

Table of Contents

3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	35
3.01 INTRODUCTION	35
Analysis Process	35
Cumulative Effects	36
Affected Environment Overview	37
Assumptions and Limitations	38
Resource Analysis	39
Resource Reports	39
Route Data	40
Law Enforcement	40
Information on Other Resource Issues	41
Air Quality	41
Calaveras Big Trees State Park	41
Climate Change	41
Fire	41
Geology	42
Noxious Weeds	42
Private Property	42
Range	43
Special Events	43
Vegetation	43
Wilderness	43
Yosemite National Park	43
Analysis Framework	43
National Forest Management Act	44
2005 Travel Management Rule 36 CFR 212	44
Forest Plan Direction	44

List of Tables

Table 3.01-1	MTVM and ROS Allocations	44
--------------	--------------------------------	----

3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

3.01 INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the physical, biological, social, and economic environments that are affected by the proposed action and alternatives and the effects on that environment that would result from implementation of any of the alternatives. This chapter also presents the scientific and analytical basis for comparison of the alternatives presented in Chapter 2.

The “Affected Environment” section under each resource topic describes the existing condition against which environmental effects were evaluated and from which progress toward the desired condition can be measured. Environmental consequences form the scientific and analytical basis for comparison of alternatives, including the proposed action, through compliance with standards set forth in the Stanislaus National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended (Forest Plan). The environmental consequences discussion centers on direct, indirect and cumulative effects, along with applicable mitigation measures. Effects can be neutral, beneficial or adverse. The “Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources” section is located at the end of this chapter. These terms are defined as follows:

- Direct effects are caused by the action and occur at the same place and time as the action.
- Indirect effects are caused by the action and are later in time, or further removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable.
- Cumulative effects are those that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

Analysis Process

The environmental consequences presented in Chapter 3 address the impacts of the actions proposed under each alternative. This effects analysis was done at the forest scale (the scale of the proposed action as discussed in Chapter 1). However, the effects findings in this chapter are based on site-specific analyses of each route proposed for addition to the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) and any changes in vehicle class and/or season of use for existing NFTS roads and trails.

Resource specialists reviewed each affected route proposed in the alternatives. Readers seeking information concerning the environmental effects associated with a specific route are directed to the Resource Analysis Database, which documents details concerning mitigation measures and other findings. This report is part of the project record on file at the Forest Supervisor’s Office in Sonora, California and copies are available by request.

For ease of documentation and understanding, the effects of the alternatives are described separately for three discreet actions and then combined to provide the total direct and indirect effects of each alternative (see below). The combination of these discreet actions is then added to the past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions in the cumulative effects analysis. The three discreet actions common to all action alternatives are:

1. **Prohibition of cross-country motor vehicle travel:** The direct and indirect effects of this action are described generally in each alternative, considering both current conditions and projected trends. Both short (1 year) and long-term (approximately 20 years) effects are presented.

2. **Addition of new facilities to the NFTS:** As described above, the impacts of new facilities (roads or trails) are addressed in sum total in this chapter while impacts of individual routes or areas are addressed in appendix A. For most resources, one or more resource indicators are used to measure the direct and indirect effects of each alternative. Both short (1 year) and long-term (approximately 20 years) impacts are presented.
3. **Changes to vehicle class and season of use on the existing NFTS:** Impacts caused by changes to vehicle class and season of use on the existing NFTS are described generally by alternative. For some impacts (for example public safety), impacts are also addressed by route. Where impacts associated with individual routes are warranted, the reader is directed to appendices or project files where this data is located.

Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 (see Chapter 2) include a fourth action item for non-significant Forest Plan Amendments. The proposed amendments make certain additions to the NFTS and changes to the existing NFTS compliant with the Forest Plan. The analysis discloses the effects of these additions or changes under action items 2 and 3 above.

Cumulative Effects

According to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations, “cumulative impact” is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such actions (40 CFR 1508.7).

