

Table of Contents

3.04 RECREATION RESOURCES	109
<i>Analysis Framework: Statute, Regulation, Forest Plan and Other Direction</i>	<i>109</i>
<i>Effects Analysis Methodology</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Assumptions Specific to Recreation Resources Analysis.....</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Data Sources.....</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Recreation Resources Indicators.....</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Recreation Resources Methodology by Action.....</i>	<i>111</i>
<i>Affected Environment.....</i>	<i>112</i>
<i>Environmental Consequences</i>	<i>114</i>
<i>Alternative 1 (Proposed Action).....</i>	<i>119</i>
<i>Alternative 2 (No Action).....</i>	<i>120</i>
<i>Alternative 3 (Cross Country Prohibited)</i>	<i>121</i>
<i>Alternative 4 (Recreation).....</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>Alternative 5 (Resources)</i>	<i>123</i>
<i>Summary of Effects Analysis across all Alternatives.....</i>	<i>124</i>
<i>Compliance with the Forest Plan and Other Direction.....</i>	<i>125</i>

List of Tables

Table 3.04-1	NVUM Classified Activities.....	114
Table 3.04-2	NFTS: SPNM and Cross Country Travel	115
Table 3.04-3	Proximity of Non-Highway Legal Vehicles to Private Land	116
Table 3.04-4	Additions to the NFTS: Degree of Difficulty.....	116
Table 3.04-5	Total Motorized Opportunities	116
Table 3.04-6	Additions to the NFTS: Trail Categories.....	117
Table 3.04-7	Additions to the NFTS: Dispersed Access Routes.....	118
Table 3.04-8	Summary of Effects for Recreation Resources	125

3.04 RECREATION RESOURCES

This section examines the extent to which alternatives respond to recreation management direction established in the Forest Plan and the TM Rule. The Forest Plan recreation direction was established under the implementing regulations of NFMA which requires the provision of a broad spectrum of forest and rangeland-related outdoor recreation opportunities that respond to current and anticipated user demands. The Forest Plan satisfies this requirement through its use of the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classification system of “zoning” recreation opportunities. In addition, specifically for off-road vehicle use, NFMA requires that these motor vehicle opportunities be planned and implemented to protect land and other resources, promote public safety, and minimize conflicts with other uses of the NFS lands. The TM Rule requires an examination of: the compatibility of motor vehicle use with existing conditions in populated areas; the conflict between motor vehicle use and existing or proposed recreational uses of NFS lands or neighboring federal lands; and, the provision of recreational opportunities and access needs.

Analysis Framework: Statute, Regulation, Forest Plan and Other Direction

Direction relevant to the proposed action as it affects recreation resources includes:

National Forest Management Act (NFMA) - The NFMA sets forth requirements for development of Forest Plans. The Stanislaus National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan includes standards and guidelines for recreation management including use of Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV).

Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) - The SNFPA established the direction to prohibit motorized vehicle travel off designated routes, trails, and limited OHV use areas. Unless otherwise restricted by current forest plans or other specific area standards and guidelines, cross-country travel by over-snow vehicles would continue.

Travel Management (TM) Rule - The TM Rule requires that in designating NFS roads, trails, and areas, Responsible Officials consider the provision of recreational opportunities; public access needs; conflicts among uses of NFS lands, including other recreational uses; and the compatibility of motor vehicle use with existing conditions in populated areas.

Forest Plan - The Forest Plan provides goals for the recreation resource and requires a broad range of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities in balance with existing and future demand. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) is the basic inventory that was used to create recreation-opportunity “zoning” in these plans. For the purposes of the proposed action, the term “off-road vehicles” applies to public motor vehicle use (highway legal and non-highway legal). The ROS inventory provides for a spectrum of classes from “Urban” to “Primitive.” Motorized and non-motorized spectrum classes (or ‘zones’) are distinct. Motorized use falls in the motorized ROS classes: Urban, Rural, Roaded Natural, and Semi-primitive-Motorized. Non-motorized classes include Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized and Primitive.

In summary, Forest Plan direction specific to recreation emphasizes providing a variety of quality recreation opportunities while protecting the natural setting and natural resource values. Specific elements address motorized activities to optimize recreation opportunities while minimizing conflict with non motorized activities, encouraging public participation, managing conditions on the ground, and assuring effective and sustainable management. See Appendix C, Forest Plan Direction for specific recreation and OHV direction.

Effects Analysis Methodology

Assumptions Specific to Recreation Resources Analysis

1. The prohibition of motorized cross-country travel does not change ROS (e.g., semi-primitive motorized); it is simply a prohibition within that ROS 'zone' to travel off designated routes. The ability to add or remove routes in the future is still guided by NEPA, and is not affected by the action of prohibiting motorized cross-country travel and limiting travel to designated routes forest wide.
2. Proposed additions to the NFTS can have a beneficial effect on the motor-vehicle experience by sustaining a variety of riding experiences (variety of easy-to-difficult riding experiences) and contributing to the continuity of the motor-touring experience, including access to dispersed recreation activities and trail loop opportunities (both motorized and non-motorized). Reductions in OHV riding opportunities can affect the viability of route systems, the overall capacity, and the quality of recreation opportunities.
3. The Forest NVUM report accurately expresses the most popular recreation activities for analysis.
4. The Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment accurately defines the Forest Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) defense zone, as mapped on the Stanislaus National Forest.
5. The number of NFTS miles in the WUI defense zone, per alternative, is a metric to help us better understand the cumulative effects of motorized use to neighboring populated areas.
6. OHV use is considered to be the use of four wheel drive (4WD) vehicles, all terrain vehicles (ATVs) and motorcycles on rough roads and trails that require some skill and challenge to operate. Four wheel drive vehicles operating on paved or smoothly graded roads will be considered part of general passenger vehicle use and are not included in the following discussions.
7. The Forest Plan states that recreation demand will not be met at some point in the future (USDA 1991-d). With the exception of alternative 2, all alternatives reduce supply and hasten the time when demand will not be met for OHV activities on the Forest. The OHV supply and demand section of the Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.
8. Some trailheads and staging areas may need to be developed near designated trail systems in the future to maximize use of the NFTS system. These projects, if needed, will be analyzed in a future NEPA analysis.
9. Wheeled Over Snow (WOS) use does not affect other recreation resources since the use is on existing NFTS routes that are open to public motorized use during the normal summer driving season.

