



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Northern Region

June 2008



Summary of Public Comments Travel Management Plan Clearwater National Forest

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact [USDA's TARGET Center](#) at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1—POLICY AND PROCESS

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Decision-making Process and Methods..... | 2 |
| 1.2 Forest Service Role and Authority..... | 3 |
| 1.3 Consistency with Laws, Rules, Policies..... | 4 |
| 1.4 Influences on Decision-making..... | 15 |
| 1.5 Decision-making Philosophy..... | 17 |
| 1.6 Public Involvement..... | 18 |
| 1.7 Use of Best Available Science..... | 23 |
| 1.8 Data Needed to Support the Process..... | 27 |
| 1.9 Agency Models..... | 30 |
| 1.10 Agency Organization, Funding and Staffing..... | 31 |

CHAPTER 2—ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION

| | |
|--|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 2.1 Scope of Proposal..... | 2 |
| 2.2 Purpose and Need..... | 4 |
| 2.3 Proposed Action..... | 6 |
| 2.4 Issues..... | 8 |
| 2.5 Interdisciplinary Team..... | 10 |
| 2.6 Document..... | 10 |
| 2.7 Maps..... | 13 |
| 2.8 Forest Plan..... | 15 |
| 2.9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement..... | 19 |
| 2.10 Analysis Needed to Support the Process..... | 21 |
| 2.11 Cumulative Effects..... | 27 |
| 2.12 Alternatives..... | 28 |
| 2.13 Mitigation..... | 41 |
| 2.14 Implementation..... | 42 |

CHAPTER 3—NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 3.1 Natural Resources Concerns (General)..... | 2 |
| 3.2 Global Warming..... | 4 |
| 3.3 Noise..... | 4 |
| 3.4 Visual Resources Management..... | 5 |
| 3.5 Monitoring..... | 5 |
| 3.6 Enforcement..... | 6 |
| 3.7 Water Management..... | 7 |
| 3.8 Wildlife..... | 8 |
| 3.9 Aquatic Ecosystems..... | 15 |
| 3.10 Listed Species..... | 16 |
| 3.11 Range Management..... | 18 |
| 3.12 Noxious Weed Management..... | 18 |
| 3.13 Timber Management..... | 19 |
| 3.14 Fire and Fuels Management..... | 19 |
| 3.15 Heritage Resource Management..... | 19 |

CHAPTER 4—TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

| | |
|--|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 4.1 Roads and Trails..... | 2 |
| 4.2 Roads Management..... | 19 |
| 4.3 Trails Management..... | 22 |
| 4.4 Over-snow Travel..... | 39 |
| 4.5 Transportation Related Structures..... | 48 |
| 4.6 Maps..... | 50 |

CHAPTER 5—RECREATION

| | |
|--|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 5.1 Recreation..... | 2 |
| 5.2 Dispersed/Undeveloped Recreation..... | 9 |
| 5.3 Motorized Recreation..... | 10 |
| 5.4 Mechanized Recreation (Bicycles)..... | 12 |
| 5.5 Motorized and Mechanized Recreation..... | 13 |
| 5.6 Non-motorized and Mechanized Recreation..... | 14 |
| 5.7 Non-motorized Recreation..... | 14 |
| 5.8 Winter Recreation..... | 15 |
| 5.9 Multiple/Combined Uses..... | 15 |
| 5.10 Environmental Impacts..... | 18 |

CHAPTER 6—LANDS AND SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 6.1 Public Lands Ownership..... | 2 |
| 6.2 Lands Acquisition and Exchange..... | 2 |
| 6.3 Special Designations..... | 2 |
| 6.4 Remote Backcountry..... | 3 |
| 6.5 Inventoried Roadless Areas..... | 3 |
| 6.6 Recommended Wilderness..... | 4 |
| 6.7 Designated Wilderness..... | 9 |
| 6.8 Research Natural Areas..... | 10 |
| 6.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers..... | 10 |
| 6.10 Other Designations..... | 10 |

CHAPTER 7—SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Summary..... | 1 |
| 7.1 Social..... | 2 |
| 7.2 Economic..... | 5 |

APPENDIX A—ACRONYMS

APPENDIX B—SITE-SPECIFIC ROUTE SUGGESTIONS

APPENDIX C—ATTACHMENTS

APPENDIX D—FORM LETTERS

APPENDIX E—CODING STRUCTURE

APPENDIX F—PREPARERS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Document

This document is a summary of public comments received in response to the issuance of the Clearwater National Forest travel planning proposed action that was issued November 28, 2007. The “scoping” comment period began with the release of the proposed action and concluded February 29, 2008. Comments received after February 29 will be considered in the development of the draft environmental impact statement; however, they are not reflected in this report.

This report was written for multiple audiences and purposes. It is believed this report will provide valuable information about people’s concerns and ideas to the Forest’s interdisciplinary team and decision-maker so they can identify and refine issues and develop alternatives that are responsive to them. The document is also written for the respondents so they can be assured their responses were read and considered. The report will also provide commenters with a snapshot of the diversity of public opinion, the passion associated with the topic of travel management and the complexity of the issues.

While this report is an important compilation of information and ideas, it is important to remember that respondents are self-selected; therefore, this report does not necessarily represent the views of the public as a whole.

Content Analysis Process

The content analysis process used in this project was developed by a specialized Forest Service unit located in Salt Lake city, Utah. It has been used on many agency projects, particularly those that are large and complex.

This method employs both qualitative and quantitative approaches. It involves reading each comment, isolating specific comments by topic, evaluating similar comments from different responses and summarizing like comments as concern statements. The process also provides a relational database capable of reporting various types of information while linking comments to original letters.

Through the content analysis process analysts strive to identify all relevant issues, not just those represented by the majority of respondents. The breadth, depth and rationale of each comment are especially important. In addition to identifying relevant factual input, analysts try to capture the emotion and strength of public sentiment behind particular viewpoints in order to represent people’s viewpoints and concerns as fairly as possible.

The process is not used to determine whether or not a comment is relevant to the project or whether or not a comment is factual. Those determinations will be made the interdisciplinary team and line officer as they use the content analysis report to develop issues that will frame the alternatives.

It is important to note that the content analysis process used to analyze comments makes no attempt to treat input as if it were a vote; instead, the process is used to ensure that every comment is considered at some point in the decision-making process.

Document Overview

This report is a comprehensive summary of the information, issues and ideas submitted in response to the Clearwater National Forest's travel planning proposal. The report attempts to organize the information in seven chapters: (1) Policy and Process, (2) Environmental Analysis and Documentation, (3) Natural Resource Management, (4) Transportation System, (5) Recreation, (6) Lands and Special Designations, and (7) Social and Economic Considerations.

Most ideas didn't fit neatly into a single category, so readers may find similar thoughts in more multiple chapters. Where a comment appears often depends upon context that may not be included in this report. Since the options for grouping and displaying the information are countless, there was no perfect structure for the report.

For easy reference, chapters, topics and subtopics are numbered. It is important to track the progression of the headings to fully understand the context of a comment. Following the numbered headings readers will see **bolded statements** referred to as "public concern statements." These are the agency's interpretation of the action requested by the commenter.

The public concern statement is followed by a supporting quotation that is *italicized*. There may be more than one quotation to indicate that the idea was presented in multiple responses and/or to display the nuances associated with the concern. Attempts were made to present quotations in a manner that is fair and that represents the various perspectives. Quotes were not "sanitized." In some cases they were specifically selected so readers could understand the passion associated with an issue.

The quotations are followed by a string of information inside of parentheses. First is the type of group with whom the commenter identified themselves (if any), where the commenter is from, and the response number. When "no address" is listed, the respondent likely e-mailed the comment and did not provide a city and town.

Acronyms were commonly used by commenters. While their comments were not altered to explain the acronyms, a guide to acronyms used in this report is included in Appendix A.

Demographics

Through February 29, 2008, the Forest received 4492 comments in response to the proposed action. A total of 750 were determined to be duplicate comments. Duplicate comments are received when an individual sends a comment through multiple methods (hand deliver, mail, e-mail and/or fax) to ensure the comment is received before the deadline. Other commenters send comments more than one time because they mistakenly believe it is a vote and the more times it is sent, the more it will count.

Of the remaining 3742 comments, 3021 were identified as form letters. Forms are often created and posted on a website so others can cut-and-paste content from them into a communication to the Forest Service. Other form letters are distributed by hand. The Forest identified seven form letters. They are displayed in Appendix D.

Finally, 721 responses were determined to be "unique," composed without incorporating paragraphs from a form letter. Many of these letters expressed similar ideas that were indicative that a high degree of networking occurred as responses were composed.

Responses were received from all 50 states and one indicated that its origin was New Zealand, though no physical address was provided. Most comments originated from the immediate area, with 779 from Washington, 588 from Idaho, 471 from Oregon and 398 from Montana. California residents submitted 509 comments.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Document

This document is a summary of public comments received in response to the issuance of the Clearwater National Forest travel planning proposed action that was issued November 28, 2007. The “scoping” comment period began with the release of the proposed action and concluded February 29, 2008. Comments received after February 29 will be considered in the development of the draft environmental impact statement; however, they are not reflected in this report.

This report was written for multiple audiences and purposes. It is believed this report will provide valuable information about people’s concerns and ideas to the Forest’s interdisciplinary team and decision-maker so they can identify and refine issues and develop alternatives that are responsive to them. The document is also written for the respondents so they can be assured their responses were read and considered. The report will also provide commenters with a snapshot of the diversity of public opinion, the passion associated with the topic of travel management and the complexity of the issues.

While this report is an important compilation of information and ideas, it is important to remember that respondents are self-selected; therefore, this report does not necessarily represent the views of the public as a whole.

Content Analysis Process

The content analysis process used in this project was developed by a specialized Forest Service unit located in Salt Lake city, Utah. It has been used on many agency projects, particularly those that are large and complex.

This method employs both qualitative and quantitative approaches. It involves reading each comment, isolating specific comments by topic, evaluating similar comments from different responses and summarizing like comments as concern statements. The process also provides a relational database capable of reporting various types of information while linking comments to original letters.

Through the content analysis process analysts strive to identify all relevant issues, not just those represented by the majority of respondents. The breadth, depth and rationale of each comment are especially important. In addition to identifying relevant factual input, analysts try to capture the emotion and strength of public sentiment behind particular viewpoints in order to represent people’s viewpoints and concerns as fairly as possible.

The process is not used to determine whether or not a comment is relevant to the project or whether or not a comment is factual. Those determinations will be made the interdisciplinary team and line officer as they use the content analysis report to develop issues that will frame the alternatives.

It is important to note that the content analysis process used to analyze comments makes no attempt to treat input as if it were a vote; instead, the process is used to ensure that every comment is considered at some point in the decision-making process.

Document Overview

This report is a comprehensive summary of the information, issues and ideas submitted in response to the Clearwater National Forest's travel planning proposal. The report attempts to organize the information in seven chapters: (1) Policy and Process, (2) Environmental Analysis and Documentation, (3) Natural Resource Management, (4) Transportation System, (5) Recreation, (6) Lands and Special Designations, and (7) Social and Economic Considerations.

Most ideas didn't fit neatly into a single category, so readers may find similar thoughts in more multiple chapters. Where a comment appears often depends upon context that may not be included in this report. Since the options for grouping and displaying the information are countless, there was no perfect structure for the report.

For easy reference, chapters, topics and subtopics are numbered. It is important to track the progression of the headings to fully understand the context of a comment. Following the numbered headings readers will see **bolded statements** referred to as "public concern statements." These are the agency's interpretation of the action requested by the commenter.

The public concern statement is followed by a supporting quotation that is *italicized*. There may be more than one quotation to indicate that the idea was presented in multiple responses and/or to display the nuances associated with the concern. Attempts were made to present quotations in a manner that is fair and that represents the various perspectives. Quotes were not "sanitized." In some cases they were specifically selected so readers could understand the passion associated with an issue.

The quotations are followed by a string of information inside of parentheses. First is the type of group with whom the commenter identified themselves (if any), where the commenter is from, and the response number. When "no address" is listed, the respondent likely e-mailed the comment and did not provide a city and town.

Acronyms were commonly used by commenters. While their comments were not altered to explain the acronyms, a guide to acronyms used in this report is included in Appendix A.

Demographics

Through February 29, 2008, the Forest received 4492 comments in response to the proposed action. A total of 750 were determined to be duplicate comments. Duplicate comments are received when an individual sends a comment through multiple methods (hand deliver, mail, e-mail and/or fax) to ensure the comment is received before the deadline. Other commenters send comments more than one time because they mistakenly believe it is a vote and the more times it is sent, the more it will count.

Of the remaining 3742 comments, 3021 were identified as form letters. Forms are often created and posted on a website so others can cut-and-paste content from them into a communication to the Forest Service. Other form letters are distributed by hand. The Forest identified seven form letters. They are displayed in Appendix D.

Finally, 721 responses were determined to be "unique," composed without incorporating paragraphs from a form letter. Many of these letters expressed similar ideas that were indicative that a high degree of networking occurred as responses were composed.

Responses were received from all 50 states and one indicated that its origin was New Zealand, though no physical address was provided. Most comments originated from the immediate area, with 779 from Washington, 588 from Idaho, 471 from Oregon and 398 from Montana. California residents submitted 509 comments.

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 1—POLICY AND PROCESS | 1 |
| Summary | 1 |
| 1.1 Decision-making Process and Methods..... | 2 |
| 1.1.1 Decision-making..... | 2 |
| 1.1.2 Process..... | 2 |
| 1.2 Forest Service Role and Authority | 3 |
| 1.2.1 Coordination/Consultation | 3 |
| 1.3 Consistency with Laws, Rules, Policies | 4 |
| 1.3.1 Laws | 4 |
| 1.3.1.1 General | 4 |
| 1.3.1.2 Multiple Laws..... | 5 |
| 1.3.1.3 Accessibility Laws..... | 5 |
| 1.3.1.4 Clean Water Act | 5 |
| 1.3.1.5 Endangered Species Act | 5 |
| 1.3.1.6 Equal Opportunity Laws..... | 6 |
| 1.3.1.7 National Environmental Policy Act..... | 6 |
| 1.3.1.8 National Historic Preservation Act..... | 7 |
| 1.3.1.9 Recreational Trails Laws..... | 7 |
| 1.3.1.10 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act..... | 7 |
| 1.3.1.11 Wilderness Act | 7 |
| 1.3.2 Executive Orders | 8 |
| 1.3.2.1 Executive Orders 11644 & 11989 (Use of Off-road Vehicles on Public Lands) | 8 |
| 1.3.2.2 Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice)..... | 9 |
| 1.3.2.3 Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species) | 9 |
| 1.3.3 Regulations..... | 9 |
| 1.3.3.1 Department Regulations | 9 |
| 1.3.3.2 Agency Regulations..... | 9 |
| 1.3.4 Rules..... | 10 |
| 1.3.4.1 Travel Management Rule | 10 |
| 1.3.4.2 Roadless Rule | 11 |
| 1.3.5 Policies and Mission..... | 11 |
| 1.3.5.1 General | 11 |
| 1.3.5.2 Mission | 12 |
| 1.3.5.3 Recommended Wilderness Guidance | 12 |
| 1.3.5.4 Road Management Policy..... | 13 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.3.6 Forest Plan | 13 |
| 1.3.6.1 1987 Forest Plan | 13 |
| 1.3.6.2 Forest Plan Settlement Agreement | 15 |
| 1.4 Influences on Decision-making | 15 |
| 1.4.1 General | 15 |
| 1.4.1.1 Conflict | 16 |
| 1.4.1.2 Local versus Non-local | 16 |
| 1.4.1.3 Majority | 16 |
| 1.4.1.4 Personal Agendas | 16 |
| 1.4.2 Interest Groups | 17 |
| 1.4.2.1 Environmental Groups..... | 17 |
| 1.4.2.2 Hikers | 17 |
| 1.4.2.3 Motorized Users | 17 |
| 1.5 Decision-making Philosophy..... | 17 |
| 1.5.1 Management | 17 |
| 1.5.1.1 Active Management..... | 18 |
| 1.5.1.2 Multiple-use Management..... | 18 |
| 1.5.2 Protection..... | 18 |
| 1.6 Public Involvement..... | 18 |
| 1.6.1 General | 18 |
| 1.6.2 Agency Communication..... | 19 |
| 1.6.2.1 Content | 19 |
| 1.6.2.2 Methods | 19 |
| 1.6.3 Methods | 19 |
| 1.6.3.1 Fairness..... | 19 |
| 1.6.3.2 Meetings | 20 |
| 1.6.3.3 Methods | 20 |
| 1.6.4 Collaboration..... | 21 |
| 1.6.4.1 Collaborate with All | 21 |
| 1.6.4.2 Collaborate with Specific Groups..... | 21 |
| 1.6.4.3 Challenges | 22 |
| 1.6.5 Comment Period..... | 22 |
| 1.6.6 Use of Public Comments | 23 |
| 1.7 Use of Best Available Science | 23 |
| 1.7.1 General | 23 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.7.1.1 Endangered Species..... | 23 |
| 1.7.1.2 Fisheries and Wildlife..... | 23 |
| 1.7.1.3 Mountain Biking..... | 24 |
| 1.7.1.4 Peer Review..... | 24 |
| 1.7.2 Best Science Doesn't Support Proposed Action..... | 24 |
| 1.7.2.1 Effects of Motorized Travel on Natural Resources..... | 24 |
| 1.7.2.2. Effects of Motorized Travel on Fish and Wildlife..... | 25 |
| 1.7.2.3 Effects of Motorized Travel on the Great Burn..... | 25 |
| 1.7.3 Suggested Sources of Best Science..... | 26 |
| 1.7.3.1 Natural Resources (General)..... | 26 |
| 1.7.3.2 Wildlife..... | 26 |
| 1.8 Data Needed to Support the Process..... | 27 |
| 1.8.1 Transportation System..... | 27 |
| 1.8.2 Fish and Wildlife..... | 29 |
| 1.8.3 Cultural and Social..... | 30 |
| 1.9 Agency Models..... | 30 |
| 1.10 Agency Organization, Funding and Staffing..... | 31 |
| 1.10.1 Funding..... | 31 |
| 1.10.1.1 General..... | 31 |
| 1.10.1.2 Enforcement..... | 31 |
| 1.10.1.3 Trails..... | 31 |
| 1.10.2 Staffing..... | 32 |
| 1.10.2.1 General..... | 32 |
| 1.10.2.2 Volunteers..... | 33 |

CHAPTER 1—POLICY AND PROCESS

Summary

The Process and Policy chapter presents commenters' concerns with and ideas about the overall travel management planning process. Some of the concerns are philosophical in nature, while many are very specific to the process.

Generally respondents were in agreement regarding the decision-making process and methods. People of all persuasions desired a fair and transparent process. And they wanted an opportunity to shape the ultimate outcome.

Many questions were raised regarding the authority of the Clearwater National Forest to restrict motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wilderness. While some praised the agency's proposal as forward thinking and necessary to protect the character of potential wilderness lands, others believed this level of restriction was not necessary to preserve options for future wilderness designation. They thought the proposal created "defacto" wilderness, circumventing Congress. They pointed out that only Congress, not the Forest Service, has the authority to designate Wilderness.

There were many comments regarding compliance with laws, regulations and policies. Most made very specific observations or suggestions regarding laws, regulations, policies or Forest Plan direction with which the agency should comply. Most commonly cited were the National Environmental Policy Act, Wilderness Act and Forest Plan standards.

Respondents tended to be concerned about influences on decision making. Since local respondents are generally more directly affected by the outcome, some commenters believed local respondents should have more influence on the final decision. Many expressed concern about the abilities of interest groups to influence the decision. Particular concern was expressed about the persuasive abilities of environmentalists and motorized users.

In the area of public involvement, many commenters wanted a fair process and they suggested methods that would better suit their needs or the needs of their groups. Most respondents indicated a willingness to collaborate, though challenges associated with the collaborative process were stated.

Many opinions were expressed regarding the best available science. Some contended there wasn't science to support the proposed action. Respondents identified a number of specific data needs. While there was a wide variety of opinion regarding the best sources of science, there was almost universal agreement that the Forest Service needed to work from and provide the best data and science available to support the travel management process and resulting decisions.

Finally, many respondents expressed concern about funding for travel management, including maintenance. Some saw restrictions as the answer to increasing maintenance costs; others believed continued use was the mechanism to securing funding and volunteer maintenance. Respondents presented many ideas for utilizing and enhancing agency budgets including tax revenue, grants and partnerships.

1.1 Decision-making Process and Methods

1.1.1 Decision-making

The Clearwater National Forest should respect the public's trust in making decisions.

Please respect the trust the public places in you for the decisions you make. It seems too few within the USFS appreciate that trust as evidenced by outcomes harbored in personal agendas. (Individual, FAIR OAKS, CA—1562)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the rights of citizens when making the decision.

I feel my rights as a tax paying citizen are being taken away from me, every time the Forest Service closes more land to motorized vehicles, just to reserve it for non motorized users. (Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—929)

The Clearwater National Forest should establish wildlife and recreation values as priorities for making travel management decisions.

One key issue that was briefly discussed in our meeting that we would like to reiterate is the specification of criteria and prioritization of factors to be considered during the road and trail designation process. The travel rule already requires that the Forest Service consider the impacts that designations will have on wildlife and other resources, and we would encourage you to prioritize important wildlife and recreation values as a lens to make all route designation decisions through. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—6)

The Clearwater National Forest should establish a multiple-use review board to oversee the decision-making process.

We request a multiple-use Review Board be established to assure that the decision-making reflects the multiple-use management goals and needs of the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.1.2 Process

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct a fair process.

At the workshops attendees were told to submit their comments on the RWA closures, although every one of the forest staff there knew that any recommendation to leave those areas open would be ignored. We find this entire process, from the unwritten policy, to the Tidwell letter and the conduct of the workshops, unacceptable. We certainly don't always expect to prevail but in this instance, we can't! The cards are simply stacked against us. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose the influences of other planning processes.

The forest watershed and viewshed planning process(es) tend to influence motorized access and motorized recreation in an undisclosed manner that is deceiving the public. Adequate public disclosure in these cases would require direct means of communication with motorized recreationists to inform them of the potential changes that will result from the respective plan(s). (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

If the agency wants to avoid tripping several serious process flaws, it must disclose all of the various planning projects underway and describe how each may or may not affect the other. Forest visitors who are directly affected by the Travel Plan must be able to compare and contrast the proposed action and alternatives and understand future likely scenarios that may occur under

ALL of the agency's various planning efforts if they are to understand what impacts the decision making will have on their activities. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate a peer review into the process.

We request that an adequate peer review plan and process be used for all impact analyses and include experts that are neutral about motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a training protocol as part of the travel planning process.

BRC requests that you address any legitimate funding concerns by incorporating a training protocol into your travel plan that would train agency staff on how to apply for grants, use the challenge cost share program, effectively manage volunteer programs and learn about and apply for other funding sources. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

1.2 Forest Service Role and Authority

The Clearwater National Forest does not have the authority to make proposed changes.

Management policy changes this broad and far reaching need the value of public participation, stakeholder agreement and Congressional action not simply administrative decisions. (Individual, SEELEY LAKE, MT—2558)

Gentlemen, how and by whose authority, can employees of the Forest Service, close public lands to citizens? Without open to the public hearings on this, I cannot believe this can possibly be legal! (Individual, NO ADDRESS—3403)

The Clearwater National Forest does not have the authority to designate Wilderness through the travel management process.

This is really a disgusting example of usurping powers you don't have the right to usurp. Congress makes wilderness areas not the FS. (Individual, REXBURG, ID—1598)

Congress can only move this area into Wilderness by law! Please provide in writing what law gives you the right to manage this area as wilderness and limited the public access to this area? (Recreation Group, BILLINGS, MT—1624)

I strongly oppose your plan to try to manage RWA areas to exclude motorized uses, the Forest Service is trying to do an end run around Congress and create de facto Wilderness which is illegal. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2925)

I oppose additional Federal land closures anywhere. In 1964 Congress said that only Congress can designate Wilderness and frankly I am sick and tired of local FS-BLM officials usurping that authority and declaring emergence closures and "wilderness study" areas and managing them as if they were already "wilderness". This bypasses the check and balance system set up by congress, where the people/voters have control. (Individual, POCATELLO, ID—1779)

1.2.1 Coordination/Consultation

The Clearwater National Forest should coordinate with adjacent national forests and the Bureau of Land Management.

There needs to be better coordination between adjoining National Forest and BLM lands when making maps, laying out trails, and establishing travel plans. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should coordinate with adjacent national forests.

The travel plan should also take into account other possible closures in adjacent and nearby national forests. Decisions on the Lolo, Bitterroot and other forests directly impact the Clearwater because they form a larger, regional picture of mountain bicycling. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

The Clearwater National Forest should coordinate with Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

The Forest Service should consult with IDFG on any Forest Plan amendments that effect resource-related standards and have the potential to impact those resources managed by IDFG. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should coordinate with Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation looks forward to participating in this Travel Planning process as a cooperating agency. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage in a manner that is consistent with the Treaty of 1855.

The federal government has a fiduciary responsibility to uphold the Treaty of 1855 with the Nez Perce Tribe. By opening up these areas (Pot Mountain, Fish and Hungry Creeks, and the Lochsa area) to development for of road vehicles, the United States Forest Service is facilitating the degradation of treaty reserved resources within these habitats. (Tribal, PULLMAN, WA—4395)

1.3 Consistency with Laws, Rules, Policies

1.3.1 Laws

1.3.1.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should limit the number of new rules or laws.

Try to be discriminate when considering rules or laws. The degree of sanity available in any given society or culture is inversely proportional to number of "laws" in effect in that group. (Individual, LACLEDE, ID—4199)

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct a legal travel management planning effort.

Simply put this default land closure proposal is unlawful at best. This is nothing more than another abuse of tax paying citizens (who are the real owners of this property) by politicians eager to please a small but well oiled and funded "green" political machine. It needs to be soundly rejected just on principle alone! (Individual, HEWITT, NJ—4352)

I would urge the Planning Team to develop a fair and balanced plan that recognizes the need and legal requirement to provide recreational opportunities for motorized users as well as non-motorized users. (Individual, GRAHAM, WA—2434)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict all trails until it complies with all laws.

The so-called current situation, as represented in the scoping list and scoping map (and even the past guides), ignores the executive orders on ORVs and the direction in the forest plan. Policy and regulations are clear; the default position, absent NEPA and the analysis of minimizing damage and conflict as required by the executive orders, is that trails and areas are to be closed until compliance with the law can be assured. (Preservation/Conservation, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.1.2 Multiple Laws

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Multiple-use Sustained Yield Act, National Forest Management Act and other laws by changing its definition of sustainability.

The proposed alternative wrongly assumes that the "sustained yield" mandates of MUSYA (Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act) and NFMA (National Forest Management Act) require "sustainability." Thus, the proposed alternative expands the concept of sustained yield . . . "Sustained yield" under the MUSYA simply means the maintenance of a regular output of several renewable resources. . . .

. . . the proposed alternative wrongly assumes that all sustainability must be predicated upon ecological sustainability. The proposed alternative assumes that sustainability (or sustained yield) of any sort cannot be achieved without first achieving ecological sustainability. However, this assumption is false. While biological diversity undisputedly affects certain legitimate uses of National Forests, it is not essential to multiple use and sustained yield, as defined by the MUSYA.

. . .

. . . in addition to not following the mandates of the Organic Act, MUSYA, and NFMA, the document states that the enactment of various other laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"), the Clean Air Act ("CAA") and the Clean Water Act ("CWA") reinforce ecological sustainability as the first priority of National Forest system management." Again, this is incorrect; none of these statutes in anyway change the mandates for the management of National Forests. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Federal Land Policy and Management and Multiple-use Sustained-yield Acts by closing fewer roads and trails.

A significant closing of roads and motorized trails in the project area is not consistent with meeting the needs of the public and the goals of Multiple-Use Management as directed under Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 and P.L. 88-657. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.1.3 Accessibility Laws

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with laws regarding accessibility at federal sites by balancing resource protection and the need for accessibility.

We request that the proposed action adequately address and comply with recommendations of the study conducted to address P.L. 105-359 including items 1 and 7. Clarify the balance between resource protection and accessibility. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.1.4 Clean Water Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Clean Water Act by obtaining National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits.

The Forest must evaluate, analyze and disclose information on pollutants that will result from the Travel Plan. The Forest must then ask the U.S. EPA for a NPDES permit or several NPDES permits to comply with the CWA. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

1.3.1.5 Endangered Species Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Endangered Species Act by consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Section(s) 7 and 9 of the ESA requires that the Forest Service consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and ensure that the Forest's actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. The ESA also

requires that the Forest Service take proactive steps under the affirmative duty obligation of ESA section 7(a)(1). (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

1.3.1.6 Equal Opportunity Laws

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with equal opportunity laws by providing equal opportunities for all recreationists.

Equal access laws also apply to motorized recreationists and provide for equal access to both an equal level of opportunities and an equal quality of opportunities. Our laws do not give non-motorized recreationists priority over motorized recreationists. Our laws also set the precedent that public facilities must be reasonably shared with one another. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.1.7 National Environmental Policy Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by providing a true range of alternatives.

The Proposed Action indicates the EIS that is to be prepared is not likely to comply with NEPA as it will examine only variation on one concept: reducing mileage available to motorized access. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act in developing the 2005 Travel Guide.

The 2005 Travel Guide is a special order drawn up to address environmental concerns. There was never an NEPA process accomplished and therefore all temporary changes will require evaluation under NEPA. The special order is not in compliance with 36 CFR 212.52.2 (2005 rule). (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by analyzing the cumulative effects.

We request an adequate evaluation of the significant cumulative loss in miles, acres, and quality of motorized recreation and access opportunities within public lands as required under 40 CFR 1508.7 and 1508.25, and guidelines published by the Council on Environmental Quality "Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act." (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by gathering local economic data.

CBU requests that during your gathering of economic data as required by the NEPA process that you comply with the CEQ requirement and attempt to survey those businesses that will be, or could be affected by the Clearwater Travel Plan and specifically by any proposed closures you may have to multiple use in the final decision. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by involving motorized users.

We request that the travel management process seek out and document the needs of all motorized visitors including those who traditionally use the primitive roads and trails, plus the handicapped, elderly, and physically impaired as required under 40CFR 1506.6 (a). (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by limiting the number of pages in environmental documents.

The agency is ignoring the page limit guidance (according to Council on Environmental Quality regulations for the proper implementation of NEPA) and the documents produced are way beyond what the public can process. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Environmental Policy Act by conducting the proper analysis for Kelly Creek Trail 567 and Weitas Creek Trail 20.

Both Trails 567 and 20 were opened to motorcycles without going through the NEPA process and consequently Trail 20 has had over 10 years of use by motorcycles riders. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

1.3.1.8 National Historic Preservation Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the National Historic Preservation Act by conducting cultural surveys.

Full surveys of cultural or archaeological resources should be completed in conjunction with the NEPA analysis of effects and in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.1.9 Recreational Trails Laws

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with laws regarding the use of Recreation Trails Program funds by spending the funds appropriately.

One source of funding for trail construction, reconstruction and maintenance on Forest Service lands comes from the Recreational Trails Programs (RTP). According to the FHA, use of these funds are not permitted to be used for "upgrading, expanding, or otherwise facilitating motorized use or access to recreational trails predominantly used by non-motorized recreational trail users and on which, as of May 1, 1991, motorized use was prohibited or had not occurred." 23 U.S.C. ## 206 (g)(4). Please ensure that use of these funds complies with this mandate. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

1.3.1.10 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by restricting off-road vehicle use in wild and scenic river corridors.

The travel plan should be consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the comprehensive management plan for each WSR segment (e.g. dispersed campsites along WSRs should not degrade WSR characteristics). In essence, ORV use in wild and scenic river corridors is inconsistent with the law. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.1.11 Wilderness Act

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Wilderness Act by allowing Congress to designate Wildernesses.