The cumulative effects analysis area is described under each resource, but in most cases includes the entire Stanislaus National Forest including private and other public lands that lie within the Forest boundary. Past activities are considered part of the existing condition and are discussed in the “Affected Environment (Existing Conditions)” and “Environmental Consequences” section under each resource.

In order to understand the contribution of past actions to the cumulative effects of the proposed action and alternatives, this analysis relies on current environmental conditions as a proxy for the impacts of past actions. Existing conditions reflect the aggregate impact of all prior human actions and natural events that affected the environment and might contribute to cumulative effects. This cumulative effects analysis does not attempt to quantify the effects of past human actions by adding up all prior actions on an action-by-action basis for three reasons.

First, a catalog and analysis of all past actions would be impractical to compile and unduly costly to obtain. Innumerable actions over the last century (and beyond) impacted current conditions and trying to isolate the individual actions with residual impacts would be nearly impossible.

Second, providing the details of past actions on an individual basis would not be useful to predict the cumulative effects of the proposed action or alternatives. In fact, focusing on individual actions would be less accurate than looking at existing conditions, because information on the environmental impacts of individual past actions is limited, and one can not reasonably identify each and every action over the last century that contributed to current conditions. Additionally, focusing on the impacts of past human actions risks ignoring the important residual effects of past natural events which may contribute to cumulative effects just as much as human actions. By looking at current conditions, we are sure to capture all the residual effects of past human actions and natural events, regardless of which particular action or event contributed those effects.

Finally, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued an interpretive memorandum on June 24, 2005 regarding analysis of past actions, which states, “agencies can conduct an adequate cumulative effects analysis by focusing on the current aggregate effects of past actions without delving into the historical details of individual past actions” (CEQ 2005).

The cumulative effects analysis in this EIS is also consistent with Forest Service National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (73 Federal Register 143, July 24, 2008; p. 43084-43099), which state, in part:

“CEQ regulations do not require the consideration of the individual effects of all past actions to determine the present effects of past actions. Once the agency has identified those present effects of past actions that warrant consideration, the agency assesses the extent that the effects of the proposal for agency action or its alternatives will add to, modify, or mitigate those effects. The final analysis documents an agency assessment of the cumulative effects of the actions considered (including past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions) on the affected environment. With respect to past actions, during the scoping process and subsequent preparation of the analysis, the agency must determine what information regarding past actions is useful and relevant to the required analysis of cumulative effects. Cataloging past actions and specific information about the direct and indirect effects of their design and implementation could in some contexts be useful to predict the cumulative effects of the proposal. The CEQ regulations, however, do not require agencies to catalogue or exhaustively list and analyze all individual past actions. Simply because information about past actions may be available or obtained with reasonable effort does not mean that it is relevant and necessary to inform decision making. (40 CFR 1508.7)”

For these reasons, the analysis of past actions in this section is based on current environmental conditions. Appendix B (Cumulative Effects Analysis) lists present and reasonably foreseeable future actions potentially contributing to cumulative effects.

Affected Environment Overview

All resources share many aspects of the affected environment. In order to avoid repeating these shared elements of the affected environment in each resource section, the following general elements of the affected environment are provided.

Located on the western slope of the Central Sierra Nevada, the Stanislaus National Forest contains about 1.1 million acres within its boundary, of which 898,000 acres is National Forest System (NFS) lands. The Forest's topography is characterized by a series of broad sloping benches separated by river canyons and numerous tributary drainages. The dominant aspect is west towards the Central Valley and Pacific Ocean. Elevation varies from 1,100 feet in the Tuolumne River canyon to 11,575 feet at Leavitt Peak along the Sierra crest. Four major rivers (Merced, Mokelumne, Stanislaus and Tuolumne) occupy deep canyons that drain west into the Central Valley. A fifth river, the Clavey, flows southward into the Tuolumne. Elevation differences in these canyons can range from 1,000 to 2,000 feet within a half-mile or less. Slopes along the river canyons are steep with gradients of 60-100 percent.

