

Developing Proposed Action(s)

Motorized Route Designation Process

Mendocino National Forest

During the collaborative process for developing the proposed action for motorized route designation, we have worked toward identifying needs and opportunities (possible actions) to incrementally improve our existing designated system. It has become apparent that there are a variety of distinct needs that are not closely enough related to each other to be effectively addressed by a single proposed action. For that reason, we will be putting forth a suite of several proposed actions, rather than a single, all-encompassing proposed action.

Table 1 provides an overview of the needs identified during collaboration, along with possible actions that could be implemented to meet each need. Each need has one or more actions that would meet the need to varying degrees, and which may have distinct advantages and disadvantages. The core IDT has identified some potential advantages and disadvantages associated with each possible action, and those are listed in the notes column. We encourage stakeholders to add their perspective to these initial thoughts, as it will be these advantages and disadvantages that influence our determination of which of the *possible* actions to put forth as *proposed* actions.

Possible actions that are highlighted in **gray** are those we believe are ripe for consideration and decision within the scope and time constraints of the Pacific Southwest Region motorized route designation process.

Following Table 1 is a preliminary screening of possible actions against the decision criteria established by the Forest Supervisor and District Rangers. Other factors related to the ripeness of a possible action for environmental analysis and decision are also noted.

Please provide us with your comments on our preliminary screening, including whether we left out any proposals that were submitted during the process. We have had a lot of material to sift through and organize, and some things may have been lost in translation.

| Table 1 – Overview of Needs, Possible Actions, and Tentative Proposed Actions | |
|--|--|
| Needs | Possible Actions (Tentative Proposed Actions Highlighted in Gray) |
| Dispersed Camp Access | A. Designate Access to All Dispersed Camps (pg 4) |
| | B. Designate Access to Low-Impact Dispersed Camps (pg 5) |
| Connectivity for Non-Street-Legal Vehicles & Drivers (OHV for Shorthand) | A. Wolf -Trough-Letts OHV Riding Connectivity (pg 5) |
| | B. Trough- Letts OHV Riding Connectivity (pg 6) |
| | C. Upper Deer Valley Road OHV Riding Connectivity (pg 6) |
| | D. Hull Mtn to Bald Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 7) |
| | E. Low Gap to Bald Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 8) |
| | F. Cabbage Patch – Low Gap OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 8) |
| | G. Ivory Mill Saddle to Snow Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 9) |
| | H. Bearwallow – Kneecap OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 10) |
| | I. Hammerhorn Lake – Pacific Crest OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 10) |
| | J. Espee – Hammerhorn Lake OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 11) |
| | K. Pacific Crest OHV Hunting Connectivity (pg 11) |
| | L. Long Ridge OHV Connector Corridor (pg 12) |
| Motorized Vehicle Access to Acquired 'Commander Tract' Lands | A. Commander Tract Public Motorized Vehicle Access Option A (pg 13) |
| | B. Commander Tract Public Motorized Vehicle Access Option B (pg 13) |
| | C. Cold Creek Alternate Emergency Escape Route (pg 14) |

| Table 1 – Overview of Needs, Possible Actions, and Tentative Proposed Actions | |
|--|--|
| Needs | Possible Actions (Tentative Proposed Actions Highlighted in Gray) |
| More Quantity or Quality of OHV Recreation Opportunities | A. Pine Mountain Area OHV Trail Additions (pg 15) |
| | B. Baldy Ridge Route (pg 16) |
| | C. Higgins Loop Proposal (pg 16) |
| | D. Liles Single-Track Proposal (pg 17) |
| | E. Ellis Pillsbury-North Proposal (pg 17) |
| Discourage Trespass on Private Land | A. Close OHV Trail 68 to Kilkenny Property (pg 18) |

Need: Dispersed Camp Access

We have identified a number of existing dispersed campsites that are not located adjacent to an existing, designated motorized vehicle route. These will not be legally accessible after conclusion of this route designation process unless the FS designates access routes to them.

Possible Action A: Designate Access to All Dispersed Camps

Designate routes to access all known, existing dispersed camp sites (identified by the contracted route inventory¹, by FS personnel and by the public during collaboration). Routes to about 170 sites would be designated.

¹ This would include those 'use areas' that have been determined to be dispersed camps.