Areas deemed in need of Wilderness protection may be presented to Congress for consideration through the established public review and comment procedures. To circumvent that process and make decisions without public review is not within the authority of the U.S. Forest Service. (Individual, DENVER, CO—1940)

Rulemaking agencies cannot create areas that are wilderness in all but name. Wilderness study areas and non-motorized areas are managed as wilderness areas and are simply a mechanism to evade the measures set forth in the Wilderness Act. If these lands are important wilderness-type lands, then the agency must follow the laws set forth in the Wilderness Act (Public Law 88-577 - 16 U.S.C. 1131-1136) (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

On your website you state that both motorized and mechanized use will be removed from Forest Service Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWA). CBU (Citizens for Balanced Use) feels that only Congress can designate Wilderness areas and for the FS to restrict motorized and mechanized in RWAs areas without the authority of Congress is circumventing the law (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize snowmobile and mechanized uses are not incompatible with provisions of the Wilderness Act.

The Wilderness Act directs "these areas shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness"

Back country snowmobiling will not, and does not, impair future use and enjoyment as wilderness.

It is also my understanding it is only the Region 1 Forest District that is establishing guidelines to exclude mechanized use in a designated area.

There is no quantifying argument that snowmobiles negatively impact a designated Wilderness area. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2917)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Wilderness Act by considering case law.

In Montana Wilderness Assoc. VS US Forest Service it was found that Congress required the FS to strike and maintain a balance between wilderness and motorized use. I need an explanation how you folks can ignore the law whenever you want to do so. What you are doing is illegal and against the middle class working people's wishes. (Individual, DELTA, CO—3516)

1.3.2 Executive Orders

1.3.2.1 Executive Orders 11644 & 11989 (Use of Off-road Vehicles on Public Lands)

The Clearwater National Forest should revise Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 to provide "equitable guidance."

We request that revisions to Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 be made in order to return equitable guidance to federal land-use managers. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 by conducting proper analyses and closing trails where potential for resource damage exists.

Presidents Nixon and Carter recognized the threats to public lands from unmanaged off-road vehicle use They issued two Executive Orders (#11644 and #11989) that guide off-road vehicle use to this day. The Forest Service has failed in its duty to American citizens by ignoring the mandates in the executive orders. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

Agency documents, both present and past, are inconsistent. This had led to an informal policy of if, at any time, an area has not been clearly and formally closed to any type of ORV use, it shall be open to all ORV use. Again, the default position is open unless expressly closed. Such a policy is directly in conflict with the executive orders which mandate trails be open only where conflicts and resource damage do not occur, after appropriate analysis. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.2.2 Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Executive Order 12898 by providing more opportunities for motorized recreationists.

We believe that federal environmental justice compliance requirements as initiated by Executive Order 12898 should be applied immediately to correct the disproportionately significant and adverse impacts that motorized recreationists have been subjected to. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The efforts to involve motorized recreationists in the process using unique methods as required by the environmental justice regulations have not happened. The process must allow for and accommodate that needs of citizens and families who, for the most part, act and live independently and are not organized to the level of environmental organizations. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.2.3 Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Executive Order 13112 by restricting travel on roads and trails that serve as weed vectors.

The Forest Service should also comply with the executive order on noxious weeds (EO 13112), by limiting roads and trails that serve as vectors for the spread of these species. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.3 Regulations

1.3.3.1 Department Regulations

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with department regulations by conducting the stipulated social analysis.

Social issues must be adequately evaluated per the SOCIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS (SIA): PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES TRAINING COURSE . . . and Environmental Justice issues per Departmental Regulation 5600-2. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.3.2 Agency Regulations

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with agency regulations by providing for community stability.

36 CFR 221.3(a)(3) states that the FS is obligated to consider and provide for "community stability" ("community stability" is defined as a combination of local customs, culture and economic preservation) in its decision making process. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—4380)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with agency regulations by signing closed routes.

I found the Forest Supervisor's decision on signing inconsistent with Federal regulations which require signage for closed routes, not open ones. The Forest Supervisor is directed to manage motor vehicle travel as restricted to designated routes unless signed or physically closed. Vehicle restriction must be processed in accordance with 36 CFR 261.50 and posted in accordance with 36 CFR 261.51. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.4 Rules

1.3.4.1 Travel Management Rule

The Forest Service is on track with the final rule for travel management.

I support the Final Travel Rule for Travel Management, limiting designated routes to not include user created routes, the prohibition of game retrieval off roads and trails and closing motorized use on all closed roads. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Forest Service should change the focus of the travel management rule.

. . . we have seen a significant problem arise because of the focus of the OHV Rule- to designate roads, trails and areas for use by ATVs, 4X4x, dirt bikes, and other types of motorized vehicles. This route-by-route pattern sets false expectations, creates needless conflict and ignores many other very valuable natural resources in national forest. In the end, we fear that this will lead to a less reasoned and informed decision. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—9)

The Clearwater National Forest should adapt the national travel management rule to account for site-specific conditions.

National OHV criteria and standards are not entirely applicable to conditions in the Clearwater National Forest The analysis needs to allow for judgment on site specific conditions so that the decision is a better match for local conditions and customs which center on motorized access and motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with various aspects of the travel management rule.

Specific references to the new National OHV Policy that must be adequately addressed include: The unit or district restricts motor vehicles to "existing" routes, including user-created routes which may or may not be inventoried and have not yet been evaluated for designation. Site-specific planning will still be necessary to determine which routes should be designated for motor vehicle use. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The 05 OHV Rule along with the 01 3 State OHV Rule which the 05 OHV Rule was derived from requires a complete trail inventory and trail analysis be done prior to any travel planning actions. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The proposed action . . . does not comply with the (OHV) rule. Please rewrite the Alternative to take into account the following . . . "Even after designations are complete, the rule will have no direct economic impact because designations merely will regulate where and, if appropriate, when motor vehicle use will occur on NFS roads, on NFS trails, and areas on NFS lands." Clearly the intention of the Final Rule was to expand opportunities for OHV use, and maintain a stable economic base for the surrounding communities, in contradiction to the objectives illustrated in the current Alternative. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Forest Service should be planning for a managed system, and working with all groups, including OHV enthusiasts, in order to comply with not only the agency's own directives and the Travel Management Rule, but the policies behind the Rule. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The comprehensive nature of this Travel Management Rule process mandates the agency disclose, analyze and consider the impacts of non-motorized uses (as well as impacts to non-motorized users). (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

Although the Upper Palouse ATV Project provided a "technical" compliance with the Travel Management Rule the project was not (what) the general Travel Management Plan the Rule

mandates. There is a need to at least consider adding certain routes to the classified road and trail system in the Upper Palouse area. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

Clearly the (OHV) rule intended to identify existing routes being used for motorized access and recreation and preserve existing non-motorized routes by elimination of cross-country travel. . . .the rule preserves existing non-motorized routes by not allowing them to be converted to motorized routes and it does not state anywhere that non-motorized travel and experiences were to be significantly enhanced by a wholesale conversion of motorized routes to non-motorized routes. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The signing of "closed unless posted open" is not consistent with the 3-States OHV ROD and national OHV policy. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should not use the travel management rule to close routes due to budget constraints.

There is some language in the Federal Register that I do question. . . . Once the MVUM is published, vehicle use will be allowed only in designated routes or areas displayed on the map, with exceptions. Example: 212.52.b2: The Public is notified as soon as practicable following the closure by the "Responsible Official." Further closures by the "Responsible Official" can be made in 212.55a, "due to the availability of resources for maintenance and administrations." Budget constraints within the Forest Service are ongoing and future cuts will be means for additional closure. Section 212.55b could be utilized by the "Responsible Official" for additional closures (Individual, OROFINO, ID—355)

1.3.4.2 Roadless Rule

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with various aspects of the 2001 Roadless Rule.

The Final Roadless Rule published on January 5, 2001, specifically stated "The proposed rule did not close any roads or off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails." The agency must honor this commitment. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Forest Service's Roadless Rulemaking contains direction for Roadless Areas on the Clearwater that are substantially inconsistent with the Proposed Action, we wonder how the agency can reconcile these two simultaneous planning processes with different and conflicting management proposals. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

Despite consistent and ongoing positions from the Forest Service and proponents of the Roadless Rule, many Forests seem to be incorrectly interpreting the reinstatement of that Rule as imposing limits on project-level designation of routes in Roadless Areas. We urge you to take all steps necessary to rectify such misinterpretation(s). As the preservationist supporters of the Roadless Rule have made repeatedly clear, the 2001 Roadless Rule does not, and was not intended to, prohibit historical and existing motorized access along roads and trails in Roadless Areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

1.3.5 Policies and Mission

1.3.5.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should keep public lands open.

Agency managers seem to be directed to close as much public land as possible to motorized visitors by a top down management directive. The top down closure directive is in violation of the will of the people and in violation of congressional laws. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.3.5.2 Mission

The Clearwater National Forest should serve people.

The Forest Service motto is supposed to be “Caring for the Land and Serving the People.” Apparently, in the CNF, the latter part of the motto is evolving to “Eliminating People from the Forest.” Consequently, the CNF is alienating the Idaho people and becoming a policing agency instead of a public agency meant to serve the people. (Motorized Recreation Group, GARDEN CITY, ID—2723)

1.3.5.3 Recommended Wilderness Guidance

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose agency direction regarding management of recommended wildernesses.

Which forest service manual, directive or planning document specifically directs to Forest Service to manage Proposed Wilderness as Wilderness? (Individual, LOLO, MT—2634)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that regional guidance regarding mechanized and motorized uses in recommended wildernesses is unlawful.

The Region 1 rule that declares that Recommended Wilderness Areas will be managed as Wilderness areas usurps Congressional authority, was implemented without necessary NEPA processes and is arbitrary, capricious, and unlawful. Moreover, this Region 1 rule is not implemented until the CNF Forest Plan Revision is in place. (Individual, VICTOR, MT—1917)

We understand that instead of rising from a proper process, fully disclosed to the public, the closure is required by a policy hatched during a regional staff meeting and approved by an acting regional forester several years ago. To our knowledge this directive never put in written form the public view until September 24, 2007. . . .we take issue with just about everything in this statement, starting with the way it was imposed on the users of the national forests without proper disclosure, comment opportunity or NEPA analysis. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The September 24, 2007 directive on RWA management is fundamentally flawed in that it assumes motorized recreation, in our case snowmobiling, is automatically incompatible with that administrative designation. Snowmobiles are, of course, prohibited in designated wilderness but have no inherent conflict with the goals and objectives of RWA management. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

It is a policy that mandates a specific allocation of uses on public lands, affecting every forest plan in Region 1, but did not undergo public review or NEPA analysis. In short, we believe it is an illegally and unethically promulgated rule affecting a significant portion the Clearwater and other national forests in northern Idaho and Montana. To develop and impose such a policy in this manner seems to us to define the meaning of arbitrary and capricious. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize regional guidance regarding mechanized and motorized uses within recommended wildernesses is relevant.

We commend the Northern Region for stating their commitment of the responsible management of recommended wilderness areas. . . . The regional consistency guidance lays out two management policies, guidance on managing recommended wilderness areas and managing Wilderness Study Areas. The Wilderness Society's support for this regional guidance is limited to the policy for managing recommended wilderness areas.

In light of the travel management planning process that the Forest Service is undertaking to get a handle on managing off-road vehicles use on National Forests, issuing this consistency guidance is extremely timely, necessary, and an important step in more effectively managing for all recreational uses on our forests, not just motorized use. (Preservation/Conservation, BOZEMAN, MT—2988)

The Clearwater National Forest should interpret regional guidance regarding mechanized uses in recommended wildernesses differently.

Any need to ban bicycles from all trails Recommended Wilderness is also contrary to information provided by regional staff. In an October 2007 meeting with Regional Forester Tom Tidwell, Regional Land Management Planner Tom Rhode and other staff, IMBA and local bicycling advocates were told that individual forests are not required to prohibit bicycling on all trails in every Recommended Wilderness area. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

The proposed policy to ban bicycling from Recommended Wilderness is a subjective choice and contradicts Forest Service Manual 1923.03. This directive, applying to Recommended Wilderness, states, "Activities currently permitted may continue, pending designation, if the activities do not compromise wilderness values of the potential wilderness area." Bicycling does not scar the land and will not compromise an area's future eligibility for Wilderness designation. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—761)

1.3.5.4 Road Management Policy

The Clearwater National Forest should ensure consistency with the roads analysis and Road Management Policy.

The 2005 Travel Management Rule requires designation of roads open to motor vehicle use. This designation must be consistent with the information in the roads analysis and the Roads Policy Rule at 36 CFR 212.5(b). In other words, the Clearwater National Forest must only allow motor vehicle use designations on roads that the roads analysis indicates can be maintained consistent with long-term funding expectation and will minimize environmental impacts. (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

1.3.6 Forest Plan

1.3.6.1 1987 Forest Plan

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan standards for elk habitat.

The Forest Plan ROD mandated elk habitat standards that require closure of all B-2, C-1, A-3, and C-6 areas to all summer motorized use, according to agency elk habitat protocol. This mandate has never been followed. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest came out with OHV guidelines for OHV and motorized use on the forest in 1995. Those guidelines were somewhat inconsistent with the forest plan, specifically the ROD requirements for summer elk habitat. Furthermore, there are trails in specific management areas that do not even meet those guidelines. Those guidelines close certain trails to ORV use after trail reconstruction because the reconstruction would make motorized use much more likely in areas that had never seen the use (or much use) before. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater Forest Plan Record of Decision dated 1987 appears to mandate that a number of areas be managed for elk security habitat. A number of the areas appear to be compromised by motorized use allowed under your proposed plan. The compromised elk security habitats appear to be on area map F (near lower left margin,) most of the bottom portion of map E, and the left--

center portion shown by map I. If this is true, it's unacceptable. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2744)

Open route densities should not exceed habitat effectiveness for these species, nor should they exceed the standards for elk habitat effectiveness. That means that no motorized use can be allowed in areas where elk habitat is to be maintained at the 100% level. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction by providing an array of recreation opportunities.

The forest plan standard (page II-21, standard 2a) makes the ROS an allocation, not merely an evaluation process. Yet, no areas have been established on the Forest for semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation year-round, including recommended wilderness, with the exception of the tiny Elk Creek Falls area on the Palouse District. The proposed action makes a weak attempt to correct this violation by finally recommending some A-3 areas and some B-2 management areas as closed to vehicles year-round. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction by designating off-highway vehicle trails.

The forest plan in appendix F makes it clear that all trails are normally closed to vehicles with more than two wheels. Only trails specifically permitted as open to ATVs are trails where use by motorized vehicles with more than two wheels is permitted. However, trails that were only open to two wheeled vehicles in travel plans that predated the forest plan (Fish Lake, for example) have been not merely opened but allocated to ATV use over the years. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction by closing motorized trails in inventoried roadless areas.

The presently proposed motorized trails in the scoping letter which are listed as open to motorized users in the 2006 trail guide should be closed because the 1987 Forest Plan did not plan on opening roadless areas to motorized use. A lot of these trails were opened without public comment. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

*The incremental motorizing of the backcountry is illegal (see for example *The Mountaineers v. US Forest Service, 2006*; *North Cascades Conservation Council v. US Forest Service, 1999*; and *Washington Trails Assoc. v. US Forest Service, 1996*). It also conflicts with the forest plan ROD.* (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction for fisheries and water quality.

The travel plan should contribute to attainment of the riparian management objectives in the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) and the Pacific Anadromous Fish Strategy (PACFISH) and should comply with the standards and guidelines in these Forest Plan amendments. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction by restricting motorized uses in Weitas Creek.

The management of this area (Weitas Creek) for vehicles violates the forest plan, forest plan ROD, executive orders and the forest plan settlement agreements. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

. . . ATVs are not permitted on trails in C-1 and C-6 management areas, the reason being protection of wildlife habitat. . . much of Weitas Creek is in management areas C-1 and C-6, trails must be closed to all motor vehicles if they have been reconstructed . . . Also the Forest

Plan ROD allocates C&S areas to nonmotorized use. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with Forest Plan direction for the Selway-Bitterroot recommended wilderness additions.

The Forest Plan standards (for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness additions) would be violated by this proposal. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.3.6.2 Forest Plan Settlement Agreement

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Forest Plan settlement agreement by restricting motorized uses in recommended wilderness areas.

In 1993, the Forest Service reached a settlement agreement with several organizations that challenged the forest plan in court. That agreement added areas proposed for wilderness by Idaho's Rep. LaRocco to the recommended wilderness category (area B-2) in the forest plan (see below). While recommended wilderness areas were not explicitly closed to motorized vehicles year-round (the plan itself was silent), the language in the plan, plan EIS and ROD implies that motorized use would not be allowed. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with the Forest Plan settlement agreement by restricting motorized uses in the Great Burn, Mallard-Larkins and Selway-Bitterroot recommended wildernesses, and Cayuse, Fourth of July, Fish and Hungrey Creeks.

The proposed Wilderness areas in H. R. 1570 are to be managed as Forest Plan Management Area B-2 (recommended Wilderness) until the Clearwater Forest Plan is revised. In addition to the Great Burn, Mallard-Larkins, and the recommended additions to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness being managed as recommended Wilderness in the Forest Plan from beginning, Cayuse Creek, Forth of July Creek and Fish and Hungry Creeks are also to be managed as recommend Wilderness (Management Area B-2) per the Settlement Agreement .

This means that ATV trails are flat out prohibited in B-2 areas. In terms of motorcycle use, "low levels" are permitted. Any trails that have been constructed or reconstructed in Cayuse, Forth of July, Fish and Hungry Creeks or other areas proposed for Wilderness designation in the LaRocco Wilderness legislation are to be closed to motorized use. This requirement of the settlement agreement must be carried forward onto the travel plan revision by closing any trails to motor vehicle use that have received maintenance since the Settlement Agreement in B-2 Management Areas. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

1.4 Influences on Decision-making

1.4.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should make decisions based on information, fairness and sharing.

Decisions should be based on (1) accurate and unbiased information,(2) fairness to all members of the public and their needs, (3) the principles of sharing and tolerance and (4) an equitable distribution of benefits to all interests. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should base decisions on the long-term.

I ask the Forest Service to enact management for all Americans, in the long term, rather than the special interests of today. (Tribal, PULLMAN, WA—4395)

1.4.1.1 Conflict

The Clearwater National Forest should not base decisions on complaints or conflict.

The USFS all too often caves in to complaints and closes trails to motorized users. This promotes their behavior. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

Why is it that when there is a so called "conflict" that the trails are closed to motorized use? (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

The Clearwater National Forest should not base decisions on anticipated legal challenges.

Agency decision-making is being driven by accepting actions that will not be challenged in court versus decisions that are in the best interests of the public or that would meet the public's needs. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.4.1.2 Local versus Non-local

The Clearwater National Forest should not be influenced by individuals who do not live in or use the area.

These closures have to stop, why does the forest service keep giving in? Please stop these people that don't live here or only live here part time dictate how and where our land is used. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—54)

I and a lot of other people I know have children that are very upset that we are not going to be able to go camping, fishing and hunting where we normally do or want to go, because of special interest groups in other states. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—1084)

People from other states dictate how our forests are managed. What the hell are you guys doing to preserve our rights to use our forests? . . . Do you think the forest is the exclusive property of those who don't make any noise? (Individual, LOLO, MT—2233)

1.4.1.3 Majority

The Clearwater National Forest should base decisions on what is right for the majority of the people.

We do not support closures of any trail or area simply based on the decision of persons in authority who do not appear to be considering the large segment of the population using the forest. (Motorized Recreation Group, HAMILTON, MT—318)

The well funded people and their lawyers behind these restrictions are NOT the majority. Please hear the voice of the folks who live nearby, recreate these areas. Let's put the Public back in Public land management decisions and keep the other big "P", politics the hell out. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID-3236)

1.4.1.4 Personal Agendas

The Clearwater National Forest should not base decisions on personal agendas.

I feel that the motorized closure of these trails would be a direct result of Forest Service employees using this process to push their own personal views and the anti-motorized bias. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

It is also obvious that land managers project their personal agenda into decisions that are supposed to be balanced not pro-roadless not pro-roads not pro anything! (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—4274)

1.4.2 Interest Groups

1.4.2.1 Environmental Groups

The Clearwater National Forest should not be overly influenced by environmental groups.

The Green Groups do not represent the public. They are a special interest group that intends to have every acre of wilderness they can get. (Individual, CLINTON, MT—497)

We don't need a "blanket solution" to lock a large segment of users out for the benefit of a privileged few, and a large contingent of "Green" organizations with donations from members who will never use these areas and think they are doing the right thing. (Individual, PLAINS, MT—67)

Listen to the people affected by your decisions not the vociferous green left who by virtue of their money and lawyers appear, falsely, to be The Voice. They are not. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—4274)

1.4.2.2 Hikers

The Clearwater National Forest should not be overly influenced by hikers.

They (constituents) have voiced concern over the hikers and walkers controlling the process and believe this is all part of a bigger scheme to lock it all up tied to the Clinton Roadless Plan and the Greater Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—698)

1.4.2.3 Motorized Users

The Clearwater National Forest should not be overly influenced by motorized users.

Please resist pressure from the motorized use and mountain bike lobbies and move toward keeping wilderness, roadless areas and recommended wilderness protected from these destructive uses. (Individual, WHITEFISH, MT—1659)

Why do Federal and State land managers CAVE in to such users group (OHV)? Just because these people are willing to dish out several thousands of dollars for each machine in their family, why are they being treated as a special user group? . . . Will you and other Forest Supervisors bend so everybody can bring their TOYS to play as they want to on Forest Lands? (Individual, CULDESAC, ID—2327)

I know there is intense industry-paid lobbying and I know the political paybacks from the Bush administration all push toward more rip-roaring through our wilderness and near-wilderness public forests on ATVs. (Individual, KLAMATH FALLS, OR—1287)

1.5 Decision-making Philosophy

1.5.1 Management

The Clearwater National Forest should allow desired uses as long as there is no destruction.

You should remember that the National Forest is not "Your Land", but it is "Our Land." The tax payers of this country should be able to use it when and how ever they want to use it as long as they do not destroy it. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—1084)

1.5.1.1 Active Management

The Clearwater National Forest should actively manage its lands.

I am very disappointed with this decision to try and close more public lands versus actually managing them. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—84)

Wake up Supervisor Reilly! Shake yourself loose from those Wilderness advocates and get on to real forest management. Forest neglect is neither stewardship nor conservation. (Individual, PARADISE, MT—2841)

1.5.1.2 Multiple-use Management

The Clearwater National Forest should manage lands for multiple uses.

Management of these (Clearwater National Forest) lands for multiple-uses including reasonable motorized use allows the greatest enjoyment of these lands by the widest cross-section of the public to continue. These lands are designated as multiple-use lands. We ask that management of these lands for multiple-use be selected as the preferred alternative. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

I feel very strongly that an agency financed by public monies, regardless of political affiliation, needs to be guided by the principles of Multiple Use for all stakeholders. (Individual, REPUBLIC, WA—3870)

The Forest was established on multiple use. The multiple use is shrinking more and more each year. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—4456)

1.5.2 Protection

The Clearwater National Forest should protect forests.

(This is) yet another instance of Forest Service disdain for their responsibility to protect forests by permitting OHV use. (Individual, ARCATA, CA—365)

Please consider natural protection as an option so that many can continue to enjoy these beautiful places for many generations to come. (Individual, NO ADDRESS,—2755)

It is time for the Forest Service to assert its responsibility and permanently protect the forests that are in its charge. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—145)

1.6 Public Involvement

1.6.1 General

The Forest Service should limit the number of travel-related National Environmental Policy Act analyses.

The number of NEPA actions at any moment that we would have to evaluate and comment on in order to be involved would total 150 to 180. Recently the route designation process has added considerably to effort required. It is simply impossible for the public to comment on every road, trail, and NEPA document. If this is an over-arching strategy, then it is grossly unfair. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.6.2 Agency Communication

1.6.2.1 Content

The Clearwater National Forest's travel planning communications should include more information about the various natural resources.

... this proves to be a problem when the Forest Service asks for road- or trail-specific comments of substantive nature. Individuals concerned about fish, wildlife, or traditional hunting and angling opportunities are left without the information they need to make meaningful comments and suggestions and are consequently forced into a reactionary position. Too often, public meetings and scoping notices fail to highlight these valuable natural resources, which will be impacted by the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motorized recreation. Meanwhile, motorized users are unwittingly put in the position of defending routes that may damage clean water, hunting and fishing opportunities and create needless conflict. This is clearly a lose-lose situation. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—9)

1.6.2.2 Methods

The Clearwater National Forest should use different methods to communicate about potential road and trail changes.

It will take different approaches to effectively communicate to the public, which roads and trails are subject to the proposed action. For example, one alternative communication method could include posting of the roads and trails proposed for closure with signs for a period of 1 year prior to the EIS process stating "Road or Trail Proposed for Closure, for more information or to express your opinion please call xxx-xxxx or send written comments to xxxxx." Other methods could include the use of information kiosks and trail rangers . . . (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

If there were signs posted at the Schley Mountain Corridor in Montana about the proposed closure to snowmobiles, more people who use the area would see the need for letter writing and they would voice their love for snowmobiling in that area. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—89)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize web-based maps are difficult for some users to download.

(Constituents) have indicated that they are having a hard time getting maps for specific areas like Weitas Creek and others and that the internet map access is not good enough and takes too long to see. I have to agree. It is laborious and I know the folks up river do not have the internet speed I have here. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—698)

1.6.3 Methods

1.6.3.1 Fairness

The Clearwater National Forest's route proposal form may give motorized users an advantage.

The CNF designed a form for proposing motorized routes some time ago and encouraged those interested in designating more motorized routes to do so. No such form for proposing trails or roads for foot or horse traffic exists. . . . This skewed comment gathering process might create a situation where greater weight is given to comments made by vehicle users compared to others. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide a tool for “traditional” recreationists to submit suggestions.

Another concern regards the fact that off-road vehicle users have a tool on the website by which to submit route suggestions to the forest, but there is no way for those enjoying traditional forms of recreation and hunting to submit suggestions for their priorities. Although the travel management process designates which roads and trails will be open for motorized use, the Forest Service will be determining by proxy which roads and trails will be reserved for traditional uses, such as hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, or primitive hunting and thus also affects those people. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—6)

The Clearwater National Forest should reach out to all interested parties, not just motorized users.

The CNF has specifically reached out to and courted the motorized community for comments on which trails should be open or closed to motorized use. An equal effort at reaching out to other members of the public has not occurred. The CNF should make a concerted effort to gather information from all interested parties before making any decision on what routes should be added to the travel system. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

1.6.3.2 Meetings**The Clearwater National Forest should conduct meetings in Missoula, Montana.**

An open house is needed in Missoula. . . . Primary users of the forest in the Lolo Pass, Great Burn, and Hoodoo Pass area are not being sought out for input. The travel planners have a responsibility to the general public, and the Missoula bicycle community is a large user group in the Clearwater National Forest. . . . By keeping public involvement narrow, the results of this scoping will be skewed and inaccurate. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

It was brought to our attention that the forest planning process on the Clearwater, does not believe that the people of Montana are interested in this process, as there are no meetings scheduled in Montana. It is tragic that because your office is in Idaho your interest in forest management stops at the state line. This must be corrected to comply with NEPA. (Multiple-use Group, TOWNSEND, MT—2320)

1.6.3.3 Methods**The Clearwater National Forest should use different public involvement methods.**

Some public involvement methods that would be effective include: (1) the use of trail rangers (who are motorized enthusiasts) to count and interview visitors using the travelways and distribute Travel Management materials to them, (2) publication in the newsletters of motorized association, (3) attendance at motorized club meetings, (4) posting of information packets at motorized trail head areas, and (5) mailings of OHV enthusiasts and owners. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should participate in snowmobile field trips.

Please at the very least consider coming along with us for a snowmobile ride into Blacklead, Surveyor or Hoodoo to experience these areas on snowmobile, see for your self if all negative propaganda spread by the environmental groups is factual or fictitious. (Individual, BELGRADE, MT—2842)

If you wish we could arrange a meeting between your planning staff and snowmobilers who ride in the RWA's to outline their specific routes and play areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

1.6.4 Collaboration

1.6.4.1 Collaborate with All

The Clearwater National Forest should collaborate with all parties.

I hope that a common sense solution to this continuing problem will be worked out by all parties coming together for the common goal of protecting the natural beauty of all our forests and the ability to continue to use our snowmobiles in a safe and responsible way. (State Agency/Elected Official, NO ADDRESS—4265)

The Clearwater National Forest should notify interested parties of collaborative efforts.

When the various other groups have indicated a willingness to pursue this avenue (collaboration), we would accept an invitation to meet with these groups and get a better feeling of their commitment to find a mutually acceptable proposal. Having said that, we are not really interested in "horse trading" roads and trails for motorized versus non-motorized use. (Preservation/Conservation, BOISE, ID—6)

1.6.4.2 Collaborate with Specific Groups

The Clearwater National Forest should collaborate with hunters, anglers and wildlife conservation organizations.

Collaboration with hunters, anglers, and wildlife conservation organizations is needed to ensure a travel planning outcome that will minimize conflicts, provide desired opportunities, and protect resources. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should collaborate with mountain bike users.

Several mountain bicyclists have submitted individual scoping comments and many others are represented by clubs like the Montana Mountain Bike Alliance and Mountain Bike Missoula. Please take into account the opinions of these forest users and work with them to develop a sustainable network of singletrack for bicycling in the Clearwater. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

IMBA requests the Forest Service work with local cyclists to identify the most important routes for bicycling and consider leaving them to this use. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

The Clearwater National Forest should collaborate with motorized users.

For every issue presented, there is a positive action that could be taken that would address the issue. Many solutions are obvious. For those problems that have less obvious solutions, motorized recreationists would work collaboratively with the agency to develop innovative solutions. We are committed to working towards that end and provide this information and list of issues in the spirit of cooperation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Forest Service planners to further refine these maps if that would be useful. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—1422)

The Clearwater National Forest should collaborate with recreationists.

We stand ready to work with other recreationists and the Clearwater's managers to turn this trend around (trail closures), but need your willingness to do so. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

1.6.4.3 Challenges

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize challenges associated with getting all parties to collaborate.

MWA (Montana Wilderness Association) reached out to IMBA (International Mountain Bicycling Association) early on when the collaborative meeting first began and IMBA took the stand that as long as the FS was not allowing them to ride in recommended wilderness, they were not interested in coming to the table. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—8)

The Great Burn study group needs to come to the table on this issue instead of just saying no to everything. If we can get some boundaries adjusted or moved back in the Hoodoo Pass area and Lolo Pass area, maybe more people would support the Great Burn becoming a wilderness area. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—525)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize collaboration may not provide a solution.

It has been stated that motorized recreationists should participate in collaborative sessions with non-motorized groups in order to obtain motorized recreational opportunities on public lands. The agencies may think that the definition of a collaborative effort as "working together to develop a solution that reasonably meets the needs of all parties" but the dictionary definition of collaborative is "To cooperate treasonably, as with an enemy."

Additionally, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher describes consensus which is another closely related process as "the process of abandoning all beliefs, principles, values, and policies in search of something in which no one believes, but to which no one objects; the process of avoiding the very issues that have to be solved, merely because you cannot get agreement on the way ahead." (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.6.5 Comment Period

The Clearwater National Forest should start over and re-open the comment period.

We would need to reopen the comments period and start over on your proposed action because it's going beyond your scoping on your travel plan based on federal register! (Recreation Group, BILLINGS, MT—1624)

The Forest Service should extend timeframes associated with implementing the travel management rule.

The designated route rule requires motorized recreationists to identify and defend the use of every route that they would ever hope to use during their lifetime by involvement in a very complicated travel planning process in a very limited time frame Documenting and being involved in the number of actions and schedule referenced above (summary of actions associated with implementation of OHV rule on a national scale) is an impossible effort for individual motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize comment period extension sets a bad precedent.

I have heard from several insiders that the comment period was re-opened for motorized groups. I even heard that certain Clearwater Forest employees solicited comments from ORV groups. This is a horrendous precedent. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4379)

1.6.6 Use of Public Comments

The Clearwater National Forest should not consider comments as votes.