Data Sources

1. Forest Plan
2. GIS
3. NVUM reports

Recreation Resources Indicators

1. The extent of non-motorized recreation activities, as expressed primarily by Semi-primitive Non-motorized (SPNM) ROS class, displaced by proposed motor vehicle use. This includes consideration for quiet recreation opportunities, forest-wide.
2. The number of proposed NFTS miles within proximity to populated areas or neighboring public lands.
3. The number of miles devoted to each vehicle class, and the number of miles providing a variety of riding experiences, including loop opportunities.
4. The number of routes and total miles accessing dispersed recreation activities.

Recreation Resources Methodology by Action

1. Direct and indirect effects of the prohibition of cross country motorized vehicle travel

Short-term time frame: 1 year.

Long-term time frame: 20 years.

Spatial boundary: The forest boundary is the unit of spatial analysis when considering effects associated with changes in the NFTS or season of use.

Indicators: (1) the extent of non-motorized recreation activities displaced by proposed motor vehicle use; (2) the number of proposed NFTS miles in proximity to populated areas or neighboring public lands; (3) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class; and (4) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class for access to dispersed activities.

Methodology: GIS analysis of added routes in relation to ROS classes, WUI zones, most popular non-motorized recreation activities, and vehicle classes.

Rationale: The indicators address how alternatives respond to the Forest Plan and the TM Rule: the motorized recreation opportunity conflicts with other recreation opportunities, specifically non-motorized opportunities; the proximity of motor vehicle use to populated areas or neighboring public lands; the quality of the motorized recreation experience; and the quality and quantity of motorized access to dispersed recreation areas.

2. Direct and indirect effects of adding facilities to the NFTS including identifying seasons of use and vehicle class

Short-term time frame: 1 year.

Long-term time frame: 20 years.

Spatial boundary: The forest boundary is the unit of spatial analysis when considering effects associated with changes in the NFTS or season of use.

Indicators: (1) the extent of non-motorized recreation activities displaced by proposed motor vehicle use; (2) the number of proposed NFTS miles in proximity to populated areas or neighboring public lands; (3) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class; and (4) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class for access to dispersed activities.

Methodology: GIS analysis of added routes in relation to ROS classes, WUI zones, most popular non-motorized recreation activities, and vehicle classes.

Rationale: The indicators address how alternatives respond to the Forest Plan and the TM Rule: the motorized recreation opportunity conflicts with other recreation opportunities, specifically non-motorized opportunities; the proximity of motor vehicle use to populated areas or neighboring public lands; the quality of the motorized recreation experience; and the quality of motorized access to dispersed areas.

3. Direct and indirect effects of changes to the existing NFTS including identifying seasons of use and vehicle class

Short-term time frame: 1 year.

Long-term time frame: 20 years.

Spatial boundary: The forest boundary is the unit of spatial analysis when considering effects associated with changes in the NFTS or season of use.

Indicators: (1) the extent of non-motorized recreation activities displaced by proposed motor vehicle use; (2) the number of proposed NFTS miles in proximity to populated areas or

neighboring public lands; (3) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class; and (4) the number of miles devoted to each vehicle class for access to dispersed activities.

Methodology: GIS analysis of added routes in relation to ROS classes, WUI zones, most popular non-motorized recreation activities, and vehicle classes.

Rationale: The indicators address how alternatives respond to the Forest Plan and the TM Rule: the motorized recreation opportunity conflicts with other recreation opportunities, specifically non-motorized opportunities; the proximity of motor vehicle use to populated areas or neighboring public lands; the quality of the motorized recreation experience; and the quality of motorized access to dispersed areas.

4. Cumulative Effects

Short-term time frame: not applicable; cumulative effects analysis will be done only for the long-term time frame.

Long-term time frame: 20 years

Spatial boundary: The forest boundary is the unit of spatial analysis for determining cumulative effects.

Indicator(s): Net SPNM ROS class acres and number of NFTS miles in proximity to populated areas or neighboring public lands (within WUI zone).

Methodology: The total NFTS miles within WUI defense zones and SPNM areas, as shown by GIS analysis.

Rationale: The number of NFTS miles in the WUI defense zone will illustrate the cumulative effects of the proximity of the proposed NFTS, per alternative, to populated areas.

Affected Environment

The STF offers a variety of high quality recreation opportunities in a range of settings, year round. Located between Lake Tahoe and Yosemite National Park on the western slope of the Sierra, it is within a 3 hour drive of the San Francisco Bay Area. The Recreation Facility Analysis (RFA) during 2006 projected an increase in overall recreation use of 43% during the next 20 years. This is dramatically more than the average forest nationally, but typical of adjacent Forests in the central Sierra. The expected increase in visitor use will create challenges as demand approaches capacity in the future.

The STF provides a wide range of facilities located in attractive settings primarily located along reservoirs or rivers. The developed facilities include: 47 family campgrounds, 5 group campgrounds, 12 picnic grounds, 47 trailheads (this includes OHV trailheads), 8 boating sites, 745 recreation residences, 8 organization camps, and 4 resorts. These developed facilities often support recreation activities that occur outside of the developed sites as described in the following sections. California State Highways 4, 108, and 120 pass through the Forest, provide easy access to most of the recreation opportunities. Of the 3 corridors, highway 108 serves the most recreation use on the Forest. Highway 4 is a National Scenic Byway and Highway 120 is the most direct route between the San Francisco Bay Area and Yosemite National Park. The lakes and rivers offer excellent fishing, boating, and swimming opportunities. The elevation ranges from 1,500' to 12,000', providing a variety of settings for year-round recreational use.

