety and engineering considerations. A motorized mixed use analysis must be completed by a qualified engineer. The level of analysis is to be based on personal knowledge, expertise, and experience. During the analysis the engineer will review crash probability and crash severity. Routes designated as trails do not require a motorized mixed use analysis, only system roads proposed for mixed motorized use. An engineering analysis has been completed for the roads designated for motorized mixed use in the preferred alternative and is in the project record.

Designating system trails for motorized use does not require a motorized mixed use analysis. Trail characteristics, such as slower speeds than roads, generally mean that crash severity and crash frequency are lower than for roads. Although the District only has a limited number of motorized trails at this time, nationally the Forest Service estimates that it has 47,000 miles of motorized trails (Holtrop, 2008)

It should be noted that designation of roads or trails for motor vehicle use by a particular class of

## Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

vehicle under 36 CFR 212.51 should not be interpreted as encouraging or inviting use, or to imply that the road, trail, or area is passable, actively maintained, or safe for travel. Designation only indicates the types of vehicles that are permitted to be used on that route.

**Montana State Law.** The Forest Service defers to state laws in regard to operation of vehicles on roads and trails. State laws related to roads fall under: Montana Code Annotated, Title 61. Motor Vehicles. State laws related to trails fall under: Montana Code Annotated, Title 23 Parks, Recreation, Sports, and Gambling, Chapter 2 Recreation.

The Forest would not deviate from State of Montana motor vehicle law by proposing motorized mixed use on National Forest System roads and motorized trails.

To operate a motor vehicle (highway-legal) on National Forest System roads, the vehicle must be registered with a valid license plate and the operator must possess a State drivers licenses and when operating a motorcycle must have a “motorcycle endorsement” on the licenses.

Montana State Law does provide exemptions for use of non-highway-legal (off-highway aka unlicensed) vehicles on National Forest System roads if the forest has designated and approved that road for such use (i.e. designated for motorized mixed use). The exemptions allow the operator of a non-highway-legal vehicle to be *under 16 years of age but at least 12 years of age* if at the time of driving the vehicle the operator has in their *possession a certificate* showing the successful completion of an off-highway vehicle safety education course approved by the State of Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and is in the *physical presence of a person who possesses a drivers license*.

Montana State Law does not require that motor vehicles be licensed to operate on trails, but they are required to have an OHV sticker.

**Operator Responsibilities.** Operating a motor vehicle on National Forest System roads, National Forest System trails, and in areas on National Forest System lands carries a greater responsibility than operating that vehicle in a city or other developed setting. Not only must the motor vehicle operators know and follow all applicable traffic laws, but they need to show concern for the environment as well as other forest users. The misuse of motor vehicles can lead to the temporary or permanent closure of any designated road, trail, or area.

Users need to be aware of and comply with the following standard language found on the Motorized Vehicle Use Map per Forest Service policy: *“Operators of motor vehicles are subject to State traffic law, including State requirements for licensing, registration, and operation of the vehicle in question. Motor vehicle use, especially off-highway vehicle use, involves inherent risks that may cause property damage, serious injury, and possibly death to participants. Riders should drive cautiously and anticipate rough surfaces and features, such as snow, mud, vegetation, and water crossings common to remote driving conditions. Participants voluntarily assume full responsibility for these damages, risks, and dangers. Motor vehicle operators should take care at all times to protect themselves and those under their responsibility.”*

Much of the Custer National Forest is remote, and medical assistance may not be readily available. Cellular telephones do not work in many areas of the Custer National Forest. Operators should take adequate food, water, first aid supplies, and other equipment appropriate for the conditions and expected weather.

### 2.5.6.2 Implementation

In order to implement this project, the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule requires the Forest to make a free Motor Vehicle Use Map available to the public. The Forest also expects to install signs on all designated routes, undertake an estimated two year education campaign regarding new travel management direction and rules, and patrolling. These activities, other than publishing the MVUM, may vary in extent subject to the availability of funding.

Until the Record of Decision (ROD) for this project is implemented, the current decisions for the existing network of system roads and trails remain in effect. The ROD and its implementation will supercede the existing network of motorized system roads and trails when the Motor Vehicle Use Map is published and associated orders are in place. The ROD will supercede the current decisions for the existing network of non-motorized system trails when the resulting forest orders are issued for the associated non-motorized system trails. The forest order associated with the 1987 Travel Plan will be rescinded. Over-snow vehicle use would be permitted consistent with 1986 Forest Plan direction and existing NEPA decisions for prohibitions; a forest order would be used to enforce these prohibitions.

Sign purchase and installation is a one time cost, but the remaining costs such as patrolling and Motor Vehicle Use Map generation would be incurred annually. Annual funding levels may vary.

### 2.5.6.3 Enforcement

Public comment related to law enforcement issues focused on enforcing regulations, providing more law enforcement presence and providing the public with signing and education. These comments tended to concentrate on motorized activities on the forest, and were raised by both motorized and non-motorized recreationists. A number of comments highlighted impacts associated with the lack of enforcement, such as resource damage and diminished recreation experience for other forest visitors. Some comments suggested that there was a need for additional law enforcement personnel to handle the increase of motorized use on the forest.

## Background

*1987 Beartooth Travel Management Plan.* A comprehensive travel plan for the Beartooth Ranger District was completed in 1987. Procedural concerns related to implementation of the plan have limited its enforcement. These issues have caused law enforcement officials to be reluctant to issue citations related to the restrictions and closures identified in the plan, because the procedural issues make it unlikely that the magistrate will uphold the charges.

*2005 Motorized Travel Management Rule.* Until recently, travel restrictions could only be 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

## Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

262.12[a.]-[d.] and 36 CFR 261.13 [a.]-[i.]). These general prohibitions of the CFRs are considered “strict liability” prohibitions. This means that it is the 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 further discussion below on this subject.)

Most travel restrictions that historically prohibited some sort of travel on National Forest 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 especially hampers 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),” 36 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 closure 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. Lack of maintenance and vandalism of posted prohibition signing creates ongoing issues, and has the effect of negating or jeopardizing the effectiveness of special order closures.

In 2005, the Motorized Travel Rule changed the legal authority for regulating off-route travel of motor vehicles. The final rule modified regulations in 36 CFR 295 which historically governed the management of OHVs on National Forests. In addition, the rule changed the enforcement authority for motor vehicle restrictions from 36 CFR 261 Subpart B: Special Orders to the Subpart A: General Prohibitions section, making motor vehicle violations in the future a strict liability infraction. This change relieves the Agency of the posting and signing requirements of 36 CFR 261 Subpart B and authorizes map notification to be the enforcement tool in the future. The decision mandates that Districts and administrative units complete a travel management review with public involvement to designate motorized roads, trails, and areas and produce Motor Vehicle Use Map that identifies these designations (36 CFR 212.56). Once this is completed, travel management restrictions may be enforced under Subpart A without being required to post and maintain prohibition signs in the field.

The Forest Service’s Washington Office has established the format and the majority of the text that will appear on all MVUM maps prepared by the Forest Service. The text on these maps will include standardized information on the purpose and content of the map as well as a statement about motorized vehicle operator’s responsibilities and fines. The text states, “It is prohibited to possess or operate a motor vehicle on National Forest System lands on the Beartooth Ranger District other than in accordance with these designations (36 CFR 261.13). Violations of 36 CFR 261.13 are subject to a fine of up to \$5,000 or imprisonment for up to 6 months or both (18 U.S.C. 3571(e)).”.

*Staffing.* There is one full-time Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) stationed on the Custer National Forest. The District also has five permanent staff trained as Forest Protection Officers (FPO) and typically employs five to ten summer seasonals with FPO training. FPOs have limited law enforcement authority and responsibilities compared to LEOs, but are capable of issuing citations for



travel management violations associated with the prohibition created under the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule and found at 36 CFR 261.13. Increasing the number of LEOs or FPOs is primarily a function of Forest and District budget and priorities. Changes in the budget to facilitate increases in law enforcement capability can be accomplished through changes in allocations within Forest and District budgets, securing additional budget funding from within the Northern Region, or supplementing budgets with grants and similar funds. Based on past practices, additional funding would most likely be used to hire additional seasonal FPOs, rather than full-time FPOs or LEOs.

Changes in Forest priorities to increase law enforcement capability would most likely occur through two options. First, the Forest can determine which programs, such as developed recreation, travel management enforcement, wildlife, etc., should be emphasized and allocate the funds to accomplish objectives related to those priorities. Another method is to prioritize the work of existing permanent and seasonal employees so that more than the current number of staff have the training and supervisory support to enforce violations of travel management decisions.

### **Post-MVUM Enforcement**

This analysis will fulfill the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule requirements of review and public involvement for each of the action alternatives and no action. Upon publishing the MVUM for the selected alternative, the new 2005 Motorized Travel Rule regulations will become enforceable on the District (36 CFR 261.13). The MVUM would display those routes open to motorized travel by the public, along with the types of vehicles and seasons of use. The District intends to post route number signs on the open routes to correspond with numbers shown on the MVUM. These actions are expected to greatly enhance the ability to enforce travel management decisions. The regulatory requirements for posting prohibitions will no longer be applicable, and the problems associated with implementing and maintaining extensive prohibition posting will be eliminated. Hard-copy and electronic versions of the MVUM will be available to forest users and will identify those roads and trails available for motorized use by the public. This is expected to reduce confusion about where motorized vehicle use is legal. In addition, LEOs and FPOs will have clear authority for issuing citations for violations of motorized travel management decisions.

Although new travel restrictions may be less complex, the changes would require a period of adjustment for Forest visitors. Inadvertent violation of new travel restrictions is expected initially, but is also expected to diminish over the first several years after implementation. Enforcement of new travel restrictions would require additional emphasis by the Custer National Forest, with assistance from Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and the public.

Having a clear, enforceable travel plan will facilitate being able to involve groups and individuals that have expressed interest in assisting the District with volunteer “patrols” to provide an additional presence in-the-field. Volunteers can provide District visitors with information about legal motorized use, avoiding activities that have adverse impacts on natural and cultural resources, and report violations when they are observed.