Responsiveness to Decision Criteria

- **Operational Affordability** – Inclusion of problem site access would require maintenance of mitigation measures to assure continued compliance with management standards.
- **Low Capital Investment** – Mitigation of resource conflicts would require capital investment.
- **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Providing vehicle access to all existing dispersed camp sites would maintain our existing capacity to provide vehicle-based camping opportunities. However, provision of motorized access to camp sites within areas reserved for non-motorized uses would diminish the quality of non-motorized experiences.
- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – positive. Preserves existing variety of dispersed camp settings.
- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – not applicable.
- **Cost Efficiency** – To the extent that high maintenance access routes are approved, the workload would be distributed both within and outside of the existing OHV management areas. Accomplishing the work that is distant from the OHV management areas would decrease efficiency.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Inclusion of access for certain problem sites could not be mitigated to comply with various standards, prescriptions, or land allocations (for example, providing motorized access to camps within a back country area). Therefore a Forest Plan amendment would be required.
- **Other Considerations** - Inclusion of routes to sites where use of the site or route has a significant resource impact would bog down the designation process for dispersed site access, including 'no problem' access situations. Costs of mitigation design and implementation for all problem situations *en masse* are not affordable at this time.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Both District Rangers

Possible Action B: Designate Access to Low-Impact Dispersed Camps

Designate routes to access only those known, existing dispersed sites where neither the access route nor the dispersed camp site has significant resource conflicts. Routes to about 105 sites would be designated.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Providing for legal access only to low-impact camps would result in no increased mitigation maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would have no need for capital investment in mitigation measures.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Providing vehicle access to only a portion of existing dispersed camp sites would reduce our existing capacity to provide vehicle-based camping opportunities. However, elimination of motorized access to existing camp sites within areas

reserved for non-motorized uses would restore the quality of non-motorized experiences.

- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Preserves existing variety of dispersed camp settings, but will decrease the number of sites available for use.
- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
- **Cost Efficiency** – Exclusion of high maintenance access routes would minimize maintenance workload distant from OHV management areas.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – No Forest Plan amendment would be needed if we are providing only camp access that is compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - This would designate access to about 60% of the known, existing dispersed camp sites, but would have a good chance of a non-controversial NEPA process. Access to sites left out could be considered in the future as mitigated proposals become ripe for decision (visitor demand, affordable, otherwise feasible).
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Both District Rangers

Need: Connectivity for Non-Street-Legal Vehicles & Drivers

OHV users expressed a desire for improved connectivity for OHV travel (non-street-legal vehicles or drivers) between existing, designated ML2 roads and/or OHV trails that are currently connected only by ML3 roads (which are not currently legal for use by OHV). Within our existing OHV recreation management areas, the need is primarily for connectivity between OHV trails for the purpose of enhancing OHV recreation quality and opportunity. In other areas of the MNF, the need is for connectivity between ML2 roads for OHV hunter convenience and quality of experience.

Possible Action A: Wolf -Trough-Letts OHV Riding Connectivity

Designate mixed use for segments of M5 and M10 in the Letts / Trough Springs Ridge area. Includes M5 from jct w/trail 85330 to about 0.5 mile west of jct w/16N17. Includes M10 from jct w/17N02 to jct w/17N29. Also, change road management objective on 16N25 from ML1 to ML2.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – The section between jct w/17N30 jct w/trail 40 would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ the road for safe mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would maintain existing connectivity and user convenience within the Stonyford OHV Management Area.

- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
- **Cost Efficiency** – Is within Stonyford OHV management area and involves no increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - The section of M5 between the jct w/trail 85330 and jct w/trail 40 has two situations that will involve more involved analysis and longer timelines. The section between jct w/trail 85330 and jct w/17N30 is under study (~2 yr timeline) as a possible alternate access route into Fouts Springs area. The section between jct w/17N30 jct w/trail 40 will require more detailed engineering analysis to inform a decision to designate it for mixed use (it is a fairly 'fast' road, which presents more safety concerns) and will likely need capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments to 'slow-down' the road.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action B: Trough- Letts OHV Riding Connectivity

Designate mixed use for segments of M5 and M10 in the Letts / Trough Springs Ridge area. Includes M5 from near jct w/trail 85340 to about 0.5 mile west of jct w/16N17. Includes M10 from jct w/17N02 to jct w/17N29. Also, change road management objective on 16N25 from ML1 to ML2.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would not require any capital investment.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within the Stonyford OHV Management Area, but not as much as the Wolf -Trough-Letts option.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Is within Stonyford OHV management area and involves no increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – Although this action would not maintain connectivity and user convenience as much as option A, it is ripe for consideration and decision. By not including the problematic sections of M5, the analysis and decision making can proceed apace with the overall route designation process timelines. This option could be considered as a NEPA alternative to Option A as a fall-back in the event analysis difficulties preclude timely decision on Option A.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action C: Upper Deer Valley Road OHV Riding Connectivity