From a recreation management point of view, a key goal of recreation is to provide for a wide range of recreation opportunities. For OHV recreation opportunities this means the Forest should provide OHV recreation opportunities in a variety of settings from semi-primitive motorized areas to fairly developed Roaded Natural areas. OHV trails should also offer a range of trail experiences in terms of

length, range of difficulty from easy to difficult, and a range of recreation opportunities including; access to dispersed camping, access to fishing, hunting, viewing wildlife, access to scenic vistas, and other opportunities to explore the back country of the Forest. Trails should be designed for user enjoyment in terms of vegetation type, layout of the trails with views, loop opportunities, or trail systems that connect so users can explore a variety of trails and areas. These factors facilitate a quality recreation experience. A large system of trails results in opportunities for solitude and remoteness. A small system compresses the increasing use into a limited area, resulting in crowding, dust, noise, and user conflicts (between other motorized users as well as non-motorized users), and resource degradation.

Non-Motorized Recreation Opportunities

The Forest contains portions of three designated Wildernesses; the Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River; and the Merced Wild and Scenic River. These areas contribute to the 238,763 acres of Primitive ROS and 128,816 acres of SPNM ROS on the Forest. Most of the managed non-motorized trail system is associated with these areas, which are free of conflict with motorized activities. More than 1,000 miles of non-motorized trails exists outside of these areas, offering a range of opportunities. They vary from heavily used/ paved bicycle trails and interpretive trails to lightly used or overgrown historic routes in a range of settings. Even in the most highly developed areas of the Forest, such as Pinecrest, many non-motorized opportunities exist in a quiet setting, especially during low use periods. OHV activities currently occur on Semi-Primitive Motorized and Roaded Natural areas throughout the Forest. This allows for a choice and mix of motorized and non-motorized activities. This mix is preferred by many visitors, but has the potential to negatively impact quiet recreation activities when near OHV activity.

Recreation Visitor Use

Visitor use estimates for the Forest were generated based on the NVUM survey that was conducted from October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2003. Recreation use on the Stanislaus National Forest for this period was estimated at 1,759,756 National Forest visits and 2,324,863 site visits. The survey was designed to assess existing recreation demand on the forest by asking visitors what they did during their visit. This assessment resulted in two categories of visitor use: all activities in which they participated in and the main activity. It highlighted the fact that the two uses may or may not be related. For example, 52 percent of forest visitors reported participating in the viewing of natural features, but only 5 percent reported this as their main activity. The top five recreation activities visitors participated in were general relaxation, viewing scenery, hiking/walking, viewing wildlife, and fishing. Each visitor also picked one of these activities as his or her primary activity for the current recreation visit to the forest. The top main activities were downhill skiing, relaxing, fishing and developed camping (Table 3.04-1).

Most visitors to the Forest participate in a variety of activities. Many activities, such as “viewing natural features” can be either motorized or non-motorized. The overwhelming majority of visitors arrive to the Forest in a motorized vehicle, the exception being adjacent residents. This means that motorized and non-motorized activities are often combined as part of the total recreation experience. The presence of motorized activities can be either a positive or negative factor, depending on the circumstances. Table 3.04-1 identifies all classified activities in the NVUM report and highlights those that are primarily either motorized or non-motorized. Activities that are primarily non-motorized appear to have more use than motorized activities in both categories.

Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Opportunities

California is experiencing the highest level of OHV use of any state in the nation with 786,914 ATVs and OHV motorcycles registered in 2004, up 330% since 1980. Annual sales of ATVs and OHV motorcycles in California were the highest in the U.S. for the last 5 years. Four-wheel drive vehicle sales were extremely high. They increased 1500% to 3,046,866 from 1989 to 2002. According to field

personnel, overall use has more than doubled at many Forest locations during the last 10 years. These observations are supported by several studies, including the latest NVUM results from 2007 surveys (Kordell 2005).

Despite OHV use ranking 12th in the participation category and 6th as a main activity in Table 3.04-1, it is an important program on the Forest. The data indicates the Stanislaus ranks 8th of 18 National Forests in Region 5 (California) for overall recreation use, but it ranks 3rd in OHV use, having the 2nd highest percentage of OHV use as a main activity participation. Of 122 Forests nationally, the Stanislaus ranks 45th for overall recreation use but 18th for OHV use¹. Reductions in riding opportunities (capacity) would likely have a greater effect than at forests with a lower percentage of OHV use.

Table 3.04-1 NVUM Classified Activities

Activity	% Participating	Rank	% as Main Activity	Rank
Developed Camping	21.12	8	8.97	4
Primitive Camping	9.69	13	3.70	9
Backpacking	5.49	20	2.38	12
Resort Use	8.35	14	1.92	14
Picnicking	24.67	6	3.15	10
Viewing Natural Features	51.62	2	4.59	8
Visiting Historic Sites	6.60	18	0.06	26
Nature Center Activities	6.24	19	0.11	25
Nature Study	3.84	21	0.41	23
Relaxing	60.56	1	19.35	2
Fishing	30.95	5	13.51	3
Hunting	1.79	24	1.26	18
OHV Use	10.34	12	6.19	6
Driving for Pleasure	18.97	10	2.36	13
Snowmobiling	1.70	25	1.44	16
Motorized Water Activities	7.09	17	0.52	21
Other Motorized Activity	0.57	26	0.54	20
Hiking / Walking	45.25	4	7.80	5
Horseback Riding	1.91	23	0.38	24
Bicycling	7.10	16	1.23	19
Non-motorized Water	10.40	11	2.48	11
Downhill Skiing	21.37	9	20.42	1
Cross-country Skiing	2.51	22	1.35	17
Other Non-motorized	21.64	7	4.97	7
Gathering Forest Products	7.35	15	0.52	22
Viewing Wildlife	47.28	3	1.76	15
Total motorized	40.46		12.31	
Total non-motorized	88.81		18.31	

Environmental Consequences

Direct and Indirect Effects for all Alternatives

Indicator Measure 1 - The extent of non-motorized recreation activities, as expressed primarily by SPNM ROS class, displaced by proposed motor vehicle use. This includes consideration for quiet recreation opportunities forest-wide.