The Forest contains a number of small to medium-sized lakes, mostly man-made. Cherry Lake (1,800 acres) is the largest while Pinecrest Lake (300 acres) and Lake Alpine (180 acres) are the most popular for recreation use. The only naturally occurring lakes are at the higher elevations. Granite, the most common rock type on the Forest, is especially evident at the higher elevations. Volcanic rocks once covered much of the Forest, but eroded away in many areas. The Dardanelles and nearby Table Mountain are remnants of these volcanic rocks.

Forest climate is directly related to elevation. Below 4,000 feet, mild rainy winters and hot dry summers prevail, with an average 30-35 inches annual precipitation. Above 4,000 feet summers are cooler, winters are cold and snowy, and annual precipitation is 40 to 65 inches. Snow accumulates on protected exposures, and surface runoff from snowmelt, which feeds the rivers and higher elevation creeks, normally occurs from March through July.

The Stanislaus National Forest contains a mosaic of vegetation distributed and controlled primarily by climate and soils. The dominant vegetation types occur as broad bands oriented northwest-southeast

across the Forest occupying general elevation zones. The annual grass-oak woodland-digger pine vegetation type is found up to about 3,000 feet along the steep sides of the major river canyons where it is confined primarily to the south-facing slopes. The chaparral vegetation type occurs higher, from about 1,500 to 3,500 feet elevation. Most of the forested land occurs between 3,500 to 7,500 feet, with some as high as 8,500 feet. Evergreen and deciduous hardwoods are scattered throughout all elevation zones. The sub-alpine zone with a mixture of conifers and low growing shrubs exists above 7,500-8,500 feet.

Unmanaged OHV use resulted in unplanned roads and trails, erosion, watershed and habitat degradation and impacts to cultural resources. On some portions of the Stanislaus National Forest long managed as open to cross-country motor vehicle travel, repeated use resulted in unplanned, unauthorized roads and trails. These routes generally developed without environmental analysis or public involvement and do not possess the same status as NFTS roads and trails (see 1.02, Background).

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions and limitations apply to the effects analysis in each section:

1. No NEPA decision is necessary to continue use of the NFTS (i.e. OHV and transportation) as currently managed under the No Action alternative. These decisions were made previously.
2. User-created roads, trails and areas are not NFTS facilities. They are unauthorized. Proposals to add these to the NFTS require a NEPA decision.
3. Temporary roads, trails and areas built to support emergency operations or temporarily authorized in association with contracts, permits or leases are not intended for public use. They are not NFTS facilities (e.g. they are unauthorized for public use). Any proposal to add these temporary roads to the NFTS will require a NEPA decision.
4. Any unauthorized routes not included in the Proposed Action are not precluded from consideration for addition to the NFTS in future travel management actions.
5. The Agency will continue to make changes to the NFTS on an 'as needed basis'. It will also continue to make decisions about temporary roads or trails on an 'as needed' basis associated with contract, permit, lease or other written authorization.
6. Any activity associated with contract, permit, lease or other written authorization is exempt from designation under the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212.51 (a) (8) and should not be part of the proposal (i.e. fuelwood permits, motorized SUP permits, mining activity etc.). Such actions are subject to separate NEPA analysis.
7. "Designation" is an administrative act which does not trigger NEPA. Designation technically occurs with printing of the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM). NEPA is not required for printing a map.
8. For travel management, the federal action triggering NEPA, is any change to current restrictions or prohibitions regarding motorized travel by the public (for example: prohibiting cross-country travel, changing management - changing vehicle class or season of use, and any additions or deletions of facilities (roads and trails) to the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS).
9. Previous decisions on the NFTS do not need to be revisited to implement the Travel Management Rule or the MVUM. That is, the NFTS contains existing facilities (roads and trails) that either underwent NEPA or pre-date NEPA. Allowing continued motorized use of the facilities in the NFTS in accordance with existing laws and regulations, does not require NEPA.
10. Dispersed recreation activities (i.e. activities which occur after the motor vehicle stops such as: camping, hunting, fishing, hiking etc.) are not part of the scope of the proposed action. The action and the analysis focus on motor vehicle use.
11. Travel analysis is a pre-NEPA planning exercise for transportation planning which informs travel management. Until new directives are published, the agency continues to follow existing policy

related to transportation planning and analysis. For example, some Roads Analysis Process requirements in FSM 7700 and 7710 are still applicable.