Designate 16N01 (upper Deer Valley road) for mixed use, and designate about 1 mile of connecting trail between trails 85413 and 85417.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase road maintenance workload; would add about 1 mile of trail to the trail maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would not require any capital investment.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within the Upper Lake OHV Management Area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Is within Upper Lake OHV management area and involves no increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - 16N01 is currently a mixed use road, and operationally is maintained closer to ML2 than ML3. Changing the RMO would reflect maintenance realities. The lower operational maintenance level reduces the speed of the road, which in turn reduces safety concerns that complicate the engineering analysis.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action D: Hull Mtn to Bald Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate a segment of M1 for mixed use. Includes M1 from jct w/M61 at Bald Mt to jct w/M6 at Cabbage Patch.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would not require any capital investment.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – This section of M1 is currently is maintained closer to ML2 than ML3. Changing the RMO would reflect maintenance realities. The lower operational maintenance level reduces the speed of the road, which in turn reduces safety concerns that complicate the engineering analysis. Most OHV use in this area is related to hunting, although some recreational riding occurs also.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action E: Low Gap to Bald Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate M61 for mixed use. Includes all of M61 from jct w/M6 at Low Gap to jct w/M1 at Bald Mountain.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require substantial capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ the road for safe mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities. However, reducing the maintenance level on this key route would reduce access for visitors using low clearance vehicles.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – This option would provide connectivity between a substantial number and miles of existing ML2 roads, and would improve convenience for hunters using OHVs. However, M61 is identified as a key route (in the forest-scale roads analysis), providing north-south, within- and cross-forest connectivity. As such it is needed for efficient through-travel by street-legal vehicles, so is not a strong candidate for conversion to ML2. Adding more complexity to the situation is the fact that M61 is currently a ‘fast’ road, which increases the safety concerns to the mixed-use engineering assessment. Substantial capital investment and/or multi-year maintenance adjustments would be needed to slow the road down sufficiently to allay mixed-use safety concerns. Although this option deserves more consideration, it does not seem to be ripe for inclusion in the route designation process.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action F: Cabbage Patch to Low Gap OHV Riding Connectivity

Designate a segment of M6 for mixed use, from jct w/M61 at Low Gap to jct w/M1 at Cabbage Patch.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ parts of the road for safe mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. nonmotorized recreation opportunities. However, reducing

the maintenance level on this key route would reduce access for visitors using low clearance vehicles.

- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience.
- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
- **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - M6 is identified as a key route (in the forest-scale roads analysis), providing north-south and east-west, cross-forest connectivity. As such it is needed for efficient through-travel by street legal vehicles, and is not a strong candidate for conversion to ML2. This conversion would not significantly increase connectivity for NSLV/D hunters (it connects few roads outside of the game refuge), but it would improve loop opportunities (in conjunction with option D) for recreational NSLV/D riders.
- **Responsible Official** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action G: Ivory Mill Saddle to Snow Mtn OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate a segment of M3 for mixed use from Ivory Mill Saddle to near Crockett trailhead.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ the road for mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. nonmotorized recreation opportunities. However, reducing the maintenance level on this key route would reduce access for visitors using low clearance vehicles.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - M3 is already ML2 from near Crockett trailhead to its jct w/M10; this option would make the maintenance level consistent for the entire road south of Ivory Mill Saddle. Its traffic level is relatively low. M3 is a key route, serving as the primary artery for administrative traffic, including fire & vegetation/fuels management. Nevertheless, admin traffic is relatively light, and is probably exceeded by public recreation traffic. Greatest level of public use is during hunting season, with light season-long traffic accessing the northern trailheads to Snow Mt Wilderness. M3 is a relatively ‘fast’ road currently, which increases the safety concerns to the mixed-use engineering assessment. The light traffic levels diminish the

level of safety concern as compared to busier 'fast' roads, such as M5, M6 and M61.