#### **2.5.6.4 Maintenance**

Commenters indicated concerns that adding system roads and trails could increase the need for maintenance. The 2005 Motorized Travel Rule also includes a criterion related to maintenance needs that must be considered. This section is intended to address that criterion by considering the maintenance of motorized routes in this section.

## Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives

The Forest is required to maintain National Forest System roads in a condition to safely accommodate intended use in accordance with the maintenance objective for that road. Trail maintenance is intended to preserve the trail and related facilities to meet established objectives for that trail. Road Maintenance guidelines are prescribed in Forest Service Handbook 7709.58 Transportation System Maintenance Handbook and Forest Service Manual 7700 -Transportation System, Chapter 7730 – Operation and Maintenance. Trail Maintenance guidelines are prescribed in Forest Service Handbook 2309.18 Trails Management Handbook and Forest Service Manual 2300 – Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management, Chapter 2350 – Trail, River, and Similar Recreation Opportunities. The Forest’s road and trail activities are conducted in compliance with these directives.

It is important to note that the original proposed action cited reduction of maintenance costs as rationale for not designating some roads. This criterion was not used in the re-evaluation of roads and trails for the proposed action or development of the action alternatives in the DEIS or FEIS. Funding for road and trail maintenance varies from year to year and was determined to not be a suitable filter for determining routes that should or shouldn’t be designated for public motorized use.

### Maintenance Funding

Based on past funding levels, the Forest is unlikely to have sufficient funding to maintain to standard all of the routes necessary for the administration, utilization, and protection of the District for the foreseeable future. As a result, the Forest prioritizes maintenance work and routinely applies for additional/supplemental funding to increase the number of miles of road and trail maintenance completed.

Road and trail maintenance funding can only be applied to system roads and trails. Maintenance does not occur on every mile of road or trail every year. As mentioned above, maintenance is prioritized across the Forest and accomplished based on the funding received. Over the past 6 years, the Forest annual road maintenance accomplishment ranges any where from 0 to 11% of maintenance level 2 roads, 10 to 57% of maintenance level 3, and 0 to 40% of maintenance level 4 roads on the District. The following table displays the miles of road receiving annual maintenance on the District for the past 6 years.

**Table 2-3. Summary of Road Miles Receiving Annual Maintenance<sup>2</sup> by Maintenance Level.**

Beartooth District	Fiscal Year (October 1 – September 30)					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
2 - High Clearance Vehicles	-	-	-	1	21	11
3 - Suitable For Passenger Cars	6	35	22	15	20	24
4 - Moderate Degree Of User Comfort	-	6	2	-	5	1

### 2.5.6.5 Administrative Exemptions

Exemptions to off road travel as described in 36 CFR 212.51(a) would be allowed. Exemptions include administrative activities such as law enforcement, fire, emergencies, military operations,

<sup>2</sup> Based on data specific to maintenance costs that were readily available.

noxious weed control, certain special use permit provisions, and other official business purposes. All such use would require specific authorization from the appropriate Line Officer, detailing when, where, who, and under what circumstances motorized travel would be allowed.

#### **2.5.6.6 Forest Plan Amendment**

All action alternatives would involve deleting existing Forest Plan direction regarding site-specific route management (see Appendix B for details). This has been determined to be a minor amendment that will not require Regional Forester approval. Once the Record of Decision is issued, an amendment to the Forest Plan will be executed that reflects deletion of the language identified in Appendix B.

#### **2.5.6.7 Administrative Sites**

System roads associated with administrative sites will not be designated for public motorized use, except those roads that provide access to visitor services.

#### **2.5.6.8 System Roads with Forest Service Maintenance Obligations**

System roads that the FS has a legal obligation to maintain will not be removed from the system, but may or may not be designated for public motorized use.

#### **2.5.6.9 Roads Under Permit**

In instances of special use permits for ingress/egress to private inholdings, a road will generally be designated for public motorized use when the Forest Service has road maintenance responsibilities. In instances of road use permits, a road may be closed to public use when the permit holder is assigned road maintenance responsibilities.

#### **2.5.6.10 No Legal Right-of-Way**

Routes that the Forest Service has no legal right-of-way to access will not be designated for public motorized use.

#### **2.5.6.11 Season of Use Flexibility**

There is a range of potential season of use designations; those proposed were selected based on protecting resource values at risk, which may vary by locale but include values such as soils, hydrology, and wildlife. If conditions warrant, there may be flexibility to extend or reduce the season.

#### **2.5.6.12 Designated Routes Required to be Part of the National Forest System**

In accordance with the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule, only system routes can be designated for public motorized use. If motorized routes that are currently non-system roads are desired for motorized use, an action is required to add them to National Forest transportation system.

**2.5.6.13 Dispersed Vehicle Camping Authorized Only Authorized on National Forest System Lands**

Under Alternatives that allow access for dispersed vehicle camping within 300 feet of a motorized route, access is only authorized on NFS lands, not on private, state, or other federal lands that may be within 300 feet of designated routes.

**2.6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT DROPPED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS**

Federal agencies are required by NEPA to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and to briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating any alternatives that were not developed in detail (40 CFR 1502.14). Public comments received in response to the Proposed Action provided suggestions for alternative methods for achieving the purpose and need. Some of these alternatives may have been outside the scope of travel management, duplicative of the alternatives considered in detail, incorporated into alternatives considered in detail, determined to be components that would cause unnecessary environmental harm, or area already addressed by law, regulation or policy. Therefore, a number of alternatives were considered, but dismissed from detailed consideration for the reasons summarized below.

**2.6.1 LAND ZONING**

The public proposed concepts for zoning motorized and non-motorized use on the Beartooth Ranger District to reduce user conflicts. One proposal suggested designating the area south (East) of Highway 212 for motorized use and designating the area north (West) of Highway 212 for non-motorized use. Other proposals suggested identifying Riding and Hiking areas, “quiet areas”, or non-motorized enclaves in the Pryor Unit.

Zoning areas by type of use or similar management prescription is more appropriate for land management planning. This analysis is largely focused on the designation and use of routes (roads and trails), rather than prescriptive land use direction that would require a significant amendment of current Forest Plan land use direction which is beyond the scope of this analysis.

**2.6.2 ROUTE CONSTRUCTION**

There were public comments that suggested construction of various routes throughout the District. In addition, the Forest Service sought information from the public during the collaborative meetings associated with this project on potential route development for loops or other recreation opportunities. The collaborative meetings attendees did not reach agreement on any specific routes that would involve construction. However, individuals at the meetings did identify potential routes for construction.

In the spring of 2007, the Responsible Official, in consultation with the Beartooth District Ranger and the interdisciplinary team leader, determined that the scope of the proposal should be limited to road and trail designation of existing routes. Route construction, along with other potential alternative elements such as motorized over-snow use, was reviewed and not included in the proposal in an effort to keep the scope of the project appropriate for the agreed to timeframe for completion of the project. As a result, construction of new routes (motorized and non-motorized) is outside the scope of this

proposal. However, the District is interested in considering new routes that may provide or improve recreation opportunities. If any such proposals for new route construction are pursued they would be addressed through separate analysis.

### **2.6.3 GAME RETRIEVAL “SEASON OF USE” ON PUNCHBOWL ROAD**

A suggestion was made to allow game retrieval midday in the Punchbowl area using Punchbowl Road (Road #2144). This proposal suggested not designating the Punchbowl Road for public motorized use except for mid-afternoon access during hunting season. Cross-country game retrieval was not proposed, only the use of the road for game retrieval. The interdisciplinary team considered this proposal, but determined, in consultation with the Responsible Official, that this would be difficult to enforce without committing substantial resources to the site (staffing, gates, etc.). This was not desirable given the limited staff available for this type of work during hunting seasons. (Seasonal personnel are typically laid-off in early September due to funding; typically only limited numbers of permanent staff are available during fall hunting seasons.)

### **2.6.4 CONVERT SINGLE TRACK NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS TO MOTORCYCLE TRAILS**

Commenters suggested that all non-motorized trails outside of Wilderness or recommended wilderness should also be designated for motorcycle use. The District reviewed all of these routes and determined that none of them were suitable from a management perspective for this designation (see Project Record). The management concerns with designating these routes for motorcycle use varied by route, but included such concerns as:

- Inconsistent with the Forest Plan direction;
- Increased potential for inadvertent Wilderness motorized intrusions on trails that lead to Wilderness;
- Would conflict with an existing Forest Order prohibiting motorized use;
- Inconsistent with intended and/or current management of the trail;
- The route led into a developed site under special use permit;
- The route is National Recreation Trail identified for non-motorized use.

### **2.6.5 ROADS ANALYSIS UNDER FOREST SERVICE PUBLICATION FS-643**

One commenter suggested that direction in Forest Service publication FS-643 Roads Analysis should be used to develop alternatives. The Custer completed a Roads Analysis report in 2004 consistent with FS-643 Roads Analysis. During the course of this project, the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule replaced the direction in FS-643 Roads Analysis. The direction provided in the 2005 Motorized Travel Rule was used to develop the range of alternatives. In addition, information from the 2004 Roads Analysis was considered during development of this project.

### **2.6.6 CONVERT ALL ROADS TO MIXED MOTORIZED USE ROADS OR TRAILS OPEN TO ALL VEHICLES**

There were suggestions that all roads and trails should be open to all motor vehicles, highway legal and unlicensed vehicles. Not all roads are suitable for motorized mixed use. Higher standard roads, such as Maintenance Level 3 and 4 roads are designed for and accommodate higher speed traffic. Encouraging and/or permitting unlicensed vehicle use on these routes is not appropriate given the potential for increased crash severity and crash probability.

Motorized trails designated for motorcycle or vehicles less than 50 inches simply are typically not able to accommodate full-size vehicles due to their narrow tread width. The District currently has less than nine miles of these routes.

**2.6.7 DO NOT ADD ANY NON-SYSTEM ROUTES TO THE SYSTEM**

Some commenters suggested that an alternative where no non-system routes are added to the system should be considered. This is identical to the No Action Alternative. This alternative does not meet the purpose and need for this project.