Primitive (P) ROS opportunities exist on 238,763 acres within designated Wilderness on the Forest, which remains the same for alternatives. Outside of Wilderness, an additional 128,816 acres of SPNM class are identified on the Forest as stated in the Forest Plan. These two classes identify areas available for quiet recreation (non-motorized) on the forest.

¹ OHV Use on National Forests: Volume and characteristics of visitors. 2004

Table 3.04-2 displays the number of proposed NFTS miles within Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM) ROS class for each alternative. Alternatives 3 and 5 add no miles to the NFTS (within SPNM) and prohibit cross country travel, therefore having the least impact on the SPNM setting. Alternative 2 will not prohibit cross country travel, and therefore is most likely to result in vehicle intrusion into SPNM areas, but no miles of NFTS are added. Alternative one will add 1.7 miles, and alternative 4 would add 5.20 miles, the most of all alternatives.

Table 3.04-2 NFTS: SPNM and Cross Country Travel

Item	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5
SPNM (miles)	1.70	0	0	5.20	0
Cross country prohibition	yes	no	yes	yes	yes

In the following discussions of effects, motorized and non-motorized activities interact. It is often desirable for the two to exist together at the same location, but not necessarily at the same time. Mountain bikers may enjoy riding motorcycle trails, for instance. Many pristine non-motorized experiences are possible in Semi-Primitive and Roded Natural settings and will remain available in all alternatives to a varying extent. During low visitation periods, the forest can be remarkably quiet in all settings. Most of the changes to recreation settings occur within the Roded Natural ROS setting. These changes are site specific and vary by alternative. Refer to maps in the and summaries of specific areas in the Recreation Report (see project record).

Alternative 2 represents the current situation. Motorized use is concentrated in a few locations but is generally dispersed throughout the Forest (where not restricted). All of the other alternatives would limit OHV travel to NFTS routes, resulting in more concentrated use at those locations. Fewer riding opportunities would result in more noise and dust at those locations. Quiet recreation activities would be negatively impacted within the immediate area (¼ mile), but opportunities for quiet recreation will be expanded as areas are closed to motorized use. Table 3.04-3 shows additions to the NFTS by alternative.

Indicator Measure 2 - The number of proposed NFTS miles within proximity to populated areas or neighboring public lands.

Other federal lands adjacent to the Stanislaus National Forest are the Eldorado National Forest (north), the Sierra National Forest (south), Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest (northeast), Yosemite National Park (southeast), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (west). The ROS classes for each of the bordering National Forests vary, but are compatible with the ROS classes on the STF. ROS classes adjacent to the BLM and Yosemite National Park are not entirely compatible. Proposed changes would require coordination with them. Calaveras Big Trees State Park is located within the Forest boundary and would also require coordination for any changes.

The private lands surrounding the Stanislaus National Forest vary between very rural/sparsely populated to residential subdivisions. Potential impacts to populated areas may differ among the alternatives. The alternatives with fewer routes would possibly have a lower impact of noise, dust and physical presence near populated areas. Many adjacent residents enjoy riding directly onto Forest land from their property and would prefer to continue. Others may strongly disagree. These issues have surfaced at several locations on the Forest and are difficult to resolve.

The Wildland/Urban Interface (WUI), as defined in the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment, was used to comparatively display the relative effects of motorized activities near populated areas. The defense zone of the WUI in the Forest GIS database was used for the following table. It closely conforms to the ¼ mile distance established for noise and dust nuisance (USDA 2003b, Appendix C). Table 3.04-3 displays the number of proposed NFTS miles of road added within the WUI defense zone for each alternative. For a complete listing of routes within this zone, see the project record. Alternative 2 poses the greatest impact to populated areas, since all use, including non NFTS open

riding will continue and some new unauthorized routes will develop. Existing ML2 roads will remain open for use by all OHVs. Existing routes through private land will continue to be used without limitations unless action is taken by the owner. Alternatives 3, 4, 1 and 5 pose progressively less impact.

Table 3.04-3 Proximity of Non-Highway Legal Vehicles to Private Land

Vehicle Class	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5
ALL within ¼ mile of private	63.18	185.22	156.85	129.58	52.93
MC and ATV within ¼ mile of private	4.06	1.86	1.86	6.99	2.51
Total non-highway legal within ¼ mile of private	67.24	187.07	158.70	136.56	55.43

Indicator Measure 3 - The number of miles devoted to each vehicle class and the number of miles providing a variety of riding experiences, including loop opportunities.

The quality and diversity of riding experiences vary considerably by alternative. Routes range from high standard, surfaced roads already designated for public highway-licensed motor vehicle use, to roughly graded native surface roads and trails. A variety of riding experiences on loop systems are desirable, whether touring on roads or riding trails.

Mileages for “degree of difficulty” by trail category are presented for each riding area in Table 3.04-4. Alternatives 1 and 4 display a balance of riding opportunities. Alternative 2 would not designate additions to the NFTS but would have more miles in each category available for use.

Table 3.04-4 Additions to the NFTS: Degree of Difficulty

Degree of Difficulty	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5
Difficult	23.10	0	0	29.11	2.27
Moderate	58.64	0	0	65.63	12.06
Easy	76.05	0	0	87.38	19.63
Total	157.79	0	0	182.12	33.96

Table 3.04-5 illustrates the total motorized recreation opportunities including existing and proposed NFTS routes and existing unauthorized routes. This illustrates the net effect of all actions. Alternative 4 has the most total miles, followed by Alternative 2, 1, 3 and 5. In addition to total miles and difficulty, the geographical distribution and interconnectedness are factors that would vary by alternative. Refer to the alternative maps for specifics.