Under NEPA, decision-makers have a responsibility to seek out, determine, and make decisions that address the needs of all citizens and not just those that submit comments. We ask that public comments not be used as a voting process and that the needs of all citizens be fairly addressed in the document and decision-making. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

. . . the agency must not be overly influenced by the comment writing and legal campaigns of organized non-motorized groups and adequately emphasize the needs of lesser organized and funded motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

We strongly disagree with a decision-making process using comments as a voting process where the most comments wins the most trails and recreation opportunities because motorized recreationists and working class citizens have a low participation rate in NEPA processes (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.7 Use of Best Available Science

1.7.1 General

1.7.1.1 Endangered Species

The Clearwater National Forest should use sound data to support claims that recreation uses pose threats to endangered species.

The agency must support any claim that various recreational activities (e.g., off-highway vehicle use, camping, equestrian use, hunting etc.) pose significant threats to endangered species. Claims that are highly speculative and based on little or no reliable data should be excluded from the environmental analysis. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.7.1.2 Fisheries and Wildlife

The Clearwater National Forest should review literature to address fisheries issues.

It is my professional opinion that the literature before and after 1987 should be reviewed thoroughly to address the above issues (instream sedimentation, thermal preferences, illegal fishing, stock discreteness). That fairly extensive literature including local and regional studies emphasizing resident and anadromous fish ecology and habitat needs would then be meshed with existing information on the Forest by those preparing the EIS to identify any locations within proposed roaded areas where further protection of bull trout and anadromous species would be necessary. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider all science regarding the impacts of motorized travel on wildlife.

PANTRA (Panhandle Trail Riders Association) objects to the following rationale for closing trails to motorized use: Motorized travel is restricted to reduce disturbance to wildlife in certain specific areas. . . . Discussion at the 12/19/07 "Open House" indicates the Forest Service not only ignores extant research refuting the claim that motorized users affect deer and elk more than non-motorized users but discount such research "out of hand." (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

We fully support reasonable closures of critical wildlife winter habitat, and that appears to be what you have done to date. Any further closures developed during the planning process we hope will be based on fact, not conjecture, and data and science upon which they are based fully disclosed to the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

As far as fish and wildlife concerns, trail machines have been accessing these trails since the early sixties and there is no proof (actual data) showing any direct or indirect impacts to fish and wildlife populations. If there is proof, I demand to see it. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

We are challenging the validity of the other reason given for motorized closure proposals to benefit wildlife. While there may be minor disturbance to a few animals close to trails, there is absolutely no science to support the notion that this minor level of infrequent noise disturbance causes a significant negative impact. To legitimately restrict OHV because of disturbance to wildlife, a Finding of Significant Impact should be provided to support such restrictions. (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

The Clearwater National Forest should use new science regarding the impacts of motorized vehicles on wildlife.

The science, data and findings as far as road density and impact of motorized vehicles on wildlife have changed scientifically. This new information must be considered in this evaluation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.7.1.3 Mountain Biking

The Clearwater National Forest should use the latest science regarding the impacts of mountain biking.

The Forest Service needs to consider the numerous studies showing that mountain biking has no more impact than hiking/equestrian use. . . . The travel plan does not reflect the application of the latest science. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

Science supports my lifelong observations that bicycles do not harm the trails nearly as much as horses. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—1904)

. . . scientific research has shown the impacts of bicycling are similar to those of hiking and far less than horse and OHV use. . . . Decisions to close trails to bicycling should take into account the best available science. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

1.7.1.4 Peer Review

The Clearwater National Forest should have work reviewed by independent scientists.

Independent scientists should review and participate in all aspects of planning, broad-based assessments, local analysis, and monitoring. Review and participation by independent scientists is a good thing, provided the process requires standards which assure that such scientists are in fact qualified and independent, and provide the public the opportunity to review such factors. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.7.2 Best Science Doesn't Support Proposed Action

1.7.1.1 Effects of Motorized Travel on Natural Resources

The Clearwater National Forest should provide scientific evidence regarding the effects of motorized travel on natural resources.

The Proposed Action makes statements that are a matter of conjecture or opinion, unsupported by scientific evidence. We have serious reservations about (the statement) . . . "Vehicle travel

and motorized travel in particular, is known to affect a variety of resources. While the scale of effects can vary substantially, known resource concerns include soil disturbance and erosion, effects on water quality and aquatic organisms, effects on wildlife, vegetation removal or damage, visual quality degradation, and conflicts between forest users.” Please be prepared to provide substantiation of the above statements regarding OHV use in your EIS with the appropriate soil studies done by credentialed professionals and correct literature references. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

I have read through hundreds of pages of environmental analysis produced by all manner of authorities, both agency and private. All of them cite the "potential" for resource damage to one resource or another, but I challenge you to find where riding on existing trails by off-highway motorcycles results in any damage that wouldn't be consistent with use by livestock in the case of trails or hunters when assessing impacts to wildlife. (Individual, CASPER, WY—2383)

1.7.2.2. Effects of Motorized Travel on Fish and Wildlife

The Clearwater National Forest should provide scientific evidence regarding the effects of two-wheeled motorized travel on certain fish species.

There are no data, based on any fisheries research projects that prove that two-wheeled motorized travel has any direct affects on Chinook, Steelhead and Bull trout populations. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide scientific evidence to justify closures attributed to wildlife.

Any area closed should be closed solely because of good scientific reasons. The Forest Service should identify every possible animal that could possible be used as an excuse to close any area, up front, and back that possibility up with documentation from (the) biologist. As we have learned so many times, it is very easy to continually pull a different animal out of your hat, leaving no time for investigation (lynx, wolverine, etc.). (Individual, BOISE, ID—2884)

There is no documentation or data to support closure of any motorized routes in the project area to improve wildlife connectivity. The existing level of roads and trails does not significantly impact wildlife connectivity, i.e. it functions as such with the existing level of roads and trails and closing any roads or trails to motorized use would not make any measurable difference. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

. . . many closures of these trails are based on 'wildlife disturbance.' Again, this statement is being abused and has no merit for closure. I don't believe it is fair to close two-wheeled motorized access to an area based on the 'wildlife disturbance' assumption, because it is simply not true, and there are no studies to provide it. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should not use scientific information from the Starkey Research Facility.

. . . the Idaho Department of Fish and Game has been on an anti-motorized crusade and will support all closures, which is based on bias and prejudice judgment, instead of science. One study, at the Starkey Research Facility, should not be used to dictate OHV management with respect to wildlife and hunting. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

1.7.2.3 Effects of Motorized Travel on the Great Burn

The Clearwater National Forest should provide scientific evidence regarding the impacts of snowmobile use in the Great Burn.

The proposed areas to be closed for snowmobiling in the Clearwater National Forest, primarily in the Great Burn Area, have been used historically by back country snowmobilers including myself for the past twenty five years. I am not aware of any scientific study of winter use/impact in this area. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2917)

1.7.3 Suggested Sources of Best Science

1.7.3.1 Natural Resources (General)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate information from the Wildlands CPR website regarding the ecological impacts of off-road vehicle use.

There is a plethora of research showing the negative ecological impacts of ORV use. We refer you to the Wildlands CPR website, which has a bibliographic database on the impacts of off-road vehicle use, including snowmobile use. See www.wildlandscpr.org. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate studies regarding the impact of motorized uses on public and other resources.

. . . the Affected Environment section of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that accompanies your plan should cite relevant studies and the conclusions found in the Environmental Consequences chapter must incorporate and interpret information from these studies (Lovich and Bainbridge, 1999 and Trombulak and Frissell, 2000). (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

1.7.3.2 Wildlife

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate Idaho Department of Fish and Game science regarding wildlife.

Incorporate the best science and applicable data available into the analysis, including the Idaho Wildlife Conservation Strategy (Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2005), the Idaho Department of Fish and Game big game management plans (Idaho Department of Fish and Game 2006a), Wisdom et al. (2000), Wisdom et al. (2005), in the analysis of impacts to wildlife. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate science regarding the effects of recreation on wildlife.

Please include the attached document in the official record for the travel plan (“Effects of Recreation on Rocky Mountain Wildlife: A Review for Montana”). The discussion of motorized impacts to wildlife is directly applicable and must be disclosed and analyzed in the NEPA documents. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2881)

Please include the attached document in the official record for the travel plan. The discussion of motorized impacts to wildlife is directly applicable and must be disclosed and analyzed in the NEPA documents. Although this document is specific to Yellowstone national Park, the analysis and content, including references and studies are directly applicable to the CNF travel plan. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2882)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate the Fish and Wildlife Service’s grizzly bear information.

The Center incorporates by reference the entire administrative record from FWS' Grizzly Bear Recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem FEIS and associated documents, available at: <http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/species/mammals/grizzly/FEIS2000/index.htm>. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate best science related to lynx management.

We understand that the Clearwater National Forest is outside of the area mapped as "core" lynx habitat, but that it has considerable area designated "occupied" lynx habitat, and thus the Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction should be applied. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

We recognize that there is scientific uncertainty about the effects of packed snowmobile trails on lynx habitat, but at least one peer-reviewed study indicates that it may harm lynx by facilitating access by coyotes into lynx habitat. To quote from the last line of the study's abstract: Our results suggest that restrictions placed on snowmobiles in lynx conservation areas by land management agencies because of the potential impacts of coyotes may be appropriate. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

Please include the attached document in the official record for the travel plan ("Potential Impacts of Coyotes and Snowmobiles on Lynx Conservation in the Intermountain West). The discussion of motorized impacts to wildlife is directly applicable and must be disclosed and analyzed in the NEPA documents. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2863)

A lynx study completed in the Seeley Lake area found no adverse impact to Lynx from winter snowmobile use. The results of this study and the data that was collected must be used in evaluating areas open or closed to snowmobiles. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should incorporate information from Austria regarding the impacts of recreational uses on wolverine and lynx.

The only conceivable reason that it (Great Burn) should ever be considered closed is for the Wolverine and Lynx habitat. And it has been proven that snowmobiles do not impact or change the habit of the Wolverine or Lynx. But, if that were the case, snowshoeing and cross country skiing has proven more devastating than snowmobiles. See case studies made in Austria. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1085)

1.8 Data Needed to Support the Process

1.8.1 Transportation System

The Clearwater National Forest should provide a listing of National Environmental Policy Act decisions that authorized travel on routes included in the travel management system.

The baseline travel management system that will be used in the DEIS to evaluate the effects of the proposed action should only include routes which have been evaluated during a NEPA process. . . . Please provide a listing of the NEPA decision that authorized each route on the travel management system in the DEIS. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide baseline information about the conditions of roads and trails.

IDFG is very interested in learning what the current, or baseline, conditions are for roads and trails in the Forest as part of the EIS analysis (that is, how are roads and trails presently being used, who uses which trails, how many of what kind of users visit each road, when do they visit, etc) and what are the levels and kinds of use the Forest Service projects for designated roads over the lifetime of the Plan. We believe that this information is critical because current rates and types of use can be related to existing habitat and wildlife conditions, while projected rates of use are needed to predict impacts to fish, wildlife and habitat. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide data to justify the reduction in miles of trail available for motorcycle riders.

In the last 15 years the shift to motorized vehicles has been staggering. The trend due to an urbanized population base is that fewer horse use days will be seen (personal experience as well as verifiable data). Back packing recreational use days are stagnant or in decline due to the aging local and national population (personal experience as well as verifiable data). It is due to these factors I do not agree that motorcycle users should bear the brunt in the reduction of trail miles I respectfully request that some data as well as evidence be presented that backs up your Travel Planning EIS pertaining to the reasoning for this reduction in usage. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—61)

In your scoping and planning, I see no documentation that proves that motorcycle travel on a trail causes soil disturbance and erosion, effects water quality and wildlife, vegetation removal or damage, visual quality and user conflicts. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—941)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide data to support changes in seasons and types of motorized use.

Alternative 1 has shortened the available season to motor vehicles by another month to month and a half. Please provide the studies and data which support this specific change for each category for specific individual trail: vehicle, motorcycle and ATV. Also please provide the studies and data supporting the current longer trail closure seasons for motorcycle and ATV trails for each specific trail as compared to roads. In most cases these motorcycle and ATV closures appear to be from 11/1-5/1 or 10/1-6/15 which is one month to two and a half months longer than roads.

. . . Please provide documents and studies to the related type of use which led to the proposed yearlong closures on each trail proposed for yearlong closure. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Forest Service should update data posted on the national website.

. . . we request that the data in the next two tables (www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/ohv and www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs.ohv/travel_mgmt_schedule) be updated to reflect the significant reduction in miles or roads and motorized trails that decisions have produced since this data was assembled. This revised data should be used to guide the decision-making (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide better data regarding motorized and non-motorized uses.

There is a serious inaccuracy between the agency's representations of motorized versus non-motorized trail use and actual trail use that must be resolved. The routes in the project area are predominantly used by motorized recreationists.

The agency does not observe visitors on weekends and holidays and consequently is unaware of actual visitor usage. The agency simply needs to go out and count the different recreationists and mode of access on multiple-use lands on any weekend. This is what we have done and our data is an accurate representation of actual visitor usage on multiple-use lands. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

We are very concerned that a built-in bias exists with visitor use monitoring data based on the fact that all wilderness visitors must sign-in in order to visit a wilderness area and at the same time there are no self-reporting opportunities for multiple-use visitors. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The results from most visitor use surveys do not directly or adequately reflect the importance of motorized access and mechanized recreation to the typical visitor to public lands. The importance and magnitude of motorized access and mechanized recreation is hidden and dispersed within a number of different categories (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should collect data to document existing conditions as well as the effects of motorized restrictions.

We request that sufficient background data be collected to quantify the existing conditions in the resource areas of interest. Then, if a motorized closure is enacted, sufficient data should be collected to demonstrate whether or not there was significant improvement to each resource area. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide data that links proposed trail closures to real problems.

Analysis is not based on real problems because there is no data that can link wildlife disturbance issues, fisheries, user conflicts etc., with respect to OHV's, especially during the summer months on the trails you propose to close. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should adjust data regarding motorized and non-motorized opportunities.

The total route opportunity available to non-motorized recreationists is 5,870 miles and the total miles of exclusive non-motorized trails are 955 (58% of all existing) and the cross-country miles are infinite. The total miles of roads open to motorized recreationists are 286 and the total miles of trails open to motorized recreationists is 697 (42% of existing) and the miles of cross country opportunity is zero. We request that this data be used to guide the decision-making to a preferred alternative that adequately meets the needs of the public by increasing motorized recreational opportunities in the project area. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Mileage for motorized trails and non motorized trails do not state that non motorized also get to use all of the motorized trails, so all that mileage should be included in non motorized mileage totals, also all Wilderness and Primitive mileage and acres should be included in totals for non motorized. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide information about the costs of restrictions and maintenance.

Please provide documents that include the anticipated cost of the proposed closures and the actual past cost of maintenance of the existing 178 miles of motorcycle trails. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Clearwater National Forest should describe recreation opportunities and land management planning activities on adjacent lands.

The analysis should accurately describe existing recreation opportunities available on adjacent lands, including designated Wilderness. Recreational users, like wildlife, often cross jurisdictional boundaries when pursuing their preferred activities. Information should also be provided on any ongoing land management planning on adjacent lands. Such information is necessary to compare and contrast the impacts of each alternative as well as how the alternatives differ from the current condition. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

1.8.2 Fish and Wildlife

The Clearwater National Forest should provide data to support the presumption that it is possible to balance the needs of fish and wildlife with demands for motorized recreation.

To meet Forest Plan objectives, the Travel Plan must assume that it is possible to balance the needs of fish and wildlife with the increasing demand for motorized recreational opportunities; the EIS must provide evidence to support that assumption. It will be critical to describe not only how this balance will be achieved and managed, but also define what conditions will tip the balance and trigger adaptive actions to maintain or restore that balance. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider data regarding wildlife herd health.

Herd health data available from the Idaho Department of Fish and Game must be considered in the analysis. The analysis should disclose the hunting seasons and tag objectives as scheduled and determined by the IDFG. Without current herd numbers and trends, it can not be determined that motorized vehicle use on or off the forest is impacting wildlife populations and herd health to such a degree that it warrants further restrictions. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide data to support claims that recreation poses threats to endangered species.

The agency must support any claim that various recreational activities (e.g., off-highway vehicle use, camping, equestrian use, hunting etc.,) pose significant threats to endangered species. Claims that are highly speculative and based on little or no reliable data should be excluded from the environmental analysis. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

In the name of the Lynx and wolverine (and other large species) what specific impacts do the snowmobiles cause that are documented? (Individual, LOLO, MT—2477)

1.8.3 Cultural and Social

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct cultural resource surveys for all areas open to motorized vehicles.

Full cultural resource surveys should be conducted for all areas open to motorized vehicles, including the 300 foot buffer for dispersed camping. These access areas are all considered part of the Area of Potential Effects (APE). (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should explain how social, cultural and economic values were determined.

. . . the proposed alternative provide virtually no explanation or guidance regarding how these levels and values (social, cultural and economic values and desired levels) were established. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.9 Agency Models

The Clearwater National Forest should use models that are accurate.

Positive impacts to the environment in areas such as fisheries, wildlife habitat, sediment reduction, and noxious weeds are largely based on personal judgment or predictive models. These models are not calibrated or based on data from the study area. All models are wrong, so honest modelers first report the expected uncertainty of the model and then the predictions. There are no case histories and very little data to back up any of the predictions. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should not use the IMPLAN model in its economic analysis.

The IMPLAN system is inaccurate and unreliable and should not be used in your economic analysis during the Clearwater Travel Planning process. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

1.10 Agency Organization, Funding and Staffing

1.10.1 Funding

1.10.1.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should consider funding in the development of the travel management plan.

We are encouraged that the proposed action indicates that the maintenance costs will be considered in determining which routes should be designated. We recommend that the availability of resources to maintain and reconstruct roads factor heavily into the MVU Plan. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the costs associated with implementing the travel management plan.

I . . . foresee a burden by changing access. New maps will have to be drawn and distributed. New signage will have to be purchased and installed in these areas. Additional patrols will need to be funded to ensure compliance. Finally, lawsuits will need to be defended. (Individual, HAMILTON, MT—2463)

It will also become a costly burden to patrol and enforce these area closures with the decreasing budgets in the Agency. (Individual, SALMON, ID—502)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict routes to reduce management costs.

If adequate funding cannot be secured for this work or if roads cannot be maintained to Forest Service standards then the Forest may need to consider additional travel restrictions that are aimed at reducing overall maintenance and enforcement costs. For example, yearlong closures are cheaper and easier to maintain than seasonal closures. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict routes to reduce management costs.

The lack of a sufficient budget for trail and road maintenance should not be a reason for closing multiple use trails and roads. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

1.10.1.2 Enforcement

The Clearwater National Forest should use resources to enforce the existing travel management plan.

Use resources to enforce the existing rules instead of spending years of people's time and money to modify rules. (Individual, ELK RIVER, MN—1861)

These closures are being suggested for all the wrong reasons. If all that is needed to be considered is the convenience of management then perhaps we should shut down all forest use. That would be no human presence in these areas to make them easier and more convenient to manage. Spend the money it would cost to make these changes on enforcement of existing rules and boundaries. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1502)

1.10.1.3 Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should keep trails open to maintain funding.

The cost to maintain a larger dispersed trail system is far less than the smaller system the Forest is proposing. Since cost appears to be a driving factor, then keeping more trails open to motorized use will decrease costs, while simultaneously encouraging the existing motorized volunteerism. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Need for Action stated that "Current and anticipated funding levels for road and trail construction are not sufficient to fully maintain existing roads and trails." Funding levels will be further reduced with the elimination of motorized vehicle trails. . . . When an agency closes a trail to motorized use, the agency loses to potential grant funding and maintenance and construction sources such as the ORMV and the Motorbike Fund. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

If the USFS doesn't have the funds to maintain our trails then this is more the reason to keep them open to two-wheeled machine enthusiasts who care for, adopt, and maintain Idaho trails. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should pursue funding options to keep trails open.

We believe that a combination of our Trail Ranger and Trail Cat Programs along with our Grant Programs can help the CNF provide a safe, enjoyable and sustainable future travel system. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater needs to aggressively pursue available grant funds, work to promote volunteer programs, utilize IDPR Trail Ranger crews, devote a fair share of appropriated FS funds to motorized trails, and exhaust every possible avenue before trail closures are proposed. (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

With respect to the comment that there is not enough money to mitigate problems, we can work with the Forest Service as partners in many different grant applications. Basically OHV recreationists generate a significant amount OHV gas tax. These monies should be used to maintain, develop, and mitigate issues but, unfortunately, it is being diverted elsewhere. This significant issue must be addressed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

CNF should immediately begin to work with the ORV community and with Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation to obtain a portion of the funding needed to implement the development of new single track motorized trails and to refurbish or repair trails that have environmental problems. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should revise state and federal programs to ensure gas tax revenues benefit off-highway vehicle users.

We request that revisions be made to state and federal programs in order to return the full amount of the gas tax paid by OHV recreationists to programs that benefit OHV recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should spend trails funds differently.

The cost of restructuring motor vehicle access, posting and enforcement could be better spent opening new trails, clearing existing trails, and re-opening old trails. (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—95)

The Clearwater National Forest should maintain trails with road decommissioning funds.

Road decommissioning funds should be used to maintain motorized trails. We suggest that this expenditure would benefit the public and environment in a more positive way and have a more positive environmental impact. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.10.2 Staffing

1.10.2.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest's travel management plan will place additional demands on agency staff.

I have witnessed these closure proposals time and again, and it has been my observation, that rules are put in place and no monies are appropriated for enforcement. This leaves our already over-tasked forest service personnel with another issue to deal with. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—154)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain private law firms to handle litigation.

The agency should bolster its legal staff by retaining private law firms to defend their multiple-use land management decisions. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

1.10.2.2 Volunteers

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the contributions of volunteers.

. . . we as a group contribute more to trail restoration and upkeep than all of the non-motorized groups do; both through permit fees and actual on the groundwork. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

. . . organized volunteer work with the USFS on these trails since 1994 should account for something more than a "non-verifiable conflict" with any user group or a "dreamed up" problem with big game (see above stress study) as a reason to close the N.F. Clearwater trail system to motorized. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

The motorcycle groups have kept these trails open and fixed up for at least fourteen years that I know of. We need these volunteers to keep these trails open and in good condition. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—332)

The Clearwater National Forest should work with local volunteer groups.

Trail maintenance, repair and construction can be accomplished effectively through coordination with local and regional volunteer groups and the Idaho State Parks and Recreation Department. A simple change in philosophy is all that is needed. Volunteers are ready and willing to assist with this work. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—3348)

The Clearwater National Forest should form partnerships with motorized users to maintain trails.

Most trail systems are maintained and cleared yearly by motorized volunteers. . . . This benefits all users, motorized and non-motorized. With limited funds, it will be difficult for the forest service to keep these trails open for non-motorized use, without help from the motorized community. (Individual, LIBERTY LAKE, WA—1075)

I am aware that the Forest Service budgets have been slashed however I believe that volunteer labor is a large part of the answer. Motorized users have the ability to carry chain saws and other tools. We are the ones who keep many of these trails open for everyone to enjoy. (Motorized Recreation Group, MERIDIAN, ID—1423)

Any closure, changes, or motorized restrictions in this proposal are unnecessary. Many of the cyclists maintain these routes on a yearly basis. They do so for the opportunity to keep the Clearwater National Forest open for all to explore, whether via motorized vehicle or not. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—1706)

The Clearwater National Forest should form volunteer partnerships with bicycle clubs to maintain trails.

The aging backcountry horsemen, and under funded forest service trail crews, newly constrained to hand tools, may not be able to keep up with the backlog of downfall clogged trails. Reduce the wilderness volume though, and add IMBA bicycle clubs into the mix, and the trails get rebuilt with sustainability in mind, public-private trail adoption partnerships flourish, and public education about the land and wildlife grows. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

The Clearwater National Forest will require more maintenance funding if trails are closed to motorcycle users who do volunteer trail work.

The motorcycle users have historically maintained the trails for the Forest Service in some of the areas I mentioned. To restrict this user group would create a net gain in trail maintenance funding requirements. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—120)

CHAPTER 2—ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION 1

 Summary 1

 2.1 Scope of Proposal 2

 2.1.1 General 2

 2.1.2 Travel Management Rule 2

 2.1.3 Clarify Scope 3

 2.1.4 Modify Scope 3

 2.2 Purpose and Need 4

 2.2.1 General 4

 2.2.2 Winter 5

 2.3 Proposed Action 6

 2.3.1 Support 6

 2.3.2 Concerns 6

 2.3.3 Non-support 6

 2.3.4 Suggested Changes 7

 2.3.4.1 General 7

 2.3.4.2 Motorized Uses 8

 2.4 Issues 8

 2.4.1 General 8

 2.4.2 Suggested Issues 9

 2.5 Interdisciplinary Team 10

 2.6 Document 10

 2.6.1 General 10

 2.6.2 Definitions 12

 2.7 Maps 13

 2.8 Forest Plan 15

 2.8.1 General 15

 2.8.2 Forest Plan Amendments 16

 2.8.3 Settlement Agreement 17

 2.8.4 Forest Plan Revision 18

 2.9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement 19

 2.10 Analysis Needed to Support the Process 21

 2.10.1 General 21

 2.10.1.1 Global Warming/Pollutants 21

 2.10.1.2 Vegetation 21

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.10.1.3 Wilderness | 21 |
| 2.10.2 Fish and Wildlife | 22 |
| 2.10.2.1 Fish | 22 |
| 2.10.2.2 Wildlife (General) | 22 |
| 2.10.2.3 Wildlife Species (Specific) | 23 |
| 2.10.3 Transportation System | 24 |
| 2.10.3.1 General | 24 |
| 2.10.3.2 Roads and Trails | 24 |
| 2.10.3.3 Trails | 24 |
| 2.10.3.4 Off-road Vehicles | 25 |
| 2.10.3.5 Bicycles | 25 |
| 2.10.4 Water | 25 |
| 2.10.5 Social and Economic | 26 |
| 2.11 Cumulative Effects | 27 |
| 2.12 Alternatives | 28 |
| 2.12.1 General | 28 |
| 2.12.2 Range of Alternatives | 28 |
| 2.12.3 No Action Alternative | 29 |
| 2.12.4 Alternative 1 | 29 |
| 2.12.4.1 Support for Restrictions in Recommended Wildernesses | 29 |
| 2.12.4.2 Support for Restrictions on Snowmobiles | 29 |
| 2.12.4.3 Support for Alternative 1 with Additional Motorized Restrictions | 30 |
| 2.12.4.4 Concerns about Alternative 1 | 30 |
| 2.12.5 Suggested Alternatives (General) | 31 |
| 2.12.5.1 Mechanized Recreation | 31 |
| 2.12.5.2 Motorized Recreation | 31 |
| 2.12.5.3 Mechanized and Motorized Recreation | 34 |
| 2.12.5.4 Over-snow Recreation | 34 |
| 2.12.5.5 Recommended Wildernesses | 35 |
| 2.12.6 Suggested Alternatives (Specific) | 37 |
| 2.12.7 Alternatives Supported | 40 |
| 2.12.7.1 No Action Alternative | 40 |
| 2.12.7.2 Pro Access Alternative | 41 |
| 2.12.8 Alternatives Not Supported | 41 |
| 2.12.8.1 Alternative 1 | 41 |

2.12.8.2 Alternatives with Closures to Motorized and Mechanized Uses..... 41

2.13 Mitigation 41

2.14 Implementation..... 42

CHAPTER 2—ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION

Summary

Chapter 2 summarizes people's ideas and concerns regarding the analysis that is being conducted and the documents that are being prepared in the development of the travel management plan.

Many respondents commented about the scope of the travel management proposal. Some were pleased with its detail and scale. Others believed the proposal went well beyond the intent of the agency's travel management rule which requires forests to formally designate roads, trails and areas where motorized travel will be permitted and display those routes and areas on a Motor Vehicle Use Map. Many of those who favored narrowing the scope suggested over-snow travel should be dropped from the proposal. Some sought to expand the scope of the proposal, suggesting more natural resources concerns should be addressed. There were also suggestions to broaden the analysis to consider the increasing numbers of motorized users and their needs for more motorized opportunities.

Commenters were also divided in their opinions about the proposed action. No one expressed total support for the proposal. Some took time to point out the parts they agreed with; others flatly rejected major components. Many offered specific suggestions about how the proposal could be improved.

Respondents noted specific inaccuracies and discrepancies in the document and maps. Some suggested information that should be displayed. Some definitions were a source of confusion. Problem words or phrases included "resource damage," "significant conflict" and "small motorized vehicle." Many commenters requested improved maps.

Confusion seemed to exist regarding the relationship between the Forest Plan and travel management planning. It appeared there is further confusion associated with the relationship between the 1987 Forest Plan and the 2006 draft Proposed Land Management Plan that is posted on the Forest's website. Some offered specific ideas about how the Forest Plan should be amended through the travel planning process.

Commenters offered a variety of detailed opinions regarding the analysis that is needed to support the travel planning effort. Some wanted a comprehensive analysis of the roads and trails in the transportation system. Others desired specific fish and wildlife analyses. There were requests for comprehensive socio-economic analyses. Other suggestions included global warming, vegetation, water, and the mental and physical benefits associated with motorized recreation.

Some respondents expressed concern about the Forest's intent to develop a true range of alternatives, specifically alternatives that included more motorized opportunities than were presented in the proposed action.

People suggested many general ideas about what they were looking for in an alternative including more motorized opportunities, more snowmobiling opportunities, more bicycling opportunities and more restrictions on motorized vehicles and travel. Many provided options to the proposal to restrict snowmobiles and bicycles from recommended wildernesses. Ideas included boundary adjustments, the creation of corridors and a change in designation from recommended wilderness to a "National Protection Area."

Many comments included specific components they would like to have included in an alternative. Several groups developed components of alternatives complete with maps.

2.1 Scope of Proposal

2.1.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should continue travel management planning at the proposed scale.

We support this type of landscape level planning. It helps to reduce user--conflicts, minimize impacts to fish, wildlife, and other resources, and will promote effective implementation.

(Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should revise the scale of travel management planning efforts.

. . . this undertaking (travel planning) amounts to de facto comprehensive recreation management as it will decide the fate of backcountry areas into the future. Permanently opening areas to ORV use is close to being an irretrievable commitment of resources. This needs to be considered in a broader perspective. For example, how will this process bias the upcoming forest plan revision?

(Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

2.1.2 Travel Management Rule

The Clearwater National Forest should stay within the scope of the travel management rule.

What happened to the rule handed to you folks on just identifying the roads and trails? What rule requires you to close motorized roads and trails? (Individual, SEELEY LAKE, MT—2558)

The route designation process was supposed to inventory all existing motorized routes and designate them for motorized use. Instead it is being used to produce wholesale motorized closures contrary to the understanding with motorized recreationists. The process needs to be redirected back onto the right path. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The intent of the Travel Management Rule is "revising regulations regarding travel management on National Forest System lands to clarify policy related to motor vehicle use, including the use of off-highway vehicles." It is not intended to be a means to eliminate or even drastically reduce motorized recreation on National Forests. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—693)

The Clearwater National Forest should take the time necessary to address winter motorized recreation issues.

While the Travel Management Rule requires completion of summer motorized recreation travel plans by 2009, it says nothing about decreasing access. It also doesn't mandate new travel plans for motorized over-snow access. If you feel more time is needed to properly address winter motorized recreation use, there is no pressing mandate to complete a plan revision at this time.

(Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The Clearwater National Forest should address some issues through the forest planning process.

Establishing "distinct land area allocation between motorized and non-motorized uses" is properly done in the Forest Plan, not in a Travel Plan. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

2.1.3 Clarify Scope

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the scope of the project.

There is a problem with how the agency describes the scope of this project. Is this a motorized travel plan? Or is it a comprehensive recreation plan, where routes will be provided for mountain bikes, hikers and equestrians? The scoping information leaves doubt, but the Proposed Action gives us a clue that the agency might be attempting a comprehensive motorized and non-motorized travel plan. If this is the case, the decisions contemplated by the agency were not properly or adequately disclosed to the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

We commend the CNF for choosing to evaluate wintertime snowmobile use. It is a positive step. However, it is not clear that this will actually be a comprehensive look at vehicle use off main system roads. Many trails and roads are missing from the draft maps. Will the CNF be taking a full and comprehensive look at roads and trails under the new ORV regulations and the fairly recent roads policy? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

2.1.4 Modify Scope

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the scope of the proposal.