**2.6.8 MONTANA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION/PRYORS COALITION VISION ALTERNATIVE**

The Montana Wilderness Association (MWA) and later the Pryors Coalition submitted an initial and then a revised alternative. This alternative focuses on the Pryor Unit. This alternative was not used as proposed because, both versions of this alternative included elements that were outside the scope of the analysis (land zoning – see section 2.6.1) and did not include routes necessary for the administration of the District. Alternative C is very similar to the alternative proposed by MWA and the Pryors Coalition, but provides for additional administrative needs, especially motorized access to range improvements, and does not include land zoning.

**2.6.9 CUSTER PARTNERSHIP**

The Custer Partnership proposed an extensive alternative. This alternative included several elements that were outside the scope of this analysis, such as road and trail construction. It also included undeveloped elements such as locating cross-country motorized use areas in the Pryors, but without specific locations for these areas. Alternative A was developed in part to reflect the alternative proposed by the Custer Partnership, by proposing to designate the majority of the existing motorized routes on the District.

**2.6.10 SOIL UNITS**

A commenter suggested that the Forest Service should consider an alternative that only designated routes on low hazard soils. This is not a viable alternative. There are many types of soils on the District. Any given road may easily transect dozens of different types of soils with various soil hazard ratings. It would be impossible to design an alternative, using existing routes, which provided the administrative, utilization, and protection needs of the District and avoided all soils with moderate and high hazard ratings.

**2.6.11 WILDLIFE ROAD DENSITY**

One commenter suggested developing an alternative that specifically addressed the road density criteria. The suggestion was to develop an alternative that would close a reasonable number of routes during hunting season and other critical seasons and then open them during the summer recreation season. This was intended to avoid complete closure of routes in response to road density concerns. Road density was not used as a criterion for determining if specific routes should not be designated. It was only used as an indicator to determine effects. Road density was not considered a significant

issue and therefore developing an alternative to specifically address road density was not determined to be warranted. There are elements within the range of alternatives that are aimed at addressing specific wildlife concerns, such as the season of use on the Meyers Creek and Lodgepole Creek trails to address big game winter range and moose calving concerns but permit summer season motorcycle use of the trails.

## 2.7 COMPARISON OF EFFECTS

Table 2-11 and 2-12 (found at the end of the chapter) provides a summary of the effects of implementing each alternative. Information in the Table 2-11 is focused on activities and effects where different levels of effects or outputs can be distinguished quantitatively or qualitatively among alternatives. Table 2-12 provides a summary of changes in effects of implementing each action alternative compared to the no action alternative. Detail effects analysis for each Alternative is found in Chapter 3.

## 2.8 MONITORING

The designations identified on the motor vehicle use map are subject to revision. Information collected through monitoring and through public user groups and individuals will be used in evaluating and revising travel management decisions.

The goal of travel management monitoring is to determine how well travel management is working and what is not working, and to help identify what changes are needed in travel management or monitoring methods. Monitoring and evaluation tell how travel management decisions have been implemented and how effective the implementation has proven to be in accomplishing the desired outcomes.

The travel management monitoring plan will be tiered to Forest Plan monitoring activities, and that each year's monitoring plan will be adapted as needed based on changing needs, findings, and budget levels. The results of the monitoring plan will be evaluated annually, and based on the findings, potential solutions will be developed and adjustments to the motorized use map may be made.

Implementation monitoring will be based on compliance with the Travel Management decision. Effectiveness monitoring may be conducted by sampling a range of projects from the entire Beartooth Ranger District as outlined in the Forest Plan monitoring section. The Forest will utilize an adaptive monitoring plan to allow flexibility for changing budgets and staff levels and for monitoring results. The following table outlines Forest Plan criteria for evaluating the effects of effects of off-road vehicle use and damage.

**Table 2-4. Forest Plan Monitoring Items Relevant for Travel Management**

Monitoring Item	Data Source	Monitoring Objective	Variability Which Would Initiate Further Evaluation	Corrective Measures
Off-road-vehicle use and damage and Travel Plan effectiveness. (A-3).	Travel Plan (violation and incident reports, number of variances granted).	To determine compliance with travel plan direction (and, therefore, effectiveness in achieving resource protection objectives). To assist in determination of effectiveness of restriction methods, public understanding of travel plan direction.	Conflicts with Forest Management Area goals.	Review situation for change in implementation techniques such as signing, barriers, public contacts, etc.

If, based on monitoring pursuant to 36 CFR 212.57, the Forest Supervisor or other responsible official determines that motor vehicle use on a National Forest System road or National Forest System trail or in an area on National Forest System lands is causing or will cause considerable adverse effects on public safety or soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, or cultural or historic resources associated with that road, trail, or area, the Forest Supervisor or other responsible official shall immediately close that road, trail, or area to motor vehicle use until the official determines that such adverse effects have been mitigated or eliminated and that measures have been implemented to prevent future recurrence.

## 2.9 FOREST SERVICE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The Forest Service preferred alternative is Alternative B Modified. Alternative B Modified is the “preferred” alternative based on Responsible Official and interdisciplinary team deliberations. This alternative provides the road system necessary for the administration, utilization, and administration of the District. It also appears to respond best to the significant issue of recreation conflicts by providing a compromise between motorized and non-motorized recreation preferences, while reducing the overall environmental and cultural resource impacts of system roads and trails.

The Responsible Official (the Custer Forest Supervisor) may select any combination of travel management actions as presented and analyzed within this document.



**Table 2-5. Alternative B Modified Elements Different From Alternative B and Rationale for Modification.**

Alternative B Modified	Alternative B	Rationale for Modification
Meyers Creek (Trail #27) and Lodgepole (Trail #22) trails would be designated as motorcycle trails with a season of use of June 15 to December 1.	Meyers Creek and Lodgepole trails would be converted from motorcycle trails to non-motorized trails.	In response to public comment, these trails are proposed to remain motorcycle trails in order to continue to provide this opportunity on the District. The season of use is to address concerns about disturbance to moose calving and mule deer winter range, and would have the additional benefit of providing spring and early summer season, low elevation non-motorized trail opportunities.
A 2.2 mile section of Shriver Peak Road (#2088) west of Crater Ice Cave and east of its junction with 2095A would not be designated for public motorized use (see Alternative B Modified map).	The entire length of Shriver Peak Road would be designated for public motorized use.	This action is intended to reduce potential for impacts on cultural resources and traditional cultural practices, and in response to public comment would provide additional area for non-motorized recreation opportunities.
<p>The season of use dates for the following routes in the Pryors would be adjusted to 5/22 to 4/15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads and motorized trails on Big Pryor Mountain previously identified with a season of use of 6/15 to 4/1.</li> <li>• Pryor Mountain Road (#2038) from the junction with Crooked Creek Road to the Dryhead Vista.</li> <li>• Commissary Ridge Road (#2092).</li> <li>• Island Ridge Road (#2093).</li> </ul>	These routes would have a season of use of 6/15 to 4/15.	The change reflects more accurate information used to develop the dates and due to the fact that these routes area generally located in lands with a southern aspect that result in more rapid snowmelt and soil drying.
The eastern most approximate ½ mile of Punch Bowl Road (#2144) would be designated for vehicles less than 50 inches in width contingent upon the completion of trail maintenance work necessary to alleviate soils and water resource concerns with that section of trail.	Route would not be designated for public motorized use.	This change is being proposed in response to public comment and for the following reasons: Route was not proposed to be designated in Alt. B because of costly mitigation necessary to correct resource issues. If these resource issues are addressed, no other issues were identified that would prevent designation.
Road #21415 would be converted from non-system to system road, and identified for administrative use only.	Route would be identified for non-motorized trail use.	This route would be designated in response to coordination efforts with the State of Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation to provide motorized access to state lands.
Graham Trail (#2013) would be designated as a trail open to all OHVs.	Road would not be designated for public motorized use.	Commenters indicated this route was in better condition and preferable to other routes in the vicinity.
Piney Creek (#2012) east of the quarry would not be designated for public motorized use.	Road would be designated for public motorized use.	This route would be dropped in response to designating the adjacent Graham Trail. These two changes would keep the overall number of routes the same as Alternative B, consolidate designated routes into a more confined corridor, and increase the size of a consolidated defacto non-motorized area.

**Table 2-5. Alternative B Modified Elements Different From Alternative B and Rationale for Modification.**

<b>Alternative B Modified</b>	<b>Alternative B</b>	<b>Rationale for Modification</b>
The southern ¾ mile of Commissary Ridge (#2092) would be designated for public motorized use.	Portion of road would not be designated.	This change is being proposed in response to public comment and because there are no identified resource concerns with designating the route.
The first ½ mile of Roberts Bench (#20972) beginning at the junction with Punch Bowl Road (#2144) would be designated for public motorized mixed use, but the remainder of the route would not be designated.	Entire route would be designated for motorized use.	Fence was constructed across the route in the past preventing motorized use of the full route, which also reduces concerns about potential impacts to heritage resources beyond the fence line.
Picket Pin Sawmill Roads #21401A and #21401B would not be designated for public motorized use.	These two routes would be designated for public motorized use.	Not designating these routes will help reduce the routes impact on water quality. This issue was highlighted by commenters.
Road #241412 would not be designated for public motorized use.	This route would be designated for public motorized use.	Not designating this route will help reduce the routes impact on water quality. This issue was highlighted by commenters.
Picket Pin Spur #21407 would be designated for public motorized use contingent upon the completion of road maintenance work necessary to alleviate water resource concerns associated with the route.	This route would be designated for public motorized use.	Not designating this route until mitigation is completed will help reduce the routes impact on water quality. This issue was highlighted by commenters.
The season of use for Picket Pin Road (#2140) would be yearlong.	Season of use would be July 16 to March 31 to be consistent with Gallatin National Forest.	The need for a season of use on Picket Pin Road is on the Gallatin National Forest. There are no resource concerns that necessitate a season of use on the Custer National Forest's portion of Picket Pin Road.
No pack and saddle stock restrictions are proposed for the Lake Fork, Lost Lake, Lake Mary, Keyser Brown, or Crow Lake trails.	Pack and saddle stock restrictions are proposed for the Lake Fork, Lost Lake, Lake Mary, Keyser Brown, or Crow Lake trails.	In response to public input, the Forest determined that resource issues may be more effectively and appropriately addressed through site-specific Forest Order closures, additional Wilderness management planning, and/or other mechanisms.
Nichols Creek (#2478) would be identified as administrative use only.	Nichols Creek would not be designated and would be identified as a ML 1 system road.	The District has identified administrative needs for this route.
The following roads in the vicinity of the upper end of the Benbow and Stillwater Plateau Trailhead areas would be designated for public motorized use contingent upon obtaining a legal right-of-way to access them. Benbow (#2414) (.08 miles) Benbow-Stillwater Road (#2014) #20142 The Golf Course (#20144) Stillwater Plateau Trailhead (#20144B)	Roads would be designated for public motorized use.	There is no legal right-of-way to the identified roads. However, it is desirable to obtain a right-of-way to provide access Stillwater Plateau Trailhead.