12. Setting road maintenance levels and changing maintenance levels are administrative and not subject to NEPA. However, changes in allowed vehicle class, season of use, access, and proposals to reconstruct facilities are subject to NEPA.
13. The system will be maintained to standard and all additions or changes to the NFTS will meet standards prior to availability for public use.

Resource Analysis

Each resource specialist assessed every unauthorized route proposed as an addition to the NFTS in any alternative at a level sufficient to support their effects analysis and identify any necessary site-specific mitigation. Appendix H (Resource Analysis Summary) presents a summary of this resource analysis with each specialist indicating one of the four options listed below for every route. The Resource Analysis Database (project record) contains additional details.

1. The route was considered; a field visit was not necessary; the effects of adding the route to the NFTS are acceptable (meet law, regulation, and policy; routine maintenance is assumed).
2. The route was considered, a field visit was made and the effects are acceptable (meet law, regulation, and policy; routine maintenance is assumed).
3. The route was considered, a field visit was made and site-specific mitigation is prescribed to reduce the effects to acceptable (meet law, regulation, and policy; routine maintenance is assumed).
4. The route was considered, a field visit was made and a determination was made that the effects could not be mitigated. The route is not recommended by the specialist for inclusion.

Resource Reports

Most resource sections in this chapter provide a summary of the project-specific reports, assessments, and other documents prepared by Forest Service specialists. These reports are part of the project record on file at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Sonora, California and they are available by request. The following reports, assessments and other documents are incorporated by reference:

Botany: Botanical Resources Report; Biological Evaluation for Sensitive Plants and Other Botanical Resources; Weed Risk Assessment

Geology: Geologic Assessment for Asbestos Occurrence; Abandoned Mine Lands Report

Cultural: Cultural Resources Report; Cultural Resource Management Report (05-16-1305)

Recreation: Recreation Resources Report

Transportation: Transportation Facilities Report; Mixed Use Analysis

Roadless and Special Areas: Roadless and Special Areas Report

Social: Society, Culture and Economy Report

Soil: Soil Resource Report

Visual: Visual Resources Report

Water: Water Resources Report; Cumulative Watershed Effects; Riparian Conservation Objectives Analysis

Wildlife: Terrestrial and Aquatic Biota Report; Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (BA/BE) for Fish and Wildlife; Management Indicator Species Report

Route Data

During the planning stages of the travel management project for the Stanislaus National Forest, the public recommended additions and changes to the existing NFTS with a focus on adding unauthorized routes. Comments regarding specific routes were also received during the public scoping period for the Notice of Intent (72 Federal Register 222, November 19, 2007; p. 64988-64991). The disposition of these routes fell into two categories: routes brought forward for detailed study in the alternative and routes eliminated from detailed study. The responsible official made these decisions based upon the purpose and need, the scope of the EIS and issues.

The action alternatives consider a number of additions to the NFTS and changes to the existing NFTS. The Forest developed a route data listing of all additions and changes considered in an alternative, shown in Appendix I (Route Data). The route data identifies:

- the alternative(s) under which the additions to the NFTS or changes to the existing NFTS is proposed;
- the type of vehicles allowed;
- season when the route would be open; and,
- mitigation measures that would be implemented on the route prior to publication on a MVUM and allowing public use (see Appendix F, Maintenance and Mitigation Definitions).

Regular operation and maintenance activities (e.g. brushing, signing, cleaning and maintaining existing drainage structures patrolling routes, etc.) are a part of regular maintenance and management strategies for the NFTS and covered under separate NEPA.