Table 3.04-5 Total Motorized Opportunities

Motorized Opportunity	Alternative				
	1	2	3	4	5
All Vehicles (ALL) Road	1387.43	1734.91	1734.91	1682.16	1226.15
Highway Licensed Only (HLO) Road	735.58	429.17	429.17	473.23	869.05
All Vehicles (ALL) Trail	136.76	61.35	61.35	198.11	83.25
All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Trail	60.05	21.00	21.00	71.95	28.48
Motorcycle (MC) Trail	71.22	12.94	12.94	74.46	26.52
Permit Only (PER) Trail	1.38	0.00	0.00	1.38	0.54
Highway Licensed Only (HLO) Trail	46.02	0.00	0.00	30.97	9.45
Total	2438.44	2259.37	2259.37	2532.26	2243.45
Combined Use Roads (CU)	16.51	0.00	0.00	18.44	0.00
Mixed Use Roads (MU)	70.56	0.00	0.00	74.79	0.00
Total	87.06	0.00	0.00	93.23	0.00
Additions to the NFTS	157.79	0.00	0.00	181.72	31.51
NFTS roads changed from closed to open	67.96	0.00	0.00	101.83	11.66
NFTS roads changed from open to closed	51.40	0.00	0.00	13.13	64.45
Net miles of change in existing NFTS routes	21.98	0	0	91.17	-47.37

Table 3.04-6 displays the total trail mileage available for each vehicle class by alternative, and those miles proposed for seasonal closure. Seasonal closures apply to alternatives 1, 4 and 5. Alternatives 2 and 3 have no additions to the NFTS.

Table 3.04-6 Additions to the NFTS: Trail Categories

Trail Category by Alternative	Season of Use	Miles
Alternative 1		
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.99
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	8.87
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	4.45
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	7.72
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	14.29
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	28.35
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	12.69
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	24.32
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.60
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	39.09
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	15.04
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) – Total all zones		13.13
Trails open to all vehicles – Total all zones		61.64
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50")		47.71
Trails open to motorcycles – Total all zones		58.26
Trails open under SUP – Total all zones		1.38
Total		157.79
Alternative 4		
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.99
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	7.90
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	4.25
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	8.09
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	20.75
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	32.80
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	13.89
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	33.82
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.60
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	42.02
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	15.64
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) – Total all zones		13.13
Trails open to all vehicles – Total all zones		61.64
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50")		47.71
Trails open to motorcycles – Total all zones		58.26
Trails open under SUP – Total all zones		1.38
Total		182.12
Alternative 5		
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	0.25
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	2.56
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	2.98
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	4.96
Trails open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	3.32
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	2.31
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50") (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	5.15
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	11.74
Trails open to motorcycles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	0.15
Trails open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) – Total all zones		2.81
Trails open to all vehicles – Total all zones		11.26
Trails open to ATVs and motorcycles (<50")		7.46
Trails open to motorcycles – Total all zones		11.89
Trails open under SUP – Total all zones		0.54
Total		33.96

Indicator Measure 4 - Number of routes or miles accessing dispersed recreation sites.

Dispersed recreation sites may be campsites or parking areas for other activities (motorized and non-motorized). Some visitors prefer the characteristics of dispersed areas, which include the lack of development, fees, regimentation, and management controls. Greater solitude and privacy are often possible at these remote locations. Visitors may prefer the freedom to engage in activities not appropriate in developed locations, such as OHV use, discharge of firearms, or bringing along a noisy dog. Some dispersed sites accommodate groups, providing the opportunity to camp close to each other, and away from others, compared to developed campgrounds. Sites that have a long history of repeated use are often special places that visitors return to over time, creating memories and traditions. Elimination of motorized access to them can be a significant change, especially to the elderly or persons with disabilities. Some traditional activities relying on proximity to the vehicle such as RV, trailer, or camper use are displaced as vehicle access is prohibited. These sites would then be available for non-motorized use with the parking relocated to the NFTS road. Existing sites in close proximity to system roads will be affected less than those at great distances. Of the estimated 1000+ routes on the forest, 256 were inventoried and included in this analysis. The average inventoried dispersed access route length is 690 feet adding up to 32 miles total. It is estimated that this is about ½ the total mileage on the Forest, since routes not analyzed are shorter in length, estimated to be an average of 200 feet. It is assumed that the majority not analyzed will be closed to motorized uses.

Table 3.04-7 Additions to the NFTS: Dispersed Access Routes

Dispersed Access Routes by Alternative	Season of Use	Miles
Alternative 1		
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.99
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	8.80
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	4.45
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.41
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Nov 30	6.03
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 30	7.15
Total		27.83
Alternatives 2 and 3		
No proposed additions to NFTS	No change	0
Alternative 4		
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.99
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	7.90
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	3.72
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.41
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 1- Dec 31	10.23
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	Apr 1- Dec 31	8.61
Total		31.96
Alternative 5		
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	0.25
Dispersed Access routes open to highway legal vehicles only (HLO) (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	2.56
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 1)	Open All Year	0.00
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 2)	Apr 15- Nov 15	1.77
Dispersed Access routes open to all vehicles (Zone 3)	May 15- Nov 15	0.74
Total		5.32

Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Motorized recreation: Of the 5 alternatives, Alternative 1 would provide the 3rd-highest motorized mileage available to all OHV use, behind alternative 2 and 4. NFTS routes would meet existing demand. Consideration has been given to accommodate a range of difficulties for motorcycles, ATVs, and four-wheel-drive vehicles and they are distributed to many different riding areas. Of the 252 miles of unauthorized route, 158 miles will be added to the NFTS. Road management will change to allow an additional 22 miles of use by OHVs, primarily to complete loop opportunities. Access to staging or trailheads is easy over good roads. Since the Forest would be closed to cross-country travel, all use is on designated routes. Season of use is more restrictive than Alternative 4, but less than 5. Although a reduction in miles occurs, this system would be more manageable and sustainable than alternatives 2 or 4 with 2,438 miles of potential opportunity in the NFTS (see project record).