**Table 2-5. Alternative B Modified Elements Different From Alternative B and Rationale for Modification.**

Alternative B Modified	Alternative B	Rationale for Modification																
<p>The following routes in Tie Flats, Beaverslide, and Punchbowl areas would be designated for public motorized mixed use (see Alternative B-Modified map):</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">#2097A-Guard Station Green Cabin</td> <td style="width: 50%;">#2097-Beaverslide</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2144-Sage Creek Road (4 mile section)</td> <td>#20972-Roberts Bench</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2073-Stephens Draw (2 mile section)</td> <td>#2104-Tie Flats</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2073H</td> <td>#2104A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2085-Crooked Creek Road (1.24 mile section)</td> <td>#2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2308-Pryor Mountain Road (0.84 mile section)</td> <td>#2002A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2308C</td> <td>#2002A1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#230811</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	#2097A-Guard Station Green Cabin	#2097-Beaverslide	#2144-Sage Creek Road (4 mile section)	#20972-Roberts Bench	#2073-Stephens Draw (2 mile section)	#2104-Tie Flats	#2073H	#2104A	#2085-Crooked Creek Road (1.24 mile section)	#2002	#2308-Pryor Mountain Road (0.84 mile section)	#2002A	#2308C	#2002A1	#230811		<p>The subject routes would be designated for highway legal vehicles.</p>	<p>In response to public comment, these routes would be changed from a highway legal vehicle designation to mixed motorized use to provide additional motorized recreation opportunities. A few of the listed routes are improved roads and lend themselves to a mixed motorized use designation than a motorized trail designation. Therefore, this network is proposed to for mixed motorized use designation.</p>
#2097A-Guard Station Green Cabin	#2097-Beaverslide																	
#2144-Sage Creek Road (4 mile section)	#20972-Roberts Bench																	
#2073-Stephens Draw (2 mile section)	#2104-Tie Flats																	
#2073H	#2104A																	
#2085-Crooked Creek Road (1.24 mile section)	#2002																	
#2308-Pryor Mountain Road (0.84 mile section)	#2002A																	
#2308C	#2002A1																	
#230811																		
<p>The Burnt Timber Road (#2849) would be designated for motorized mixed use.</p>	<p>Burnt Timber Road would be designated for highway legal vehicles.</p>	<p>This route would be designated as mixed motorized use to provide consistency where the route connects to BLM routes.</p>																
<p>A 1.24 mile section of Crooked Creek Road (#2085) (see Alternative B-Modified map) would be designated for motorized mixed use.</p>	<p>The subject portion of Crooked Creek Road would be designated for highway legal vehicles.</p>	<p>This segment of Crooked Creek Road would be designated as mixed motorized use to provide a loop opportunity for unlicensed vehicles using the proposed #2096 motorized trail. Unlicensed vehicles would be able to travel south on Crooked Creek Road to BLM land where there would be multiple opportunities for loops.</p>																
<p>The Benbow Jeep Trail (#2415) would be designated for motorized mixed use.</p>	<p>Benbow Jeep Trail would be designated for highway legal vehicles.</p>	<p>In response to public comment, this route would be changed from a highway legal vehicle designation to mixed motorized use to provide an additional motorized recreation opportunity.</p>																

**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Administrative Use</b>	Roads identified for administrative use are not designated for public motorized use to protect the public from hazardous situations, protect facilities and/or materials, or due to permit terms and conditions. Examples of these types of administrative routes include certain system roads within the Rock Creek Work Center, Red Lodge Ski Area, Lions Camp, and some areas with active mining. Appendix C includes all non-system roads that would be converted to system roads and identified for administrative use. Existing administrative use system roads area not proposed to be changed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same rationale as Alternative A.  This alternative contains the largest number of administrative roads. This is because several roads that were not proposed to be designated for public use were identified as needed for administrative use.	Existing roads identified for administrative use.	Same as Alternative A.
<b>Legal Access</b>	The Motor Vehicle Route and Area Designation Guide states that designation for public motorized use should be avoided in instances where the Forest Service does not have legal access. This guidance was applied to all instances where the situation occurred in this alternative, with one notable exception. The Stillwater Plateau Trailhead, a Forest Service developed trailhead,	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A	System roads that the Forest Service does not have legal access to use will be included in this alternative, unlike the action alternatives. This is because not designating these system roads would constitute an action, which would be inconsistent within the context of this No Action Alternative.	The Motor Vehicle Route and Area Designation Guide states that designation for public motorized use should be avoided in instances where the Forest Service does not have legal access. This guidance was applied to all instances where the situation occurred in this alternative.

**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
	<p>can only be accessed by crossing private land for which the Forest Service does not have a right-of-way to cross. The Forest Service has pursued a right-of-way, but the landowner has not been interested in granting an easement. However, the landowner has been willing to continue to allow public use of the existing road that accesses the trailhead. Given the circumstances, the District has determined that in this situation the Forest Service portions of the road accessing the trailhead should be designated so that the public may continue to access the trailhead.</p>				
<p><b>Pack and Saddle Stock Use</b></p>	<p>There would not be any new restrictions on pack and saddle stock use on system trails proposed in this alternative.</p> <p>Existing pack and saddle stock restrictions would not be changed.</p>	<p>Pack and saddle stock would be limited to day use only on the Lake Fork Trail (Trail 2), Lost Lake Trail (Trail 2A), Keyser Brown Trail (Trail 2C), and Lake Mary Trail (Trail 1A). Pack and saddle stock would be prohibited from using the Crow Lake Trail (Trail 13B). These changes are reflected in Appendix C.</p> <p>Existing pack and saddle stock restrictions would not be changed.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>The existing pack and saddle stock restrictions on the West Rosebud, Huckleberry, Basin Lake, and Glacier Lake trails are included in this alternative.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>

**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<p><b>Season of Use Designations</b></p>	<p>Season of use for all designated routes is yearlong except for the following seasons of use. Existing season of use designations would not be changed.</p> <p><b>May 15 through September 30 season of use would be designated for currently gated campgrounds:</b> Palisades, Cascade, Basin, Sheridan, Greenough Lake, Limber Pine, Woodbine, Pine Grove, Lower Pine Grove, Emerald, and Jimmy Joe.</p> <p>The following season of use designation would be implemented under this alternative to protect roadbeds when they tend to be particularly wet and to discourage visitors from driving around wet or muddy sections of roads.</p> <p><b>July 16 through March 31 season of use would be designated</b> for Picket Pin – Iron Mountain and related spur roads (#2140 series). Maintains consistency with the Gallatin National Forest.</p>	<p>Season of use for all designated routes is yearlong except for the following seasons of use. Existing season of use designations would not be changed.</p> <p><b>May 15 through September 30 season of use would be designated for currently gated campgrounds:</b> Palisades, Cascade, Basin, Sheridan, Greenough Lake, Limber Pine, Woodbine, Pine Grove, Lower Pine Grove, Emerald, and Jimmy Joe.</p> <p>The following seasons of use designations would be implemented under this alternative to protect roadbeds when they tend to be particularly wet and to discourage visitors from driving around wet or muddy sections of roads.</p> <p><b>July 16 through March 31 season of use would be designated</b> for Picket Pin – Iron Mountain and related spur roads (#2140 series). Maintains consistency with the Gallatin National Forest.</p>	<p>Season of use for all designated routes is yearlong except for the following seasons of use. Existing season of use designations would not be changed.</p> <p><b>May 15 through September 30 season of use would be designated for currently gated campgrounds:</b> Palisades, Cascade, Basin, Sheridan, Greenough Lake, Limber Pine, Woodbine, Pine Grove, Lower Pine Grove, Emerald, and Jimmy Joe.</p> <p>The following seasons of use designations would be implemented under this alternative to protect roadbeds when they tend to be particularly wet and to discourage visitors from driving around wet or muddy sections of roads.</p> <p><b>July 16 through March 31 season of use would be designated</b> for Picket Pin – Iron Mountain and related spur roads (#2140 series). Maintains consistency with the Gallatin National Forest.</p>	<p>Season of use for all designated routes is yearlong except for the following documented existing seasons of use.</p> <p><b>April 15 through December 1 season of use designations include</b> West Fork, Lake Fork, Basin Trailhead, Silver Run, Wild Bill Lake, and Robertson Draw areas of the Beartooth Unit.</p> <p><b>June 30 through September 1 season of use designation includes</b> Mill Hollow Road #2085T in the Pryors Unit.</p> <p><b>September 1 through December 1 season of use is currently designated for pack and saddle stock use only</b> on West Rosebud Trail #19, Huckleberry Trail #19A, and Basin Lake Trail #61.</p>	<p>Season of use for all designated routes is yearlong except for the following seasons of use. Existing season of use designations would not be changed.</p> <p><b>May 15 through September 30 season of use would be designated for currently gated campgrounds:</b> Palisades, Cascade, Basin, Sheridan, Greenough Lake, Limber Pine, Woodbine, Pine Grove, Lower Pine Grove, Emerald, and Jimmy Joe.</p> <p>The following seasons of use designations would be implemented under this alternative to protect roadbeds when they tend to be wet from snowmelt and to discourage visitors from driving around snow banks.</p> <p><b>May 22 through April 15 season of use would be designated</b> for higher elevation roads in the Pryor Unit with southern aspects. See the Map Package and Appendix C for more details.</p>

Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
		<p><b>June 15 through April 15 season of use would be designated for</b> higher elevation roads on Big Pryor Mountain and on Big Ice Cave Road (Road # 2308) from the junction with the Beaverslide (Road # 2097) east to the forest boundary. See the Map Package and Appendix C for more details.</p> <p><b>June 1 through April 1 season of use would be designated on</b> Red Lodge Creek Road (Road #2141) and Pole Road (Road #21416).</p> <p><b>April 15 through December 1 season of use designation</b> consistent with season of use for West Fork of Rock Creek Road (Road #2071) would be implemented for non-system roads converted to system roads accessed by West Fork of Rock Creek Road.</p>	<p><b>June 15 through April 15 season of use would be designated for</b> higher elevations in the Pryor Mountains on portions of Red Pryor Divide Road #2091, Miller Trail #2496, and Stockman Trail #2850; and on Big Ice Cave Road (Road # 2308) from the junction with the Beaverslide (Road # 2097) east to the forest boundary. See the Map Package and Appendix C for more details.</p>		<p><b>June 15 through April 15 season of use would be designated for</b> higher elevation roads in the Pryor Unit with northern aspects. See the Map Package and Appendix C for more details.</p> <p><b>May 1 through March 1 season of use would be designated on</b> Red Lodge Creek Road (Road #2141) and Pole Road (Road #21416).</p> <p><b>April 15 through December 1 season of use designation</b> consistent with season of use for West Fork of Rock Creek Road (Road #2071) would be implemented for non-system roads converted to system roads accessed by West Fork of Rock Creek Road.</p>
<b>Type of Vehicle Designations</b>	System roads in the following areas would be converted to system motorized trails and designated for use by all motorized vehicles:	The majority of system roads south of Sage Creek Road and west of Crooked Creek Road would be converted to system motorized trails and designated for use by all	System roads would be designated for use by highway legal vehicles. Under this alternative, there would be only highway legal roads; no motorized trails.	System roads would be designated for use by highway legal vehicles.	The majority of system roads south of Sage Creek Road and west of Crooked Creek Road would be converted to system motorized trails and designated for use by all

**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
	<p><b>Tie Flat/Stephens Draw/Mill Hollow.</b> This is a popular dispersed camping area for families. These roads would be converted to provide several smaller loop opportunities that could be enjoyed by families.</p> <p><b>Big Pryor/Red Pryor.</b> This area would be converted to provide motorized recreationists with a variety of experiences, challenging terrain, and loop opportunities.</p> <p><b>Benbow.</b> This is a popular dispersed camping area for motorized recreationists. System roads that make a connection between dispersed camping areas and the Benbow Jeep Trail would be converted to allow recreationists, particularly families, to ride from camp to the jeep trail. The jeep trail would also be converted to allow all types of motorized vehicles.</p> <p><b>Iron Mountain.</b> The upper portion of Picket Pin and all routes along Iron Mountain would allow all types of motorized vehicles.</p>	<p>motorized vehicles. In general, all other designated system roads in the Pryors and Beartooth units would be designated for use by highway legal vehicles.</p> <p><b>Lodgepole and Meyers Creek</b> trails would be converted from motorized single track trails to non-motorized trails.</p> <p>Appendix C provides a complete list of all type of vehicle designations.</p>	<p>Appendix C provides a complete list of all type of vehicle designations.</p>		<p>OHVs.</p> <p><b>Lower Red Pryor/Crooked Creek, Punchbowl, Tie Flats area, and Beaverslide</b> area would have mixed use.</p> <p><b>Lodgepole and Meyers Creek</b> trails would remain motorized single track trails.</p> <p><b>Benbow.</b> The jeep trail would be converted to allow all types of motorized vehicles.</p> <p>In general, all other designated system roads in the Pryors and Beartooth units would be designated for use by highway legal vehicles.</p> <p>Appendix C provides a complete list of all type of vehicle designations.</p>



**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
	<p>In general, all other designated system roads would be designated for use by highway legal vehicles. Appendix C provides a complete list of all type of vehicle designations.</p>				
<p><b>Dispersed Vehicle Camping</b></p>	<p>Access for dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails on the District. See Appendix D for further details regarding Dispersed Camping.</p>	<p>Under Alternative B, access to dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails on the District, except along system road <b>#2421 Main Fork of Rock Creek</b>.</p> <p>Along the Main Fork Rock Creek road, the goal is to continue to provide dispersed vehicle camping while not allowing further dispersed site establishment. Current use has been evaluated and is generally acceptable. Water quality, cultural, and aesthetic resource concerns exist with expansion of dispersed vehicle camping site establishment and recurring use. Elements of Alternative B address these concerns.</p> <p>Along the Main Fork Rock Creek Road #2421, dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed on or</p>	<p>Alternative C would not allow the use of motor vehicles within a specified distance of designated motorized routes solely for the purposes of dispersed vehicle camping. However, parking would be allowed within one vehicle length from the edge of system roads and motorized trails. See Appendix D for further details regarding Dispersed Camping.</p>	<p>Access to dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails on the District. See Appendix D for further details regarding Dispersed Camping.</p>	<p>Under Alternative B-Modified, access to dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails on the District, except along system road <b>#2421 Main Fork of Rock Creek</b>.</p> <p>Along the Main Fork Rock Creek road, the goal is to continue to provide dispersed vehicle camping while not allowing further dispersed site establishment. Current use has been evaluated and is generally acceptable. Water quality, cultural, and aesthetic resource concerns exist with expansion of dispersed vehicle camping site establishment and recurring use. Elements of Alternative B-Modified address these concerns.</p> <p>Along the Main Fork Rock Creek Road #2421, dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed on or</p>

**Table 2–6. Summary of Elements for Each Alternative**

Element	Alternative A (Existing Condition)	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
		<p>within a vehicle’s length from the edge of designated spurs off system road #2421.</p> <p>Six of about 30 existing dispersed camp areas along Main Fork of Rock Creek Road #2421 would not be open for public use due to water quality and cultural resource concerns under Alternative B. The location identifier in Appendix D, Table D-1 can be cross-referenced to its location in Figures D-1 through D-3.</p> <p>Also under Alternative B, access to dispersed vehicle camping along the <b>West Fork Rock Creek Road #2071</b> would continue to be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails. However, per Forest Plan direction, there would be a 100 foot dispersed vehicle camping prohibition from the West Fork Rock Creek live streams.</p> <p>See Appendix D for further details regarding dispersed vehicle camping.</p>			<p>within a vehicle’s length from the edge of designated spurs off system road #2421.</p> <p>Six of about 30 existing dispersed camp areas along Main Fork of Rock Creek Road #2421 would not be open for public use due to water quality and cultural resource concerns under Alternative B-Modified. The location identifier in Appendix D, Table D-1 can be cross-referenced to its location in Figures D-1 through D-3.</p> <p>Also under Alternative B-Modified, access to dispersed vehicle camping along the <b>West Fork Rock Creek Road #2071</b> would continue to be allowed within 300 feet of all designated system roads and motorized trails. However, per Forest Plan direction, there would be a 100 foot dispersed vehicle camping prohibition from the West Fork Rock Creek live streams.</p> <p>See Appendix D for further details regarding dispersed vehicle camping.</p>

**Table 2-7. Summary of Miles<sup>3</sup> of Roads and Trails by Alternative**

Route Designation		Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action	Alternative B Modified	
<b>National Forest System Roads</b>	Designated for public motorized use	Pryor Unit	77	74	78	150	75
		Beartooth Unit	148	137	120	129	135
		District	225	211	198	279	210
	Administrative use only	Pryor Unit	6	13	27	1	13
		Beartooth Unit	36	38	38	28	40
		District	42	51	65	29	53
	Not designated	Pryor Unit	14	34	59	12	10
		Beartooth Unit	7	10	13	7	34
		District	21	44	72	19	44
<b>Non-System Routes</b>	Not converted to system roads or trails	Pryor Unit	2	26	33	37	27
		Beartooth Unit	17	30	43	54	30
		District	19	56	76	91	57
<b>National Forest System Trails</b>	Non-motorized use	Pryor Unit	2	2	2	2	2
		Beartooth Unit	277	284	286	271	271
		District	279	286	289	273	279
	Designated for public motorized use	Pryor Unit	100	51	0	0	50
		Beartooth Unit	18	2	0	8	8
		District	118	53	0	8	58

**Table 2-8. Summary of Miles of System Roads and Trails by Type of Public Use Designation by Alternative**

Type of Use	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action	Alternative B Modified
<b>Road Designation Type</b>					
All types allowed (motorized mixed use)	28	27	0	0	52
Highway legal vehicles	197	185	198	279	158
Subtotal	225	212	198	279	210
<b>Motorized Trail Designation Type</b>					
All types allowed	110	50	0	0	49
Less than 50 inches only	2	2	0	2	2
Motorcycles only	6	0	0	6	6
Subtotal	118	52	0	8	57
<b>Motorized - Total Miles</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Non-Motorized Trail Designation Type</b>					
All types allowed	91	98	96	88	88
Pedestrian/hiking use only	8	9	9	6	6
Pedestrian/hiking, and pack and saddle stock use only	177	177	183	177	176
Pedestrian/hiking and mechanized use only	3	3	0	3	3
<b>Non-Motorized - Total Miles</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>273</b>

<sup>3</sup> Comparison between tables may not be exact due to rounding error.

**Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives**

**Table 2-9. Miles of System Roads and Trails Designated for Public Motorized Use by Proposed Season of Use Designation for each Alternative**

Season of Use	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action	Alternative B Modified
Yearlong	310	167	148	269	177
April 15 – December 1 (Wildlife - Robertson Draw; Winter Recreation - Routes added off of West Fork of Rock Creek and Ingles Creek)	15	19	15	15	19
May 15 – March 8 (Spring Thaw - Red Lodge Creek)	0	0	0	0	3
May 15 – September 30 (Protection - Ten Gated Campgrounds)	7	7	7	0	7
May 22 – April 15 (Spring Thaw - Pryors High Elevation)	0	0	0	0	43
June 15 – April 15 (Spring Thaw- Pryors High Elevation)	0	60	19	0	15
June 15 – December 1 (Wildlife – Meyer/Lodgepole)	0	0	0	0	6
June 30 – September 1 (Timber Sale Mitigation - Mill Hollow)	0	0	0	3	0
July 16 – March 31 (Consistency with Gallatin NF)	12	12	7	0	0

**Table 2-10. Miles of non-motorized system trails with pack and saddle stock day-use restrictions for each alternative.**

Season of Use	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action	Alternative B Modified
Day Use – Pack and Saddle Stock	0	12	12	0	0

**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature		Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Recreation</b>						
<b>Motorized Recreation Opportunity</b>						
Acres of Rural ROS	Pryor Unit	0	0	0	0	0
	Beartooth Unit	12,676	12,676	12,676	12,676	12,205
	District	12,676	12,676	12,676	12,676	12,205
Acres of Roaded Natural ROS	Pryor Unit	19,399	25,739	41,621	44,055	25,875
	Beartooth Unit	51,832	51,830	51,314	51,830	52,307
	District	71,231	77,569	92,935	95,885	78,182
Acres of Semi-Primitive Motorized ROS	Pryor Unit	35,985	23,380	0	0	22,439
	Beartooth Unit	6,715	1,848	1,848	6,715	6,072
	District	42,700	25,228	1,848	6,715	28,511
Miles of motorized roads and trails	Pryor Unit	177	122	78	149	124
	Beartooth Unit	165	139	120	138	143
	District	341	261	198	287	267
<b>Non-Motorized Recreation Opportunity</b>						
Acres of Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS	Pryor Unit	22,584	28,849	36,347	33,913	29,654
	Beartooth Unit	127,281	132,150	132,666	127,283	127,920
	District	149,865	160,999	169,013	161,196	157,574
Acres of Primitive ROS	Pryor Unit	0	0	0	0	0
	Beartooth Unit	327,121	327,121	327,121	327,121	327,121
	District	327,121	327,121	327,121	327,121	327,121
Miles of non-motorized trails	Pryor Unit	2	2	2	1	2
	Beartooth Unit	274	285	284	271	271
	District	276	287	286	272	273
<b>Opportunity for Off-Highway Vehicle Operation</b>						
Miles of Mixed Use System Roads		28	27	0	0	52
Miles of Motorized System Trails		118	52	0	8	57
Total Miles available for Off-Highway Vehicle Operation		146	79	0	8	109
<b>Noise</b>						
Acres in motorized ROS settings (Percent of land unit in motorized ROS settings)	Pryor Unit	55,384 (71%)	49,119 (63%)	41,421 (53%)	44,055 (56%)	48,314 (62%)
	Beartooth Unit	71,233 (14%)	66,354 (13%)	66,038 (13%)	71,222 (14%)	70,584 (13%)
	District	126,607 (21%)	115,473 (19%)	107,459 (18%)	115,277 (19%)	118,898 (20%)
Acres in non-motorized ROS settings (Percent of land unit in non-motorized ROS)	Pryor Unit	22,584 (29%)	28,849 (37%)	36,347 (47%)	33,913 (43%)	29,654 (38%)
	Beartooth Unit	458,416 (87%)	459,272 (87%)	495,515 (87%)	454,404 (87%)	455,041 (94%)

**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature		Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
settings)	District	481,000 (79%)	488,121 (81%)	495,862 (82%)	488,317 (81%)	484,695 (80%)
<b>Cultural Resources</b>						
Number of Sites potentially affected (directly and indirectly)	Pryor Unit	16	7	0	19	7
	Beartooth Unit	6	2	1	7	3
	District	22	9	1	26	10
Number of Cultural Landscapes potentially affected	Pryor Unit	2	1	2	2	0
	Beartooth Unit	0	0	0	0	0
	District	2	1	2	2	0
Number of Traditional Cultural Properties potentially affected within the project area.	Pryor Unit	17	12	12	14	5
	Beartooth Unit	30	23	6	25	23
	District	47	35	18	39	28
<b>Water Quality, Fisheries, and Aquatics</b>						
Miles of actions that reduce risks on moderate and high risk routes within the project area		8.5	54.6	51.9	0	43.3
Miles of actions that increase risks on moderate and high risk routes within the project area		5.8	4.2	4.0	0	4.1
<b>Sensitive Aquatic Species</b>						
Number of Species with No Impact		2	2	2	2	3
Number of Species with potential to effect individuals or Habitat but will not Likely Contribute to a trend towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Population or Species		1	1	1	1	0
Number of Species likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability		0	0	0	0	0
<b>Aquatic Species of Concern</b>						
Number of Species with No Impact		0	0	0	0	1
Number of Species with potential to effect individuals or Habitat but will not Likely Contribute to a trend towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Population or Species		1	1	1	1	0
<b>Wildlife</b>						
<b>Threatened or Endangered Wildlife Species</b>						
Number of species with No Jeopardy		1	1	1	1	1
Number of species with potential to effect, but not likely to adversely affect.		1	1	1	1	1
Number of species with potential to effect, and likely to adversely affect		0	0	0	0	0

**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)	
<b>Sensitive Wildlife Species</b>						
Number of Species with Beneficial Impact	0	5	0	0	5	
Number of Species with No Impact	14	15	15	14	15	
Number of Species with potential to effect individuals or Habitat but will not Likely Contribute to a trend towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Population or Species	9	3	8 <sup>4</sup>	9	3	
Number of Species likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Management Indicator Species</b>						
Number of Species with Positive Effects	0	0	2	0	0	
Number of Species with Neutral Effects	16	16	14	16	16	
Number of Species with Negative Effects	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Other Species of Concern</b>						
Number of Species with No effect	3	3	3	3	3	
<b>Canada Lynx</b>						
Motorized Route Density within Lynx Analysis Unit (miles per square mile)	Pryor Unit	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5
	Beartooth Unit	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
	District	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
<b>Gray Wolf</b>						
Motorized Route Density change from No Action (miles per square mile)	Pryor Unit	+ 0.3	- 0.1	- 0.35	0	- 0.1
	Beartooth Unit	+ 0.09	+ 0.07	- 0.05	0	+ 0.06
	District	+ 0.15	- 0.01	- 0.13	0	+ 0.02
<b>Grizzly Bear</b>						
Percent secure habitat available outside the primary conservation area	Suitable	91%	92%	92%	92%	92%
	Unsuitable	52%	59%	64%	57%	58%
	Suitable + Unsuitable	79%	82%	84%	81%	82%
<b>Wolverine</b>						
Motorized Route Density - no habitat in the Pryor Unit	Beartooth Unit	Low (<0.7 miles per square mile)				

<sup>4</sup> Although Alternative C has fewer motorized routes than the other alternatives, it does not provide the same level of protection to some sensitive species due to lower amount of area receiving seasonal restrictions. Therefore, there is potential to affect individuals or Habitat but will not Likely Contribute to a trend towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Population or Species on more sensitive species in Alternative C than in Alternatives B or B Modified.

**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature		Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
Acres of Refugia - no habitat in the Pryor Unit (Acres)	Beartooth Unit	346,300	389,600	389,600	346,300	371,155
<b>Elk</b>						
Motorized Route Density (miles per square mile)	Pryor Unit	1.49	1.16	0.69	1.44	1.27
	Beartooth Unit	0.47	0.41	0.37	0.44	0.39
Percent secure habitat within elk habitat	Pryor Unit	22%	25%	37%	23%	26%
	Beartooth Unit	65%	68%	69%	64%	66%
<b>Big Horn Sheep</b>						
Acres of Escape Terrain	Pryor Unit	3,920	4,926	6,138	4,388	5,129
	Beartooth Unit	5,543	5,904	5,970	5,612	5,809
Acres of winter range within and outside motorized route buffer within bighorn sheep habitat on the District.	Within buffer	8,373	8,191	8,161	7,966	8,316
	Outside buffer	10,076	10,258	10,288	10,483	10,129
<b>General Wildlife</b>						
Percent of Land Unit that is core wildlife habitat (base on motorized routes)	Pryor Unit	16%	25%	35%	22%	27%
	Beartooth Unit	82%	83%	83%	82%	82%
Percent of Land Unit that is core wildlife habitat (based on motorized & non-motorized routes)	Pryor Unit	16%	25%	35%	22%	27%
	Beartooth Unit	56%	57%	57%	57%	57%
<b>Soils</b>						
<b>High/Very High Erosion Hazard Rating</b>						
Miles of Motorized Routes designated for public use	Pryor Unit	81	57	31	67	58
	Beartooth Unit	29	23	19	27	25
	District	111	80	50	94	84
Miles of Non-motorized Routes designated for public use.	Pryor Unit	1	2	2	1	2
	Beartooth Unit	72	76	76	72	72
	District	73	78	77	73	74
<b>Medium Erosion Hazard Rating</b>						
Miles of Motorized Routes designated for public use.	Pryor Unit	19	9	8	13	10
	Beartooth Unit	35	23	19	26	26
	District	54	32	27	40	36
Miles of Non-motorized Routes designated for public use.	Pryor Unit	0	0	0	0	0
	Beartooth Unit	78	82	82	75	78
	District	78	82	82	75	78



**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature		Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Vegetation</b>						
<b>High Risk Areas - Motorized Routes</b>						
Acres Potential Frequent Use Areas (% of High Risk Area)	Pryor Unit	221 (2%)	202 (2%)	52 (<1%)	217 (2%)	173 (2%)
	Beartooth Unit	21 (<1%)	20 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	11 (<1%)	22 (<1%)
	District	195 (<1%)	218 (<1%)	102 (<1%)	228 (<1%)	195 (<1%)
Acres Potential Infrequent Use Areas (% of High Risk Area)	Pryor Unit	1851 (16%)	1481 (13%)	291 (3%)	1581 (14%)	1497 (13%)
	Beartooth Unit	1442 (1%)	1411 (1%)	237 (<1%)	1256 (1%)	1685 (1%)
	District	3293 (2%)	2892 (1%)	528 (<1%)	2837 (1%)	3570 (2%)
Miles in High Risk Area	Pryor Unit	29	23	21	25	20
	Beartooth Unit	23	21	17	17	22
	District	52	44	38	42	42
<b>High Risk Areas - Non-Motorized Routes</b>						
Acres Potential Frequent Use Areas (% of High Risk Area)	Pryor Unit	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Beartooth Unit	42 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	42 (<1%)
	District	42 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	44 (<1%)	42 (<1%)
Miles through High Risk Area	Pryor Unit	1	1	1	1	1
	Beartooth Unit	109	109	109	109	107
	District	110	110	110	110	108
<b>Weeds Susceptibility</b>						
Weed Susceptible Acres within designated road corridor		15,290	11,029	2,211	13,087	11,097
<b>Weed Infestation</b>						
Total Infested Acres within Motorized Route potentially affected corridor		254	236	218	277	236
<b>Sensitive Plants</b>						
Number of Species with No Impact		9	9	9	9	9
Number of Species with potential to effect individuals or Habitat but will not Likely Contribute to a trend towards Federal Listing or Loss of Viability to the Population or Species		3	3	3	3	3
Number of Species likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability		0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inventoried Roadless Areas</b>						
Miles of non-system routes within inventoried roadless area proposed to be converted to system routes.		1.8	0.6	0.5	0	0.6
Miles of system routes within inventoried roadless areas.		13.6	9.4	9.4	13.6	12.6

**Table 2-11. Comparison of Effects by Alternative**

Feature	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	No Action Alternative	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Economics</b>					
Estimated economic contribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities on the District to local and regional economies.	There is no appreciable difference under all alternatives.				