The ultimate goal of the Forest Service should be to develop a system of motorized and non-motorized routes that is sustainable and maintainable. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—6)

The travel management planning process should address not only off-road vehicles and designation of routes open to motorized use, but also specifically how the Clearwater National Forest will achieve a road system that minimizes environmental impacts, and that the Forest Service can properly manage within its funding constraints. (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

The Clearwater National Forest should address the need to develop a financially sustainable roads system.

The Clearwater National Forest's roads analysis clearly indicates that the roads system currently far exceeds a system that is financially sustainable. Therefore, the roads system must be drastically reduced. The roads analysis also states that it does not specify where any new road will be built or decommissioned; the Forest evidently intended to make those decisions through a NEPA process. As the Forest is now engaging in such a NEPA and planning process, this would be the appropriate time to make these decisions. (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

The Clearwater National Forest should drop conclusions included in the proposal.

“For trails (OYS, OYM, OSS, and OSM), the proposed action would provide a better spectrum of trail opportunities, reduce wildlife disturbance in key areas, and protect the character of areas recommended for Wilderness designation. Generally this would be accomplished by restricting motorcycle use on some backcountry trails. This would affect trails where motorized travel is not currently restricted but does not occur (about 36 miles) or occurs at a very low levels (45 miles) due to trail conditions as well as other trails that currently receive motorcycle use to varying degrees.” Such conclusions are inappropriate in a scoping document. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should address existing routes and new construction.

The scope of the project must address both existing routes and new construction. This is necessary and reasonable because a certain percentage of the existing routes are likely to be closed. Putting a sideboard on the project scope that prevents the evaluation and creation of any new trail segments also eliminates the opportunity to mitigate the overall level of motorized closures. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should include routes on the Palouse Ranger District.

We do not agree that the Upper Palouse ATV EA completed travel planning for most of the Palouse Ranger District. The EA only analyzed routes in the Sand Mountain and Gold Hill areas on the Palouse Ranger District. The EA and Decision restricted cross-country travel district-wide. The Motor Vehicle Use rule requires the CNF when it does travel management, it should analyze every system route. The analysis needs to include what types of vehicle are appropriate for the route and what season of use the route should be available. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider only summer recreation in the travel planning analysis.

The planning staff should consider narrowing the scope of the revision to cover only summer recreation use and break winter travel planning into a separate NEPA analysis. Winter use and summer use along with their impacts are very different. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should not include over-snow vehicles in the proposal.

The travel management final rule on November 9, 2005 rule does not require that over-snow vehicles, such as snowmobiles are limited to a designated system by exempting them under 121.51. I am aware that also stated in 212.81 that "use by over-snow vehicles on National Forest System lands may be allowed, restricted, or prohibited." Please reconsider not including over-snow vehicles in the analysis. (Motorized Recreation Group, ANACONDA, MT—498)

The Clearwater National Forest should not include bicycling in the proposal.

The decision to include bicycling in the implementation of the OHV rule is perplexing. Reading the proposed action, it appears bicycling was merely added to proposed policies for motorized vehicles, without written justification. This is troubling for two reasons: bicycling and motorized travel are inherently different, and our activity's travel network has not received a comprehensive evaluation. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

2.2 Purpose and Need

2.2.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the purpose and need does not make sense.

The three reasons listed for the proposed closures are ridiculous. The first reason is "travel opportunities spectrum". I asked Doug Gober what that meant. He said that the balance of trail opportunity was too heavy towards motorized. I added up the miles of trail currently closed to motorized use in the 2005 travel guide for the Clearwater National Forest. There are 750 miles of non-motorized trails listed. That does not include the approximate 50 mile State line trail. It does include the approximately 55 miles of trail in the Mallard Larkins area that is accessed from the North Fork, but is administered by the St. Joe. The scoping letter for this process lists 490 miles of trail on the CNF currently open to motorcycles. How can the balance of opportunity be

corrected by closing more trails to motorcycles. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

The Clearwater National Forest should revise the project's purpose and need.

The project cannot be a success without a clear statement of the owners and the objective for the travel plan project. The owners of the travel plan project must be identified as the end users of the project, i.e. all of the public that relies on the project area for motorized access and recreational opportunities. The objective for the project should be "To meet the needs of the public for a functional network of motorized roads and trails for access and recreation with practical and reasonable consideration of the environment." (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Suggested Purpose and Need for Action: The purpose and need for this action is to improve management of motorized vehicle use on National Forest System lands within the Clearwater National Forest in accordance with provisions of 36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261, and 295 Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Notice of Intent is not clear whether this is comprehensive road, trail and vehicle planning. This is important as there are roads and trails, which are not, indicated in the maps packets. It is assumed they will remain open regardless of the resource damage or economic problems. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

2.2.2 Winter

The Clearwater National Forest should explain the need for winter restrictions.

As of yet we cannot see that you have identified any pressing issues concerning winter recreation that require the closure of the 200,201 additional acres identified in the proposed action. We therefore see no reason to deviate from the direction of the existing Forest Plan relative to winter use of the forest, including RWA's until the review of roadless areas and RWA's discussed in the Regional Forester's policy statement is complete. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The final rule does not require that oversnow vehicles such as snowmobiles be limited to designated routes, but does provide that they may be allowed, restricted or prohibited.

This does not adequately explain the need to include snowmobiles in this process. In the EIS, please include a sufficient discussion of the need for change that precipitated this action. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should explain the need for winter restrictions in the Great Burn.

The Idaho side of the Great Burn is proposed for closure. For what purpose? . . . Shouldn't there be an actual Purpose and Need to suggest a closure? Is it because it adjoins a proposed/recommended wilderness on the Montana side? (Individual, CATALDO, ID—716)

Based on the facts on the ground determined by the agency itself, there is no logical rationale for the reductions in recreational uses planned in the Proposed Action to "protect wild character." (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should re-consider the need to be consistent with travel restrictions in Montana.

I have heard that one of the considerations for closing this area is to be consistent with Montana's closure, and that sleds access Montana through Idaho. We do ride through the corridor that is approved to reach Idaho but I find that all the riding that I wish to do is in

IDAHO and do not condone crossing back into Montana. (Individual, STEVENSVILLE, MT—2344)

2.3 Proposed Action

2.3.1 Support

The Clearwater National Forest has developed a proposed action that is supported.

We feel you are doing the right thing and that this is an important stand to take on the issue of motorized recreation and our public lands. (Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—4209)

I am extremely excited about the proposed travel plan with restrictions on motor vehicles in the proposed wilderness area. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—4349)

The Clearwater National Forest has developed a proposed action that is supported in part.

*IDFG supports the following directions in the Proposed Action: *Implementation of the National OHV Rule. *Limit indiscriminate cross-country motorized travel (Note: IDFG supports this direction with the understanding that the goal of the OHV Rule is to eliminate, not "limit" illegal cross-country travel) and limit motorized travel to designated routes. *Designate selected roads and trails for motorized travel. *Designate routes and areas open for use by over-snow vehicles. *Balance travel opportunities with maintenance and management capabilities. *Manage impacts to forest resources. *Improve clarity and consistency of existing travel restrictions. *Amend the 1987 Forest Plan to accomplish the Travel Management Plan.* (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

2.3.2 Concerns

The Clearwater National Forest should not abandon trails.

Another disturbing aspect of the proposed action is the number of trails that will be dropped from the system. We did a quick review of the source GIS trails data and the proposed action GIS data. We found that the proposed action actually abandons 320 miles of trail. This is a loss for both motorized and non-motorized recreationists. Without maintenance, these trails will eventually disappear making it impassible even for hiking use. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a proposed action that is objective.

The Travel Planning EIS, after noting that motorized use has increased greatly since 1987 Travel Plan was released, goes on to make the following highly subjective (and questionable) comment about the Proposed Action:

"The trails (OYS, OYM, OSS, and OSM), the proposed action would provide a better spectrum of trail opportunities, reduce wildlife disturbance in key areas, and protect the character of areas recommended for Wilderness designation." (Individual, GRAHAM, WA—2434)

2.3.3 Non-support

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider trail restrictions in the proposed action.

I cannot support any components of the proposed action for three reasons. 90% of riders already obey trail designations and rules, so instead of changing and eliminating trails severe punishments could be implemented. There is already enough designated off road area in the wilderness, the available amount to ride on is quite sufficient. And finally we as Americans do what we are supposed to as citizens of this country and we have the right as Americans to use the land and trails that have been designated to us for years. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—125)

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider Great Burn boundaries presented in the proposed action.

I too do not agree with the proposed Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan and the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness Boundaries. (State Agency/Elected Official, NO ADDRESS—4265)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a proposed action that is based upon data.

. . . the proposed alternative is built upon a tenuous foundation which assumes that: (1) various statutes require that ecological sustainability be the dominant consideration for all management of National Forests; (2) sustained yield of various goods and services derived from the forests cannot be achieved without first achieving ecological sustainability; and (3) that ecological sustainability in all cases is the highest and best use of the forests for the American people. To be supportable, these assumptions would require significant legal, scientific, and economic data. As it is, such data has not been provided and these assumptions are false, therefore, the proposed alternative is flawed and should not be adopted. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.3.4 Suggested Changes

2.3.4.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to address a variety of concerns.

1) It (the proposed action) would restrict multi-use. 2) It would restrict citizens (taxpayers) to a smaller area. 3) Making crowding and over use more a problem. 4) No plans for upgrading or maintaining trails that all ready in place. 5) No plans for future expansion or Rec. needs. 6) Montana and Idaho have more than enough "Wilderness". 7) Some of the "wilderness" isn't really wilderness anyway. 8) No more "gates" (shouldn't "we" be trusted on our own lands?) 9) WE need better travel plans and routes, maps that are correct and easy to read? NO MORE RULES. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—66)

The Clearwater National Forest should base the proposed action upon the 1987 Forest Plan.

The CNF Proposed Action is based upon a Forest Plan Revision which is not in place—indeed may never be in place in its anticipated form. This represents an arbitrary and unlawful basis for the CNF travel planning process and must not be continued to the EIS. (Individual, VICTOR, MT—1917)

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to allow for the development of a range of alternatives.

The Proposed Action indicates the EIS that is to be prepared is not likely to comply with NEPA as it will examine only variations on one concept; reducing mileage available to motorized access. . . . As written, the narrow nature of this Proposed Action precludes both the formulation and the consideration of alternatives in the EIS other than an alternative that has a negative impact on off-road enjoyment of the Clearwater National Forest. (Individual, RIDGWAY, CO—3597)

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to include more information about natural resources and recreation.

Some of the proposed actions that we have seen provide no rationale for the proposed designations of roads, trails and areas for ATVs, 4x4s, dirt bikes, and other types of motorized vehicles. There is no clear indication that fish, wildlife, natural resources, and traditional recreation were even considered - let alone well-managed - as part of the rationale for the proposed action. The Forest Service must provide such rationale in the proposed action in order

for the public to be able to provide substantive comments pursuant to NEPA.
(Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—9)

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to provide more protection for recommended wildernesses and wildlife species.

... we do believe that the Proposed Action does not go far enough in providing adequate protection for Recommended Wilderness or for protecting critical wildlife species.
(Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

2.3.4.2 Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to address the growing demand for off-highway vehicle trails.

How will the proposed action address this increased need for OHV trails? (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action to address winter all-terrain vehicle areas.

Winter ATV riding has become very popular and winter ATV areas should be considered as part of the proposed action. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the proposed action as it relates to snowmobile uses.

The snowmobile portion of the proposed action is unclear. The proposed action is not enforceable or manageable and this should be remedied before the DEIS review is conducted.
(Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest modify the proposed action by eliminating snowmobile restrictions.

I think changes should be made to the preferred alternative to scratch snowmobiles from the list of motorized vehicles to be excluded from use in the proposed change areas. I feel the logic in closing these areas to snowmobiling is flawed. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—1055)

The Clearwater National Forest should modify the proposed action by restricting motorized uses in recommended wildernesses.

While CNF is to be commended for designating portions of roadless areas as off-limits to winter motorized use, it appears that whittling down the size of the Great Burn (aka Hoodoo-#1301) Recommended Wilderness area by allowing motorized vehicles in portions of these areas. The Proposed Action would thus set a precedent for these areas that motorized uses are desirable, ensuring that they are unlikely to be designated Wilderness at some point in the future.
(Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

2.4 Issues

2.4.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should identify and disclose preliminary issues.

Total lack of notice or discussion of any actual planning issues in the Scoping materials is a serious flaw in the agency's process. The Clearwater should immediately (or as soon as practical) post all of the preliminary planning issues on the website and give some way for the public to review, comment, suggest alternatives etc. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

2.4.2 Suggested Issues

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze multiple issues.

We request that you analyze these issues . . . amount of suitable timber base in those areas that will be proposed to be closed to multiple use travel, the amount of rescues that have occurred in wilderness versus multiple use areas and the response time and rescue time difference between them, amount of fires that have occurred in wilderness versus multiple use lands and the amount of long term ecological damage that resulted from fighting these fires versus letting them burn and analysis of watershed health and water quality in those areas that have extensive fires within your district and the effect they have had on wildlife both land based and aquatic. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

. . . we formally request the two proposed planning issues: 1. cumulative loss of motorized and mechanized recreational opportunity and 2. trail experience distinct from road experience be incorporated into the analysis and addressed in each alternative. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

I believe the issues that are important in travel planning include water quality, wildlife habitat, global climate change and species diversity. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Clearwater National Forest should address issues significant to motorized users.

The injustice is that the agency is not identifying and addressing issues that are significant to motorized recreationists including importance of each existing route, cumulative effects of all motorized closures, and need for more not less motorized recreational opportunities, and others discussed in the following comments. . . . We request that this evaluation address all of the significant issues that affect motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should address fisheries and water quality issues.

. . . the following factors should be considered: 1) Given our increased concern for and knowledge of bull trout stocks and life histories, what are the impacts of the proposed road system on potential for poaching of bull trout as well as other salmonids? 2) Are the proposed recommendations serving to promote illegal fishing activity within the Forests? If so, how can poaching concerns be allayed? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

. . . it is suggested that the following factors be considered: 1) Consideration should be given to eliminating existing roads in geologically sensitive areas that might result in increased cobble embeddedness. 2) Road should be evaluated for their potential to deliver sediment to areas used by bull trout. 3) GIS mapping would identify areas of geological conditions conducive to erosion and sedimentation. The use of such mapping would be useful in pinpointing areas where potential impacts on bull trout might be most extreme. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

The Clearwater National Forest should address the issues associated with the social and ecological effects of crowding more motorized users into smaller areas.

The CNF Proposed Action for the Travel Plan calls for a dramatic reduction in roads, trails, and areas available for motorized access. Crowding more people into smaller and smaller areas of our forest has adverse resource, wildlife and forest visitor implications. I believe that NEPA requires the CNF to specifically address these issues as part of the Travel Plan EIS. (Individual, VICTOR, MT—917)

2.5 Interdisciplinary Team

The Clearwater National Forest should have motorized recreation planners on the interdisciplinary team.

We request that the interdisciplinary team (IDT) include motorized recreation planners and enthusiasts in order to adequately speak for the needs of multiple-use and motorized visitors. A multiple-use and motorized recreationists advisory board could also be used to advise the IDT and decision-makers. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.6 Document

2.6.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should correct inaccuracies and discrepancies in the proposal.

. . . we found errors in mapping, roads and trails missing from the inventory, and inaccurate information about the current use and condition of some roads and trails confusing. Our difficulty reviewing the Proposed Action was compounded, in some instances, by inconsistencies between the maps provided and the route-based restrictions change tables used to explain the changes. There were also some inconsistencies between the existing Forest Travel Guide designations and the proposed changes in the Proposed Action. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Forest Service figures do not reflect true use acres. The Clearwater Forest has 1.8 million acres. You State that 1,322,943 are now open to over-snow use and 302,856 acres closed to over-snow use. This is only $1,625,799 + 259,165 = 1,884,964$ acres. Where are the extra acres coming from? The Wilderness portion of the forest needs to be included in acres closed to over-snow vehicles: $302,856 + 259,165 = 568,021$ acres currently closed on the Clearwater Forest. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

. . . snowmobile use on some roads and a great number of trails that were previously restricted yearlong (Alternative 0) would be opened to snowmobile use. These changes show up in "All Restrictions with Changes Highlighted" but not in the table "Oversnow Vehicle Changes." Where did these changes come from and is the listing possibly in error? If this is not an error, we are strongly opposed to these date changes. This is due to the fact that these changes will cause several compatibility problems and the fact that many of the narrow trails changes to this restriction are really not safe for winter snowmobile use. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

Table 1 in the Proposed Action (Designated Motorized Road and Trail Mileages) identifies 3,057 miles of road and trail on the Forest. This is in contrast with the 2005-2006 Monitoring and Evaluation Report, which reports a total of 4,095 designated road miles. This discrepancy appears to stem from the Proposed Action not accounting for roads closed year around (CYA). (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

Several trails proposed to be opened to motorcycle are not suitable or presently being used because they are not presently opened even to hikers or horses in the field. Also there are possible cultural and wildlife-fish conflicts. A good example is the Fish Creek Trail 2240 and the Ant Hill Trail 225 motorcycle route which is presently listed as open to motorcycles (on paper), but it is not open in the field. The travel guide also states that Trail 2240 is 15.5 mile long and goes from the Fish Creek Trailhead near Highway 12 with Road 462 to the junction with Road 5547, east of Mex Mountain. The middle of Trail 2240 was washed out years ago and never rebuilt. This trail on paper does not exist in the field. The Fish Creek Trail is labeled a mainline trail. In the middle Fish Creek near Ant Hill there are motorcycle-elk calf conflicts due to the

disturbance motorized use brings. Also the Fish Creek Meadows are spawning habitat for salmon and illegal salmon harvest is a problem not only from motorcycle access on Trail 2240 but also from ATV access on Trail 229 (ATV or old jeep road) from Fish Butte Saddle. Ant Hill Trail is clogged with brush and small trees and has not been maintained for around 60-70 years and the trail is unusable for horse or hikers, yet supposedly open to motorcycles. It also crossed a swampy wet meadow on Ant Creek. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify information in the proposal.

We could not understand what "0" meant as the change for trail please explain for the following trails: 607, 667, 523A. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

Please explain what the changes are for the following trails where "As Signed" is the only reason noted as the justification for change to each of the following roads & trails. Also please provide documents for each below trail indicating the current signage: 1606, 1607, 1608, 1612, 1613, 1614, 246-A, 247-A, 247-B, 247-C, 737B, 5162, 486A, 1649A, 1649B, 1649C, 1649D, 5548A, 102C, 1676, 1684, 1685. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The area around White Pine is proposed to have trails closed to snowmobiles. While that is positive, there is not an area closure so it begs the question whether the agency intends to close the area or just the trails in the area. If the latter, what about snowmobiles crossing trails to go into the wide open "in-between" areas? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should display specific information in the document.

In order to adequately evaluate and disclose motorized and non-motorized recreational resource and opportunity information to the public, the following information using tables and maps must be used and presented in an accurate and concise manner.

Comparison of Non-Motorized and Motorized Opportunities 1) the miles of non-motorized recreational opportunities available in the project area including all possible cross-country routes and the number of acres available for cross-country non-motorized recreation under the existing condition (it is infinite); 2) the miles of roads and trails and number of acres to be closed to non-motorized recreationists in the proposed condition; 3) the miles of existing motorized roads, ATV trails, and motorcycle trails in the project area meeting the 3-States OHV decision definitions; 4) the acres within the project area open to motorized recreationists under existing and proposed conditions; 5) the percent of motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities in the project area; 6) the miles of atv trails, motorcycle trails and roads and acres closed to motorized recreationists under both existing and proposed conditions; and 7) the cumulative miles of roads, atv trails, motorcycle trails meeting the 3-State OHV definitions and number of acres closed to motorized recreationists over the past 35 years at 5 year intervals in both the project area and regional area.

This information must be presented in order to understand the significant imbalance of recreational opportunities that exists and the decision is deficient without this information. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The document and decision must clearly disclose on maps and tables and summaries all existing areas, and existing roads and trails that would be closed to motorized access and motorized recreationists. Summaries should include overall closures percentages. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The DEIS should include the current number of road miles and density and the change in road miles and density that will occur as a result of the plan and a description of how roads on the

Forest impact resources. This analysis should consider all roads (open and closed). (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should remove illogical statements from the document.

“Provide for better spectrum of motorized, non-motorized, and non-mechanized travel opportunities across the forest in recognition of the need to retain the character of lands recommended for Wilderness designation and the National Forest's ability to provide for non-motorized recreation opportunities that are not available on other land ownerships.” This statement is not logical and should be removed from the EIS. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop separate documents for winter and summer travel plans.

The Forest Service should break the winter and summer travel planning process into two separate documents. (Individual, BOISE, ID—2884)

2.6.2 Definitions

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the team “as posted.”

The Clearwater should clarify or change its term "As Posted" in the reports. Question: Does this mean that motorized uses are "limited to routes that are Posted open?" If yes, this doesn't seem at all consistent with the TMR. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should identify “certain specific areas.”

PANTRA objects to the following rationale for closing trails to motorized use: Motorized travel is restricted to reduce disturbance to wildlife in certain specific areas. The "certain specific areas" are not identified. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

The Clearwater National Forest should define the “current climate.”

“In the current climate, and with an eye toward the future of the forest, its resources, and its users, there is a need to identify routes suitable for motorized, non-motorized, and non-mechanized travel.” The current climate? What climate is that? We formally request that this reference to "climate" be clarified in the EIS. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should define “recommended wilderness area” and “wilderness study area.”

Define the Forest Service's definition of a Recommended Wilderness Area and a Wilderness Study Area? (Individual, SPOKANE, WA—2210)

The Clearwater National Forest should define “resource damage.”

Resource damage? Prove it in plain language. Don't hide behind a 1000 page EIS. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—4274)

The Clearwater National Forest should define “significant” conflict.

We request that a reasonable definition for "significant" conflict be developed and used as part of this action. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the definition of “small motorized vehicle.”

The scoping notice for the Clearwater Travel Plan divides the classes of summer vehicles into motorcycles, "small" motorized vehicles, and all vehicles. It's pretty clear what motorcycles and all vehicles entail, but less clear what constitutes small motorized vehicles. A footnote in the scoping notice explains that "small" vehicles are ATVs and motorcycles but not UTVs. The

Clearwater should consider further clarification of the "small" vehicles class by defining the width of the wheelbase for small vehicles, such as <48 inches. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

I ride a 2007 Honda Rubicon 500 cc, is it a small motorized vehicle? (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2335)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify descriptions of the various vehicles.

Please look at the maps, and explain what the descriptions of the various vehicles are? (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2335)

The Clearwater National Forest should define and explain the use of the “travel opportunity spectrum.”

The EIS must fully disclose what the "Travel Opportunity Spectrum" is and how the Clearwater is using this in their decision making process. The public should also know the TOS was determined, the difference between the TOS and the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, and why the Clearwater is using TOS. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

At the 12/19/07 "Open House" Ranger Gober was unable to explain what the Forest Service's "vision" is for an optimal TOS. Until the Forest Service can explain just what they mean by a "good Travel Opportunity Spectrum," PANTRA challenges using TOS as a justification for closing motorized trails. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the definition of “unclassified or ghost road.”

The term "unclassified road or ghost road" may give the impression that these roads evolved illegally. We request a clarification in the document that travelways with these origins are legal travelways as recognized by all policies and decisions . . . (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should refer to routes that are available to motorized vehicles as “all-terrain vehicle roads.”

I hope land managers will start to call routes open to motorized vehicles "ATV roads." This is more than semantics. It is public relations and customer service and conflict management. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

2.7 Maps

The Clearwater National Forest should correct errors on travel management maps.

Some of these trails opened to motorized use on paper are not open in the field. The middle of the trail up Fish Creek is opened to motorized, however the trail does not exist, and it is not opened to any traffic. The Fish Creek Trail is labeled a mainline trail. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

I understand that Elk Summit is not expected to be completely shut off as shown due to a misprint on the website. (Motorized Recreation Group, ANACONDA, MT—498)

The Clearwater National Forest should improve travel planning maps.

Route maps were not included in the planning documents and the quad maps of the Opportunity Classes were difficult to read due to their scale. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The maps and figures are not easily understood. There are no identifiable or named features and no road and trail numbers on the maps. It is very difficult for the public to orient themselves and to interpret the proposed action for each specific road and trail. Therefore, the public cannot

adequately evaluate the proposal and cannot develop comments with reference to specific roads and trails. . . .

We request that mapping identify streams, road numbers, trail numbers, landmarks and key topographic features in a manner that all citizens can easily interpret. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The maps are difficult to understand. The legend is not consistent and the symbols confusing. For example, the legends suggest that trails open to motorcycles are blue dashed lines with a "1" cross-mark but some of the maps show trails as blue with circles. It is difficult to comment on a proposed action when it is unclear what that action actually entails. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The maps we had to work with during scoping were barely legible and we know you have much better maps. We would hope that better, larger scale maps would be made available for us to use and draw on as planning progresses. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The Clearwater National Forest should produce maps that distinguish recommended wilderness from designated wilderness.

Your map shows Wilderness Areas and Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWAs) in the same color without distinction. This does not provide the public a fair representation of what is being proposed. (Individual, BELFAIR, WA—2515)

RWA areas should be marked separately on maps so people are aware of what is actually wilderness and what is proposed. Being honest with the public should be one of a public employee's primary concerns. (Individual, ELK RIVER, MN—1861)

The Clearwater National Forest should review recommended wilderness boundary changes and explain them.

Pollock Ridge trail was clearly out of the recommended wilderness area on earlier maps, but seems to be within the RWA now. Was there another study or survey done for this map change? If there was, please send the dates and all pertinent information regarding the RWA boundary change. Also the RWA boundary seems to have changed along the Little North Fork. The earlier maps showed the boundary east of Bear Creek, but now the boundary has moved to the West of Bear Creek. Was this area also surveyed? If so, please provide all pertinent information regarding this matter. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

The Clearwater National Forest should include all existing trails on maps.

There are many trails in the Clearwater National Forest that are not listed on the Summer Travel Management analysis. Some trails that are on the ground are not even shown on the current map. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—941)

The Clearwater National Forest should produce a map that shows existing and proposed motorcycle use.

Produce a map that shows the existing condition of trails/roads that motorcycles can currently use (the 404 miles stated in the table) and a map that shows the change (178 mile reduction). The scoping letter indicated what roads are overgrown and not rideable - can those roads be shown? (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—93)

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify maps related to snowmobiling.

The maps also show winter range as proposed to be open to snowmobiles. Is that accurate? There is an inconsistency as to what trails may be open to snowmobiles. The summer maps reflect certain trails not open to motorized use yet the winter maps show those areas open to snowmobiles. Are snowmobiles proposed to be allowed on these trails? The written documents

and maps seem to be in conflict regarding area closures for snowmobiles. For example, there are trails proposed to be closed to snowmobiles on the maps. In some instances these are loop trail systems that effectively isolate areas that appear as open. One couldn't access these areas except by going on the closed trail (or through a closed area like wilderness). Please clarify the maps and clearly answer these questions in the next phase of the process.

(Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The winter use map is confusing. Will the 419 be open or closed to snowmobiles? Why are the Little Moose Creek and Swamp Creek drainages open to snowmobiles?

(Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

2.8 Forest Plan

2.8.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should clarify the relationship between forest planning and travel planning.

. . . if routes are proposed for closure or an area is designated for non-motorized used under the forest plan, then it is all but a done deal when travel planning comes along later. . . the current forest planning process puts motorized recreationists at a disadvantage because of the lack of understanding about its role in the travel planning process and also, it puts motorized recreationists in disadvantage position of "double jeopardy", i.e. of having to protect motorized opportunities in both forest planning and travel planning processes. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should properly tier to the 1987 Forest Plan.

By not properly tiering this travel plan off the current Forest Plan (and amendments) the Clearwater will call in to question the validity of both the Travel Plan and the Forest Plan revision processes. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose 1987 Forest Plan management direction.

The Clearwater must fully and completely disclose current management direction in the 87 Forest Plan and amendments, including Recreational Opportunity Spectrum prescriptions and other direction related to the planning issues, in the analysis and comparison of the alternative sections of the EIS. That way, the public may determine if the proposed action and the other alternatives are consistent with the current plan direction. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should tier to desired conditions in the 1987 Forest Plan, not the draft Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan.

The "desired future conditions" reflected by the Proposed Action mirror that of the Proposed Forest Plan, not the existing (1987)Forest Plan. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a plan that complies with Forest Plan habitat effectiveness standards.

Open route densities should not exceed habitat effectiveness for these species (sensitive, threatened or endangered), nor should they exceed the standards for elk habitat effectiveness. That means that no motorized use can be allowed in areas where elk habitat is to be maintained at the 100% level. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest's Forest Plan should clarify conflicting direction regarding management of roadless areas.

The Forest Plan also contains some conflicting information regarding the intent for management of certain areas, particularly those that were roadless at the time of the plan adoption and remain so today. WARNING; LAND USE HUMOR AHEAD! Are you telling us that a U.S. Forest Service Land and Resource Management Plan contains conflicting management direction?? No way! Why, that is unheard of!! (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest has a dilemma making management decisions regarding recommended wilderness areas.

The travel plan is being revised on the basis of RWA's and boundaries established in the 20-year-old Forest Plan, even as that plan is in the process of being revised.

We are, of course, caught in a catch-22 situation. If you close the RWA's in this travel plan revision, they will no longer have significant motorized use, so in the forest plan revision, even if you follow the direction in the Tidwell letter and its attached policy statement, you will not have to change anything, even though there is currently significant motorized use taking place in portions of the RWA's, especially the Great Burn. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The Clearwater National Forest should change the desired condition for recommended wildernesses.

. . . by identifying wilderness as the desired condition (dc) the Forest Service has determined to manage them (recommended wilderness areas) as wilderness with all of the constraints, including such factors as "solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation." Notably, however, the dc is not so important that the Forest Service has constrained itself from the at-will use of motors with helicopters, chainsaws and rock drills.

An appropriate dc (for recommended wilderness) would be to manage it in such a way that its eligibility for future designation would not be compromised. That would allow the option of traditional and established motorized and mechanized uses continuing until Congress decides the fate of these land, something they are under no compulsion to do within any time frame. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

2.8.2 Forest Plan Amendments

The Clearwater National Forest should identify goals, objectives and standards that could be amended and explain how they could affect travel management decisions.

It would have been useful for you to have identified those goals, objectives and standards you intend using this Proposed Action and describe either how those changes will be limited to travel management decisions, or how they will effect other management considerations in the Forest. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should comply with existing Forest Plan amendments regarding fisheries.

The travel plan should contribute to attainment of the riparian management objectives in the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) and the Pacific Anadromous Fish Strategy (PACFISH) and should comply with the standards and guidelines in these Forest Plan amendments. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should change wildlife security standards to reflect new science.

Wildlife security criteria and standards in the forest plan are out of date. The science, data and findings as far as road density and impact of motorized vehicles on wildlife have changed scientifically. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should identify new standards for elk habitat effectiveness and measuring the impacts of roads and trail use on elk.

We agree that 100% effectiveness would be difficult to achieve; however, elk are particularly susceptible to roads and motor vehicle traffic (Wisdom et al. 2005) and protections for elk benefit many other species. What standards do you intend to substitute for the elk habitat effectiveness standard? What standards do you intend to use to measure impacts of road and trail use? (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider a new standard for recommended wildernesses.

Please consider the following standard for Recommended Wilderness across Region One: Travel is strictly non-motorized, except for administrative or permitted uses. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—761)

The Clearwater National Forest should follow the regional process to amend Forest Plan direction regarding motorized uses in roadless areas and recommended wildernesses.

If you amend the Forest Plan with the Travel Plan EIS, as page 6 of the Proposed Action indicates you plan to do, the amendment should include the roadless area and RWA review outlined in Regional Forester Tidwell's October 4, 2007 letter and attachments. The RWAs where our use is now occurring should either be dropped from further consideration as recommended wilderness or their boundaries modified to exclude the areas where motorized recreation is taking place, the net result being no additional closures. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

2.8.3 Settlement Agreement

The Clearwater National Forest should protect streams and water quality according to the Forest Plan settlement agreement.

