

## Appendix L

### Forest Plan Consistency Checklist

#### Improve OHV Connectivity in the Bald Mtn to Hull Mtn Area

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 that which is applicable to the proposal. They evaluated compliance based upon the results of their environmental analysis and public scoping.

<b>Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides</b>
<p><b>Direction</b> Consistency evaluation</p>
<b>Facilities and Transportation (pp IV 18-20)</b>
<p><b>6. Determine the influence of each road on aquatic conservation strategy objectives through watershed analysis. Meet aquatic conservation strategy objectives.</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – Refer to items 1d, 1e, 1i under Riparian and Aquatic Ecosystems below, for compliance with applicable ACS objectives.</p>
<p><b>8. Minimize sediment delivery to streams from roads....</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – Hydrology report indicates reduced sediment production from the affected segment of M1 over time. Similar reduction would occur on M61 if that alternative is implemented. Reduced sediment production is associated primarily with reduction in the traveled/disturbed road width, and with more positive runoff dispersal by waterbars as compared to grading [pp 2-4 Hydrology Analysis 26 Nov 07].</p>
<b>Heritage Resources (pg IV – 22)</b>
<p><b>3. Whenever heritage resources might be affected by an activity, protect the properties or resource sites until they....</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The proposed action and Alternative 3 would be exempt undertakings (Stipulation III(E)) under terms of the <i>First Amended Regional Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Undertakings on the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region</i> (2001).</p>
<b>Recreation (pp IV – 28, 29)</b>
<p><b>1. Integrate recreation planning and management with other management activities through the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) as reflected</b></p>

<b>Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides</b>
<p><b>Direction</b> Consistency evaluation</p>
<p><b>by the ROS objectives specified in this plan, and shown on the ROS map accompanying this Plan...</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The ROS classification for the areas in which this segment of M3 is located is ‘roaded natural’. The proposed approval of mixed use is compatible with this ROS class.</p>
<p><b>2. Separate conflicting recreational uses to the extent practical and consistent with Management Area objectives.</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – Hunting is the main recreational use of the areas served by this segment of M1 and M61. Use of vehicles to get to camp and to travel from camp to hunting areas is a nearly universal aspect of the hunting experience in the area. OHV use on M1 would not conflict with this existing use. It would enhance the experience for hunters that currently use OHVs to travel the mixed-use roads that connect to M1. Equestrian groups have reported conflicts with illegal, cross-country OHV use in the Mendenhall area of Yuki Wilderness. They are concerned that allowing mixed use on M1 would increase illegal cross-country OHV use. However, our analysis indicates that the main factors influencing such illegal use are not related to whether nearby roads are open or closed to OHVs.</p>
<p><b>4. Coordinate OHV planning and management with Federal, State, and local agencies, adjacent landowners, and other interested individuals and organizations.</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The extensive public involvement to date has offered ample opportunity for interested parties to participate in the development and review of the proposed action.</p>
<p><b>5. Revise and implement an OHV plan consistent with the management objectives of the Forest Plan.</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – This direction applies because the proposed action would revise the OHV plan by adding OHV-useable mileage to the system in the form of mixed-use road. The proposed action and Alternative 3 are consistent with the objectives of the Forest Plan as explained in this document.</p>
<b>Riparian and Aquatic Ecosystems (pg IV- 30)</b>
<p><b>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 migration of individuals composing aquatic and riparian communities.</b> BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The action alternatives would reduce the average annual sediment production from the affected road segments under either action alternative. Watershed analysis found that</p>

<b>Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides</b>	
<b>Direction</b>	Consistency evaluation
	reductions in road related sediment production would contribute to restoring water quality [hydrology report].
<b>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.</b>	<b>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY</b> – The action alternatives would reduce the average annual sediment production from the affected road segments. Watershed analysis found that reductions in road related sediment production would contribute to restoring the sediment regime in terms of the volume, rate and character of sediment input.
<b>1i. Maintain and restore habitat to support well-distributed populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate riparian-dependent species.</b>	<b>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY</b> – The action alternatives would reduce the average annual sediment production from the affected road segment. Reductions in fine sediments contributes to restoring habitat for aquatic invertebrates and vertebrates
<b>Watershed &amp; Water Quality (pp IV – 40, 41)</b>	
<b>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...</b>	<b>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY</b> – Routine road maintenance activities are conducted according to MNF Road Maintenance and Repair Project Design Standards, which identifies methods and techniques for applying BMPs.

<b>Table 2 – Management Area Direction</b>	
<b>Direction</b>	Consistency
<b>MA 15 Yuki (pp IV – 140)</b>	
<b>#2. Do not permit road or OHV trail construction.</b>	<b>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY</b> – Neither of the action alternatives would construct OHV trail in the Yuki Management Area.
<b>MA 18 Refuge (pp IV – 154)</b>	
<b>#2. All activities within this area are to be implemented in accordance with the LSR management prescription.</b>	

BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – LSR Rx consistency, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.
<p><b>#5. Develop road management objectives for maintenance ...that are compatible with wildlife management objectives.</b></p> <p>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The emphasis in this management area is on species that are dependent on late-successional forest. Consistency of the proposed change of road management with the LSR Rx, documented below in Table 3, satisfies consistency with this standard.</p>
<b>MA 41 Spruce Grove (pp IV – 244)</b>
<b>No applicable direction.</b>

<b>Table 3 – Prescription Direction</b>
<p><b>Direction</b> Consistency</p>
<b>Rx 6 – Late Successional Reserve (pp IV – 65)</b>
<p><b>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....</b></p> <p>BOTH ACTION ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The proposed action involves an existing system road (M1), that comes near the western edge of the LSR RC311, but is not within it. Alternative 3 involves an existing system road (M61) that is adjacent to LSR RC310. Both roads comply with the Regional programmatic design criteria for route designation. We are awaiting the result of Regional focused studies before we evaluate existing OHV trails. As of September 2007, these studies do not indicate any need for changes. Changes may be warranted following the final data analysis and reports.</p>

Prepared in consultation with the following IDT members:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject Matter</b>
Jeff Applegate	OHV Management
Jack Horner	Recreation
Lauren Johnson	Botany
Kevin McCormick	Heritage Resources
Lee Morgan	Fisheries
Shannon Pozas	Engineering
Jim Ruhl	Wildlife
Mike Van Dame	Hydrology

*s/Mike Van Dame*

*9/23/08*

---

Mike Van Dame

Date

IDT Leader