The following table provides a summary of changes in effects of implementing each action alternative *compared to the no action alternative*. Detailed effects analyses for each Alternative are found in Chapter 3.

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Recreation</b>					
<b>Motorized Recreation Opportunity</b>					
Change in acreage of motorized opportunities within Rural settings	Pryor	No Change			
	Beartooth	No Change			Reduced by 471 Acres
	District	No Change			Reduced by 471 Acres
Change in acreage of motorized opportunities within Roaded Natural settings	Pryor	Reduced by 24,656 Acres	Reduced by 18,316 Acres	Reduced by 2,434 Acres	Reduced by 18,180 Acres
	Beartooth	Increased by 2 Acres	No Change	Reduced by 516 Acres	Increased by 477 Acres
	District	Reduced by 24,654 Acres	Reduced by 18,316 Acres	Reduced by 2,950 Acres	Reduced by 17,703 Acres
Change in acreage of motorized opportunities within Semi-Primitive Motorized settings	Pryor	Increased by 35,985 Acres	Increased by 23,380 Acres	No Change	Increased by 22,439 Ac
	Beartooth	No Change	Reduced by 4,867 Acres	Reduced by 4,867 Acres	Reduced by 643 Acres
	District	Increased by 35,985 Acres	Increased by 18,513 Acres	Reduced by 4,867 Acres	Increased by 21,796 Acres
Change in mileage of motorized road and trail opportunities (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Increased by 28 Miles	Reduced by 27 Miles	Reduced by 71 Miles	Reduced by 25 Miles
	Beartooth	Increased by 27 Miles	Increased by 1 Miles	Reduced by 18 Miles	Increased by 5 Miles
	District	Motorized Recreation Opportunities Increased by 54 Miles (Motorized Opportunities increased by 19%)	Motorized Recreation Opportunities Reduced by 26 Miles (Motorized Opportunities reduced by 9%)	Motorized Recreation Opportunities Reduced by 89 Miles (Motorized Opportunities reduced by 31%)	Motorized Recreation Opportunities Reduced by 20 Miles (Motorized Opportunities reduced by 7%)
<b>Non-Motorized Recreation Opportunity</b>					
Non-motorized opportunities increased or	Pryor	Reduced by 11329 Acres	Reduced by 5064 Acres	Increased by 2434 Acres	Reduced by 4259 Acres
	Beartooth	Reduced by 2 Acres	Increased by 4867 Acres	Increased by 5383 Acres	Increased by 637 Acres

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
reduced in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized settings in Acres	District	Reduced by 11331 Acres	Reduced by 197 Acres	Increased by 7817 Acres	Reduced by 3622 Acres
Non-motorized opportunities increased or reduced in Primitive settings in Acres	Pryor	No Change			
	Beartooth	No Change			
	District	No Change			
Change in mileage of non-motorized trail opportunities (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Increased by 1 Mile	Increased by 1 Mile	Increased by 1 Mile	Increased by 1 Mile
	Beartooth	Increased by 3 Miles	Increased by 14 Miles	Increased by 13 Miles	No Change
	District	Non-motorized Recreation Opportunities increased by 4 Miles (1%)	Non-motorized Recreation Opportunities increased by 15 Miles (6%)	Non-motorized Recreation Opportunities increased by 14 Miles (5%)	Non-motorized Recreation Opportunities increased by 1 Mile (0%)
<b>Opportunity for Off-Highway Vehicle Operation</b>					
Change in mileage of Mixed Use System Road opportunities		Increased 28 Miles	Increased 27 Miles	No Change	Increased 52 Miles
Change in mileage of Motorized System Trail opportunities		Increased 110 Miles	Increased 44 Miles	Reduced 8 Miles	Increased 49 Miles
Change in mileage available for Off-Highway Vehicle operation opportunities		Increased 138 Miles	Increased 71 Miles	Reduced 8 Miles	Increased 101 Miles
<b>Noise</b>					
Change in acreage of motorized settings where noise might be encountered	Pryor	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 138 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 71 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise reduced by 8 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 101 Acres
	Beartooth	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 11 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise reduced by 4,868 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise reduced by 5,184 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise reduced by 638 Acres
	District	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 11,330 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 196 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise reduced by 7,818 Acres	Motorized settings and associated Noise increased by 3621 Acres
Change in acreage of Quiet settings	Pryor	Quiet settings reduced by 11,329 Acres	Quiet settings reduced by 5,064 Acres	Quiet settings increased by 2434 Acres	Quiet settings reduced by 4,259 Acres
	Beartooth	Quiet settings increased by 4,012 Acres	Quiet settings increased by 4,868 Acres	Quiet settings increased by 41,111 Acres	Quiet settings increased by 637 Acres
	District	Quiet settings reduced by 7,317 Acres	Quiet settings reduced by 196 Acres	Quiet settings increased by 7545 Acres	Quiet settings reduced by 3,622 Acres

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Cultural Resources</b>					
Change in number of Sites potentially affected (% change from No Action)	Pryor	3 fewer sites potentially affected (16%)	12 fewer sites potentially affected (63%)	19 fewer sites potentially affected (100%)	12 fewer sites potentially affected (63%)
	Beartooth	1 fewer sites potentially affected (14%)	5 fewer sites potentially affected (71%)	6 fewer sites potentially affected (86%)	4 fewer sites potentially affected (57%)
	District	4 fewer sites potentially affected (15%)	17 fewer sites potentially affected (65%)	25 fewer sites potentially affected (96%)	16 fewer sites potentially affected (62%)
Change in number of Cultural Landscapes potentially affected (% change from No Action)	Pryor	No Change	1 less cultural landscape potentially affected (50%)	No Change	2 fewer cultural landscapes potentially affected (100%)
	Beartooth	No Change			
	District	No Change	1 less site potentially affected (50%)	No Change	2 fewer sites potentially affected (100%)
Change in number of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) potentially affected (% change from No Action)	Pryor	3 additional TCPs potentially affected (21%)	2 fewer TCPs potentially affected (14%)	2 fewer TCPs potentially affected (14%)	9 fewer TCPs potentially affected (64%)
	Beartooth	5 additional TCPs potentially affected (20%)	2 fewer TCPs potentially affected (8%)	19 fewer TCPs potentially affected (76%)	2 fewer TCPs potentially affected (8%)
	District	8 additional TCPs potentially affected (21%)	4 fewer TCPs potentially affected (10%)	21 fewer TCPs potentially affected (54%)	11 fewer TCPs potentially affected (28%)
<b>Water Quality, Fisheries, and Aquatics</b>					
<b>Water Quality</b>					
Miles of actions that reduce risks on moderate and high risk routes (by changing routes to administrative use, not designating existing system routes, and placing seasonal restrictions during spring thaw)		8.5 Miles of Actions reducing risks	54.6 Miles of Actions reducing risks	51.9 Miles of Actions reducing risks	43.3 Miles of Actions reducing risks
Miles of actions that increase risks on moderate and high risk routes (by adding non-system routes)		5.8 Miles of Actions increasing risks	4.2 Miles of Actions increasing risks	4 Miles of Actions increasing risks	4.1 Miles of Actions increasing risks
<b>Sensitive Aquatic Species</b>					
Changes from No Action	No Change; May Impact 1 species and No Impacts on 2 species				Moves Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout from May Impact to No Impact
	Actions will not likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability for any of the 3 species analyzed				

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Aquatic Species of Interest</b>					
Changes from No Action	No Change; Potential to Effect Species of Interest				Moves Wild Trout from Potential to Effect to No Effect
	Actions are not likely to adversely affect the one species analyzed				
<b>Wildlife</b>					
<b>Threatened or Endangered Wildlife Species</b>					
Number of species with potential to effect, and likely to adversely affect	No Change; Actions are not likely to adversely affect any of the 2 species analyzed				
<b>Sensitive Wildlife Species</b>					
Changes from No Action	No Change	Five species move from May Impact to Beneficial Impact category primarily due to protections offered during seasonal restrictions; one species moves from May Impact to No Impact category	One species moves from May Impact to No Impact category	Five species move from May Impact to Beneficial impact category primarily due to protections offered during seasonal restrictions; one species moves from May Impact to No Impact category	
	Actions will not likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability for any of the 23 species analyzed				
<b>Management Indicator Species</b>					
Changes from No Action	No Change			2 Species moves from May Effect to No Effect	No Change
	Actions are not likely to have negative effects to any of the 16 species analyzed.				
<b>Other Species of Interest</b>					
Number of Species with No effect	Actions are not likely to adversely affect any of the 3 species analyzed				
<b>Canada Lynx</b>					
Reduction or increase in risks associated with route density (i.e. displacement in denning habitat during the summer) in miles / square miles compared to No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Risk associated with density slightly increases by 0.1 mi/sq mi (17% higher density but within guidelines)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi /sq mi (17% improvement)	Risk associated with density decreases by 0.3 mi /sq mi (50% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi /sq mi (17% improvement)
	Beartooth	No Change			
	District	No Change	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi /sq mi (33% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi /sq mi (33% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi /sq mi (33% improvement)
	All alternatives are within the conservation strategy's motorized route density guidelines (maximum of 2 miles per square mile).				