- **Responsible Official(s)** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action H: Bearwallow to Kneecap OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate a segment of M6 for mixed use, from jct w/M3 to jct w/M61 at Low Gap

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to 'slow-down' the road for mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. nonmotorized recreation opportunities. However, reducing the maintenance level on this key route would reduce access for visitors using low clearance vehicles.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - This option would provide connectivity between a substantial number and miles of existing ML2 roads, and would improve convenience for hunters using OHVs. However, M6 is identified as a key route (in the forest-scale roads analysis), providing north-south and east-west, cross-forest connectivity. As such it is needed for efficient through-travel by street legal vehicles, so is not a strong candidate for conversion to ML2. Adding more complexity to the situation is the fact that M6 is currently 'fast' enough to increase the safety concerns in the mixed-use engineering assessment. Some capital investment and/or multi-year maintenance adjustments would be needed to slow the road down sufficiently to allay mixed-use safety concerns. Although this option deserves more consideration, it does not seem to be ripe for inclusion in the route designation process.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action I: Hammerhorn Lake to Pacific Crest OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate M21 for mixed use.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would not require any capital investment.

- **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. nonmotorized recreation opportunities.
- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would somewhat improve connectivity and rider convenience for deer hunting area (only a handful of spur roads are connected to M21, and no loops).
- **Win-Win Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
- **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – Would provide OHV connectivity between the Hammerhorn Lake area and the Pacific Crest area. M21 is already a functional ML2 for most of its length, so would not take much capital investment or maintenance adjustment to make it safe for mixed use.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action J: Espee to Hammerhorn Lake OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate a segment of M1 for mixed use, from jct w/23N39 to jct w/M21.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ the road for mixed use.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect the balance of motorized vs. nonmotorized recreation opportunities. However, reducing the maintenance level on this key route would reduce access for visitors using low clearance vehicles.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – This would increase NSLV/D connectivity within the Howard Basin. M1 is a key route, providing access to popular recreation destinations – Hammerhorn & Howard Lakes, YBME wilderness trailheads. It is not particularly ‘fast’, but does receive enough traffic to introduce some safety concerns regarding designation as a mixed use road.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action K: Pacific Crest OHV Hunting Connectivity

Designate a segment of M2 for mixed use, from jct w/M21 to jct w/23N39.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.

13 November 2006

- **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some capital investment or multi-year maintenance adjustments in order to ‘slow-down’ the M2 road for mixed use.
- **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Slowing down M2 would likely inconvenience trailer-hauling equestrian visitors who use it to access Greensprings trailhead for wilderness visits.
- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would improve connectivity and rider convenience within a popular deer hunting area.
- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
- **Cost Efficiency** – No increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – This section of M2 is too ‘fast’ for immediate conversion. Would impact trailer-hauling equestrian visitors using Greensprings trailhead. Mixed use on this stretch of M2 would provide OHV connectivity for a good sized chunk of the upper west Thomes Creek watershed.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action L: Long Ridge OHV Corridor Connector

Designate 17N16 for mixed use.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would not increase maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would not require any capital investment.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – would not affect the balance of motorized vs. non-motorized recreation opportunities.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would maintain connectivity and rider convenience between the Upper Lake and Stonyford OHV Management Areas. 17N16 is already operated as a mixed use road to provide a connection between the two OHV management areas.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Is within Upper Lake OHV management area and involves no increase in workload, so no impact on efficiency.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – 17N16 is currently a mixed use road, and operationally is maintained closer to ML2 than ML3. Changing the RMO from ML3 to ML2 would reflect maintenance realities and formalize the mixed use designation. The lower operational maintenance level reduces the speed of the road, which in turn reduces safety concerns that complicate the engineering analysis.
- **Responsible Official(s)** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Need - Motorized Vehicle Access to Acquired 'Commander Tract' Lands

The Commander Tract lands that were acquired in 2003 have yet to have any ML1 roads designated for public use. Unauthorized use of many of the ML1 roads is chronic preceding and during hunting seasons.

Possible Action A: Commander Tract Public Motorized Vehicle Access Option A

Revise road management objective of about 15 miles of ML1 road to ML2. Provides 3 short, self-contained loops in the upper Cold Creek watershed. Differs from option B in that this option would *not* include Cold Creek crossing or Squaw Camp connector