Because of the sensitivity of many salmonid species and the requirements of the 1993 Settlement Agreement, the Forest Service needs to ensure that the travel plan results in no new sediment delivery to the streams and water bodies on the forest where forest plan standards are not being met or such that beneficial uses would become impaired. For routes that cross streams multiple times or which include wet water fords, it will be difficult to prove that no new sediment is being delivered as a result of designating the route for motor vehicle use. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect beneficial uses of streams according to the Forest Plan settlement agreement.

The 1993 Settlement Agreement basically supersedes these water quality objectives (Appendix K) in watersheds where Forest Plan standards are not being met because the agreement requires the Forest Service to implement only the projects that would result in no new sediment.

Appendix K is still important in that it specifies the beneficial uses (i.e. the significance of fish populations) of each stream segment on the forest. The agency is obligated to protect those beneficial uses, particularly steelhead, bull trout, and Chinook. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

2.8.4 Forest Plan Revision

The Clearwater National Forest should not use travel planning to “seal the deal” on the draft Proposed Forest Plan.

A comparison of the Proposed Action and information on the Clearwater's Forest Plan Revision website would indicate that the Clearwater is tiering this travel plan off of the Proposed Forest Plan. Frankly, it looks as if the Clearwater is trying to "seal the deal" on their Proposed Forest Plan. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should complete revision or amend the 1987 Forest Plan using regional review processes to exclude areas of established motorized uses.

... if you are going to comply with the policy supported by Mr. Tidwell it appears to us that you must leave the current travel plan unchanged as it relates to RWA's until the Forest Plan is revised and its reevaluation of roadless areas and RWA's is completed, or amend the Forest Plan during the travel planning process, including the roadless and RWA review and modification to exclude areas of established motorized use. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

The Clearwater National Forest should base closures on site-specific analysis in accordance with the 2005 planning rule.

The basis for this guidance (2005 planning rule) is that from here forward forest plans will not produce any significant changes from the existing condition and if a proposed future action does produce significant impact(s) it must include specific analysis and public input developed as part of that project. Additionally, any guidance found in the forest plan must yield to the site specific project analysis. Therefore, the use of "consistency with the forest plan" is no longer a valid reason to close motorized recreational resources and only site specific data and reasons should be used to address motorized recreation needs and resources. We support this rule. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Current procedures have not allowed for adequate site-specific analysis. According to the agency's current planning documents, these areas will be closed to motorized use upon the completion of the Forest Plans. However, under the new Forest Service planning regulations, the program-level Forest Plan revision procedures will not include site-specific analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act necessary to support closure of existing uses in these areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—529)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict bicycles from recommended wildernesses consistent with language in the draft Proposed Forest Plan.

Further, the proposed action indicates it will be using Recommended Wilderness boundaries from the draft forest plan. Though the forest plan has yet to be finalized and though the planning rule under which it was developed has been successfully litigated, the draft forest plan does not require a prohibition on bicycling in Recommended Wilderness. The draft forest plan merely states that given activities are generally suitable or unsuitable for a particular management area. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider that comprehensive recreation planning should be conducted from a broader perspective than travel planning.

... this undertaking amounts to de facto comprehensive recreation management as it will decide the fate of backcountry areas into the future. Permanently opening areas to ORV use is close to being an irretrievable commitment of resources. This needs to be considered in a broader perspective. For example, how will this process bias the upcoming forest plan revision? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

2.9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The Clearwater National Forest should prepare an environmental impact statement.

. . . the proposed action is beyond the scope of an environmental assessment and an environmental impact statement must be prepared. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should describe enforcement measures in the draft environmental impact statement.

The DEIS should describe what enforcement measures will be utilized in order to discourage use of the restricted trails, and the monitoring program that will be implemented to ensure they are effective. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

It is clear from some of the materials provided that enforcement of Travel Plan restrictions will be critical to meeting stated goals of this action. We hope to review detailed provisions for enforcement of the Travel Plan in the EIS. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose water bodies that are not meeting water quality objectives in the draft environmental impact statement.

The EIS for the travel plan must disclose the water bodies that are not meeting the water quality objectives in the Forest Plan and demonstrate that designated routes and areas for motor vehicle use will not lead to measurable increases in sediment production. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose areas with sensitive vegetation and analyze potential impacts from over-snow travel in the draft environmental impact statement.

We also recommend that the DEIS disclose areas that contain sensitive vegetation and/or winter range for wildlife and analyze these areas in terms of potential impact from over-snow vehicle use. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should address four questions regarding motorized uses in recommended wilderness in the development of the draft environmental impact statement.

Question 1) In Montana Wilderness Assoc. v. U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. District Court of Montana found that Congress required the Forest Service to strike-and maintain-a balance between wilderness character and motorized use in WSAs established by that Act. Given that Congress envisioned motorized uses in Wilderness Study areas they established, what is the Forest Service's rationale for excluding motorized uses in Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWAs)?

Question 2) If the existence of motorized uses does not preclude an area from being designated as an RWA, then what is the Forest Service's rational for eliminating motorized uses in RWAs?

Question 3) What level of motorized or mountain bike use would disqualify an area from being a RWA?

Question 4) In the Eastern Wilderness Act, Congress designated areas Wilderness that contained motorized uses, structures, maintained roads and even sections of paved roads. Has the Forest Service studied the level of motorized uses that actually precludes Congress from designating an area Wilderness? (Motorized Recreation Group, POCATELLO, ID—531)

The Clearwater National Forest should address the following questions regarding the transportation system in the draft environmental impact statement.

The following is a list of issues that the Forest should address in the EIS:

Is there a comprehensive transportation atlas? Does it include roads that were formerly designated as "unclassified"? If not, how does the Forest keep track of these roads? How can the Forest justify building any new roads if it has not documented already existing roads, whether "authorized," or "unauthorized," as defined by the Travel Management Rule?

Was a minimum road system determination already done? If not, why not? Any current proposal must explain how any designation would be consistent with the minimum road system determination, or, if the proposal is to increase the minimum road system, how is this consistent with the roads analysis?

Have old, unused roads been adequately considered? There is no basis for allowing establishment of new routes when there are still old roads causing damage.

Have the impacts of level 1 and 2 roads been adequately considered?

Does the proposal protect refugia for imperiled species?

Will there be concrete goals for road decommissioning in the action? If there are no goals, how can the Forest ensure it will actually achieve a minimum road system?

How will the Forest track road density, including non-system roads, in connection with this proposal? (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

The Clearwater National Forest should address the following issues regarding mountain biking in the draft environmental impact statement.

I would like to have the draft environmental impact statement for TMP address (what) follows:

Mountain biking (MTB) in recommended wilderness areas in the Great Burn, Mallard-Meadow, and Sneakfoot Meadows if those areas do not become wilderness areas as presented in the Clearwater National forest (NF) Management Plan;

Mitigation of loss of MTB trails within the areas recommended for wilderness with the creation of mtb trails elsewhere in the Clearwater NF;

Separation/segregation of motorized and non-motorized uses;

Development of MTB opportunities for longer trips and trips to recreation destinations such as lakes, peaks, or vistas;

Relationship of TMP with the draft proposed Clearwater NF Forest Plan (Plan) in terms of the growing use of bicycles in the Clearwater NF;

TMP impact on the Plan;

Re-alignment of recommended for wilderness area boundaries within the Plan to mitigate loss of MTB trails within those areas; and

Development of MTB opportunities in a non-motorized setting within a reasonable travel distance from area communities. (Individual, BOISE, ID—2983)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose the rationale for the variations in seasonal restrictions in the draft environmental impact statement.

The public can not understand the nexus between individual project analysis restricting motorized uses and the incomprehensible seasonal restrictions currently in force on the Clearwater. If the agency includes this section in its final EIS, it might be good disclose to the public a bit more detail on why those individual projects resulted in all that variation in seasonal restrictions. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

2.10 Analysis Needed to Support the Process

2.10.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of funded national foundations on agency decision making.

We request the significant impact that national foundation to environmental groups has on motorized recreationists be adequately evaluated and considered including: (1) the impact that foundation funding has on the NEPA process, (2) the impact that foundation funding has on the decision-making, and (3) the impact that foundation funding has on the NEPA process through significant use of legal challenges to nearly every decision involving multiple-use proposals for public lands. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.1.1 Global Warming/Pollutants

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of motorized travel on global warming.

This project authorizes motorized activity on public lands that will result in the emission of a significant amount of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide. As such, the CNF must analyze the impacts of this authorization on global warming. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently ruled that federal agencies must analyze the impacts of a federal action on global warming. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze information about pollutants that will result from the travel plan.

The Forest must evaluate, analyze and disclose information on pollutants that will result from the Travel Plan (to comply with the Clean Water Act). (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

2.10.1.2 Vegetation

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of motorized restrictions on fire management, fuel wood cutting and timber management.

We request that the process include consideration of the negative impacts that proposed motorized road and trail closures will have on fire management, fuel wood harvest for home heating, and timber management. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze all factors contributing to the spread of noxious weeds.

We request that the document make a fair evaluation of all sources and uses that contribute to the noxious weed problem including hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians (non-use of weed-free hay), etc. The document should also fairly evaluate how natural processes and wildlife spread noxious weeds. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.1.3 Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze differences in uses that occur in wilderness, non-motorized and multiple-use lands.

We request that the difference in visitor use between designated wilderness/non-motorized/exclusive-use lands and multiple-use lands be acknowledged and adequately addressed in the evaluation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze how motorized uses affected previous wilderness designations.

I request the EIS include a discussion and analysis of previous Congressional Wilderness designations so the public may understand how the existence of motorized uses actually impacts Congress's ability to designate wilderness. (Individual, SIMPSON, IL—2338)

2.10.2 Fish and Wildlife

2.10.2.1 Fish

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the plan's impacts to bull trout.

Bull trout: The following factors should be considered:

1) How many stocks are affected under the proposed plan? 2) How does the proposed plan affect the habitat and viability of each if the defined stocks in the basin? 3) Are any specific stocks particularly vulnerable at this time at any stage(s) of their life cycle to actions under the proposed plan? 4) Are any existing road crossings or other travel-related impacts negatively affecting the movements of bull trout stocks? 5) How are actions in roaded areas going to affect fish spawning in roadless areas but rearing in roaded areas? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

. . . it is suggested that the following factors be considered:

1) Are the minor changes in road access recommenced under the proposed plan adequate to maintain and improve bull trout habitat in roaded areas of the Clearwater and Nez Perce Forest? 2) Do the proposed road plans take into account projections on climatic changes over the next decades and their potential effects on bull trout? 3) Would road alternatives more restrictive than the proposed one allow bull trout to effectively recolonize areas where they have been extirpated or to increase in numbers in areas where there numbers are seriously depressed? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze impacts of the proposal on salmon and steelhead.

Embeddedness and thermal issues related to the proposed plan should be addressed for anadromous salmonids, chinook, salmon and steelhead trout. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

2.10.2.2 Wildlife (General)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze impacts to wildlife fairly.

Impacts to wildlife from motorized and non-motorized users must be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of motorized activities on resources and wildlife.

To have a blanket ban on these (motorized) activities with out an in depth study of the impacts on the natural resource and wildlife is simply wrong. As a stake holder in the use of this magnificent area I am asking (begging) the Forest Service to do a study of this area and base the decision on science. (Individual, BELGRADE, MT—2842)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze impacts to “species of greatest conservation need.”

Travel planning analysis should consider the effects of the Proposed Action Alternative on species of greatest conservation need identified in the Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct a geographic information system analysis to evaluate core habitat size.

We also recommend the Forest Service develop a GIS analysis that evaluates the core habitat size of each proposed alternative. These two analyses (open route density and GIS) are an important indicator and demonstration of the extent that each alternative will have on particular wildlife species. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of residences on wildlife habitat.

The encroachment of residences into the forest is often the most significant factor contributing to the loss of summer and/or winter wildlife habitat. First, we request that the impact of these permanent encroachments be qualified and compared to the relatively minor impact that mechanized forest visitors have on wildlife habitat. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.2.3 Wildlife Species (Specific)**The Clearwater National Forest should analyze impacts to elk.**

The impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative must be analyzed for its potential impacts on elk and how those impacts will relate to IDFG management objectives. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the effects of the proposal on fishers.

Given the rarity of fishers in the Northern Rockies, and the potential risks to fishers posed by snowmobiles, we request that the Forest Service analyze the following effects for each of the project alternatives: Areas of overlap between proposed snowmobile use and fisher habitat; potential of the proposed snowmobile use to facilitate access into fisher habitat by trappers; and potential of the proposed snowmobile use to fragment fisher habitats and populations. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze information related to grizzly bears.

The Forest must evaluate and analyze the available information on habitat suitability for Grizzly Bears on the CNF and the available information flowing from the proposed reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the Bitterroot Ecosystem conducted by the FWS. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the pending “delisting” of grizzly bears and other species in its analysis.

The current analysis does not adequately consider grizzly bear delisting under the Reasonably Foreseeable actions. This action is imminent. Other pending delisting of endangered species must also be considered. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of the proposal on lynx.

Given this management direction to protect lynx habitat, we request that the Forest Service analyze the effects of each project alternative in the following areas: Expansion of snow compacting activities (Objective HU 01); concentrating activities in existing developed areas, rather than developing new areas (Objective HU 03); expansion of designated over-the-snow

routes or designated play areas outside baseline areas of consistent snow compaction, unless designation serves to consolidate use and improve lynx habitat (Guideline HU G11); and maintenance of lynx habitat and connectivity. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the effects of the proposal on wolverines.

. . . we request that the Forest Service analyze the effects of each alternative on wolverine denning habitat and dispersal routes. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

2.10.3 Transportation System

2.10.3.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the effects of motorized uses in a fair manner and compare it to baseline data.

Impacts should be evaluated and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner and with a relative sense of magnitude. Analysis of vehicle use should be compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the Preliminary Proposals can be determined. Impacts should be described in sufficient detail for the public to fully understand the nexus between the impacts and the conclusions and, ultimately, the decision reached by the Deciding Officer. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

2.10.3.2 Roads and Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct a site-specific analysis of every road and trail.

Site-specific analysis should be provided for every road and trail so that the benefits of keeping each motorized travelway is adequately addressed and accounted for in the decision. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

. . . a route-by-route analysis would be the appropriate way to evaluate the use and value of each trail. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—6)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze open route densities.

We recommend that the FS conduct an open route density analysis and ensure that open route densities do not exceed those recommended by applicable scientific literature.

(Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze all roads and trails using the roads analysis process.

We request that FS-643 (Roads Analysis Process) be used in this evaluation to determine the specific values of each motorized road and trail. We request full use of the FS-643 Roads Analysis Manual in order to adequately account for the social, economic, cultural, and traditional values that motorized roads and trails provide to the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.3.3 Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the effects of trail use through all seasons.

Given the potential for cumulative impacts, we recommend that motorized wintertime trail use be considered together with motorized trail use in other seasons. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze proposed changes in trail uses.

We recommend that the FS clearly identify and thoroughly analyze any proposed changes in the use of trails and that all scoping and other materials identify those changes, unless that use has been previously analyzed under NEPA and has undergone public scrutiny. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

2.10.3.4 Off-road Vehicles**The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the impacts of off-road vehicles.**

. . . ORVs create many negative impacts. The DEIS needs to analyze the impacts of ORVs from many perspectives. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze off-highway vehicle use trends.

The same analysis (growth rated of "stickered" OHVs) must be done for the Clearwater National Forest and it will find the same growth trend and a lack of an adequate number of existing routes that is further made worse by a lack of new routes to address growth. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Analysis of vehicle use must be compared and contrasted to baseline data in order to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the Preliminary Proposals can be determined. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the needs of motorized recreationists.

The agency should commit the resources and has an obligation to evaluate the needs of OHV recreationists at a least the same level of detail as key wildlife and natural resources areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

We request that the analysis adequately evaluate the type and quality of experiences that motorized visitors enjoy and want maintained in the area. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.3.5 Bicycles**The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the suitability of bicycling in recommended wilderness.**

IMBA (International Mountain Bicycling Association) requests the Forest Service perform a route-by-route analysis of the suitability of bicycling in Recommended Wilderness. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the need to close areas to bicycles.

Analysis and justification for excluding bicycles is required for the large scope of the closures proposed. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

2.10.4 Water**The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the transport capacity of streams.**

The transport capacity of the project streams must be established and compared to the amount of historic sediment transport to determine if there is any additional capacity to transport the increase amount of sediment predicted by the project evaluation. This basic check should be conducted so that the increase in sediment production and associated negative impacts are not over-estimated to the disadvantage of public use and motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should compare the amount of sediment produced by natural events with the amount of sediment that results from motorized routes.

The sediment yield must be compared to naturally occurring conditions which includes fires. Recent fires in the Clearwater National Forest discharged thousands of cubic yards of sediment to the area streams which is more than all of the motorized routes in the project area for the next 100 years. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The impact of recreation should be fairly compared to the impact of floods, wildfire, and other natural events on all resource areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.10.5 Social and Economic**The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the mental and physical benefits of motorized recreation.**

We request that the evaluation include adequate recognition of the serious physical fitness problem affecting all age groups of our population. We also ask that the tremendous value of OHV recreation for both mental and physical health benefits (equivalent to jogging) be recognized in the evaluation and used to justify an increase in motorized recreational opportunities. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze economic effects of the proposal.

Backcountry hunting and recreating is a major economic factor in the communities of Clearwater County. It is critical that an economic impact analysis be part of the evaluation when considering any action alternatives; efforts are underway in community economic development strategies that are targeting the access to public lands and the business development opportunities (guiding, equipment rentals/service and touring) that such access permits. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—2472)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze benefits and costs associated with motorized and non-motorized uses.

We request that the (economic) analysis include an adequate benefit cost of the non-motorized trails per the actual and documented number of non-motorized trail user. The economic analysis should also compare the annual benefit-cost per non-motorized user versus the annual benefit-cost per motorized user if the trails and funding were used as multiple-use/motorized trails. . . . The benefit-cost analysis should also recognize the significant economic benefit associated with motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze economics using local data.

We request that the economic analysis use actual local data to determine the true economic and social impact of proposed motorized access and closures on the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze socio-economic and recreational opportunity impacts.

Each route must include a socio-economic analysis that includes the impacts on the public owning OHVs and looking for opportunities to use them and landowners who purchases property with the intent of being able to access and recreate using motor vehicles. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The analysis must determine logical significance criteria for socio-economic and recreational opportunity impacts. Indicators such as miles of routes available for motorized use are useful, but others are needed for adequate analysis, such as number loops, diversity of modality, number

of existing campsites closed, level of difficulty, etc. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The negative social and economic impact experienced by motorized recreationists when motorized recreational opportunities do not exist in nearby public lands must be adequately evaluated and considered in the decision-making. This is especially significant now that fuel is over \$2.00 per gallon. These impacts include the complete loss of recreational opportunities and the cost of having to travel farther and farther in search of fewer and fewer motorized recreational opportunities in times of increasing travel costs. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.11 Cumulative Effects

The Northern Region/Clearwater National Forest should analyze the cumulative effects of all road and trail restrictions.

The cumulative effect of all motorized closures has been significant and is growing greater every day yet they have not been adequately addressed. Ignoring cumulative effects allows the agency to continue to close motorized routes unchecked because the facts are not on the table. CEQ guidance on cumulative effects was developed to prevent just this sort of blatant misuse of NEPA. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

CBU (Citizens for Balanced Use) has continued to request that a Programmatic EIS be completely by Region 1 on the cumulative affects that the numerous travel planning efforts and past actions that have affected multiple use recreation and active management in the many forest districts. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater is attempting to implement a new policy for RWA's that has had little, if any, cumulative analysis. The analysis should not indicate a brief but accurate description of past actions affecting travel management. It should also include a brief description of motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities on adjacent public lands. The analysis should also include a brief but accurate description of the ongoing travel management planning projects on adjacent lands as well as other public lands in the region. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Northern Region/Clearwater National Forest should analyze the effects of multiple travel planning efforts on bicyclists.

The plan must take into account that at some level Region One planning impacts to bicyclists, must be coordinated across forest boundaries. In midsummer, bicyclists need cool, beautiful, alpine destinations to ride to just like hikers and equestrians, and the impact of these three plans (Clearwater, Lolo and Bitterroot) will close all of these places within 90 miles of Missoula. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the cumulative effects associated with concentrating visitors into narrow recreation corridors.

We request the evaluation of the cumulative negative impacts from management goals that tend to concentrate visitors to narrow corridors and reduce recreation opportunities for motorized visitors. Other associated negative impacts that should also be evaluated include loss of dispersed recreation opportunities, reduced quality of recreation, loss recreation diversity, and unequal of recreation opportunities. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the cumulative effects of national foundation funding on all projects involving multiple use and motorized recreation.

The document should evaluate the cumulative negative impact national foundation funding has had on all past NEPA actions involving multiple-use and motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should analyze the cumulative impacts that have resulted from the diversion of gas taxes to development programs.

We request the evaluation of the impact and cumulative negative impacts that have resulted from diversion of gas tax paid by OHV recreationists to development programs. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.12 Alternatives

2.12.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should base alternatives upon fact and a complete roads and trails inventory.

Your planning process must include alternatives based on fact and a complete inventory (of roads and trails). This can only be done with your cooperation with all resource users. We will look forward to seeing this correction made. (Multiple-use Group, TOWNSEND, MT—2320)

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate how alternatives affect loop opportunities.

The proposed action destroys a large portion of those single-track loop experiences. The CNF needs to examine how each alternative will affect loop opportunities. The forest currently provides multiple loop opportunities, but each alternative affects those opportunities by either decreasing or increasing loop opportunities. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

2.12.2 Range of Alternatives

The Clearwater National Forest should provide a true range of alternatives.

The proposed action precludes a true range of alternatives. The Proposed Action indicates the EIS that is to be prepared is not likely to comply with NEPA as it will examine only variation on one concept: reducing mileage available to motorized access. As written, the narrow nature of this Proposed Action precludes both the formulation and the consideration of alternatives in the EIS other than an alternative that has a negative impact on off-road enjoyment of the Clearwater National Forest. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

What the OHV community does not support is being presented with a "range" of management alternatives when all of the alternatives represent a significant reduction in OHV opportunity. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—693)

The DEIS must consider an adequate range of alternatives. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should be objective when developing alternatives.

The starting alternative proposed to eliminate motorized access and motorized recreational opportunities without first adequately addressing the needs of the public for motorized access and motorized recreation and without proper evaluation of facts and information. This procedure is evidence of a significant predisposition in this process. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.12.3 No Action Alternative

The Clearwater National Forest should clearly define the no action alternative.

. . . what will be the no action alternative for this process? Will it reflect the illegal and gradual motorization that has occurred since the executive orders and forest plan or will it reflect an assumed compliance with those legal mandates . . . ? (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

There is a need for the agencies to develop an accurate "no action" alternative. Alternative must provide enough information to at least have a reasonable understanding of what the existing condition on the ground is. Alternative must include existing available non-motorized recreational opportunities on the Clearwater and on adjacent lands as well. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The No Action Alternative as presented is not accurate. Many changes have been made in preparation of the No Action Alternative that already reduced the number of motorized routes significantly. (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt the current plan without the temporary closures as the “no action” alternative.

The current plan, without the temporary closures, should be presented, as the current travel plan in the as is alternative. The 2005 travel guide is just what it says a guide. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

2.12.4 Alternative 1

2.12.4.1 Support for Restrictions in Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in recommended wildernesses.

After reviewing the proposed action (Alternative 1), we have seen several things that we really like. For example, the closure of trails to motorized use in proposed wilderness and other back-country areas is long overdue. . . . Similarly, the restrictions of oversnow vehicles in the Mallard Larkins and the Great Burn areas is a "no brainer" and we applaud the Forest for moving forward with this restriction. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

The Idaho Conservation League strongly supports the Forest Service's commonsense proposal to close the Great Burn and Mallard-Larkins Proposed wilderness areas to off-road vehicles and snowmobiles. This action will protect the wilderness character of these pristine areas. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—704)

2.12.4.2 Support for Restrictions on Snowmobiles

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile uses in certain areas.

If there had been in recent years little or no change in snowmobile power and technology, perhaps winter use would not be such a big issue, but these machines have become vastly more high powered and are increasingly reaching places where they should not be allowed - step places, places where bears are hibernating, where goats, sheep, and fur bearers are trying hard to exist, and during late spring, places where even elk, deer, and moose are weak, hungry, and at risk. The preferred alternative goes a long way in inhibiting these growing misuses of snow machines, and has my full support. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

2.12.4.3 Support for Alternative 1 with Additional Motorized Restrictions

The Clearwater National Forest should proceed with Alternative 1 and enact additional restrictions on motorized uses.

Idaho Backcountry Hunters and Anglers(BHA) supports the Alternative 1 which proposed to reduce the number of miles of trails open to motorcycle travel. In addition, although not recommended in Alternative 1, we would support reduction of already over-generous trail usage by OHVs and snowmobiles.

BHA asks that you stand firm with Alternative 1 for the sake of the native wildlife, plant species, water quality and the right for other citizens to recreate in peace and quiet. (Recreation Group, POLLOCK, ID—2076)

I am in agreement with the Proposal. . . . In addition, I would ask that the Forest Service do whatever possible to protect the wild and remote character of the following important areas by closing motorized routes: North Lochsa Slope, Bighorn Weitas, Pot Mountain, Moose Mountain, Meadow Creek/Upper North Fork, and Rawhide. (Individual, WILSON, NC—2640)

2.12.4.4 Concerns about Alternative 1

The Clearwater National Forest should address a variety of concerns associated with Alternative 1.

The general concerns that I have with Alternative #1 are: 1) Lack of backcountry motorized camping/fishing use available. Access to historical and unique features located in an around the North Fork area via motorized access. 2) Lack or reduction of novice to intermediate trails available for beginning riders. Trail classification: Novice-well defined 30 inch wide (average) trails of gently (0-20%) gradient native soil tread surfaces with few precipitous slope areas along the route. Intermediate-Defined 24 inch wide (average) trails of moderate (15-30%) gradient, native and rocky tread surfaces with some precipitous slope areas along the route. Expert-Defined-Somewhat defined 20 inch minus wide trails with steep gradients up to 45%, rocky-boulder strewn tread surfaces with many precipitous slopes along trail. 3) Reduction of trails connecting vehicular (car/pickup) travel routes to one another, specifically the Lolo motorway (FS road #500) to the North Fork River Road (FS road #250). 4) Use of unlicensed operators and unlicensed vehicles utilizing FS road #250 to return to the starting point of a "loop" trail route. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—2635)

I feel that proposal Alternative #1 Proposed Action, would create these problems.

Problem #1-These closures would force more motorcycle users, whether licensed or not, onto sections of the #250 roads. This will produce more chance accidents. We have had many incidents of injury related motorcycle accidents occurring on roads than off.

Problem #2-Closures of the proposed roads will create more problems for Search and Rescue usage. An example of this is a search we had in the mid 1990's on Monroe Butte, the majority of the trails in the Cook Mtn, Junction, and Raspberry area that are in the proposal for closure, we had to use motorcycles while searching for a lost hunter. We also used horses in the same area as the motorcycles with no conflict. We have used motorcycles in a lot of the proposed closure area for many other types of searches, including injured and overdue hunters on horseback. We can access the area quicker on motorcycles than we can on horses. As backcountry Deputy I only had one complaint of a conflict between horses, motorcycles, and hikers in five years that I worked there. Closing 178 miles of backcountry rails will hinder not only response time, but the ability of rescue workers to reach a victim and save the victims life.

Problem #3-By reducing 178 miles of trails this will put more motorcycles on the open trails, which could lead to more motorcycle accidents.

In closing I do not agree with proposed trail closures as I feel this will have significant effect on not only those who recreate in the area, but also do law enforcement to the best of our ability. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—2635)

In summary, the proposed alternative is built upon a tenuous foundation which assumes that: (1) various statutes require that ecological sustainability be the dominant consideration for all management of National Forests; (2) sustained yield of various goods and services derived from the forests cannot be achieved without first achieving ecological sustainability; and (3) that ecological sustainability in all cases is the highest and best use of the forests for the American people. To be supportable, these assumptions would require significant legal, scientific, and economic data. As it is, such data has no been provided and these assumptions are false, therefore, the proposed alternative is flawed and should not be adopted. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.12.5 Suggested Alternatives (General)

2.12.5.1 Mechanized Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an action alternative that does not reduce mountain bicycling opportunities.

I also request that the Clearwater provide a true range of management Alternatives, including one "action" alternative that, at the very minimum does not reduce the mountain bike opportunity. (Individual, BOISE, ID—2363)

2.12.5.2 Motorized Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that removes all motorized travel restrictions.

I support the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE on this current proposal OR total REMOVAL OF ALL MOTORIZED TRAVEL RESTRICTION, WITHIN THE BOUNDRIES OF THE CLEARWATER NATIONAL FOREST. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1071)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a “maximum recreation” opportunity alternative.

There is a need for the agencies to formulate a "maximum recreational opportunity" Alternative. . . . The planning team must not make the mistake of assuming the "no-action alternative" serves as a "maximum recreation" alternative. The agency can not legitimately claim that maintaining the current allowances and restrictions for OHV use and motorized travel, as described in the current forest plan and travel plan is a viable "action alternative." (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that expands motorized opportunities.

We need an alternative which expands existing motorized opportunities. Additional meaningful opportunities (as defined by the users) need to be created in order to adequately disperse winter motorized recreationists thereby insuring minimal impacts and satisfying the increasing public expectations. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—163)

You don't have any problems with snowmobiling that we are aware of which require more closures, certainly not in excess of 200,000 acres. Closures should be the last resort, after all else has failed, not the first. We stand ready to work with you in identifying alternatives that

increase access opportunities and resolve any identified problems. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

CBU (Citizens for Balanced Use) requests that an acceptable alternative be provided for the public in the DEIS that increases OHV trails and roads. We would like to see additional road and trail opportunities that provide loops and vistas. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that preserves and enhances motorized opportunities and compensates for past closures.

This action and others to follow should address the issues and needs of the public by; (1) Preserving all reasonable existing motorized recreational opportunities, (2) Enhancing existing and developing new motorized opportunities to address the growing needs of the public for motorized recreational opportunities, and (3) Implementing mitigation plans to compensate for excessive amount of past motorized closures. (Motorized Recreation, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative based on existing levels of motorized access.

The existing level of motorized access and recreation is (a) reasonable alternative and an alternative other than No Action must be built around it. This reasonable alternative should also include mitigation to protect the natural environment and compensate motorized recreationists for the significant cumulative effect of past losses, and enhancement to adequately address the growing need for motorized access and recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide different types of motorized opportunities throughout the range of alternatives.

In order to reduce controversy, we recommend that the CNF focus on providing different types of motorized opportunities throughout the range of alternatives. For example, one alternative could offer more ATV opportunities than another. One alternative could provide more seasonal closures while another could provide more yearlong motorized opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop alternatives favorable to motorized recreation that are viable.

. . . we ask that you assure that alternatives favorable to motorized recreation are actually viable. Too often we see those alternatives presented as strawmen, incorporating features that make them easy to discount and avoid in selecting a preferred alternative. Winter and summer recreation have fundamental differences. We urge you to not paint all motorized and mechanized recreation activities with the same brush. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a motorized recreation alternative based on the recreation opportunity spectrum.

We also request a motorized recreation alternative with a recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) comparable to the surrounding ROS available for non-motorized recreationists be adopted as the "proposed action." (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that mitigates the losses of single-track and snowmobile opportunities.

The Clearwater's Proposed Action significantly reduces single track and snowmobile opportunities. Given the intent of the Rule, the Clearwater has a responsibility to consider, in one or more of their Alternatives, mitigating the proposed loss. At least one Alternative should

consider direction to provide similar experiences in other areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that includes sharing uses.

A simple weekend/weekday division is an option, as in, Monday to Thursday motorcycle access, Friday to Sunday non-motorized access. (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—95)

I think that there should be small areas in both drainages (Weitas and Kelly) for motorized as well as non (motorized). If this is not possible, I think all areas should be left as is and alternate weeks or every two weeks between motorized and non motorized use so that everyone can enjoy there experience on the great North Fork of the Clearwater. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1082)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that addresses specific factors.