The existing and proposed NFTS trails in popular OHV riding areas will see increasing use that will approach capacity within a decade. At these popular areas and heavily used NFTS routes, more noise, and dust would occur, negatively affecting quiet recreation activities for some recreationists. As demand increases for motorized activity, these effects will be felt more. At some point, controls on the amount of use may be needed. The Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.

Adjacent ownership: Routes have been selected to avoid conflict with adjacent landowners, and be compatible with adjacent public lands. This alternative includes much more HLO (ML2) compared to Alternative 2, reducing trespass.

Recreation settings and non-motorized recreation: Cross-country travel would be prohibited resulting in a smaller footprint for motorized activity and better management of the NFTS. Routes have been selected to reduce potential impact with non-motorized activities. More use would occur on the NFTS creating more noise and dust impacts near them, but other areas would become free of motorized activities. This will increase opportunities for quiet recreation away from the NFTS. 1.7 miles of motorized use are proposed within SPNM, though a Forest Plan Amendment. This will allow existing use to occur on 4N80Y (Candy Rock Rd.) and at 5N02R (Pine Needle Flat Trail)

Dispersed recreation access: 27.83 miles of existing routes are provided for motorized access, serving hundreds of campsites and other activities. Parking one vehicle length off the NFTS system would be allowed. Although the majority of the motorized routes accessing dispersed recreation sites were not analyzed in this project, they will remain available for walk-in access only.

Many recreation activities stage from a vehicle, camper, or trailer. Closure of routes will displace this activity to the parking area at the edge of the road. Fire rings, clearing of the Forest floor for tents, tables, etc. will result in new user-made campsites at many locations. Over time, proliferation of new campsites adjacent to NFTS roads would replace many of those closed to motorized access. Some existing campsites would continue to be used, especially those close to the parking area. Other campsites away from the road would be welcomed by those who prefer quiet recreation, solitude, and separation from motorized use, especially near water and other attractions. Many routes and campsites would not be used and will naturally recover (disappear) over time.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with certain past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix B (Cumulative Effects Analysis). Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily to complete loop opportunities (5 miles minimum). An analysis of unauthorized routes providing motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make other additions to the NFTS not analyzed in this analysis. Timber harvest

and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Alternative 2 (No Action)

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Motorized recreation: Of the 5 alternatives, Alternative 2 would provide the most motorized opportunities with few limitations. Of the 252 miles of existing unauthorized trails, all would remain available for use. Added to the existing NFTS road and trail miles (2,259), this alternative has a total of 2,511 miles of routes plus the cross country riding opportunity. This results in more total miles of motorized opportunity than any other alternative, including alternative 4. Season of use does not change. Existing closures would remain in effect. Weather permitting, year-round opportunities exist. Allowable uses on roads will not change. Without a prohibition on cross country riding, opportunities to pioneer new routes will exist, resulting in an estimated addition of 45 miles of user made routes over the next 20 years. Due to terrain and vegetation limitations, true motorized cross country travel opportunities are limited. Significant management challenges would occur since the extensive and growing network of routes will be difficult to monitor, maintain, and enforce. Increasing resource degradation and user conflicts would reduce the quality of the experience and could lead to closure at some locations. This alternative would be the least sustainable over time. To meet standards, it would be the most expensive and most demanding.

Adjacent ownership: This alternative would have the greatest conflict with adjacent land owners and the most incompatibility with adjacent public lands. Recreation settings and non-motorized recreation: Cross-country travel would continue unabated, potentially entering SPNM areas, creating additional resource issues in the future. This alternative has the greatest potential to negatively alter recreation settings and cause resource damage. Recreation settings in popular areas will become more dominated by OHVs and their impacts as use increases in the future. Dust, noise, and vehicle traffic, resulting from motorized use, would increase and expand to new areas on the Forest. Although use would grow and expand, it will be dispersed over much of the Forest, and be less concentrated than other alternatives. This would provide more expansive riding opportunities compared to the other alternatives. This may negatively affect the experience of recreationists engaged in non-motorized activities at unpredictable locations. This alternative would have the highest potential impact on non-motorized or quiet recreation activities.

Dispersed recreation access: Alternative 2 is the only alternative that would continue to provide motorized access to all of the existing dispersed recreation sites on the forest. An estimated 1000 of these types of routes are currently in use.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with certain past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix B (Cumulative Effects Analysis). Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily to complete loop opportunities (5 miles minimum). An analysis of unauthorized routes providing motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make other additions to the NFTS not analyzed in this analysis. Timber harvest and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Without a cross country prohibition, existing motorized use would continue to expand, creating approximately 2.25 miles of new unauthorized each year. The lack of controls and enforcement capability would encourage activities that result in resource degradation and overuse. Over time, this will affect the quality of the experience for the more responsible riders. The Forest Service would be challenged to meet standards. It therefore is the least sustainable of all alternatives. With no deterrent

to increasing use, demand would not be limited in any way by the supply of OHV opportunities. The Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.

Alternative 3 (Cross Country Prohibited)

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Motorized recreation: Alternative 3 adds no additional routes, and cross-country travel would be prohibited, eliminating use on 272 miles of unauthorized routes. No conversion of NFTS routes to non-motorized use is proposed. 2,259 miles of existing roads and trails will remain available. Existing closures would remain in effect. Motorized use will be prohibited on many of the most challenging motor cycle and ATV trails. This use would continue only at existing NFTS system locations. The quality of the recreation experience for experienced riders will be most affected. Isolated segments of existing roads do not provide a quality opportunity. These segmented sections are therefore not desirable and will receive little use by motorized riders. Existing use will be concentrated in a few desirable areas. Crowded conditions would result, negatively changing the experience and setting. This alternative is the least desirable for motorized recreation. Little thought of the recreation experience has been incorporated. Use would be limited to existing level 2 roads, which do not necessarily provide continuity or loop experience.

