

Appendix L

Forest Plan Consistency Checklist

Motorized Access for Dispersed Camping

The tables below identify applicable Forest Plan management direction and explain how the proposed action is consistent with that direction. The interdisciplinary team identified this management direction as being applicable to the proposal. They evaluated compliance based upon the results of their environmental analysis and public scoping.

Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides
<p>Direction Consistency</p>
Heritage Resources (pg IV – 22)
<p>3. Whenever heritage resources might be affected by an activity, protect the properties or resource sites until they are evaluated. Follow procedures for assessing and treating any effects, and maintain the integrity and values of eligible properties, to the extent possible, as outlined in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s regulations (36 CFR 800).</p> <p>COMPLIES - All of the proposed routes and the campsites they access have been assessed for potential to affect heritage resources. Three properties are potentially affected and will be monitored determine if there are any new or on-going effects. If effects are identified through monitoring, the sites will be evaluated to determine National Register eligibility. For sites designated as eligible, mitigation measures will be implemented. A formal monitoring plan will be developed for this project.</p>
Recreation (pp IV – 28-29)
<p>1. Integrate recreation planning and management with other management activities through the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) as reflected by the ROS objectives specified in this plan, and shown on the ROS map accompanying this Plan...</p> <p>COMPLIES – The ROS classification for the areas in which the proposed routes are located is ‘roaded natural’ or ‘semi-primitive motorized. The proposed adoption of these user-created routes into the NFS trail system is compatible with this ROS class.</p>
<p>4. Coordinate OHV planning and management with Federal, State, and local agencies, adjacent landowners, and other interested individuals and organizations.</p> <p>COMPLIES – The extensive public involvement to date has offered ample opportunity for interested parties to participate in the development and review of the proposed action. Modifications have been made to earlier versions of</p>

Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides	
Direction	
Consistency	the proposal in response to public input.
5. Revise and implement an OHV plan consistent with the management objectives of the Forest Plan.	COMPLIES - This direction applies because the proposed action would revise the OHV plan by adding motorize trail mileage to our trail system. The proposed action is consistent with the objectives of the Forest Plan as explained in this document.
15. Design new recreational facilities within riparian reserves, including trails and dispersed sites, to not prevent meeting aquatic conservation strategy objectives. Construction of these facilities should not prevent future attainment of these objectives. For existing recreation facilities within riparian reserves, evaluate and mitigate impact to ensure that these do not prevent, and to the extent practicable contribute to, attainment of aquatic conservation strategy objectives.	COMPLIES – Some of the routes and/or the camp sites they access are located within riparian reserves. Refer to compliance with Riparian standards, below.
16. Work toward completing an adequate system of recreation trails, by utilizing a mix of strategies including construction, reconstruction, maintenance, and abandonment (or elimination). Abandon or eliminate from the system those trails: a) which no longer serve their original purpose, b) which do not serve current or future recreational demand, c) whose continued use is incompatible with other management objectives for given areas (e.g. aquatic conservation strategy objectives), and/or d) where current use is causing soil erosion or adverse impacts to riparian and watershed resources. Inventory and evaluate heritage resources before proceeding with the abandonment or elimination of existing trails or portions of trails.	COMPLIES - This proposal contributes to providing an adequate system of motorized trails to access known, existing dispersed camping areas. We have screened out candidate routes that have been found to have unacceptable resource impacts.
Riparian (pp IV – 30-31)	
1c. Maintain and restore the physical integrity of the aquatic system, including shorelines, banks, and bottom configurations.	COMPLIES – None of the routes is located in aquatic habitat.
1d. Maintain and restore water quality necessary to support healthy riparian, aquatic, and wetland ecosystems. Water quality must remain within the range that maintains the biological, physical, and chemical integrity of the system and benefits survival, growth, reproduction, and	

Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides
<p>Direction Consistency</p>
<p>migration of individuals composing aquatic and riparian communities. COMPLIES - Routine trail maintenance is conducted on system trails as needed to minimize erosion and sediment delivery that would degrade water quality. Motorized trail maintenance activities are conducted according to MNF Road Maintenance and Repair Project Design Standards, which identifies methods and techniques for applying BMPs</p>
<p>1e. Maintain and restore the sediment regime under which aquatic ecosystems evolved. Elements of the sediment regime include the timing, volume, rate, and character of sediment input, storage, and transport. COMPLIES – See 1d above.</p>
<p>1h. Maintain and restore the species composition and structural diversity of plant communities in riparian areas and wetlands to provide adequate summer and winter thermal regulation, nutrient filtering, appropriate rates of surface erosion, bank erosion, and channel migration and to supply amounts and distributions of coarse woody debris sufficient to sustain physical complexity and stability. COMPLIES – Some of the routes and campsites are located in riparian reserves. Candidate routes/camps that pose a threat to these features have been dropped from this proposal</p>
<p>Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Plants (pg IV – 34)</p>
<p>1. Manage sensitive plants to ensure that species do not become threatened or endangered because of Forest Service action. COMPLIES – Botany BA/BE determined that there would be no effects on sensitive plant species.</p>
<p>Watershed & Water Quality (pg IV – 41)</p>
<p>1d. Implement Best Management Practices (BMP) to meet water quality objectives and maintain and improve the quality of surface water on the Forest. Identify methods and techniques for applying the BMPs during project level environmental analysis and incorporate them into the associated project plan and implementation document... COMPLIES - Routine trail maintenance is conducted on system trails as needed. Motorized trail maintenance activities are conducted according to MNF Road Maintenance and Repair Project Design Standards, which identifies methods and techniques for applying BMPs.</p>