Law Enforcement

Appendix E (Law Enforcement) details the law enforcement authority and jurisdiction, cooperation, implementation and tracking, implementation strategy, assumptions and measures of success.

ENFORCEMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Enforcement of the laws and regulations related to 36 CFR 212 will be enforced equally in authority and weight as with all other Federal laws and regulations. As with any change in a regulation on NFS lands, a transitional period is usually allowed for the public to understand the changes. A higher number of violations to CFR 212.51 is anticipated the first few years and the number of violations will decline as the users understand and comply with the rules. It is assumed:

- Users in communities adjacent to the Forest will comply within 1-2 years.
- Frequent users but further in distant from the Forest will comply within 2-3 years.
- Infrequent users regardless of distance may take up to 5 years to comply.
- Law enforcement officer and agency personnel's presence and enforcement actions will positively affect OHV users' behaviors and attitudes.
- The MVUM clearly defines the designated routes; therefore, making violations to CFR 212 unequivocal.
- Once the MVUM is published, the implementation of the established dedicated network of roads and trails with signs, and user education programs, will reduce the number of violations.
- Forest Protection Officers spend a large percentage of their time on Travel Management issues, and depending on the Forest the estimate range from 30 to 50 percent. Law Enforcement Officers spend approximately 10-20% of their time on enforcement of off-highway vehicle issues.
- The proposal to provide additional facilities to the NFTS through some action alternatives is anticipated to assist enforcing the shift from an "open to cross country motor vehicle travel" management situation to one where such use is prohibited. These actions provide opportunities and access where such use was occurring in key popular dispersed locations based upon

recreation analysis and public input. Providing opportunities in popular, key areas will help relieve pressure to travel off of designated routes.

Information on Other Resource Issues

The alternatives considered in detail do not affect these resource issues or localized effects are disclosed under other resource sections. A brief summary on why they are not further discussed in Chapter 3 is provided based upon input received during scoping.

Air Quality

Actions proposed are in compliance with state air quality regulations and the Forest Plan. Air emissions are generally managed and analyzed spatially by air basins (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/knowzone/basin/basin.swf>) where topographic features delineate common air quality characteristics. Air quality conditions are highly controlled by short and long term meteorological and climate conditions.

Generally, the number of vehicle miles traveled annually by forest users is not expected to change in any alternatives through the prohibition of cross country travel and the redirection of motorized use onto a designated system of roads and trails. As a result, no adverse effects are anticipated to air quality. Where seasonal restrictions are put into place, a slight benefit to air quality may occur as a result of the actions. Where action alternatives propose adding routes to the NFTS, any air quality related issues are offset by the reduction of cross country travel. These routes were pulled from the inventory of unauthorized routes open to public use as part of cross country travel prior to this proposal. The following analysis led to a determination that no adverse effects to air quality would result from any of the action alternatives: none of the proposed routes pass through serpentine soils (see Geologic Assessment for Asbestos Occurrence, project record); none of the alternatives propose routes or terminal facilities that would result in a significant increase or change in concentration of use; and, none of the alternatives propose routes located in federal (national) non-attainment areas for pm2.5 and ozone 8 hour. Tailpipe emissions accounted for by CARB in the green/red sticker program suggest that CARB regulates these emissions to achieve state implementation plan targets. No adverse change in attainment status is expected to occur as a result of these projects. The San Bernardino National Forest Travel Route Designation Project Air Quality Report indicates no significant impacts to air quality and is generally representative of the Region's travel management proposals (project record).

Calaveras Big Trees State Park

The Stanislaus National Forest shares a common boundary with the Calaveras Big Trees State Park. California State Park regulations prohibit any disturbance or destruction of natural resources. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect this resource where motorized travel is confined to designated roadways. The Forest Service will regulate motorized travel adjacent to Calaveras Big Trees according to the decision implementing this project.

Climate Change

The State of California controls tailpipe emissions and therefore greenhouse gasses and ozone emissions are outside the scope of this project (see Air Quality).