Alternatives should include:

Educating the non-motorized visitors about when and where they may encounter vehicle traffic as well as informing them of areas where they may avoid such encounters.

Educating the vehicle assisted visitor of where the road or trail might be shared with non-motorized visitors, and encouraging slower speeds and a more courteous ethic in these areas.

Re-routing either use so as to avoid sections of roads or trails that are extremely popular with both groups. For example, a hiking trail can be constructed to avoid a section of popular OHV route. Or an equestrian trail may be constructed to avoid a section of popular mountain bike route, etc.

Dispersing all forms of recreational use so as to minimize conflict and create a more desirable experience. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that balances the needs of fish and wildlife with quality motorized trail opportunities.

We ask the Forest to develop and analyze an alternative that balances the needs of wildlife with the desire to improve quality motorized trail opportunities. This alternative would reduce the potential for conflicts between user groups, provide security habitat for big game during hunting seasons, reduce disturbance that displaces wildlife from preferred habitats, and expand source habitats currently fragmented by roads and trails. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that restricts motorized vehicles to existing roads outside of inventoried roadless and sensitive areas.

Some possible themes to consider would be to restrict vehicles to the 4,000 plus miles of road that exist on the Clearwater National Forest to protect wildlife and watersheds. Another would be to allocate roadless areas for foot and horse travel to protect wildlands, wildlife habitat and watersheds. . . .

Roadless and sensitive areas need to be closed to vehicle use. Such an alternative would still leave thousands of miles of routes open for use. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

It is becoming increasingly rare to find large roadless areas of habitat to support connectivity for wildlife throughout these wild areas. I own a car and believe there is a place for motorized outlets, but crucial recovery habitat found in the Clearwater NF is not the place for snowmobiles, ATVs or dirt bikes. In times of rising fuel prices, providing complimentary policies to support national efforts to decrease dependency of fossil fuels and restoring areas to natural conditions

seems to make sense for the fish, wildlife, and humans. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—2329)

2.12.5.3 Mechanized and Motorized Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that maintains motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wilderness.

Since the current Forest Plan does not preclude these uses from recommended wilderness, the CNF staff should develop an action alternative that keeps these areas and trails open to motorcycle, snowmobile and mountain bike use. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

2.12.5.4 Over-snow Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that increases motorized over-snow opportunities.

We ask that you develop and objectively analyze viable alternatives that increase motorized over-snow access opportunities, looking at present use patterns and considering user needs from throughout the state of Idaho and western Montana. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

We need an alternative which expands existing motorized opportunities. . . . A management prescription allowing winter only motorized recreation use would be adequate. Another might be to create a winter motorized recreation use corridor along the border in concert with the Lolo NF. This would allow motorized recreation use in about 5% of the Great Burn Area until or if Congress chooses to include it in the wilderness system. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2192)

We need an alternative which expands existing motorized opportunities. Additional meaningful opportunities (as defined by the users) need to be created in order to adequately disperse winter motorized recreationists thereby insuring minimal impacts and satisfying the increasing public expectations. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1225)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that allows winter motorized recreation in specific areas.

I enjoy snowmobiling in the Stateline area of Hoodoo Pass. It would be nice to see trail #738 stay open for motorized winter recreation. The areas shaded (Additional Areas where Oversnow Vehicles and Bicycles would be prohibited under the proposed action) in Alternative 1-proposed action of the Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan should remain open for snowmobiling. Dispersion (keeping these areas open for snowmobiling) would lessen snowmobile traffic on other parts of the Clearwater National Forest. In a nutshell, please consider keeping this area open for motorized winter recreation. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—357)

I would support adjusting the boundaries to keep the areas that we ride open or designating the proposed wilderness as a National Protection area that includes the allowance of snowmobile use. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—491)

For this reason (snowmobiler safety) I would not only like to leave the Idaho side of the border open to cross country snowmobile use but encourage it's use by creating better parking at Schley Mountain Corridor and Hoodoo Basin and reopening of the Crooked Fork Trail out of Lolo Pass. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1475)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that includes the creation of winter motorized corridors.

A new or modified designation for a winter motorized corridor will be the most appropriate action for the areas that are traditionally used by over snow vehicles. (Business, SEELEY LAKE, MT—293)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that defines snowmobiling opportunities by degree of challenge.

We need alternatives that define snowmobiling opportunities by degree of challenge and increase access rather than imposing more closures. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

2.12.5.5 Recommended Wildernesses**The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that adjusts boundaries of recommended wilderness and designates lands as national protection areas.**

Adjust the boundary of the proposed wilderness to exclude the historical areas where I and my fellow snowmobilers ride (as submitted by the Missoula Snowgoers Snowmobile Club). Use one of the three alternative designations to wilderness that retain some of the character of the wilderness but allow snowmobile use. Please consider the National Protection Area designation that is similar to wilderness but allows snowmobiling, bicycling, motorized rescue and mechanical trail work. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—820)

An alternative to closing these areas that we have used for over 25 years is to adjust the boundaries of the proposed wilderness to exclude the snowmobile areas from the proposed wilderness as a national protection area. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—152)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that designates the Great Burn as a National Protection Area.

Consider a National Protection Area Designation similar to what other Forests have adopted. This would allow you to maintain trails and offer fire suppression using mechanized equipment. It would allow bicycles. It would also allow snowmobiles. (You knew I had to sneak that in somewhere.) It could also be adjusted to fit the characteristics of the particular area, unlike a Wilderness designation. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2532)

A NATIONAL PROTECTION AREA can be structured site specific to a balance the needs of the users and protection of the land. My understanding is the structure is developed at a State level jointly between users, Forest Service and State Legislators. I was also told that much of the success of the two Colorado National Protection Areas was due to excellent stewardship of the local snowmobile clubs. As a representative of the Missoula Snowgoers Snowmobile Club I have previously stated that we stand ready to participate in that process. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2787)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that does not preclude motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wildernesses.

Since the current Forest Plan does not preclude these uses from recommended wilderness, the CNF staff should develop an action alternative that keeps these areas and trail open to motorcycle, snowmobile and mountain bike use. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

There are other options available that can protect the area while still allowing people to enjoy the area (Great Burn). These options include designating it a national conservation area, a national protection area and/or a national scenic area. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—319)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that adjusts the boundaries of recommended wildernesses to accommodate established snowmobile use.

The north and south ends of the Great Burn RWA are significant, historic snowmobiling areas. The boundaries of this RWA should be modified to leave these traditional use areas open or left open until the boundary modification is made in a later Forest Plan modification. The North end, the Hoodoo area, is important to snowmobilers from the Coeur d'Alene area and Montana; the south end (Williams Peak and Rhoads Peak vicinities) is important to both Idaho and Montana snowmobilers.) (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

We would prefer that an alternative plan would be implemented which would adjust the boundaries of the proposed wilderness area to exclude the snowmobile areas, which have been used by the public for over 25 years. (Business, LOLO, MT—2883)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative to address guidance in the regional consistency paper (regarding recommended wilderness).

If one is to accept that the directive (consistency paper) is driving management of the RWAs, as you have apparently done, it specifies that there are three choices in dealing with RWAs experiencing significant motorized use. Your proposed action focuses only on the first and ignores the other two. This means that to comply with the directive you must develop and examine alternatives that include removing traditional motorized use areas from modifying RWA boundaries or removing the RWAs altogether from that status. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative with options regarding bicycle use in recommended wildernesses.

In scoping for the Clearwater National Forest Travel Management Plan, the agency should review other management techniques and timing options in addressing bicycle usage in the recommended Wilderness area. (Individual, GARDEN CITY, ID—4377)

I have witnessed solutions in other National Forests in the where simple boundary adjustments, cherry stemming trails or alternative designations in conjunction with some new proposed Wilderness has protected the land and still allowed cycling opportunities. While my preference is to see continued bicycle access to the Great Burn RWA, I see where a few adjustments to the boundaries could keep a few great rides open for cycling while allowing for other non-mechanized areas. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—2816)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that adjusts boundaries to accommodate bicycle use.

An improvement toward forging good relations and gaining support from bicyclists would be to show some boundary concessions and some backcountry non-motorized alpine regions adjoining the Great Burn, especially in the Lolo Pass and Hoodoo Pass areas. The creation of some mechanized buffer zones, and creative corridors to alpine destinations is a minimal request. . . . Bicyclists have noted that RWA boundaries are terminated along or cherry-stemmed around roads, showing the planners willingness to accommodate motor traffic. Comparatively, the plan does not show any accommodations in RWA boundaries for bicyclist's historic routes. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—16)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that allows some mechanized routes within the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness Area.

There should be some non-motorized, mechanized routes or regions within the Great Burn RWA, to recognize primary bicycle routes, and also accommodate game carts. Some planners call these areas "buffer zones" to protect wilderness from mechanized users. But Great Burn boundaries have introduced into the potential buffer zones in many locations, and need to be

adjusted. We propose quiet, mechanized buffer zones around portions of a reduced Great Burn R.W.A. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

2.12.6 Suggested Alternatives (Specific)¹

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that replaces OSM-2 designations with OSM-6.

. . . I would like to have the OSM-2 designation removed from your proposal in favor of re-designating them to OSM-6. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—2865)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that eliminates specific motorized restrictions t in the Weitas drainage.

In conclusion, I feel that the trails in the N.F. Clearwater, specifically Weitas Creek, 4th of July, and Junction Mountain entrances and Cook Mountain, Weitas Butte, Weitas Ridge, Liz Butte, Windy Creek, Cook Mountain, and all the others in the Weitas drainage that are proposed for closure to motorized travel should remain in the present state under Alternative "0" - NO CHANGES. I feel that what has been stated above verifies the fact that there has not been enough conclusive reasons for a change in status of these trails. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that removes all-terrain vehicle access to Fish Lake.

I would like to see the Fish Lake atv access removed so to enhance connectivity and remove a cherry stem motorized trail/road system. I have repeatedly seen violations from snowmobilers into the closed portion on the MT side and closing the entire area would ensure wilderness management objectives and make enforcement of existing rules easier and more intuitive. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2629)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that addresses the Capital Trail Vehicle Association suggestions.

We ask that management of these lands for multiple-use be selected as the preferred alternative.

We respectfully ask that the selected action for the Clearwater National Forest Travel Management Plan . . . (1) reverse the trend of closing us out of the forest, and (2) provide for the continued responsible use of roads and trails that we have used for decades so that we might enjoy a form of recreation that is important to us.

We respectfully ask that the agency represent our needs by using all of our comments and information to justify a reasonable and equitable increase of motorized access and motorized recreational opportunities in the project area and to counter any opposition to those opportunities.

The action must develop a preferred alternative that mitigates the significant impacts on the public from the loss of motorized access and motorized recreational opportunities from the propose action and the combined cumulative effect of all other actions in the state.

The preferred alternative must provide for an adequate number of routes as required to provide access to the many historic mines and cabins and an adequate number of dispersed campsites and trailheads.

¹ Many route-specific suggestions were submitted as components of alternatives. Due to the challenge of presenting all of them in narrative format, a table of road and trail suggestions has been created and is displayed in Appendix B of this report.

. . . recreational resource allocation between wilderness/non-motorized visitors and motorized/multiple-use visitors should be based on equal ratios. . . we request that the preferred alternative address this disparity and reverse the trend by managing all of the project area as motorized multiple-use.

The existing level of access and motorized recreation is a reasonable starting position and alternative. An even fairer position given that this should be a travel plan seeking to address the needs of the public for motorized access and recreation would be an alternative based on an enhanced level of opportunity.

. . . formulate an Alternative that maximizes all existing recreational opportunities, as well as anticipates and plans for an increase in recreational use in the future.

. . . develop management alternatives that allow for proactive OHV management. All alternatives should include specific provisions to mark, map and maintain existing OHV opportunities. All alternatives should include instructions to engage in cooperative management with OHV groups and individuals.

Alternatives should include areas where OHV trails can be constructed and maintained when demand increases.

. . . look for management alternatives that provide for mitigation instead of closure. . . . carefully consider displaced use. . . . develop alternatives that allow for additional access and additional recreational opportunities in suitable areas in order to properly manage the displaced use.

. . . designate all single-track trails on multiple-use lands open to motorcycle use.

There is no legitimate reason why the single-track trails in the multiple-use areas of the project should not be shared between motorized and non-motorized recreationists to a much greater extent. This reasonable alternative must be included.

The proposed alternative should report and reflect the true nature and role of ecology in multiple use and sustained yield management not elevate it over the Congressional mandates.

(Develop) a starting benchmark alternative that identifies all of the existing roads and trails available to motorized recreationists including non-system routes and those falling under some undefined definition of "unusable" and those additional routes required to meet the needs of the public.

The environment document should accurately address the significant negative impacts associated with disturbing existing stable roadways in order to obliterate the existing roadbed. A reasonable alternative would be to reclassify the road to either restricted-width or unrestricted-width motorized trail.

. . . incorporate reasonable mitigation measures and convert roads to unrestricted-width or restricted-width trails to provide motorized recreation opportunities and then remove these roads from the roads inventory. We request that this reasonable alternative be included as part of the preferred alternative.

. . . reasonable alternatives to the closure of motorized roads and trails exist and can be used to address wildlife concerns. We request that those sorts of reasonable alternatives to closure of roads and trails to motorized visitors be adequately considered and incorporated into the preferred alternative.

The number of hunters is declining . . . there are no compelling reasons "to elevate the level of elk security in the project area and enhance elk populations". . . there are no compelling reasons to justify reduced road densities as a sought-after or necessary wildlife management

critterion. . . . there are reasonable alternatives including permit hunting and seasonal travel restrictions that can better accomplish the outcome sought by reduced road and trail densities.

. . . consider the vehicle alternative of closing a reasonable number of routes during hunting season and other critical seasons and then opening them during the summer recreation season. This strategy would effectively address road density criteria without nearly as many motorized closures as proposed.

We request consideration of fish and game management alternatives and a more balanced consideration of recreation versus fish and wildlife populations in the decision-making.

. . . enhance the level of opportunities for motorized visitors in order to be responsive to the needs of the public. Enhancement could include roads and trails systems with loops, exploration destinations such as lakes, mines, scenic overlooks, and inter-connections to other public lands and regional trails. We request that the preferred alternative include the enhancement of motorized recreational opportunities.

In order to avoid contributing to further cumulative negative impacts, we request that an alternative based on incorporating all existing motorized roads and trails and restricting motorized travel to those travelways be included in the analysis and selected by the decision-makers.

We request that the ties to the land that are part of our local western culture and heritage be protected and that the preferred travel management alternative include opportunities to visit these features as part of motorized interpretative spur destinations and loops.

The preferred travel management alternative should not restrict motorized access and recreation to narrow corridors along a few major roads. This restriction would not provide for the type of experiences that most motorized visitors are seeking

Concern with sound levels can be mitigated by establishing a reasonable decibel limit for exhaust systems. We encourage all jurisdictions to adopt the stationary sound test procedures as set forth in the Society of Automotive Engineers J-1287 June 1980 standard. Public land -use agencies could establish reasonable sound limits and use this approach to address the sound level issue. This alternative would be more equitable than closures.

We ask that an alternative that includes the conversion roads to atv instead of closing the roads be included. Each road should be evaluated on a site specific basis. The alternative should also include new construction to connect and complete atv loops where reasonable

. . . we request that the project team formulate a wide range of alternative including at least one Alternative that maximizes motorized recreational opportunities in the project area and addresses the following:

. . . emphasizes OHV use in Roaded Natural and Semi-Primitive Motorized opportunity setting for recreation.

. . . strive(s) to provide for the current and future demand for OHV recreational routes.

. . . include areas where OHV trails can be constructed and maintained when demand increases.

. . . analyze the impacts of any future route construction and include those in the decision.

Direction for the required process to construct new routes should be incorporated into each alternative.

. . . maximize the ability to construct new sustainable trails to meet the current and future need.

. . . develop management alternatives that allow for proactive OHV management.

... include specific provisions to mark, map and maintain designated roads, trails and areas in cooperation with OHV users.

... include direction to engage in cooperative management with OHV groups and individuals. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop an alternative that explores an even/odd use provisions.

... (Create) an Even/Odd Use Restriction (EOUR)-Allowing alternative use weeks over the duration that a trail is open for use in the areas where motorized vs. non-motorized user conflicts exist.

Example: FS Trail #20 opens on May 1 for use. Non-motorized users are allowed use for the first week of use while motorized use is prohibited. FS Trail #191 opens on May 1 for use and motorized users are allowed the first week of use as well as non-motorized users. Week 2 FS Trail #20 is open for motorized use and FS Trail #191 is open for non-motorized use only.

A simple colored placard at the head of a trail could be used to designate these trails. The utilization of this system would allow non-motorized users a week without motorized conflict as well as identifying a trail and week in which motorized use is to be expected on a trail. Motorized users should have to allow non-motorized users during their week as potential non-motorized user traffic may necessitate this allowance. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—20)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the Panhandle Trail Riders' Association alternative.

... the Panhandle Trail Riders' Association (PANTRA) formally submits the attached "Pro Access" Alternative for the North Fork, Powell and Lochsa Districts of the Clearwater National Forest. We request that the information included in this document be incorporated into the analysis and released for public comment and review within your travel management designation process. This document should be used as a fundamental building block in creating of a range of alternatives that addresses both the current and future needs of the motorized recreating public. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—693)

2.12.7 Alternatives Supported

2.12.7.1 No Action Alternative

the Clearwater National Forest should adopt the no action alternative.

The present routes and areas open for motorized vehicle access are very sufficient. There does not need to be any changes made, thus please consider that we are asking there be no change. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—486)

I do not agree with these proposed actions. I would change all at the proposed actions and keep everything as is. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—351)

I, like many others, look forward to the opportunity of sharing the forest with my children in the future and feel that Alternative 0 is a step in that direction. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1123)

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt elements of the no action alternative.

I oppose the restriction of oversnow vehicles (snowmobiles) in the proposed travel plan of the Clearwater National Forest. To restrict snowmobile use primarily to eliminate conflict between ski routes, in my opinion is not justification for restriction. I propose that the decision in the Travel plan in this area remain unchanged. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—160)

Summer travel - No new changes. The areas being open to hikers, horseback, Mt Bike, Motorcycles has worked as far as I'm concerned. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—201)

2.12.7.2 Pro Access Alternative

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt the “pro access” alternative.

I have seen the Clearwater National Forest Pro Access Alternative prepared and submitted by the Panhandle Trial Riders Association (PANTRA) in association with many other user groups, and fully support and endorse their approach to the development of a Travel Plan. They have provided references to support the contention that motorized use is no more or less of a sustainable and legitimate use of the Forest than any other recreational activity. (Individual, GRAHAM, WA—2434)

I am a member of the Blue Ribbon Coalition, and support a "Pro Access Alternative" they (we) speak of. My desire is to continue to enjoy my public lands in the respectful, responsible manner that I have in the past, and to include any other users that want to do the same. (Motorized Recreation Group, ALBANY, OR—1121)

With all these points in mind we are choosing to support the Pro-Access alternative rather than those proposed by the Forest Service. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

2.12.8 Alternatives Not Supported

2.12.8.1 Alternative 1

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider restrictions in Alternative 1.

I am writing in opposition to the issue of Alternative 1 closure in the Clearwater National Forest. I currently enjoy riding my snowmobile in the areas that are proposed to be closed to snowmobiles. When the snow melts there are rarely tracks to be seen. I feel there are already enough closures that keep ORVs out of the forest. Please reconsider your closure plan Alternative 1. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—807)

I strongly oppose "Alternative 1"; it has closed too many trails and has eliminated most of the "loops" that exist within the current trail system. A rider will be forced to ride out a trail and back again over the same route. If there has been zero user conflicts, then obviously the multiuse designation is working extremely well and does not require any changes. There are limited camping opportunities at or near the proposed trail heads. There is very little access to the trails on the south side of the North Fork from the North Fork. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—1077)

2.12.8.2 Alternatives with Closures to Motorized and Mechanized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should not select an alternative with additional closures to motorized and mechanized uses.

Many of our supporters recreate in the Clearwater National Forest and we do not support any additional closures to motorized and mechanized use. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

2.13 Mitigation

The Clearwater National Forest should choose mitigation over restrictions.

We strongly support mitigation before motorized closure and, in fairness to the public, encourage the agency to adopt this policy also. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should establish a motorized access mitigation bank.

If the loss of motorized routes cannot be mitigated within the project area, then a Motorized Access and Recreation Mitigation Bank must be established. This mitigation bank would keep an overall accounting of the miles and acres of motorized access and recreational opportunities closed and the new motorized access and recreational opportunities created to offset that loss. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should mitigate the impacts of lost motorized recreation opportunities.

We request that the decision-making provide for adequate mitigation to avoid the irretrievable and irreversible impacts of lost opportunities on motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop mitigation measures to minimize impacts from over-snow travel.

Mitigation measures to avoid or minimize these impacts should also be discussed. For example, prohibiting off-trail snowmobile use until at least 6 inches of snow has accumulated can help to minimize risk to sensitive alpine vegetation. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt mitigation measures for noxious weeds that are fair.

The discussions, decisions and measures used to mitigate noxious weeds should be applied impartially to all visitors and with a realistic representation of noxious weeds natural ability to spread versus a relative magnitude for every activity's contribution. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider sediments traps as a mitigation measure.

Paper No. J05063 of the Journal of the American Water Resources Association (JAWRA)) has concluded that sediment traps are highly efficient at trapping sediment from routes (page 198--199) and are a reasonable mitigation measure. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

2.14 Implementation

The Clearwater National Forest should consider phased-in implementation.

I feel that going from a no restriction practice to a year long closure in the proposed areas would be too large of scaled implementation. Instead if the Clearwater National Forest wants to begin a process of preservation that a small step is better than a large one. It might be perhaps a two or five year implementation subject to review and reevaluation. If need be a larger step could be looked at that particular time. (Individual, PASCO, WA – 2892)

A reasonable process exists to move from the existing management of open to cross country travel to one of travel being limited to routes. It involves restricting cross country travel while limiting use to existing routes and then further refining the existing route system though future planning efforts. (Motorized Recreation Group, LEWISTON, ID—339)

The Clearwater National Forest should define the Plan's lifetime and provide for periodic review and modification.

IDFG recommends that the Forest Service should propose a definite lifetime for the Plan. In addition or in lieu of a definite lifetime, the Plan should include a provision to require periodic updates to ensure the Plan responds to changes in use, technology and scientific knowledge. We suggest a review period every 5 years. Also, as mentioned above, we suggest a provision that

would allow interim modifications of hunting season closures on an annual basis, if needed.
(State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should work with snowmobile clubs to develop boundary enforcement strategies.

. . . how would the boundaries be monitored/policed? Based on the successful negotiation of another somewhat similar situation, this is where we as a snowmobile club are willing to contribute our resources to being part of that solution. I think a five year probationary period allowing us to prove our long term commitment and ability to boundary enforcement and land stewardship would be fair. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—327)

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 3—NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT | 1 |
| Summary | 1 |
| 3.1 Natural Resources Concerns..... | 2 |
| 3.1.1 Impacts of Motorized Uses..... | 2 |
| 3.1.2 Impacts of Non-motorized Uses | 3 |
| 3.1.3 Impacts of Motorized Uses Overstated | 3 |
| 3.2 Global Warming | 4 |
| 3.3 Noise..... | 4 |
| 3.4 Visual Resources Management | 5 |
| 3.5 Monitoring..... | 5 |
| 3.6 Enforcement | 6 |
| 3.6.1 General | 6 |
| 3.6.2 Strategies | 6 |
| 3.7 Water Management | 7 |
| 3.7.1 Stream Protection | 7 |
| 3.7.2 Erosion..... | 8 |
| 3.8 Wildlife..... | 8 |
| 3.8.1 General | 8 |
| 3.8.1.1 Impacts of Transportation System..... | 9 |
| 3.8.1.2 Impacts of Motorized Uses..... | 10 |
| 3.8.1.3 Roadless Areas | 11 |
| 3.8.1.4 Wildlife Corridors | 12 |
| 3.8.2 Specific Wildlife Species | 12 |
| 3.8.3 Impacts of Snowmobiles on Wildlife | 13 |
| 3.8.3.1 Positive/Neutral/Minimal Impacts..... | 13 |
| 3.8.3.2 Negative Impacts | 14 |
| 3.8.3.3 Impacts on Specific Species | 14 |
| 3.8.3.4 Possible Effects of Restrictions | 15 |
| 3.9 Aquatic Ecosystems..... | 15 |
| 3.10 Listed Species..... | 16 |
| 3.10.1 General | 16 |
| 3.10.2 Specific Species..... | 17 |
| 3.11 Range Management | 18 |
| 3.12 Noxious Weed Management | 18 |
| 3.13 Timber Management | 19 |

3.14 Fire and Fuels Management 19

3.15 Heritage Resource Management..... 19

CHAPTER 3—NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Summary

Chapter 3 includes a variety of comments regarding the relationships between the transportation system and the various modes of travel and natural resource management issues.

Some commenters believed motorized uses have negative impacts on the environment. They said motor vehicle use causes environmental damage to many resources including water, soil, air and fish and wildlife. They also cited global warming and noise as reasons to restrict motorized uses. Other respondents countered that the impacts of motorized uses were overstated, and that non-motorized and mechanized users had impacts of equal or greater magnitude. They pointed out that natural events often resulted in more environmental effects than motorized vehicles.

Enforcement was another area of interest. Commenters generally agreed that enforcement is critical to implementing travel management plans. Some commenters believed the Forest is proposing restrictions in lieu of dealing with enforcement problems. Others requested that an enforcement framework and enforcement strategies be developed as part of the travel planning process. A few commenters suggested enforcement issues were symptomatic of a problem with too many motorized users and not enough motorized recreation opportunities.

There were many comments related to the connection between motorized uses and wildlife. Again, some respondents believed the transportation system and motorized uses are harmful to wildlife. They contended motorized vehicles disturbs wildlife, reduces habitat quality, displaces animals and reduces hunting opportunities. Others disputed those claims or thought they were overstated. These commenters requested proof that motorized vehicles have negative impacts. A few cited studies that conclude hikers also have adverse impacts on wildlife.

Many of the comments were specific to the impacts of snowmobiles on wildlife. A number of respondents stated snowmobiles have minimal or no impacts because they operate over snow and don't cause erosion. Many reported they don't see animals while snowmobiling because they operate machines in the high country and wildlife generally over-winter at lower elevations. They added that restricting higher elevation areas, such as recommended wildernesses (Great Burn and Selway-Bitterroot additions), would force snowmobilers to recreate at lower elevations where there could be more conflicts with wildlife. Others countered science shows there are impacts from the compaction caused by snow machines. They also believed the presence of snowmobiles disturbs wildlife and affects dispersion patterns. Some cited studies that concluded snowmobiles have an impact on furbearers.

A number of respondents discussed the impacts of the transportation system and motorized travel on aquatic ecosystems. They requested the Forest use the travel planning process to take actions such as reducing road densities and improving drainage to improve the overall aquatic health of watersheds. Cayuse, Kelly, Weitas, Fourth of July, Fish and Hungrey Creeks were most often mentioned as streams of concern.

People who addressed noxious weeds generally agreed there was a problem. While some argued for motorized travel restrictions to stem the spread of weeds, others requested the Forest Service address all the mechanisms of spread including hikers, stock and cattle.

3.1 Natural Resources Concerns

3.1.1 Impacts of Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized uses are not consistent with a pristine environment.

Motorized use goes against all the good intentions of those who have worked so hard to keep our forests and the animals, the whole ecological system, pristine and a place of solace and peace and not disturb habitat and vegetation that is essential for this earth to sustain life at all.

(Individual, MOSCOW, ID—361)

The Clearwater national Forest should recognize motorized uses cause permanent damage.

The motorized use on our public lands is growing at an alarming and uncontrolled rate. It is causing damage permanent in the scope of a human lifetime, let alone the lifetimes of sage grouse, native fish and other species.

(Individual, WHITEFISH, MT—1659)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the many environmental impacts of motorized uses.

These (environmental) impacts take many forms, including habitat fragmentation, increased human access and encounters with wildlife (crucial for large carnivores and some big game), impacts on aquatic species (erosion and direct impacts from use of ORVs in streams), soil compaction, noise (wildlife and humans), pollution, and impacts to quiet recreationists.

(Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

. . . opening up additional areas (to ORVs and snowmobiles) will only degrade the natural characteristics of these beautiful lands and diminish the wildlife such as chinook, steelhead, bull and cutthroat trout, mountain goats, wolverines and lynx that require undisturbed areas to thrive.

(Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2688)

Besides all of the noise and disruption these vehicles cause they do much damage to the fragile forest floor and also terrorize the wildlife.

(Individual, ALBANY, OR—1503)

Motorcycles (off-road dirtbikes), all-terrain vehicles (ATV's) and snowmobiles create many impacts to wildlife and fish habitat, native plants (spreading weed seed), wetlands, watersheds, air quality, trails and the viewshed.

(Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

Designating trails for motorized use will lead to decreased wildlife security, decreased water quality and increase the chance for human caused fire starts and the spread of noxious weeds.

(Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

I have seen the tragic damage caused by a minority of ATV riders on both forests. Most ATV riders enjoy the visuals and ecosystem as much as I do. There are about 35% who ruin it for everyone. Unfortunately, their motivation cannot be identified before the damage is done. They are nearly impossible to apprehend.

(Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—221)

The Forest Service should not allow off-highway vehicles to pollute the environment.

The pollution from these ohvs is tremendous pollution of air/water and soil and this is an assault on every other American that does not ride ohvs. We are disgusted with this allowance of pollution by the Forest Service in national lands that ALL TAXPAYERS ACROSS THIS NATION ARE PAYING AND HAVE BEEN PAYING TAXES TO PRESEVE FOR THE PAST SIXTY YEARS MINIMUM.

(Individual, FLORHAM PARK, NJ—99)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the environmental impacts of organized off-road vehicle rallies.

. . . organized ORV rallies like the one that happened in Meadow Creek last year threaten the integrity of these forests and the people who like the forest and the sounds found there naturally. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4379)

3.1.2 Impacts of Non-motorized Uses**The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of non-motorized uses.**

We caution the agency not to make the assumption that non-motorized and non-mechanized uses do not result in soil disturbance, erosion, effects on water quality, wildlife, vegetation and user conflict. Indeed, a brief review of literature available indicates the non-motorized uses can and do impact these resources, sometimes significantly so. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should correctly represent the impacts of packtrains on the environment.

I have observed and been told by a Forest Service recreation specialist that snowmobiles and mountain bikes have far less of an impact on the land than a pack-train of horses or mules. Nevertheless, the latter are allowed in Wilderness areas, while the former are not. (Individual, HELENA, MT—2758)

The Clearwater National Forest should regulate activities that create impacts to the environment.

When there is an obvious impact to the environment, activity should be regulated in order to reduce any negative outcomes. For example, mountain biking or riding horses on trails during the muddy season create a serious trail erosion problem. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—326)

3.1.3 Impacts of Motorized Uses Overstated**The Clearwater National Forest should consider the impacts of non-motorized uses and natural occurrences.**

Resource damage and wildlife disruption is a smoke screen. Studies have shown that horses degrade trails more than motorized vehicles. A tree that falls across a stream creates a new channel and invariably erodes the bank. Forest fires have deleterious effects beyond measure. (Motorized Recreation Group, MERIDIAN, ID—1423)

The Clearwater National Forest should measure the impacts of off-highway vehicle use in relation to natural events.

Any measurable impact from OHV use is automatically and incorrectly judged to be significant. OHV impacts are a small fraction of natural actions. Nature should be used as the standard for comparison of OHV impacts. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest has overstated the impacts caused by over-snow vehicles.