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would increase maintenance level of existing roads from level 1 to level 2 on about 15 miles of road. May decrease maintenance and enforcement costs by increasing user compliance with closure status on remaining level 1 roads.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some investment to harden or otherwise protect the stream crossings at Cottonwood Glade.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide new motorized access in an area with a 'roaded natural' Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide motorized access into acquired lands.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – The roads are adjacent to existing NFS roads, so road maintenance crews would not have to travel out of their way to maintain them.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Creates threats to heritage resources and riparian and meadow habitats due to lack of natural barriers to cross-country vehicle travel in the Squaw Camp and Cottonwood Glade areas.
- **Other Considerations** – Roads were selected based on low resource impact and ease of maintenance. Omission of the Cold Creek crossing and Squaw Camp connector will avoid bogging down the designation of the other, less problematic roads (refer to option B 'Other Considerations'). Also, omission from this option does not preclude public access from being pursued for those road segments on a separate track.
- **Responsible Official** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action – Commander Tract Public Motorized Vehicle Access Option B

Revise road management objective of about 17 miles of ML1 road to ML2. Provides 3 short, self contained loops, and 2 larger loops connecting existing

open roads in the upper Cold Creek watershed. Includes Cold Creek crossing and Squaw Camp connector

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would increase maintenance level from level 1 to level 2 on about 17 miles of road. May decrease maintenance and enforcement costs by increasing user compliance with closure status on remaining level 1 roads.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – None required.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide new motorized access in an area with a ‘roaded natural’ Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide motorized access into acquired lands.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – The roads are adjacent to existing NFS roads, so road maintenance crews would not have to travel out of their way to maintain them.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** - Roads were selected based on low resource impact and ease of maintenance. Squaw Camp connector and the Cold Creek crossing provide easy vehicle access to sensitive prehistoric sites and riparian / aquatic habitat, which would result in impacts. Preliminary evaluation (PIT project) of the Cold Creek sites for eligibility for the National Register has been funded by Glenn-Colusa RAC for FY07. The results of this will likely not be timely for completing NEPA on the route designation schedule. Evaluation of the Squaw Camp sites is not currently funded.
- **Responsible Official** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action C: Cold Creek Alternate Emergency Escape Route

Issue Special Use Permit (SUP) or Road Use Permit (RUP) to an association of the recreational residents of the Brushy Mountain-Jenks Camp area for exclusive use of the segment of 21N215 crossing Cold Creek and connecting to FH7.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Maintenance costs would be borne by the permittee.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Capital investment costs, if any, would be borne by the permittee.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Not applicable
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Not applicable
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – Not applicable
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Not applicable
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.

13 November 2006

- **Other Considerations** – The crossing at Cold Creek has been available in the past for emergency egress, should CR312 be blocked, for recreation residents of private land inholdings and the Keeran recreation residence tract that is under SUP. Before this option is ripe for consideration and decision, FS and potential SUP holder need to develop an acceptable low-water or other crossing strategy that the SUP holder can afford to construct and maintain.

Need - More Quantity or Quality of OHV Recreation Opportunities

OHV users expressed a general desire for more quantity and quality opportunities. Several specific possibilities were suggested.

Possible Action A: Pine Mountain OHV Trail Additions

Designate some motorized trails in the Pine Mountain area. Three preliminary options have been developed – see maps.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would add to the trail maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some investment to meet resource protection requirements.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide new motorized routes in an area with a 'roaded natural' Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would increase mileage of designated routes available, and increase connectivity between existing designated routes. Additional mileage is also important to special use permittees sponsoring enduro events.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** –
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Located adjacent to existing OHV management area, so trail maintenance crew would not have to travel far out of its way to maintain the trails.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Unclear at this time. The various options have not been scrutinized by resource specialists yet.
- **Other Considerations** – Project does not have necessary funding or adoptive sponsor committed. This area is within a Late Successional Reserve and a watershed with Federally listed anadromous fish. These two circumstances will require longer, more involved consultation timelines. These factors do not preclude the eventual designation of some trails in the Pine Mountain area, but make it untimely for inclusion in this route designation process.
- **Responsible Official** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action B: Baldy Ridge Route

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would add about 2 miles to the road or trail maintenance workload, depending upon which system it was added to
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Unknown – depends on whether much realignment or other design changes would be needed to meet resource protection standards.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide additional motorized access in an area with a ‘roaded natural’ Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Provides challenging experience in some sections and nice views over most of the route.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** –
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Requires trail maintenance equipment and is distant from the main OHV trail management areas.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Unknown – because there is no right of way for portions crossing private land, no resource evaluations were done for this proposal. Low funding is available for right-of-way acquisition.
- **Other Considerations** – Until a public right-of-way exists across the private land, this proposal will not be ripe for decision. This route is located away from the established OHV management areas of the Forest, so acquisition of a right-of-way would have a low priority among the Forest’s overall needs.