Fire

The lower elevations of the Stanislaus National Forest support a combination of weather, fuel types, topography and fire occurrence that create a significant fire environment. Arson, campfire escapes, debris burning and smoking continue as the leading causes of human-caused fire on the Forest. Lightning is common during summer months and in most cases precipitation accompanies the thunderstorms. Dry thunderstorms occur frequently, but not usually of the magnitude or under the

conditions that existed during the drought of 1987 resulting in the massive Stanislaus Complex Fire, which burned approximately 145,500 acres.

From 1970 through 2007, lightning is the number one cause of wildland fire starts with 2,259 fires followed by escaped campfires in second with 628 fires. During that time, mechanical (motor vehicles, chainsaws, hot saws, heavy equipment, etc) causes accounted for 165 fire starts with 5,293 acres burned, representing less than 4% of the total fire starts and less than 2% of the acres burned on the Forest (B. Shindelar, personal communication, November 14, 2008).

Fire and fuels planning is an integral part of the overall resource management on the Forest. Fire suppression, fire prevention and fuels management programs provide the balanced program needed to keep wildfire acreages below maximum fire size objectives. Multi-funded resource enhancement projects provide many opportunities to avoid fire problems by manipulating fuel beds to lower hazard levels. Fuel breaks, fuel modification zones, water source development, large-scale mosaic prescribed burn activities and activity fuel treatments lessen the chance for large and damaging wildfires.

Data is not readily available which specifically identifies fires caused by motor vehicle use. It is assumed that visitors who use motor vehicles on the Forest will:

- comply with such laws as using approved and operating spark arrestors;
- obtain campfire permits for camping outside of developed sites;
- stay on authorized routes during appropriate season of use; and,
- adhere to any fire restrictions in effect.

The alternatives considered in detail do not change the number of human-caused fires or affect emergency access. Continued Forest Service access is available on administrative use only and special use permit roads. In emergency situations, the Forest Service can access federal land where no public right of way exists.

Geology

Granite, the most common rock type on the Stanislaus National Forest, is especially evident at the higher elevations. Volcanic rocks once covered much of the Forest, but eroded away in many areas. The Dardanelles and nearby Table Mountain are remnants of these volcanic rocks. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect geology. The Geologic Assessment for Asbestos Occurrence (project record) shows that none of the proposed routes pass through serpentine soils (see Air Quality). The Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) Report (project record) shows that 6 routes (1.03 miles), proposed as additions to the NFTS in Alternatives 1 and 4, intersect or are within 200' of AML sites. The AML report recommends that these routes not be available to the public until the Forest AML program develops site specific mitigations. The Resource Analysis Database Summary Report (project record) contains additional details.

Noxious Weeds

The Stanislaus National Forest maintains a list of noxious weeds and non-native, invasive pest plants of concern that currently infest 2,623 acres and 30 miles of motorized routes within the analysis area. The botany section and the Noxious Weed Risk Assessment (project record) disclose the effects of noxious weeds on specific resources.

Private Property

About 200,000 acres of private property exists within the boundary of the Stanislaus National Forest. California regulates timber harvest on private land under the Forest Practice Rules. County plans address other private land uses including management of private roads available for use by the public consistent with the California Vehicle Code. Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) owners of the largest portion of private land opposes public motorized travel on their lands. For the purpose of estimating

environmental effects this analysis assumes that private roads will not be available for public motorized use. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect private roads or use on private property. The recreation and society, culture and economy sections disclose any localized effects on private property.

Range

The Stanislaus National Forest contains 356,200 acres of land suitable for grazing. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect grazing permittees since the proposed prohibitions and restrictions include exceptions as allowed by permit or other authorization. The botany, soils, visual, water and wildlife sections disclose any localized effects on specific vegetation components of the range resource.

Special Events

During scoping, some comments suggested that route designations may not provide adequate opportunities for motorized special use events. Actions proposed comply with the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212) and do not authorize any future permits for special events. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect special events because permit issuance is subject to additional site-specific NEPA that could consider and authorize temporary special event use on routes other than those designated through this analysis.

