

## Appendix L

### Forest Plan Consistency Checklist

#### Close OHV Trail 68

The tables below identify applicable Forest Plan management direction and explain how the proposed action and action alternatives are consistent with that direction. The interdisciplinary team identified this management direction as being applicable to the proposal and alternative 3. 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>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 ALTERNATIVES COMPLY - No historic properties are present within or adjacent to areas that would be affected by the proposed action. The areas that would be affected by construction of the loop section under alternative 3 would be surveyed prior to ground-disturbing activities, and any discovered properties would be avoided. This would be in accordance with the <i>Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Designating Motor Vehicle Routes and Managing Motorized Recreation on the National Forests in California.</i></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 by the ROS objectives specified in this plan, and shown on the ROS map accompanying this Plan....</b>            BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY - The area affected by the proposed action is located adjacent to the existing trail; the area affected by alternative 3 is located adjacent to the retained northern section of existing trail, and the new loop section. The ROS classifications of the affected area are <i>semi-primitive motorized</i> and <i>roaded natural</i>. Neither of the action alternatives would be inconsistent with either of these ROS classifications.</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 ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The extensive public involvement to date</p>

**Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides**

has offered ample opportunity for interested parties to participate in the development and review of the proposed action. The proposed action originated as an effort to minimize the MNF OHV trail system’s contribution to private land trespass. Alternative 3 was developed to respond to the OHV recreation issue that was raised during scoping.

**5. Revise and implement an OHV plan consistent with the management objectives of the Forest Plan.**

**BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY** – This direction applies because the proposed action would revise the OHV plan by removing 2.7 miles of OHV trail from the system, and alternative 3 would reconfigure one of the trails in the system. The proposed action and alternative 3 are both consistent with the objectives of the Forest Plan as explained in this document.

**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.**

**BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY** – The proposed action would eliminate a relatively low value element of the MNF motorized trail system on Upper Lake RD. As noted in the EA Purpose and Need, Trail 68 is a non-loop trail that is not connected to any system OHV trails or mixed use roads. It is out of the way for maintenance work. The proposed action would also contribute to reducing trespass onto private land and proliferation of user-created routes on NFS lands.

Alternative 3 would modestly improve a relatively low value element of the MNF motorized trail system on Upper Lake RD. It would create a loop in the trail, but would leave the trail unconnected to any system OHV trails or mixed use roads. The trail would remain inconvenient for maintenance work. Alternative 3 would also contribute to reducing trespass onto private and proliferation of user-created routes on NFS lands, but would likely be less effective than the proposed action.

The abandonment aspect, under the proposed action and alternative 3, has been evaluated and cleared for heritage resources. Heritage resource evaluation under alternative 3 would have to be deferred until lay-out and brush clearing, due to dense vegetation along the tentative alignment of the new section of trail.

<b>Table 1 – Forest-wide Standards and Guides</b>
<p><b>5. Develop and apply erosion control plans to road construction, mining, recreation developments, and other site disturbing projects. Use the Soils and Geologic Resource Inventories for predicting the need and extent for erosion control measures.</b></p> <p>BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The proposed action would close, and hydrologically stabilize trail 68 using standard trail maintenance BMPs. Alternative 3 would do the same on the south end, and would implement BMPs during construction of the new section of trail.</p>
<b>Watershed &amp; Water Quality (pg IV – 41)</b>
<p><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. During implementation of a project, utilize additional BMPs as necessary to protect water quality even though the BMPs may not be specifically identified in the project plans (See Plan Appendix G).</b></p> <p>BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The proposed action would utilize standard trail maintenance BMPs to minimize erosion during the natural vegetative recovery period. Alternative 3 would utilize design practices that minimize the new trail section’s inherent sediment production potential, and would implement applicable BMPs during construction. Implementation of standard trail maintenance BMPs would minimize sediment production over time.</p>

<b>Table 2 – Management Area Direction</b>
<p><b>Direction</b> Consistency evaluation</p>
<b>MA 12 Skeleton Glade (pg IV – 128)</b>
<p><b>Give low priority to improving access.</b></p> <p>BOTH ALTERNATIVES COMPLY – The proposed action would be consistent with this direction. Alternative 3 is also consistent, as it would result in very little increase in motorized trail mileage.</p>

<b>Table 3 – Prescription Direction</b>
<b>No applicable prescriptions</b>

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
Jim Ruhl	Wildlife
Mike Van Dame	Hydrology

---

Mike Van Dame  
IDT Leader

Date