Possible Action C: Higgins Loop Proposal

Designate GR005 for motorized use, to produce an OHV-usable loop between 17N87, 17N26 and 17N16. Also designate a connecting trail to dispersed camp DC049, to provide OHV access from camp to the OHV trail system.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would add about 0.3 to 1.5 miles to the trail maintenance workload depending on which option was pursued.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Unknown, but probably minor investment required.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** –
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would create a loop open to non-street-legal vehicles and drivers.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** –
 - **Cost Efficiency** –
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – No apparent Forest Plan compliance problems, but designation of GR005, which is in an inventoried roadless area, would be precluded by Roadless Area regulations.
- **Other Considerations** – GR005 is within an inventoried roadless area, so can not be designated for motorized use under current regulations. However, the Wolf/Trough/Letts connectivity proposal would accomplish

the same connection by designating M10 for mixed use in the same vicinity. That leaves the connector route to be considered.

- **Responsible Official** – Upper Lake / Covelo District Ranger

Possible Action D: Liles Single-Track Proposal

Designate some inventoried routes in the Stonyford OHV Management Area as single track trails. Offers 4 options for adding single track trails.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Options 1 and 4 have some potential for being sustainable under an adopt-a-trail arrangement. Options 2 and 3 have been previously closed for resource protection due to the cost and difficulty of mitigating damage when use is allowed.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Options 1 and 4 have unknown but likely minor investment needs to protect resources. Options 2 and 3 have unknown but likely substantial investment needs to harden against resource damage.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would not affect balance between motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would add some single track mileage and minor loop variety to areas with existing loops.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** –
 - **Cost Efficiency** – Is located in the Stonyford OHV area.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Options 1 and 4 could probably be designed to be compliant without high capital and maintenance inputs; options 2 and 3 might possibly be made compliant, assuming substantial capital and maintenance inputs were available.
- **Other Considerations** – No capital funding is currently available or in the pipeline that would support options 2 or 3. Application for State grant funding would likely be uncompetitive, considering that previous grants funded restoration of these problem routes.
- **Responsible Official** – Grindstone District Ranger

Possible Action E: Ellis North Pillsbury Proposal

Designate some inventoried routes and ML1 roads in the Hull Mountain area to create multiple loop opportunities. Refer to maps.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would add to the trail and road maintenance workloads.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Would require some investment to meet resource protection requirements.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Would provide new motorized routes in an area with a 'roaded natural' Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.

- **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – Would increase mileage of designated routes available, and increase connectivity between existing designated routes.
- **Compensatory Trade-Offs** –
- **Cost Efficiency** – Located adjacent to existing OHV management area, so trail maintenance crew would not have to travel far out of its way to maintain the trails.
- **Forest Plan Compliance** – Unclear at this time. The various options have not been scrutinized by resource specialists yet.
- **Other Considerations** – Project does not have necessary funding or adoptive sponsor committed. Much of the area is within a Late Successional Reserve. This will require longer, more involved consultation timelines. These factors do not preclude the eventual designation of some trails, but make it untimely for inclusion in this route designation process. However, there may be some opportunity to designate some of the ‘easy keeper’ routes as compensatory tradeoff for the tentative proposal to close trail 85468.
- **Responsible Official** – Grindstone District Ranger

Need – Discourage Trespass on Private Land

Possible Action A: Close Trail 85468

Close trail 85468, which dead-heads at private land, and has been encouraging trespass.

- **Responsiveness to Decision Criteria**
 - **Operational Affordability** – Would eliminate about 2.5 miles of OHV trail from maintenance workload.
 - **Low Capital Investment** – Unknown cost to decommission.
 - **Balanced Recreation Opportunities** – Trail is located adjacent to new wilderness. It was left outside of the wilderness to avoid forcing its closure. It seems Congress’ intent was to not eliminate existing motorized use adjacent to new wilderness areas, even though it may compromise the quality of non-motorized uses within earshot.
 - **Quality Motorized Recreation Opportunities** – The trail is a dead end route that is gated at private land. Dead-end routes are generally considered to provide a lower quality experience than loop trails.
 - **Compensatory Trade-Offs** – No specific trade-off option has been proposed, but may be some opportunity in the Ellis proposal, which is in the same general vicinity.
 - **Cost Efficiency** – The trail is an outlier of the Upper Lake OHV management area, so maintenance crews must travel out of their way to maintain it.
 - **Forest Plan Compliance** – Would be compliant.
- **Other Considerations** – .
- **Responsible Official** – Grindstone District Ranger