The few existing NFTS OHV riding areas would receive substantially greater use than in Alternatives 1 or 4. The concentration of use at these locations will change the riding experience (more congestion, dust, etc). Quiet recreation will be increasingly impacted nearby, and resource impacts concentrated. Increasingly intensive management will be required as use increases beyond a desirable level in the near future. The OHV supply and demand section of the Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.

Adjacent ownership: This alternative would have the least conflict with adjacent land owners and the most compatibility with adjacent public lands since no unauthorized routes would remain open.

Recreation settings and non-motorized recreation: Alternative 3 does not provide any additional motorized routes and prohibits cross-country travel. The recreation setting would change from a predominately motorized setting to a predominately non-motorized setting on lands currently popular for riding. This alternative would also provide the lowest potential to negatively alter recreation settings and cause resource damage. The indirect effect of displacing use to other areas is the primary impact. Outside of those few locations, dust and noise from motorized vehicles would be minimized. This alternative would result in the lowest impact to non-motorized recreation users.

Dispersed recreation: This alternative provides motorized access to the fewest number of dispersed recreation opportunities contrasting with Alternative 2 which continues all existing motorized access to dispersed campsites on the forest. All of the estimated 1000 routes will be closed to motorized travel. Parking will be limited to the shoulder of the existing roads. New campsites will be pioneered along these roads by those displaced. Campsites and special places would still be accessible to those who wish to hike or bike on the route. Dispersed campers would seek new sites in lieu of access to traditional sites which would be unavailable for motorized use. Proliferation of new campsites adjacent to parking locations along NFTS roads would occur at many locations. Demand will not be met for more difficult trail riding. Increasing demand will be focused on a limited number of riding opportunities. The quality motorized opportunities remaining on the Forest will receive a high level of use. Intensive management (permits, etc.) would be needed, since demand will soon exceed the capacity.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 4 (Recreation)

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Motorized recreation: Of the 5 alternatives, Alternative 4 would provide the 2nd-highest motorized mileage available to all OHV use, behind alternative 2. Existing demand would be met with less concentration of use. Consideration has been given to accommodate a range of difficulties for motorcycles, ATVs, and four-wheel-drive vehicles and they are distributed to many different riding areas on the Forest. Of the 252 miles of existing trails, 182 miles will be added to the NFTS. Road management will change to allow an additional 91 miles of use by OHVs, primarily to complete loop opportunities. Access to existing staging or trailheads is convenient to most areas on good roads. Since the Forest would be closed to cross-country travel, all use is on designated routes. Unlike alternative 1, some of these routes will not be a part of a loop system. Season of use is less restrictive than either alternative 1 or 5, providing more winter opportunities. Although a reduction from the existing use, this system would be more manageable and sustainable than alternatives 2, but less than 1. Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily to complete loop opportunities (5 miles minimum). Combined with the road system, 2,532 miles of potential opportunity exist, more than the other four alternatives (see project record, specialist report Appendix A).

The more extensive riding opportunities (compared to alternatives 1,3, and 5 would disperse use and likely attract more volunteers and potential funding from the OHV community. Use would concentrate at the most popular areas, but less than alternatives 1, 3, and 5. At these popular areas, and heavily used NFTS routes, more noise and dust would occur, negatively affecting quiet recreation activities for some recreationists. As demand increases for motorized activity, these effects will be felt more. At some point, controls on the amount of use may be needed as demand exceeds available supply. The OHV supply and demand section of the Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.

Adjacent ownership: Some conflicts with adjacent private land may occur with the routes selected for addition. Proposed routes are compatible with adjacent public lands. Fewer miles of HLO (ML2) than alternatives 1 or 4, increases the possibility of trespass.

Recreation settings and non-motorized recreation: Cross-country travel would be prohibited resulting in a smaller footprint for motorized activity and better management of the designated routes. Routes have been selected to maximize motorized opportunities on routes with legal access. This alternative has the 2nd greatest potential to impact non-motorized activities. Use would increase moderately on the designated routes creating more noise and dust impacts near them, but other areas would become free of motorized activities. This would increase opportunities for quiet recreation away from the proposed routes, but less than Alternatives 3, 5, or 1. A Forest Plan Amendment proposes 5.2 miles of motorized use are within SPNM. This will allow existing use to occur on 4N80Y (Candy Rock Rd.) and at 5N02R (Pine Needle Flat Trail), and 1N09 (Jawbone Flat).

Dispersed recreation access: This alternative would convert the majority of the motorized routes accessing dispersed recreation sites to non-motorized status. 31.86 miles of routes will continue to serve hundreds of campsites and other activities, slightly more than alternative 1. Many recreation activities stage from a vehicle, camper, or trailer. Closure of routes will displace this activity to the parking area at the edge of the road. Fire rings, clearing of the Forest floor for tents, tables, etc. will result in new user-made campsites at many locations. Over time, proliferation of new campsites adjacent to NFTS roads would replace many of those closed to motorized access. Some existing campsites would continue to be used, especially those close to the parking area (within a vehicle length of the NFTS route. Other campsites away from the road would be welcomed by those who prefer quiet recreation, solitude, and separation from motorized use, especially near water and other attractions. Many routes and campsites would not be used and will naturally recover (disappear) over time.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 5 (Resources)