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Gray Wolf</b>					
Reduction or increase in risks associated with route density (i.e. potential for illegal killing or displacement) in miles / square miles compared to No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Risk associated with density increases by 0.3 mi/sq mi (25% higher density)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi/sq mi (8% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.35 mi/sq mi (29% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.1 mi/sq mi (10% higher density)
	Beartooth	Risk associated with density slightly increases by 0.09 mi/sq mi (16% higher density)	Risk associated with density slightly increases by 0.07 mi/sq mi (13% higher density)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.05 mi/sq mi (9% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly increases by 0.06 mi/sq mi (11% higher density)
	District	Risk associated with density slightly increases by 0.15 mi/sq mi (15% higher density)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.01 mi/sq mi (1% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly decreases by 0.13 mi/sq mi (13% improvement)	Risk associated with density slightly increases 0.02 mi/sq mi (2% higher density)
<b>Grizzly Bear</b>					
Percent change from No Action in the availability of secure habitat outside the Primary Conservation Area	Suitable	Availability of secure habitat is 1% lower	No Change		
	Unsuitable	Availability of secure habitat is 9% lower	Availability of secure habitat is 4% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 12% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 2% higher
	Suitable and Unsuitable	Availability of secure habitat is 2% lower	Availability of secure habitat is 1% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 4% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 1% higher
<b>Wolverine</b>					
Risks associated with motorized route density (i.e. displacement of wolverine or den sites) compared to No Action - no habitat in the Pryor Unit	Beartooth	All alternatives have low risk associated with low motorized route density (<0.7 miles per square mile)			
Percent change in availability of Refugia compared to No Action (Acres) - no habitat in the Pryor Unit	Beartooth	No Change	Availability of Refugia is 13% higher (43,300 Acres)	Availability of Refugia is 13% higher (43,300 Acres)	Availability of Refugia is 7% higher (24,755 Acres)

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Elk</b>					
Risks associated with motorized route density (i.e. displacement, excessive mortality during hunting season, etc.) compared to No Action	Pryor	Risk associated with density increases by 3%	Risk associated with density decreases by 19%	Risk associated with density decreases by 52%	Risk associated with density decreases by 12%
	Beartooth	Risk associated with density increases by 7%	Risk associated with density decreases by 7%	Risk associated with density decreases by 16%	Risk associated with density decreases by 11%
Percent change from No Action in the availability of Secure Habitat	Pryor	Availability of secure habitat is 4% lower	Availability of secure habitat is 9% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 61% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 13% higher
	Beartooth	Availability of secure habitat is 2% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 6% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 8% higher	Availability of secure habitat is 3% higher
<b>Big Horn Sheep</b>					
Percent change in availability of Escape Terrain compared to No Action (Acres)	Pryor	Availability of Escape Terrain is 11% lower (468 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 12% higher (538 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 40% higher (1750 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 17% higher (741 Acres)
	Beartooth	Availability of Escape Terrain is 1% lower (69 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 5% higher (292 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 6% higher (358 Acres)	Availability of Escape Terrain is 4% higher (197 Acres)
Percent change in availability of Winter Range within and outside motorized route buffer compared to No Action (Acres)	Beartooth (Within buffer)	Availability of Winter Range is 5% higher (407 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 3% higher (225 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 2% higher (195 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 4% higher (350 Acres)
	Beartooth (Outside buffer)	Availability of Winter Range is 4% lower (407 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 2% lower (225 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 2% lower (40957 Acres)	Availability of Winter Range is 3% lower (354 Acres)
<b>General Wildlife</b>					
Percent change in availability of core wildlife habitat (base on motorized routes)	Pryor	Availability of Core Habitat is 14% lower	Availability of Core Habitat is 14% higher	Availability of Core Habitat is 59% higher	Availability of Core Habitat is 23% higher
	Beartooth	Availability of Core Habitat is 2% lower	No Change	No Change	Availability of Core Habitat is 1% lower
Percent change in availability of core wildlife habitat (based on motorized & non-motorized routes)	Pryor	Availability of Core Habitat is 27% lower	Availability of Core Habitat is 14% higher	Availability of Core Habitat is 59% higher	Availability of Core Habitat is 23% higher
	Beartooth	Availability of Core Habitat is 2% lower	No Change	Availability of Core Habitat is 2% higher	No Change

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Soils</b>					
<b>High/Very High Erosion Hazard Rating</b>					
Percent change of designated motorized routes in High/Very High (H/VH) Erosion Hazard Rating from No Action (Miles)	Pryor	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 21% (14 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 15% (10 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 54% lower (36 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 13% (9 Miles)
	Beartooth	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 7% (2 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 15% (4 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced 30% (8 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced 7% (2 Miles)
	District	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 18% (17 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 15% (14 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 47% (44 Miles)	Motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating is reduced by 11% (10 Miles)
Percent change of designated non-motorized routes in High/Very High (H/VH) Erosion Hazard Rating from No Action (Miles)	Pryor	No Change	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 100% (1 Mile)	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 100% (1 Mile)	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 100% (1 Mile)
	Beartooth	No Change	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 6% (4 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 6% (4 Miles)	No Change
	District	No Change	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 7% (5 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 5% (4 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in H/VH Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 1% (1 Mile)
<b>Medium Erosion Hazard Rating</b>					
Percent change of designated motorized routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating from No Action (Miles)	Pryor	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 46% (6 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 31% (4 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 38% (5 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 23% (3 Miles)
	Beartooth	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 35% (9 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 12% (3 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 27% (7 Miles)	No Change



**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
	District	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 35% (14 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 20% (8 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 33% (13 Miles)	Motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating reduced by 10% (4 Miles)
Percent change of designated non-motorized routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating from No Action (Miles)	Pryor	No Change			
	Beartooth	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 4% (3 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 9% (7 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 9% (7 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 4% (3 Miles)
	District	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 4% (3 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 9% (7 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 9% (7 Miles)	Non-motorized Routes in Medium Erosion Hazard Rating increases by 4% (3 Miles)
<b>Vegetation</b>					
<b>High Risk Motorized Settings</b>					
Change in acreage of potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk motorized settings (i.e. dispersed campsites) from No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 4 Acres (2%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 15 Acres (7%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 165 Acres (76%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 44 Acres (20%)
	Beartooth	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 10 Acres (91%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 9 Acres (82%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 9 Acres (82%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 11 Acres (100%)
	District	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 33 Acres (14%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 10 Acres (4%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 126 Acres (55%)	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 33 Acres (14%)
Change in acreage of Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk motorized settings (i.e.	Pryor	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 270 Acres (17%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 100 Acres (6%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 1290 Acres (82%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 84 Acres (5%)

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
vehicle access to campsites) from No Action (% change from No Action)	Beartooth	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 186 Acres (15%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 155 Acres (12%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 1019 Acres (81%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 429 Acres (34%)
	District	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 456 Acres (16%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 55 Acres (2%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings reduced by 2309 Acres (81%)	Potential Infrequent Use Areas in High Risk settings increases by 733 Acres (26%)
Change in mileage of motorized routes in High Risk settings from No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 4 Miles (16%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings reduced by 2 Miles (8%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings reduced by 4 Miles (16%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings reduced by 5 Miles (20%)
	Beartooth	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 6 Miles (35%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 4 Miles (24%)	No Change	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 5 Miles (29%)
	District	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 10 Miles (24%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings increases by 2 Miles (5%)	Motorized routes in High Risk settings reduced by 4 Miles (10%)	No Change
<b>High Risk Non-Motorized Settings</b>					
Change in acreage of potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk non-motorized settings (i.e. dispersed campsites) from No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	No Change			
	Beartooth	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Acres (5%)	No Change		Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Acres (5%)
	District	Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Acres (5%)	No Change		Potential Frequent Use Areas in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Acres (5%)
Change in mileage of non-motorized routes in High Risk settings from No Action (% change from No Action)	Pryor	No Change			
	Beartooth	No Change			Non-motorized routes in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Miles (2%)

**Table 2-12. Summary of Changes in Effects Compared to the No Action Alternative**

Change from the No Action Alternative	Unit	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative B Modified (Preferred Alternative)
	District	No Change			Non-motorized routes in High Risk non-motorized settings reduced by 2 Miles (2%)
<b>Weeds Susceptibility</b>					
Change in acreage of Weed Susceptible areas, within motorized route corridor, from No Action (% change from No Action)		Weed Susceptible Area increased by 2203 Acres (17%)	Weed Susceptible Area reduced by 2058 Acres (16%)	Weed Susceptible Area reduced by 10,876 Acres (83%)	Weed Susceptible Area reduced by 1990 Acres (15%)
<b>Weed Infestation</b>					
Change in motorized route corridor exposure to weed infestation acreage from No Action (% change from No Action)		Motorized route corridor exposure to weed infestations reduced by 23 Acres (8%)	Motorized route corridor exposure to weed infestations reduced by 41 Acres (15%)	Motorized route corridor exposure to weed infestations reduced by 59 Acres (21%)	Motorized route corridor exposure to weed infestations reduced by 41 Acres (15%)
<b>Sensitive Plant Species</b>					
Change from No Action		No Change between Effects Determination categories. However, spring thaw seasonal restrictions will provide more protection to vulnerable species. Actions will not likely to result in a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability for any of the 12 species analyzed			
<b>Inventoried Roadless Areas</b>					
Changes in mileage of non-system routes proposed to be converted to system routes within inventoried roadless areas from No Action		Non-system routes proposed to be converted to system routes increases by 1.8 miles	Non-system routes proposed to be converted to system routes increases by 0.6 miles	Non-system routes proposed to be converted to system routes increases by 0.5 miles	Non-system routes proposed to be converted to system routes increases by 0.6 miles
Changes in mileage of existing system routes within inventoried roadless areas from No Action		No Change	Existing system routes within inventoried roadless areas reduced by 4.2 miles	Existing system routes within inventoried roadless areas reduced by 4.2 miles	Existing system routes within inventoried roadless areas increased by 1 mile.
<b>Economics</b>					
Estimated economic contribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities on the District to local and regional economies.		There is no appreciable difference under all alternatives.			

## **Chapter 2: Public Participation, Issues and Alternatives**

**- End of Chapter 2 -**