(page3, paragraph 1) states that "...soil disturbance and erosion, effect on water quality and aquatic organisms, effect on wildlife, vegetation removal damage. . . ." I find it difficult to believe that "oversnow" vehicles lead to an excessive amount of the above mentioned degradation. I would further submit that USFS vehicles have more effect on these particular environs that do snowmobiles, with regard to soil disturbance. I do not desire to discount that there is an issue that needs to be addressed, but including all motorizes vehicles wholesale is not the correct manner to accomplish the task. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2733)

We do not believe that snowmobiling has a negative impact on the environment in the areas scheduled to be closed. Due to the higher elevation and the amount of snowfall these areas receive, almost all of the wildlife have migrated to lower elevations for the winter months. We also believe that snowmobiles do not cause any damage to the land. All traces of snowmobile activity are gone when the snow melts in the spring. Access to these areas is limited due to the lack of groomed trails to minimize any additional impact that is not necessary. Snowmobile activity in the areas identified is not increasing, but is relatively stable. (Business, LOLO, MT—2883)

I have never seen any animals up there. So I don't think we are impacting on there winter grounds. Also packing the snow down I think would help to keep the snow pack up there longer for prolonged runoff in the spring to help with water through the spring. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1475)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that motorcycles only cause environmental damage in extreme situations.

Only in the most extreme case does an off-road motorcycle do any significant damage to watershed or wildlife. Due to the relative light weight of motorcycles they are not capable of doing any real damage. (Individual, HAYDEN, ID—701)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the environmental and social impacts of reducing and denying access.

Ripping roads, pulling culverts, removing the road prism and other physical practices that deny any access or future use alienates a broad spectrum of the user public and causes more resource damage than the current use. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—2598)

3.2 Global Warming

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the relationship of off-highway vehicle travel to global warming.

. . . global warming is never discussed in conjunction with OHV travel in national forest and yet global warming may become the single biggest threat to national forests. How is encouraging more OHV travel consistent with moving America society towards using fewer machines that contribute to our carbon output? (Individual, SEATTLE, WA—2811)

The Clearwater National Forest should not consider global warming.

Many political leaders and scientist are going away from the scare of global warming because it is just not true. Now it is being called climate change. Well they are right on that. The climate changes pretty much every day. And it changes drastically from winter to summer in many parts of the world. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—130)

3.3 Noise

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize sound levels associated with off-highway vehicles are similar to natural sounds.

A study of sound levels from OHV use was found to be less than the background noise of the wind in treetops . . . at distances over 400 feet, motorcycles do not raise the ambient sound level (they are no louder than background levels of noise). Absolute quite is not a reasonable expectation. Sound from motorized sources such as airplanes exists even in the most remote areas. The sound level of motorized recreation use is not greater than natural sounds, and therefore, sound level should not be used as a reason to justify motorized recreation and access closures. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest already provides substantial “quiet opportunities.”

According to the Forest Service, an estimated 85% of our National Forests provide Quiet Opportunities through special designation and administrative closures. Please note that 5% of the recreating public uses the National Forest for Quiet use. That group doesn't need even more opportunities at the expense of motorized use. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—296)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide “sound sheds” for quiet uses.

. . . the Forest Service should use a landscape-level approach to travel management, by providing sound sheds with opportunities for quiet use and key wildlife habitat. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

3.4 Visual Resources Management

The Clearwater National Forest should consider roads and trails as part of the natural landscape.

We request that the existence of trails be considered part of the natural landscapes, and that the visual appearance of motorized trails and non-motorized trails be recognized as equal in most cases (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

3.5 Monitoring

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a scientific monitoring plan.

Monitoring and evaluation must be made consistent with and pursuant to the best available scientific information, techniques, and methods, and any conclusions based on these evaluations must be statistically significant. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should monitor motorized and non-motorized uses.

Site specific monitoring of motorized versus non-motorized use must be provided for each route. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should monitor areas with motorized vehicle restrictions to validate expected improvements.

There must be monitoring to back up the claimed improvements to the natural environment (from closures to motorized vehicles). (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should monitor compliance with restrictions.

We appreciate that the current proposal appears to designate a number the trails within these drainages (Hungrey, Fish and Cayuse Creeks) as a restricted yearlong to all vehicles. . . . We note, however, many of the roads and trails that intersect with the trails proposed for closure will remain open year around. The DEIS should describe what enforcement measures will be utilized in order to discourage use of the restricted trails, and the monitoring program that will be implemented to ensure they are effective. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should monitor snowmobile use.

Monitoring current "baseline" levels of snowmobile use is an important component of this analysis, and valuable for a variety of resource management issues. We urge the Forest Service to conduct comprehensive monitoring of snowmobile use on the Clearwater NF this winter, including spatial and temporal components (i.e., what areas of the forest are used by snowmobiles, at what levels, and during what times of the year?) (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

Monitoring levels of snowmobile use is crucial. The Clearwater National Forest has failed to monitor activities from motorized use, contrary to direction in the forest plan. This monitoring information is important to analyze impacts of motorized recreation on lynx, wolverine and fisher. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should monitor attainment of wildlife goals.

The Proposed Action Alternative should also include a strong monitoring component. Monitoring should not only track use of trails, but should also assess how implementation of the Plan is meeting critical wildlife goals in the Forest Plan. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

3.6 Enforcement

3.6.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should deal with enforcement problems.

Off-road vehicle use is a problem but it is mostly an enforcement problem and should be addressed as such; closing routes is not going to alleviate the problem. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

Bad behavior must be policed. But problems must not be used as an excuse to shut the public out of public lands. (Individual, STEVENSVILLE, MT—2724)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide enough area for motorized uses to diminish illegal uses.

If there is enough area for people to enjoy their hobbies, the issue of "outlaw" use will be minimized. With closures, "outlaw" use only increases. (Individual, LOLO, MT—57)

3.6.2 Strategies

The Clearwater National Forests should develop an enforcement framework as part of the travel planning process.

. . . the CNF must commit to effective enforcement of all motorized use requirements. We request that the CNF provide an enforcement framework, including budgeting, personnel, and strategies, to accompany this travel plan. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop enforcement strategies related to the travel management plan.

. . . the motor vehicle use map must be accompanied by successful enforcement strategies to ensure that off-road vehicle enthusiasts follow the designations provided for them. In a time of reduced agency budgets, agency officials must be creative at finding successful enforcement strategies. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—14)

I've seen a lot of good Forest plans and proposals become irrelevant without adequate enforcement. Please include a detailed enforcement strategy and substantial funding. (Individual, SEWARD, AK—137)

Please describe in detail in the Travel Plan how the Forest plans to enforce the travel restrictions proposed, specifically keeping snowmobiles out of recommended wilderness areas and the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness. (Individual, CHICAGO, IL—157)

The Clearwater National Forest should describe enforcement measures that will be used to discourage use of restricted trails.

We appreciate that the current proposal appears to designate a number the trails within these drainages (Hungrey, Fish and Cayuse Creeks) as a restricted yearlong to all vehicles. . . . We note, however, many of the roads and trails that intersect with the trails proposed for closure will remain open year around. The DEIS should describe what enforcement measures will be utilized in order to discourage use of the restricted trails (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should establish trail patrols in partnership with various users and groups.

BRC (Blue Ribbon Coalition) suggests incorporating direction to pursue agreements with motorized users, user groups and IDPR that would establish Trail Patrols in order to educate visitors and provide "peer enforcement" of the travel plan. Such efforts have been recognized as a key part of effective law enforcement efforts. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct more patrols and increase fines.

If they are having trouble with land being torn up, then they should be out patrolling better and make stiffer fines for a penalty. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—41)

The Clearwater National Forest should target law enforcement to certain days and known problem areas.

. . . please increase your law enforcement on certain days (including weekends) to saturate known problem areas. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—221)

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct an enforcement operation in the Bighorn-Weitas inventoried roadless area.

We recommend that you initiate a concerted enforcement effort to curtail all motorized travel off designated routes in the Bighorn-Weitas. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

3.7 Water Management

3.7.1 Stream Protection

The Clearwater National Forest should protect water quality.

Motorized roads and trails should avoid further impacts to water quality. Some areas are heavily damaged, including but not limited to Lolo Creek, quartz Creek, the Palouse River, and Orogrande Creek. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect streams from sediment.

Designated routes and areas for motor vehicle use must not retard the attainment of the Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs) of INFISH and PACFISH. By designating such a route and publishing a motor vehicle use map with the route on it, increased use by motor vehicles is sure to occur and hence additional sediment delivered to the stream or water body. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

We encourage the Forest Service to use the motor vehicle use plan process to explore opportunities to protect sensitive resources, reduce sediment contributions to stream and support water quality restoration plans. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

There are three approved Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) in the CNF, including the Upper North Fork Clearwater, Lower North Fork Clearwater, and Jim Ford Creek. There are also

many waterbodies listed as impaired in the Lolo, Musselshell, and Lochsa drainages. Most of these listings are for sediment and/or temperature. We recommend that the Forest look for opportunities to reduce road-related sediment in the listed and TMDL watersheds. In addition, where roads/trails affect shading of streams, these segments should be evaluated for relocation or closure. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should use mitigation measures to deal with sedimentation where possible.

. . . roads and trails can easily be hydrologically disconnected from streams. Therefore, the sedimentation concerns can be easily mitigated and should not be used as a reason to justify motorized recreation and access closures except in exceptional cases that cannot be adequately mitigated. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

3.7.2 Erosion

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize trails are prone to erosion.

Much of the trails on the Clearwater National Forest are built in areas of loose decomposed granite soils that are easily eroded. Even on flat ridges past use on old Indian trails used for centuries has left deep ditches. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize over-snow vehicles cause erosion.

We commend the Forest Service for including over snow vehicles in the DEIS. Snow compaction often retards the melting of snow, leading to muddy trails and roads which are then susceptible to damage and enlargement. Additionally, compaction can lead to altered melting and discharge regimes, further increasing soil erosion (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that stock use causes erosion.

As for the opinion that motorcyclists contribute to erosion and wear of trails this is true but we don't wear down the trail anymore than horses. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

Most stock weights much more than an ATV or motorcycle, they have steel hoofs and put more weight per square inch into each step they take than a motorized machine leaving a much greater impact on the ground. This greater impact causes much more disturbed soil that causes erosion and sediment in our streams. (Individual, HAMILTON, MT—4345)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize erosion problems in the vicinity of Fish Lake.

Erosion problems I have personally witnessed from motorcycles have occurred above Clearwater Fish Lake to the State Line Trail which is closed to motorized use, but not enforced. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

3.8 Wildlife

3.8.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should provide lands for wildlife.

Already there are too many lands taken by people. Animals need these lands to survive. And we as people need animals and biodiversity to survive. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2637)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect elk by providing access for hunters who kill predators.

On much of the proposed area, the elk herds are getting hit hard by predation. The need to hunt cougar, bear and eventually wolf is very important. You close these trails and there will be no elk left to hunt. (Business, NO ADDRESS—2568)

The Clearwater National Forest should distinguish between actions necessary to protect wildlife and actions necessary to protect big-game.

Some of the proposed trail closures are for reducing disturbance to wildlife. While OHV disturbance to wildlife has been very well researched, it is unclear what, if any effect it has on big game survival, production, or total population size. Generally, specific seasonal closures are adequate to protect big game calving and security. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

3.8.1.1 Impacts of Transportation System**The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of the roads and trails on wildlife habitat.**

Many species of wildlife are displaced from habitats adjacent to roads and motorized trails. These effects of roads and trails are species-specific and vary considerably. In highly motorized areas, the ability of many species to make efficient use of otherwise suitable habitat near motorized roads and trails is compromised. . . . Elk are particularly susceptible to roads and motor vehicle traffic Displacement from preferred habitat can affect energy conservation; consequently survival and reproduction may be compromised. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of transportation system features on wildlife.

The effects of transportation features on wildlife include mortality from collisions, modifications of animal behavior, disruption of the physical environment, alteration of chemical environment, spread of exotic species, and changes of human use of lands and water Examples are habitat loss and fragmentation; diminished animal use of habitats because of noise, dust emissions, and the presence of humans; loss of forage for herbivores; interference with wildlife life--history functions (courtship nesting, migration, and others); spread of non-native species that are introduced by vehicles and that alter the availability and use of habitat; increased poaching of unethical hunting practices; increased dispersion of recreation impacts, particularly by off-road vehicles; and degradation of aquatic habitat through alteration of stream banks and increased sediment loads. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should reduce road densities to maintain wildlife populations.

Road and trail densities on the Clearwater National Forest are of particular concern, and keeping densities at a level consistent with the applicable science is important for maintaining the future of wildlife populations. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of the roads and trails on hunting opportunities.

Road and trail and densities and increasing motorized use have affected the quality and quantity of security habitat during the hunting season. . . . In summary, increases in motorized roads and trails equates to reduced quality mature deer and elk hunting opportunities for sportsmen and limits the Department's ability to manage for quality hunting opportunities in the future. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

3.8.1.2 Impacts of Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of off-road vehicles on wildlife.

ORVs fragment wildlife habitat and disrupt traditional wildlife use patterns (in this area, affecting such endangered species as bull trout, westslope cutthroat trout, steelhead, salmon, and wolves), damage wetlands and wetland species, increase air and water pollution (from gas, oil, and noise), cause serious soil erosion, and spread invasive species. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—145)

Directs impacts of ORV and cross-country travel (on wildlife) has been well documented, and includes destruction of soil stabilizers, soil compaction, reduced rates of water infiltration, increased wind and water erosion, noise, decreased abundance of wildlife populations, and compaction of vegetation. Effects to soil, over time, cause erosion of soils, loss of topsoil, and compaction of soils. These impacts bring changes in the types of vegetation that can be sustained within these landscapes. Vegetation changes on the landscape overtime change the diversity of the wildlife utilizing the area. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

Elk are a species of particular concern on the Clearwater, and the effects of ORVs on elk are well documented. . . . elk began moving when ATVs were as far away as 2,000 yards but tolerated hikers to within 500, horseback riders within 800 and bicyclists within 1,300 yards, and elk run from ATVs but tend to walk away from hikers unless startled at close range Lyon (1983) conducted a study that showed elk do not use habitat adjacent to roads to its full potential. He found that "habitat effectiveness can be expected to decline by at least 25 percent with a density of 1 mile of road per square mile and by at least 50 percent with two miles of road per square mile." (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should limit wildlife-related off-highway vehicle restrictions to areas where negative impacts can be proven.

The impact of OHV recreation on wildlife has been overstated by the agency and wildlife biologists. First, wildlife populations are at all time high at the same time when OHV use is increasing. If there is any impact to be identified, it appears that it should be that the positive impact associated with increasing OHV use and increasing wildlife populations. Secondly, OHV use does not kill wildlife. Wildlife coexists just fine with OHVs.

The agency is encouraged to avoid road and trail closures based on wildlife concerns except where negative wildlife impact can be specifically identified and documented. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should not overstate the impacts of motorized uses on wildlife.

A study of National Park elk habituated to human activity and not hunted were more sensitive to persons afoot than vehicles. Therefore, hikers disturb elk more than motor vehicles

A study of the heart rate of elk found that humans walking between 20 to 300 meters from the elk caused them to flee immediately 41% of the time while an OHV passing within 15 to 400 meters of the elk caused them to flee 8% of the time

A study of mule deer found that 80% fled in reaction to encounters with persons afoot while only 24% fled due to encounters with snowmobiles

Wildlife can and do effectively coexist with motorized visitors in even the most heavily visited places. Therefore, concerns with motorized forest visitors and wildlife are often over--stated and over--emphasized which unfortunately demonstrates a predisposition in the process.

(Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should disclose the real threats to furbearers.

Wildlife disturbance on public land is often used as an argument for restricted use. However, to use the "wildlife disturbance" argument as a blanket objection to all activity on public lands seems a bit shortsighted and perhaps self aggrandizing. Witness the increased issuance of trapping licenses. Montana issued 4187 licenses for trapping muskrat, raccoon, otter, fisher wolverine, marten, bobcat, coyote and lion (Missoulian, Dec. 2007) for the current season. What would one suppose to "disturb" wildlife to a greater degree, noise or traps? (Motorized Recreation Group, HAMILTON, MT—1729)

What really bothers me is that these animals (wolverine) are still allowed to be legally killed in a trap. Is snowmobiling the problem or is trapping? This paradox has not been mentioned in any EIS that I have read. (Individual, CLINTON, MT—497)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider motorcycles have few impacts on wildlife.

On the issue of wildlife protection, we should remember the reality of the wild condition. The truth is that in the wild, animals are either the hunted or the hunter. Nature has equipped animals with either the ability to find and kill, or hide and evade. In that world a motorcycle is a non-issue. (Individual, HAYDEN, ID—701)

From what I have seen during my riding, wildlife couldn't care less that a motorcycle rides by. As a matter of fact, I think they are less stressed by it because they can here it coming and have time to get out of the way, and go on about their business. I think that hikers and horseback riders cause more stress to game than motorcyclists because they sneak up on the animal and startle it resulting in a longer run and elevated stress levels. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

3.8.1.3 Roadless Areas

The Forest Service should protect roadless areas to provide habitat for wildlife.

Vast areas of roadless terrain are needed to preserve threatened species such as the grizzly bear, and to provide habitat for other large species like elk and moose. However, only 50 million acres of roadless area are left, and the 50-year plan of the Forest Service is a serious threat to that remaining wilderness. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

The Forest Service should protect unroaded areas to provide habitat for wildlife.

Unroaded areas provide habitat to many wildlife species that do no mix with motors. Elk, deer, wolves and many other species need protection to insure population viability now and in the future. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect Weitas, Cayuse, Fourth of July and Hemlock Creeks for their wildlife values.

Weitas Creek was considered, during the roadless area evaluation of the 70s--80s, the most important unroaded area on the Clearwater in terms of wildlife. Weitas, Cayuse, and Fourth of July Creek, along with Hemlock Creek (location of a proposed research/natural area) and the unique high--elevation stands of ancient cedars, should have maximum protection. . . . These areas are crucial recovery habitat for rare populations. As climate changes it is important to be generous in habitat protection. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—79)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in Kelly Creek, Mallard-Larkins and the Great Burn due to wildlife values.

I strongly support the USFS proposal to close the Kelly Creek, Mallard-Larkin, and Great Burn proposed wilderness to motorized users. These areas are critical wildlife corridors and habitats which are adversely impacted by motorized access. Now that a grizzly bear has been found

(albeit shot) in Kelly Creek we need to make a special effort to protect the wilderness values even without a wilderness designation.

There is evidence of lynx in these drainages as well. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2656)

3.8.1.4 Wildlife Corridors

The Clearwater National Forest should provide wildlife corridors.

I support wildlife corridors for the movement of all wildlife among core areas. Only a minimum number of roads should be open in these corridors. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Clearwater National Forest should justify the need for wildlife corridors.

Some interests are pushing the wildlife corridor concept as a reason to close areas to motorized use. We have not seen adequate documentation for reasoning to justify this position . . . Significant issues must be answered before this concept can be given any credibility. Issues include: 1) Why would wildlife follow physically challenging basin divides where food and water is scarce versus other corridors? . . . 2) There is no data or credible documentation that the continental divide or other basin divides are favored for wildlife migration. 3) The lack of authorization or mandate from Congress for this sort of designation and use of public land. 4) The socio-economic issues associated with the attempt to use the wildlife corridor concept to convert multiple-use lands to defacto wilderness. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

3.8.2 Specific Wildlife Species

The Clearwater National Forest should provide secure habitat for fishers.

The Clearwater NF provides the core habitat for one of the last resident fisher populations in the Northern Rockies region. This population is particularly important given the recent discovery that its members are descendants from a native fisher population, rather than from fishers reintroduced from other areas. . . . Thus, the Clearwater NF shares the important responsibility of providing secure and effective habitat to maintain a viable population of this population. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the need to provide for wolverine connectivity.

Recent communication with wolverine researchers Jeff Copeland and Kevin McKelvey indicates that the Bitterroot Crest along the Montana/Idaho Border appears to function as the primary dispersal route for wolverines across the region. . . . This research indicates the Clearwater NF may have outstanding importance to wolverine connectivity and persistence throughout the entire Northern Rockies. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect moose wintering areas in Kelly Creek and the Great Burn areas.

I am optimistic that your proposed motor ban will ease my concerns over moose wintering areas in the Kelly Creek / Great Burn area. Snowmobile use in upper elevations has shifted moose wintering over time from much of Little Moose Ridge west--southwest of Bruin Hill, down to Hansen Meadows. This creates an unnatural concentration of moose there. It also represents moose moving to winter area with less terrain advantages for them to use when avoiding predation. I am hopeful that the motorized ban you have proposed will allow moose to disperse more normally there during winter and thus help reverse the unnatural wintering conditions near Hansen Meadows. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2744)

3.8.3 Impacts of Snowmobiles on Wildlife

3.8.3.1 Positive/Neutral/Minimal Impacts

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize snowmobiles can have positive benefits for wildlife.

Another benefit for the wildlife in the area is the use of the snowmobile tracks on the snow. Time and time again in a deep powdery winter the animals can get around much easier to forage for food when they have the use of these tracks. (Individual, LAMONT, WA—35)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize snowmobiles have no impacts to wildlife.

I have an extremely hard time understanding what environmental effects snowmobiling has on the environment, they do not cause erosion, and I never see any wildlife when I am snowmobiling because the snow is too deep for anything to survive that is why animals hibernate and migrate because winter is far too harsh in the high country for them to survive. (Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—1989)

I have had almost no contact with wild life in these areas due to the amount of snow that these areas receive. Also I have been in the areas that we ride snowmobiles on in the summer time and there is no impact to the environment from the use of snowmobiles in these areas. After every snow storm the area is just like no one was ever there. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—491)

I understand the reasons for shutting other motorized users from these areas, but snowmobiles travel over snow and leave no trace when the snow melts. This is the critical difference that sets snowmobiles apart. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1475)

It has been said that the animals are being scared off (by snowmobiles) and detrimental effects are happening to these animals. Number 1) most animals besides some birds and a few other select animals are not present in the winter because they are either hibernating or they have moved into lower elevations locations so they can get food because the snow is too deep to get anything to eat. And 2) the animals that are still up in the high country are accustomed to human interaction. I have seen on many occasions an animal using a snowmobile trail to walk down because it is much easier for them to use that then walk in the deep snow. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—130)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize snowmobiles have minimal impacts on wildlife.

If over-snow vehicles are to be considered in this travel plan, please recognize the description and definition that the Forest Service has historically recognized snowmobiles to be uniquely different from other forms of motorized vehicles in that environmental disturbance is non-existent or minimal it at all following use of snowmobiles over adequate snow cover. (Motorized Recreation Group, ANACONDA, MT—498)

Of all the riding in these areas I have done over the past fourteen years and having a keen eye for wildlife, their sign and migration routes I've never seen more than an occasional moose, crow, magpie or snowshoe hare, let alone a wolverine, elk, deer, mountain goat, mountain sheep or Canadian lynx. Doesn't it make sense that as the snow gets deeper at the higher elevations where vegetation is more readily available? (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—820)

What game animals are really afraid of are silent, stealthy predators, including man on foot, that try to sneak up on them and eat them. They are not nearly as afraid of something they can hear coming, is on a predictable path, and has no history of killing them. (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

3.8.3.2 Negative Impacts

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the negative effects of snowmobiles on wildlife.

While some believe that snowmobiles have little or no impact, the stress game and non-game animals feel from their intrusion is significant and, at certain times of the year when snow conditions are patchy, they have proven to be a transport agent for non-native plant species. (Recreation Group, POLLOCK, ID—2076)

We have seen over the years the effect of snowmobiles on wildlife. Overflights-not too many years in the past though prior to the time when most snowmobiles were the new and lighter machines-showed little use in backcountry or roadless areas. The nature of the Clearwater National Forest is such that ungulates, especially moose and elk, can use areas with deeper snow in the winter. We commonly observed ungulate tracks and trails in the snow a few years ago as well as forest carnivore tracks.

It now seems that ungulates are being concentrated in areas where snowmobilers don't desire to go and wolverine tracks are much less frequent. Natural dispersion patterns have been upset and this may lead to reduced vigor and increased stress of ungulates. In particular, such impacts have been observed in the backcountry in and adjacent to the Kelly Creek (Hoodoo/Great Burn) IRA and areas in the upper Lochsa. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

Snow compaction can potentially impact wildlife species and habitat conditions through alterations in the temperature profile and thermal conductivity of snow; increases in water-holding capacity; increases in melting times; and the formation of a partial gas seal over the substrate Studies on habitat have also shown . . . substantial impacts on subnivean vegetation, including damage, reductions in standing crop, and retarded spring recovery and growth.

Studies on the effects of snow compaction on wildlife are few, but mortality of subnivean fauna . . . and mechanical barriers to movement by subnivean mammals . . . are possible consequences. Snow compaction effects may vary considerably according to snow depth and moisture content Other studies have reported that some groups of wildlife, such as canids, preferentially use compacted trails, presumably because of greater ease of travel. Others, such as snowshoe hare, avoid these trails, possibly in order to avoid predators. . . . (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

Several authors . . . have reasoned that compaction and the resultant mortality of small mammals could lead to declines in predator populations because some predators forage in the subnivean zone and compaction may limit or prevent their access. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

3.8.3.3 Impacts on Specific Species

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that snowmobile use impacts wolverine, fisher and lynx habitat.

Winter snowmobile use has been implicated in some studies as drastically affecting wolverine, fisher and lynx habitat. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that snowmobile use may impact wolverines.

There is scientific uncertainty about the effects of snowmobiles on wolverines, but there is strong evidence that snowmobile use displaces wolverines and may reduce reproductive success, especially when it occurs within potential wolverine denning habitat. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that snowmobile use impacts fishers.

One clear effect, given that fishers are vulnerable to traps set for other species, is that snowmobiles can provide trappers with access to fisher habitat. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—509)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that snowmobile use may impact Canada lynx.

Some researchers maintain winter activities, (e.g. cross-country skiing, snowmobiling) can compact snow allowing other predators that compete with lynx to access lynx habitat that is normally the exclusive winter range of the lynx Advances in snowmobile capabilities have raised concerns about intrusion into previously isolated areas Snowmobiles can traverse vast forest areas in short periods of time. This increased access can increase lynx disturbance and vulnerability to harvest collision, or harassment. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The effects of increased motorized use on the survival of lynx in the area should be a major consideration in designating routes or areas for snowmobile access. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

3.8.3.4 Possible Effects of Restrictions**The Clearwater National Forest should recognize high elevation restrictions force snowmobiles into lower elevations where wildlife is likely to be wintering.**

. . . by forcing closures that push snowmobiles out of the "high country" and onto the lower elevation logging roads, it actually defeats the purpose of animal protection. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—89)

If this area (areas with proposed snowmobile closures) is closed you will be pushing riders down to lower elevations causing more conflicts and disturbing wildlife that does not travel in alpine areas throughout the winter. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2690)

3.9 Aquatic Ecosystems**The Clearwater National Forest should use the travel planning process to make improvements in aquatic health.**

EPA believes reduction in road density, improvements in road drainage, and reductions in sediment delivery from roads are important components for improving aquatic health in streams. . . . Of particular concern are Pete King Creek, Canyon Creek, Lolo Creek above Musselshell Creek, Orofino Creek, Eldorado Creek, the Palouse River above Laird Park, and Quartz Creek. We recognize that the Forest is actively working to reduce road densities in these areas, but recommend that these areas also receive additional consideration as the MVUM is developed. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

We encourage the Forest to engage in a process designed to address the widespread degradation of aquatic ecosystems caused by the road system. (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

We hope that the Clearwater National Forest will use this travel management planning process as a real opportunity to make significant headway in reducing the aquatic impacts of roads on the Forest, by limiting the road system to one that can be properly maintained under its budget. (Preservation/Conservation Group, PORTLAND, OR—517)

The Cleawater National Forest should recognize the impacts of off-road vehicle travel on watersheds.

Directs impacts of ORV and cross-country travel (on wildlife) has been well documented, and includes destruction of soil stabilizers, soil compaction, reduced rates of water infiltration, increased wind and water erosion, noise, decreased abundance of wildlife populations, and compaction of vegetation. . . . Watershed conditions are also impacted by eroding soils, which then affect water quality and the fish populations within those affected waters

(Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize and protect the fish and wildlife values associated with Cayuse Creek.

Cayuse Creek is an important stronghold for many wildlife species and as a tributary of Kelly Creek, maintains outstanding water quality and harbors an important population of Westslope cutthroat trout. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

. . . the Cayuse Creek watershed is an important, wild, backcountry watershed that provides intact wildlife and fish habitat. It currently receives little motorized use. As a tributary of Kelly Creek, it is also crucial to maintaining water quality and Westslope cutthroat trout populations. Cayuse Creek may also be used by grizzly bears, given the confirmation of a grizzly bear in Kelly Creek last year. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

Cayuse Creek is a major reason why Kelly Creek is such a renowned fishery, one that regularly draws fisherman from other states. The Cayuse Creek drainage is recognized among fisheries scientists as home to the genetically pure West Slope Cutthroat Trout strain. Cayuse Creek is a true Idaho gem and more needs to be done to protect it from degradation by of motorized use. (Individual, MOSCOW, D—2744)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the aquatic values of Weitas, Fish and Hungrey Creeks.

The Weitas Creek area has three major streams that need to be protected. Pot Mt. has important goat habitat. Fish and Hungrey Creeks are Idaho's most important steelhead stream.

(Individual, SEWARD, AK—90)

3.10 Listed Species¹

3.10.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should protect the critical habitat of threatened and endangered species.

Motorized roads and trails should not impact core or critical habitat for sensitive, threatened and endangered fish, wildlife and plants. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Forest Service should protect inventoried roadless areas to provide habitat for threatened and endangered species.

All Clearwater NF roadless areas are crucial recovery habitat for rare predators. In order for grizzlies to recover, these areas need be closed to motor vehicles. Wolverines and lynx need large areas free from snowmobiles. (Individual, PULLMAN, WA—34)

¹ This includes species listed as threatened or endangered in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the values of specific areas in recovering threatened and endangered species.

. . . the unique habitat and intrinsic qualities that make the areas around Pot Mountain, Fish and Hungry Creeks, and the Lochsa area are strongholds for recovering species, including sheep, grizzlies, wolves, and other endangered species. (Tribal, PULLMAN, WA—4395)

3.10.2 Specific Species

The Clearwater National Forest should provide secure habitat and travel corridors for grizzly bears.

The agency must now apply the precautionary principle, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"). Under a precautionary approach, the Forest Service must assume that Grizzly Bear are occupying areas of suitable habitat on the CNF and modify proposals and management to provide secure habitat for the bear. (Preservation/Conservation Group – MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The recent discovery of a grizzly in the North Fork illustrates the need for action. Grizzlies need secure habitat. There is wonderful grizzly habitat in the roadless areas of the Clearwater National Forest. Weitas Creek (Bighorn-Weitas), Kelly Creek (Hoodoo, also called Great Burn), Vanderbilt Hill (upper North Fork/Meadow Creek) and Pot Mountain Proposed Wildernesses are all areas that have had reliable sightings after the last confirmed (dead) grizzly was found on the Clearwater National Forest. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Selkirk population is one source of Grizzly Bears for the CNF. There are numerous other corridors of suitable habitat that bears could travel to and from the CNF, including but limited to, the Cabinet Mountains, Ninemile area, Sapphire Mountains, or across from Yellowstone National Park. The Forest must take all of this into account when evaluating the motorized road and trail system. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should not recommend additional closures to protect grizzly bears.

All indications are that grizzly bear habitat is fully occupied and that additional road closures and obliteration will not produce any more bears and, therefore, motorized closures are not reasonable or productive. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect the habitat of Canada lynx.

Research suggests that local refugia are critical for successful lynx reproduction and fitness Higher elevations Inventoried Roadless Areas are considered important refugia for lynx. On the Clearwater National Forest these would include the Mallard--Larkins, Meadow Creek--Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Hoodoo, North Fork Spruce-White Sand, and Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Areas. . . .

Habitat connectivity is also an important component of habitat conservation for lynx, as well as many other wildlife species Providing for habitat connectivity in order to promote wildlife movement and generic interaction would also benefit lynx populations by maintaining secure habitat dispersal routes used by juvenile animals and for breeding activities. . . . Connectivity routes between the Hoodoo (Great Burn) Roadless Area over Lolo Pass to the Selway--Bitterroot Ecosystem could be a critical linkage in the greater Yellowstone-to-Yukon corridor. . . .