Vegetation

The Stanislaus National Forest contains a mosaic of vegetation distributed and controlled primarily by climate and soils. The dominant vegetation types occur as broad bands oriented northwest-southeast across the Forest occupying general elevation zones. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect the distribution of vegetation across the Forest for these reasons: motorized trail use occurs over only 274 acres or less than 0.04% of the project area; no new construction is proposed; disturbance already occurred since the alternatives consider only existing routes. The botany, soils, visual, water and wildlife sections disclose any localized effects on specific vegetation resources.

Wilderness

The Stanislaus National Forest manages all or portions of the Carson-Iceberg, Emigrant and Mokelumne Wildernesses. Actions proposed comply with Wilderness designations and the Wilderness Act of 1964. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect this resource where motorized activity is prohibited under all the alternatives per the Wilderness Act.

Yosemite National Park

The Stanislaus National Forest shares a common boundary, much of which is Wilderness, with Yosemite National Park to the east. The National Park Service manages park resources and values to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. The alternatives considered in detail do not affect this resource where motorized travel is confined to designated roadways. The Forest Service will regulate motorized travel adjacent to Yosemite according to the decision implementing this project.

Analysis Framework

This section provides the statutes, regulations, Forest Plan and other direction that apply to this analysis. NEPA at 40 CFR 1502.25(a) directs “to the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with and integrated with ...other environmental review laws and executive orders.” Each resource section lists the applicable laws, regulations, policies and Executive Orders relevant to that resource. Surveys, analyses and findings required by those laws are addressed in the resource reports in the project record.

National Forest Management Act

Specifically for off-highway vehicle management, NFMA requires that this use be planned and implemented to protect land and other resources, promote public safety and minimize conflicts with other uses of the NFS lands.

2005 Travel Management Rule 36 CFR 212

Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 212 (36 CFR 212) is the implementing regulation for the Travel Management Rule (70 Federal Register 216, November 9, 2005; p. 68264-68291). Part 212 provides criteria for designation of roads and trails. The alternatives are designed specifically to implement the requirements of the travel management rule. In particular, it addresses the requirements of 36 CFR 212 Designation of roads, motorized trails, and motorized areas which states in part “Motor vehicle use on National Forest System roads, on National Forest System trails, and in areas on National Forest System lands shall be designated by vehicle class and, if appropriate, by time of year by the responsible official on administrative units or Ranger Districts of the National Forest System.”

Forest Plan Direction

The Stanislaus National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan), as amended, directs the management of the Stanislaus National Forest. Table 3.01-1 shows the Forest Plan management area allocations to Motor Vehicle Travel Management (MVTM) and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), the primary Forest Plan direction for managing motorized use on the Stanislaus National Forest (USDA 2005a). Appendix C (Forest Plan Direction) lists the Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs) that specifically apply to Motorized Travel Management.

Table 3.01-1 MVTM and ROS Allocations

#	Management Area	MVTM	ROS
1	Wilderness and Proposed Wilderness	Closed	Primitive
2	Wild and Scenic Rivers and Proposed Wild and Scenic Rivers	Closed (Wild)	Primitive (within Wilderness) Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized
		Restricted (Scenic and Recreational)	Roaded Natural
3	Near Natural	Closed	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized
4	Wildlife	Restricted	Semi-Primitive Motorized Roaded Natural
5	Special Interest Areas	Closed (within Wilderness)	Primitive (within Wilderness)
		Restricted	Semi-Primitive Motorized Roaded Natural
6	Research Natural Areas	Closed	Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized
7	Experimental Forest	Restricted	Roaded Natural
8	Scenic Corridor	Restricted	Roaded Natural
9	General Forest	Restricted	Roaded Natural
10	Developed Recreation Sites	Restricted	Roaded Natural Rural
11	Winter Sports Sites	Restricted	Roaded Natural Rural
12	Developed Non-Recreation	Restricted	Rural