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Motorized recreation: Of the 5 alternatives, Alternative 5 would provide the lowest motorized mileage available to all OHV use. Due to the 34 miles of addition to the NFTS, more quality riding opportunities than alternative 3 would exist. Demand in the single track and ATV trail categories would not be met. This alternative includes less than ½ the mileage of alternatives 1 and 4. Little consideration was given to accommodate a range of difficulty for OHVs on trails, and they are not well distributed to different riding areas on the Forest. Of the 252 miles of existing non-system trails, 34 miles will be added to the NFTS. Changes in use on roads reduce OHV opportunities an additional 47 miles. Few loops provide very limited riding opportunities. The quality of the recreation experience for experienced riders will be most affected. Isolated segments of existing roads do not provide a quality opportunity. Existing use will be concentrated in a few desirable areas. Crowded conditions would result, negatively changing the experience and setting. Access to staging or trailheads is convenient, but loop and system riding opportunities from them are minimal. Since the Forest would be closed to cross-country travel, all use is on designated routes. Unlike alternative 1 or 4, most of the routes will not be a part of a loop system. Season of use is more restrictive than either alternative 1 or 5, providing fewer winter opportunities. Being a substantial reduction from the existing use, this system would be more manageable and sustainable, but less likely to attract volunteers and partnerships. Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily to complete loop opportunities (5 miles minimum). Combined with the road system, 2,243 miles of potential opportunity in the NFTS is less than the other four alternatives, most of it on existing ML 2 roads (project record). The few remaining riding areas would receive substantially greater use than in Alternatives 1 or 4. The concentration of use at these locations will change the riding experience (more congestion, dust, etc). Quiet recreation will be increasingly impacted nearby, and resource impacts concentrated. Increasingly intensive management will be required as use increases beyond a desirable level in the near future. As demand exceeds supply, controls on amount of use will be required. The Recreation Report (see project record) discusses supply and demand.

Adjacent ownership: The low mileage of new routes reduces the possibility of conflict with adjacent landowners. No known conflicts with adjacent public lands exist.

Recreation settings and non-motorized recreation: Cross-country travel would be prohibited resulting in a smaller footprint for motorized activity and better management of the NFTS. This alternative has the least potential to impact non-motorized activities. Use would increase substantially on the NFTS, but other areas would become free of motorized activities. This would increase opportunities for quiet recreation away from the NFTS, similar to alternative 3. No motorized uses are proposed within SPNM areas.

Dispersed recreation access: Motorized access would be prohibited on the majority of existing routes. A total of 5.32 miles of routes will continue to provide motorized access to less than 100 campsites forestwide. Proliferation of new campsites adjacent to NFTS roads would occur. Demand will not be met for more difficult trail riding. Increasing demand will be focused on a limited number of riding opportunities. The quality motorized opportunities remaining on the Forest will receive a high level of use. Intensive management (permits, etc.) would be needed to protect the quality of the experience and resource since demand will soon exceed the capacity.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Same as Alternative 1.

Summary of Effects Analysis across all Alternatives

1. *Direct and indirect effects of the prohibition of cross country motorized vehicle travel in Alternatives 1, 3, 4 and 5.*

Direct Effects: As a result of prohibiting cross-country travel, motorized recreation riding opportunities would be reduced. In addition, access to dispersed campsites by all vehicles would be reduced. This would directly impact recreationists that rely on motorized access to their “special places”, reducing capacity for those types of use. Opportunities for some non-motorized recreation activities would be affected by the loss of access also. Some non-motorized opportunities would benefit by the action, which will improve opportunities for quiet recreation.

Indirect Effects: The recreation setting in areas that receive significant cross-country use would change from a predominately motorized environment to a predominately non-motorized environment. By default, routes not inventoried or included in this analysis will be unavailable for motorized use. Vehicles would be required to park alongside the NFTS road, often in new locations. Dispersed recreation would occur at many of these locations.

2. *Direct and indirect effects of adding facilities to the NFTS including identifying seasons of use and vehicle class in Alternatives 1, 4 and 5.*

Direct Effects: Adding facilities would continue existing riding opportunities for OHV vehicle classes, but at a reduced scale, varying by alternative. Riding opportunities decrease during seasonal closures affecting early and late-season use. Changes of vehicle class from “highway legal only (HLO) to “all vehicles” would expand recreational opportunities on the specific routes affected.

Indirect Effects: By adding these routes to the NFTS, it will be clear to all users where the motorized uses are allowed. This would facilitate enforcement. Maps and information about these routes would be valuable to new riders and make enforcement easier. Recreationists would know where to expect motorized activity in order to avoid it if they desire a quiet setting.

3. *Direct and indirect effects of changes to the existing NFTS including identifying seasons of use and vehicle class in Alternatives 1, 4 and 5.*

Direct Effects: Motorized recreation would benefit if the changes contribute to the continuity of the motor-touring experience, including access to dispersed recreation and loop trails. Motorized recreation would also benefit with the addition of routes designated for mixed use. A reduced season of use would limit early and late season access.

Indirect Effects: Changes to the volume and mixes of vehicles would occur.

Table 3.04-8 shows a summary of the effects on recreation resources across all alternatives.

Table 3.04-8 Summary of Effects for Recreation Resources

Indicator – Recreation Resources	Rankings of Alternatives for Each Indicator ¹				
	1	2	3	4	5
Proximity: Non-motorized recreation compatibility (extent of non-motorized recreation activities displaced by motor vehicle routes)	3	2	4	2	4
Proximity: non-motorized recreation compatibility (extent of non-motorized recreation activities displaced by cross-country travel)	5	1	5	5	5
Proximity: the proximity of motor vehicle use to populated areas or neighboring public lands (proposed NFTS miles in proximity to populated areas or neighboring federal lands, within the WUI)	4	1	4	3	4
Average for non motorized/quiet recreation.	4	1.3	4.3	3.3	4.3
Opportunity: the quality and diversity of motorized recreation experience (number of miles devoted to each vehicle class)	3	5	1	4	1
Opportunity: the quality of motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities (number of miles devoted to each vehicle class for access to dispersed activities)	2	5	1	3	2
Average for motorized opportunities/access	2.5	5	1	3.5	1

¹ A score of 5 indicates the alternative is the least impact for this resource; a score of 1 indicates the most impact.

Compliance with the Forest Plan and Other Direction

Alternatives 1, 4 and 5 include non-significant Forest Plan amendments making them consistent with the Forest Plan. Alternative 3 meets Forest Plan S&Gs. Alternative 2 does not comply with the Forest Plan because it allows wheeled vehicle travel off designated routes.