Table 2 – Management Area Direction	
Direction	
Consistency	
	MA 1 Bartlett (pg IV – 84)
No applicable direction	
	MA 2 Middle Creek (pg IV – 88)
No applicable direction	
	MA 4 Sullivan (pp IV – 96)
No applicable direction	
	MA 6 Alder (pp IV – 104)
	Proposed routes in this MA: NE-142A, 602
No applicable direction	
	MA 7 Bear Creek (pp IV – 108)
	Proposed routes in this MA: SE-227, 284, 292
	<p>2. Emphasize wildlife habitat improvement from Bear Creek northward Manage OHV development in this area consistent with wildlife habitat management objectives.</p> <p>COMPLIES – The routes are for access to dispersed camp sites, which is generally compatible with the habitat needs of the main species of interest listed by the Forest Plan: tule elk, bald eagle, deer, and wild turkey [LRMP p. IV- 107]. Dispersed camping and motorized access thereto do not alter physical habitat characteristics. Also, they are low disturbance activities that occur intermittently, which minimizes impacts on the quality or usability of the habitat by dependent species.</p>
	<p>3. Do not construct OHV trails within 1/4 mile of key fawning areas...</p> <p>COMPLIES – None of the routes is within ¼ mile of a key fawning area.</p>
	MA 8 Round Mountatin (pp IV – 112)
No applicable direction	
	MA 9 Bowery (pp IV – 116)
No applicable direction	
	MA 14 Open Ridge / Alder (pp IV – 136)
No applicable direction	
	MA 15 Yuki (pp IV – 140)
	Proposed routes in this MA: 20N65, 20N65A
No applicable direction	

Table 2 – Management Area Direction	
Direction	Consistency
MA 16 Buttermilk Springs (pg IV – 144, 145)	
Proposed routes in this MA: 24N105; NE-564, 1124, 1125, 1150, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1337, 1445; RD-006, 014	
<p>2. All activities within this management area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription. COMPLIES – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>	
MA 17 Grizzly (pg IV – 150)	
Proposed routes in this MA: 20N22; NW-700	
<p>2. All activities within this management area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription. COMPLIES – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>	
MA 18 Refuge (pg IV – 154)	
Proposed routes in this MA: NE-451, 502; NW-073, 579, 580	
<p>2. All activities within this management area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription. COMPLIES – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>	
MA 20 Pine Mountain (pg IV – 162)	
Proposed routes in this MA: RD-008	
<p>2. All activities within this management area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription. COMPLIES – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>	
MA 21 Blue Slides (pg IV – 166)	
Proposed routes in this MA: 17N58; RD-011; SE-540	
<p>2. All activities within this management area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription. COMPLIES – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>	
MA 23 Buck (pg IV – 172)	
No applicable direction	
MA 25 Leech (pg IV – 180)	

Table 2 – Management Area Direction	
Direction	
Consistency	
Proposed routes in this MA: NW-759-1	
<p>1. Evaluate the effects of proposed management activities within this management area on the Middle Fork Eel River Wild and Scenic River Corridor and its associated resource values.</p> <p>COMPLIES – None of the routes or camps is located within the corridor. Compliance with riparian and watershed standards, as documented above, assure that no indirect impacts occur to the anadromous fishery values of the river.</p>	
MA 26 Twin Rocks (pg IV – 184)	
No applicable direction	
MA 28 Whitlock (pg IV – 192)	
No applicable direction	
MA 31 Grindstone / Harvey Springs (pg IV – 204)	
No applicable direction	
MA 32 North Grindstone (pg IV – 208)	
No applicable direction	
MA 33 Valley View (pg IV – 212)	
No applicable direction	
MA 34 Whisky Saddle (pg IV – 216)	
No applicable direction	
MA 35 Three Prong (pg IV – 220)	
No applicable direction	
MA 37 Rupert (pg IV – 228)	
Proposed routes in this MA: SW-575	
<p>3. Complete an inventory of non-system roads and trails. Analyze the need for and suitability of such roads and trails, with particular attention to roads and trails which pass through Ruppert key winter range, through key fawning areas, or within ½ mile of the potential peregrine falcon nest sites. Permanently or seasonally close roads and trails shown to cause adverse impacts to peregrine falcon or deer during their breeding seasons. Permanently close any unnecessary roads or trails. Rehabilitate trails not designated for closure, and add them to the system.</p> <p>COMPLIES – Inventory of non-system roads was accomplished by the 2005 forest-wide motorized route inventory, as part of the route designation</p>	

Table 2 – Management Area Direction	
Direction	
Consistency	process. Collaborative FS-public analysis during the route designation process identified SW575 as being needed for dispersed camp access. SW575 is outside of the Ruppert key winter range and not within ½ mile of potential peregrine falcon nest sites.
MA 39 Brushy Mountain (pg IV – 236)	
No applicable direction	

Table 3 – Prescription Direction	
Direction	
Consistency	
Rx 6 – Late Successional Reserve (pg IV – 65)	
<p>7. Allow nonsilvicultural activities inside LSRs that are neutral or beneficial to the creation and maintenance of late-successional habitat. While most existing uses and developments may remain, it may be necessary to modify or eliminate some current activities in LSRs that pose adverse impacts...</p> <p>CONSISTENT – Neither the routes nor the camping activities that they have enabled have had a discernable impact on late successional habitat in which they occur. We do not expect that continued use that would be authorized by this proposal would impact the maintenance of late successional habitat.</p>	

Prepared in consultation with the following IDT members:

Name	Subject Matter
Jeff Applegate	OHV Management
Jack Horner	Recreation
Lauren Johnson	Botany
Kevin McCormick	Heritage Resources
Lee Morgan	Fisheries
Shannon Pozas	Engineering

Name

Jim Ruhl

Mike Van Dame

Subject Matter

Wildlife

Hydrology

s/Mike Van Dame

11/20/07

Mike Van Dame

Date

IDT Leader