Risk factors for lynx include direct human threat (shooting, trapping, vehicle collisions), as well as changes in forage and denning habitat. Fire suppression and logging have altered the mosaic of habitats needed for prey species and denning sites. . . . Roads and trails have resulted in

increased human access and activity in lynx habitat, particularly during critical winter months. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect westslope cutthroat, bull and steelhead trout.

Several ESA-listed and candidate fish species, including Westslope Cutthroat Trout, Bull Trout and Steelhead will be negatively affected by the proposal because of water quality degradation. (Preservation/Conservation, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

3.11 Range Management

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access for range management.

I support taking care of Forest Service lands in a manner that will enhance them. Part of proper care for any land includes the ability to access that land. The area under my jurisdiction is the use and proper harvesting of forage from the lands within my grazing allotments. This includes the use of herding techniques and the placement of salt at specific points to encourage good cattle distribution and prevent overgrazing. Gathering the cows in the fall also requires a significant investment of time and the ability to travel freely within the allotment. (Special Use Permittee, PRINCETON, ID—82)

3.12 Noxious Weed Management

The Clearwater National Forest should deal with all noxious weed transport mechanisms.

The transport mechanism for noxious weeds includes all visitors and uses of public lands including hikers, equestrians, and cattle grazing in addition to motorized recreationists. Many events including fire, floods, and the importation of invasive species also contribute to noxious weed problems. For the most part, vehicles do not have a surface texture that will pick up and hold noxious weeds seeds. Transport mechanisms based on hair, fur, manure, shoes and fabrics are more effective than the smooth metal and plastic surfaces found on vehicles. Additionally, motorized recreationists practice the "wash your steeds" policy. However, closures due to noxious weed concerns are only placed on motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized uses spread noxious weeds.

The spread of weeds has exploded over the last 20--30 years and opening up more trails to motorized use will result in a situation where only massive expensive treatment may not be enough to solve the spread of weeds. . . . The proposed motorized backcountry trails proposed in this scoping letter will only increase the spread of weeds. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

In many areas where ATV use could otherwise be allowed (no conflict with wilderness or history, for example), their use has proven to be an important vector in the spread of weeds. It's not clear to me why trail bikes, used for many years, didn't spread weeds too badly, but ATV use has and still does. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize stock users spread noxious weeds.

Stock users have no control over where their animals decide to get rid of waste, many times the animals use streams, by lakes, the meadows and trails leaving behind many seeds of non-native plants and many noxious seeds. (Individual, HAMILTON, MT—4345)

3.13 Timber Management

The Clearwater National Forest should change its timber management efforts to generate more revenue for roads and trails.

This (travel plan proposal) is a product of failed timber management efforts/policy to not produce adequate revenue for maintenance (of roads and trails) and personnel resources to meet the Public's demand. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—2598)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the harm done by logging operations.

The logging industry does more harm to the forest by not only tearing out the needed trees but the effects of logging roads; erosion and species disruption is far greater than what the off-road community will do. (Individual, TRACY, CA—4266)

3.14 Fire and Fuels Management

The Clearwater National Forest should manage forests to reduce fuels.

On another subject, I think some active fuels reduction management, timber sales, thinning contracts, etc. would benefit the forest and the local economy as well as reducing wild fire danger. (Individual, PLAINS, MT—67)

To exclude management and fuels treatment, and to lock up such vast acreages, is completely out of sync with the decided threat of further global warming and increased drought predicted for our ecologically fire adapted forests. These forests must be managed to reduce the threat of wildfire escaping to developed and inhabited areas. Wilderness designation is permanent. The existing forests are not. Wildfire will manage these areas and the more developed and inhabited areas adjacent and beyond if designated Wilderness is established as you plan.

Wake up Supervisor Reilly! Shake yourself loose from those Wilderness advocates, and get on to the real forest management. Forest neglect neither stewardship nor conservation! (Individual, PARADISE, MT—518)

Also, I have witnessed in my local area that the unmaintained wilderness is far less healthy than the ohv lands due to their lack of controlled burns and no general upkeep. (Individual, KELSEYVILLE, CA—3738)

3.15 Heritage Resource Management

The Clearwater National Forest should protect cultural resources.

Transportation access also increases vandalism, theft and damage to archaeological and cultural sites. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect historic trails.

The system of ancient, pre-European trails in this area is little understood and because of that, the forest should not place any possible historic sites or trails at risk from machines. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

The 4-wheeler "trail" is going to alter the character of the old single path historic Forest Service trail. That "trail" may be an old Indian trail, centuries old. Over 90% of our old Forest Service trails on the Clearwater are adopted Indian trails. They are protected, but they aren't. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

| | |
|---|----|
| CHAPTER 4—TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM | 1 |
| Summary | 1 |
| 4.1 Roads and Trails | 2 |
| 4.1.1 General | 2 |
| 4.1.1.1 Support | 2 |
| 4.1.1.2 More Motorized Uses | 2 |
| 4.1.1.3 No Changes | 2 |
| 4.1.1.4 Regulated Motorized Uses | 3 |
| 4.1.1.5 Limited to No Motorized Uses | 3 |
| 4.1.1.6 Suggested Changes | 4 |
| 4.1.2 Road and Trail Inventory | 5 |
| 4.1.3 Road and Trail Densities | 5 |
| 4.1.4 Seasonal Restrictions | 5 |
| 4.1.5 General Restrictions | 7 |
| 4.1.6 Site-specific Suggestions Regarding Motorized Uses | 8 |
| 4.1.6.1 Allow Motorized Uses within Specific Areas | 8 |
| 4.1.6.2 Allow Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Specific Areas | 8 |
| 4.1.6.3 Allow Motorized Uses within Inventoried Roadless Areas | 8 |
| 4.1.6.4 Allow Motorized Uses within Multiple Inventoried Roadless Areas | 8 |
| 4.1.6.5 Allow Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses | 9 |
| 4.1.6.6 Allow Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages | 9 |
| 4.1.6.7 Greatly Limit Motorized Uses within Inventoried Roadless Areas | 9 |
| 4.1.6.8 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Areas | 9 |
| 4.1.6.9 Restrict Motorized Uses within All Inventoried Roadless Areas | 9 |
| 4.1.6.10 Restrict Motorized Uses within Multiple Inventoried Roadless Areas | 10 |
| 4.1.6.11 Restrict Motorized Uses within a Specific Inventoried Roadless Area | 11 |
| 4.1.6.12 Restrict Motorized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses | 11 |
| 4.1.6.13 Restrict Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses | 12 |
| 4.1.6.14 Restrict Motorized Uses within Areas Recommended as Wilderness by Others | 12 |
| 4.1.6.15 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages | 13 |
| 4.1.7 Roads and Trails Mapping and Analysis | 13 |
| 4.1.8 User-created Routes | 13 |
| 4.1.9 New Routes | 15 |
| 4.1.10 Rights-of-way | 15 |
| 4.1.11 Closed Unless Designated Open | 16 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.1.12 Cross-Country Travel | 17 |
| 4.1.13 Travel to Campsites | 18 |
| 4.1.14 Access for Permittees | 19 |
| 4.2 Roads Management | 19 |
| 4.2.1 General | 19 |
| 4.2.2 Road Densities | 20 |
| 4.2.3 Seasonal Restrictions/Closures | 20 |
| 4.2.4 Road Construction/Reconstruction | 21 |
| 4.2.5 Road Removal/Decommissioning | 21 |
| 4.2.6 Road Restoration | 21 |
| 4.3 Trails Management | 22 |
| 4.3.1 General | 22 |
| 4.3.1.1 More Trails for Motorized Uses | 22 |
| 4.3.1.2 Retain Trails for Motorized Uses | 22 |
| 4.3.1.3 Alternatives to Restrictions | 23 |
| 4.3.1.4 Restrict Motorized Uses | 23 |
| 4.3.1.5 Other | 24 |
| 4.3.2 Trail Safety | 25 |
| 4.3.3 Trail Designation/Inventory | 25 |
| 4.3.4 Trail Maintenance | 26 |
| 4.3.4.1 Retain/Maintain the Trails System | 26 |
| 4.3.4.2 Costs of Not Maintaining Trails | 26 |
| 4.3.4.3 Dealing with Trail Problems | 26 |
| 4.3.4.4 Encourage Maintenance by Motorized Users | 27 |
| 4.3.4.5 Other | 28 |
| 4.3.5 Mountain Bicycle Trails | 28 |
| 4.3.6 Single-track Trails | 29 |
| 4.3.7 Motorcycle Trails | 30 |
| 4.3.8 Trail Conversion/Decommissioning/Restoration | 31 |
| 4.3.9 Off-highway Vehicle Trails | 32 |
| 4.3.10 Loop Trails | 33 |
| 4.3.11 Historic Trails | 34 |
| 4.3.12 Trail Construction | 34 |
| 4.3.13 Trail Restrictions | 35 |
| 4.3.14 Site-specific Trail Suggestions | 37 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.3.14.1 Leave Trails Open | 37 |
| 4.3.14.1 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Inventoried Roadless Areas | 37 |
| 4.3.14.3 Restrict Summer Motorized Uses within an Inventoried Roadless Area | 37 |
| 4.3.14.4 Restrict Motorized Uses Adjacent to Wilderness | 38 |
| 4.3.14.5 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages | 38 |
| 4.3.14.6 Importance of Consistency | 38 |
| 4.4 Over-snow Travel | 39 |
| 4.4.1 General | 39 |
| 4.4.1.1 Allow Snowmobile Use | 39 |
| 4.4.1.2 Restrict Snowmobile Use | 39 |
| 4.4.1.3 Miscellaneous | 40 |
| 4.4.2 Technology | 40 |
| 4.4.3 Seasonal Snowmobile Restriction | 41 |
| 4.4.4 Site-specific Restrictions | 42 |
| 4.4.4.1 Allow Snowmobile Use within Recommended Wilderness Areas | 42 |
| 4.4.4.2 Allow Snowmobile Use within the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness | 43 |
| 4.4.4.3 Allow Snowmobiles within Areas Adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness | 44 |
| 4.4.4.4 Allow Snowmobile Use within Specific Drainages | 44 |
| 4.4.4.5 Allow Snowmobile Use within Other Specific Areas | 44 |
| 4.4.4.6 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Inventoried Roadless and Recommended Wilderness Areas | 45 |
| 4.4.4.7 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Inventoried Roadless Areas | 45 |
| 4.4.4.8 Restrict Snowmobile Use within Specific Inventoried Roadless Areas | 45 |
| 4.4.4.9 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Recommended Wildernesses | 46 |
| 4.4.4.10 Restrict Snowmobile Use within the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness | 46 |
| 4.4.4.11 Restrict Snowmobile Use Adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness | 46 |
| 4.4.4.12 Restrict Snowmobile Use within the North Fork Ranger District | 47 |
| 4.4.4.13 Restrict Snowmobile Use within Specific Drainages | 47 |
| 4.4.4.14 Restrict Snowmobile Use in Big-game Winter Range | 47 |
| 4.4.4.15 Clarify the Proposal | 48 |
| 4.5 Transportation Related Structures | 48 |
| 4.5.1 General | 48 |
| 4.5.2 Crossings and Culverts | 48 |
| 4.5.3 Parking Areas | 48 |
| 4.5.4 Sign-in Kiosks | 48 |

4.5.5 Signs 48

4.5.6 Trailheads 49

4.6 Maps 50

CHAPTER 4—TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Summary

Chapter 4, Transportation Management, includes many concerns and ideas that are related to components of the transportation system. Not surprisingly, the majority of the comments that were received fit into this chapter. While many of the comments lend themselves to the format of this report, displaying all the route-specific suggestions in a narrative structure proved difficult and was laborious to read; therefore, all specific suggestions for roads and trails have been incorporated into a table format and are included in Appendix B. Readers are encouraged to read Appendix B in conjunction with narrative of Chapter 4.

The philosophical differences at the heart of travel planning are framed in this chapter. A few commenters didn't believe any motorized uses are appropriate on national forest lands. A few wanted motorized uses to be allowed on all roads and trails outside designated wilderness. The majority of the respondents acknowledged motorized uses as a legitimate of national forests and agreed that the uses need to be managed.

The chapter includes a litany of discussions about the places on the Forest where access should or should not be allowed by motorized and/or mechanized means. The comments seem to boil down to one question: How should motorized and mechanized uses be managed in inventoried roadless areas, recommended wilderness and certain drainages? There was little agreement about the answer to this question. The majority of this chapter presents the multitude of ideas.

Discussion about restrictions dominates this chapter. There are strong feelings on both sides of the issue. Some believed there shouldn't be travel restrictions on public lands; others believed they are necessary. There appeared to be some area of agreement regarding the proposal to standardize seasonal restrictions. Respondents generally agreed there were legitimate needs for seasonal restrictions and it was a good idea to standardize dates. Some suggested holiday-based dates. Others reminded the agency to pick dates that are consistent with the purpose of the seasonal restriction. There was also a call for flexibility depending upon conditions.

User-created routes were a point of contention. Some encouraged the agency to evaluate and designate routes as part of the travel management process. Others countered that the routes were created illegally and thereby shouldn't qualify for designation. Others were OK with designation if the agency conducted rigorous environmental analysis prior to designation.

While there were a number of comments related to roads, many more commenters chose to voice ideas and concerns about trails. Motorcycle trails were a main point of contention, with many enthusiasts making a case for more motorcycle opportunities than were afforded by the proposed action. Generally they wanted the Forest to allow continued use in traditional areas and they requested the Forest develop more opportunities that were diverse in terms of both the land and the challenge. Others felt strongly that motorcycle use should to be limited to protect watersheds and the integrity of inventoried roadless and recommended wilderness areas within the North Fork Ranger District.

A similar discussion occurred regarding motorized and mechanized uses, particularly in recommended wildernesses. Snowmobilers and mountain bikers both argued that they should be allowed to use traditional areas located within recommended wilderness because they are not having environmental impacts and do not degrade wilderness character or preclude future wilderness designation. Others contended the uses were not compatible with the proposed land designation, or caused environmental degradation, and should be halted now. Others wanted to see all motorized and mechanized uses further restricted from all inventoried roadless areas.

4.1 Roads and Trails

4.1.1 General

4.1.1.1 Support

The Clearwater National Forest should address travel management issues.

We would like to thank the Clearwater National Forest for beginning to address the difficult issue of travel management and the explosion of off highway use that has occurred in recent years. This issue has developed over a long time period and is going to take several years to correct. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.1.1.2 More Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should make more motorized areas available.

You should make more motorized area available, NOT LESS!!! Please keep what is open now OPEN and open more area to motorized (uses) so that the MAJORITY of the people can enjoy the forest and not just a few horse people. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—812)

So please leave these trails and roads open. Open more to ATVs and motorcycles. There is plenty of wilderness and places that nobody goes and can only get there by foot. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—3897)

We ask that you recognize the vast amount of land that we would be agreeing to give up access to (in the proposal). The non-motorized community has nothing to lose and everything to gain. While OHV users are once again in a position of everything to lose and no new ground to be gained. What we are asking to keep open is a very miniscule percentage of the forest as a whole. Our hope is that you will make efforts to keep the forest open to all and not just the few. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest is public land and it must be kept accessible to the public. The Forest Service should be working to make more, not less, of the National Forest accessible. This is critically important to those of us who, for reasons of health or age, are unable to gain access to the forest without motorized transport. (Individual, STEVENSVILLE, MT—2724)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide play areas for motorized recreation.

Provide open or play areas for motorized recreation opportunity and trails bikes where acceptable in selected areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.1.1.3 No Changes

The Clearwater National Forest should not change its current access plan.

The present routes and areas open for motorized vehicle access are very sufficient. There does not need to be any changes made, thus please consider that we are asking there be no change. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—85)

I had a spinal injury when I was young which temporarily left me paralyzed. I am able to walk but not for very far. Motorized travel offers me access to many areas where I can park my vehicle or ATV and walk a short distance to hunt. For the above mentioned reasons, I am in favor of keeping all roads and trails that have previously been open to motorized travel open to motorized travel in the future. (Individual, PIERCE, ID—3240)

The Clearwater National Forest should not close any roads or trails to any types of vehicles.

I am opposed to the travel plan if it involves closing of any roads/trails for any type of vehicle, over snow or ATV or whatever. I think it is ridiculous that any of this has to be closed and would

request it be left open for tax payers to use as it is meant to be used. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—41)

Consider keeping all existing routes open. (Motorized Recreation, LEWISTON, ID—91)

I am strongly against any more closures of our public lands. I have traveled over thousands of miles of Clearwater forests and have not seen any harm come from motorized use, I have seen far more harm from the closure of the public lands in the form of no timber harvest which has caused the forests to over populate and die to fire and bugs. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—2528)

The Forest Service should not add any routes to its current transportation system.

Given that the Forest Service cannot maintain or enforce its current travel system, the addition of routes seems unnecessary and excessive. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict motorized uses in the Elk Summit and Tom Beal areas.

Adding closed area in the Elk Summit and the Tom Beal areas should not be considered. They are areas that are used by both people Montana and Idaho. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1085)

4.1.1.4 Regulated Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should regulate off-highway vehicle uses.

I believe that motorized use in roadless areas should be strictly forbidden, with a high enough fine to actually be affective. There are already too many roads available for ORV/ATV use without creating new ones or allowing illegally made roads to be used. It's essential to start seriously regulating ORV and ATV use now! (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—126)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses only on existing roads and trails where compaction and erosion are mitigated.

I recommend the Clearwater NF restricts motorized users to existing roads and trails that were specifically designed and constructed to mitigate for the compaction and erosion attendant with motorized recreation. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—4463)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses on roads and non-motorized uses on trails.

Motorized users have over double the road miles of trail users. Instead of developing more trails to motorized use, I propose motorized users stay on the roads. Leave trails to more primitive historic use - horseman and hikers. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

I support a policy whereby motorized and mechanized travel would only be allowed on roads that currently allow cars, trucks and RVs whether in a wilderness area or not. For all other trails (wilderness area or not), I would support foot and stock travel only. I feel such a policy would be easier to justify than one that would allow bicycles but not motorcycles or ATVs. And it would be very clear to the public that if one desires the experience of a trail, then one will have to exert the effort on foot or with a stock animal to gain such an experience. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4450)

4.1.1.5 Limited to No Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should significantly limit motorized access.

The Center opposes the construction of motorized trails and roads in wildlife habitat and calls on the Forest Service to remove much of the road and motorized trail system on the CNF and to significantly limit motorized access on the CNF. There are too many roads and motorized trails on the Clearwater. Continuing to allow the current system of roads and motorized trails to exist

is incompatible with the protection of natural resources, fish and wildlife, wilderness and roadless designations (current and future), soils, water quality and the natural soundscape on the forest. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict all motorized uses.

If a bull enters a china shop, we don't merely make the rows within this shop wider to accommodate the bull. Logic tells us that we should remove the bull from this fragile environment, or we risk losing the entire china shop. Please remove the ORV "bull" from our irreplaceable forests. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—145)

4.1.1.6 Suggested Changes

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt restrictions by area, not a trail-by-trail basis.

Travel planning must include large strategic vehicle closures for ease of enforcement. A trail by trail approach just doesn't work. On the proposed action map, trails that are closed to vehicles or only open to certain vehicles intersect those that are open. This will create management difficulties and can cause significant confusion among trail users. There is no incentive for someone riding a vehicle to stay on the open trail. ...a trail by trail approach does not adequately address snowmobiles. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should avoid construction of motorized routes on ridge tops.

The Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy discourages the building of motorized routes on ridge tops as this might interfere with lynx habitat connectivity. Connectivity routes between the Hoodoo (Great Burn Roadless Area over Lolo Pass to the Selway-Bitterroot Ecosystem could be a critical linkage in the greater Yellowstone-to-Yukon Corridor. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should re-open motorized routes that were closed due to timber harvests.

... motorized routes that were closed due to timber harvests should be reopened (returned to pre-harvest condition) now because the vegetation and cover has been reestablished. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should restore like access when restrictions are enacted.

In the event that for valid reasons an area will be closed to public motorized or wheeled access, please restore access to areas of comparable size which has been previously closed to public motorized or wheeled access. (Motorized Recreation, ANACONDA, MT—498)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate a system of dual-purpose routes.

We request that a system of dual-purpose roads, and OHV roads and trails that interconnect be one of the primary objectives of the travel management plan and that this objective be adequately addressed in the document and decision. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide challenging routes for motorized users.

National Forest officials have stated that all challenging roads and trails would be eliminated due to their concerns about hazards on those routes. For many of us, these are the very routes that we consider to have the greatest recreational value. Again, this is another example of predisposition and discrimination. (Motorized Recreation Groups, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize users desire different experiences from roads and trails.

It is important to recognize the distinction between "trails" and "roads" during this planning process. It is vital that the Clearwater understand that just as forest roads alone would not

appeal to hikers, equestrians and bicyclists, forest roads do not fulfill the needs of motorcyclists. (Motorized Recreation, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider proposed restrictions on bicycles.

Practical bicycle routes reach beyond auto roads to the narrowest of trails. At this point in time, to propose permanent closures to bicycles without thoughtful evaluation is shortsighted.

(Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—16)

4.1.2 Road and Trail Inventory

The Clearwater National Forest should include a detailed inventory of roads and trails in the draft environmental impact statement.

. . . we recommend that the EIS include a detailed inventory of roads and trails, including their present designated use, their actual use, and their condition. We would also like to see a schedule for an on the ground inventory of roads and trails and their condition as part of the Proposed Action, if such an inventory has not already been completed. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should remove unneeded spur roads from the inventory.

The Proposed Action identifies a number of spurs which you propose to designate as open for motorized travel; primarily, it appears, to provide access to vistas. . . . We encourage you to identify unneeded spurs and remove them from the inventory of roads and trails as open. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

4.1.3 Road and Trail Densities

The Clearwater National Forest should limit road and trail densities.

Road and trail densities on the Clearwater National Forest are of particular concern, and keeping densities at a level consistent with the applicable science is important for maintaining the future of wildlife populations. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should limit road and trail densities in inventoried roadless areas.

We would recommend the Forest Service not allow the motorized road and trail densities in any of the Inventoried Roadless Areas on the Clearwater National Forest to exceed 1 mi/mi². IRAs provide important summer and winter habitat for elk as well as a number of game and non-game species, and keeping route densities at or below the level where they can start to have serious impacts to wildlife will be important for the elk and other species. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

4.1.4 Seasonal Restrictions

The Clearwater National Forest should implement seasonal restrictions for specific purposes.

Implement seasonal closures, where required, with input and review by OHV recreationists that will: (1) provide the maximum amount of OHV recreational opportunity during the summer recreation season in order to disperse all forms of trail use and thus minimize impacts to trail users; (2) provide winter OHV recreation opportunities in low-elevation areas that are not critical winter game range; (3) provide OHV recreation and access during hunting season by keeping major roads and OHV loops open while closing spur roads and trails necessary to provide reasonable protection of game populations and a reasonable hunting experience; and (4) provide OHV recreation opportunities during spring months in all areas where erosion and

wildlife calving conditions reasonably allow. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Seasonal designations of motorized routes should exclude spring wet periods when the potential for erosion, sediment delivery and mass failures are high. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

As previously stated, IDFG supports seasonal restrictions to protect fish and wildlife resources at critical times and to reduce the vulnerability of big game during hunting seasons. Examples include protection of important winter and summer elk habitat, elk calving habitats, and additional restrictions during the big game hunting seasons. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should standardize seasonal restriction dates.

. . . there is also a significant need to standardize or simplify seasonal closure dates as much as possible. We suggest that the number of different closures periods should be kept to a maximum of two, if possible, in order to avoid confusion and resulting misunderstandings. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The sheer number of different opening and closing dates on different roads and trails make it difficult for visitors to understand what is open and what is closed during specific times of the year and makes it difficult to put together loop opportunities. Standardizing these dates will make it easier for visitors to understand the closure regulations. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

We agree with your modifications of dates of some seasonal restrictions for roads and trails to reduce the variety of restricted periods and to make closures more consistent across the Forest; this will help reduce violations and improve administration of restrictions. Seasonal road closures should apply to all motorized vehicles. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider making restrictions coincide with holidays and seasons.

Recreationists can relate to holidays and seasons better than calendar dates. The CNF should consider changing these seasonal closures from the opening of rifle deer or elk season to the Friday before Memorial Day. This type of closure specifically targets the activities that need to be restricted and also provide access before a major use weekend. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

The CNF might consider changing these seasonal closures from the opening of rifle deer or elk season to the Friday before Memorial Day. This type of closure specifically targets the activities that need to be restricted and also provide access before a major use weekend. . . .

Visitors can relate to holiday weekends better than calendar days. For the openings scheduled for June 1st, they should be moved forward to the Friday before Memorial Day. This move will allow the routes to accommodate major holiday traffic. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should make seasonal restriction dates more consistent on the Palouse Ranger District.

(Palouse Ranger District) Many of the route changes move seasonal closure dates around to make them consistent. During my review I noticed that several closure dates still exist. Some closures start on October 1st while others start on November 1st. The opening dates moved around as well. Some openings are on May 1st while others are on June 1st. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

The Clearwater National Forest should use dates that reflect the intent of restrictions.

Standardization of closure dates also seems like a reasonable proposal to help simplify travel restrictions. However, care should be taken not a change to original intent of such closures in the effort towards simplification. For example, some higher elevation areas or native surfaced roads may actually require later gate-opening dates to reduce problems of erosion. Wildlife closures should not be modified to allow additional motorized access during the fall elk-hunting season and that closure start date should not modified for the purpose of simplification. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider flexible seasonal restriction dates.

Many of the closures starting times seem to be more related to when the routes get snowy or muddy. Hunting season can cause extensive damage to system routes (if the route is muddy). The IDPR would like to see flexible start dates in order to protect the route resource. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

4.1.5 General Restrictions

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses on all roads and trails outside of designated wilderness.

All trails and roads should be "open" to motorized use that are not in designated wilderness. Leaving more trails and roads open will allow for dispersed use by motorized users and lessen the impact on specific roads and trails. (Individual, STITES, ID—521)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop restrictions with a sunset provision.

We support "sunset" rules so closures cannot stay permanently in place when the reason for closure is no longer necessary or valid and those in authority neglect to act. (Motorized Recreation Group, HAMILTON, MT—1729)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize road and trail restrictions will have negative effects on forest management and will hamper emergency responses.

The closing of multiple use roads and trails will most certainly have an adverse affect on your ability to actively manage the forest with sustainable timber harvesting, emergency response from search and rescue and the ability to fight forest fires. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should not access areas restricted to motor vehicles via motorized vehicle.

Agencies should not use motorized access in areas closed to motorized access by the public because: (a) the public will see the tracks and could become upset that the motorized closure is being violated and/or (b) the public will see the tracks and conclude that motorized access is acceptable. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict roads and trails that could deliver sediment to Forest streams.

We recommend that the CNF look for opportunities to reduce road related sediment by closing roads and trails with inadequate drainage features, and those roads near streams that could deliver sediment. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

Wet water fords and routes for motorized use within riparian areas should not be designated (and a MVUM issued) in order to ensure that no new sediment delivery occurs, water quality is maintained, and fish populations are protected. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

4.1.6 Site-specific Suggestions Regarding Motorized Uses

4.1.6.1 Allow Motorized Uses within Specific Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses within specific areas

I support the continued use of these areas for public access: Hoodoo, Surveyor, Blacklead Mountain, Beaver Ridge, Tom Beal, Elk Summit and Crooked Fork. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2712)

Do not close to motorized recreation, areas recommended for inclusion in the wilderness system. This includes Hoodoo, Surveyor, Beaver Lakes and the Great Burn area. These areas have been used for motorized recreation consistently for over 45 years. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—163)

Adding closed area in the Elk Summit and the Tom Beal areas should not be considered. They are areas that are used by both people Montana and Idaho. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1085)

4.1.6.2 Allow Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Specific Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile and bicycle uses within specific areas.

Restricting snowmobile and bicycle access to these areas (Beaver Ridge, Blacklead Mountain, Crooked Fork, Elk Summit, Hoodoo, Surveyor and Tom Beal) not only discriminates against many users but is also unnecessary. Removing these two forms of transportation makes it difficult if not impossible for elderly or handicapped persons to enjoy these areas. In so doing usage will be catered to limited groups such as outfitters and horsemen. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—317)

4.1.6.3 Allow Motorized Uses within Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses within inventoried roadless areas.

We strongly uphold that roadless areas should be left as is with existing trails open to motorized recreation. (Motorized Recreation Group, HAMILTON, MT—318)

4.1.6.4 Allow Motorized Uses within Multiple Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses within specific inventoried roadless areas.

I am asking you to seriously reconsider ANY attempts to close trails and roads in Pot Mountain, Meadow Creek Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Moose Mountain, Cayuse Creek and eastern portion of Bighorn Weitas (east of Weitas Creek). Many, including handicapped persons, NEED assistance in accessing the areas. Do NOT needlessly restrict access in ANY NATIONAL PROPERTY! All of these areas are important to various recreationists, such as hunters, anglers, hiker. (Individual, RICHLAND, WA—1182)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses within the Hoodoo Inventoried Roadless Area.

I am writing to you in response to the proposed closure area near the Hoodoos. I am an avid outdoorsman and motor enthusiast. I can see absolutely no reason to close these areas to motorized use. I believe in responsibility and management as do all the people I ride with. Who are we to lock out one particular group over another in a "free" country? I will do everything in my power to stop this closure. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—49)

4.1.6.5 Allow Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobiles and bicycles within recommended wildernesses.

Leaving the areas open to snowmobile use in the winter and bicycles in the summer would likely benefit a greater number of recreationists than they would if they were closed. Wilderness designation also makes it difficult for the agency to take management action on the land. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2647)

4.1.6.6 Allow Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses within the Weitas drainage.

The Weitas drainage is a great area for family recreation. This area needs to stay open to motorized use. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—330)

4.1.6.7 Greatly Limit Motorized Uses within Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should greatly limit motorized uses in specific inventoried roadless areas.

Further, I ask that you greatly limit motorized use in the following roadless areas: Bighorn-Weitas; Eldorado Creek; Lochsa Face; Lolo Creek; Mallard Larkins; Meadow Creek- Upper North Fork; Moose Mountain; North Fork Spruce-White Sand; North Lochsa Slope; Plot Mountain; Racliff-Gedney; Rawhide; Siwash; Sneakfoot Meadows; Weir-Post Office Creek. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—4392)

4.1.6.8 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Areas.

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within specific areas.

All roadless areas and contiguous land should be closed to motor vehicles. These are the remaining wildlands in the US and they need to be free of vehicles. The vast majority of land is dedicated to vehicle use. Enclosed is a map of HR 1975 (the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act) for the Clearwater National Forest. Specifically, the areas in HR 1975, which would be designated as wilderness, must be closed to vehicles.

All Research Natural Areas need to be closed to vehicles, as do riparian areas (RHCAs). (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

All roadless areas, RNAs, and other sensitive areas need to be closed to vehicles, summer and winter. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

In addition to Kelly Creek, the Great Burn, and Mallard Larkins, the Forest Service should also designate Cayuse, Fourth of July, Weitas, Fish and Hungary Creeks as nonmotorized. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2588)

4.1.6.9 Restrict Motorized Uses within All Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within all inventoried roadless areas.

We encourage you to do so (protect forests) by banning motorized recreation from all roadless areas in the Clearwater National Forest and then restoring to their natural condition areas already damaged by illegal motorized use. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—145)

It is important for proponents of motorized recreation to have places to play, but this form of recreation is not compatible with the roadless areas and backcountry. (Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—146)

Roadless areas must be closed to motor vehicle to effectively provide wildlife habitat, protect watershed, and give rare species the chance to recover. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—532)

Motorized use should not be allowed in any of the roadless areas of the Clearwater National Forest. These areas include Weitas Creek, Pot Mountain, Fish & Hungery Creeks, the Great Burn area and all the wild areas south of the Lochsa adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. These areas are essential habitat for both anadromous and resident fisheries and for wildlife. (Individual, KOOSKIA, ID—2339)

4.1.6.10 Restrict Motorized Uses within Multiple Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within specific inventoried roadless areas.

Because the Idaho roadless planning process is ongoing, we request that the CNF designate all of the Great Burn/Hoodoo Recommended Wilderness area as non-motorized. Further, we request that all of the Lochsa Face (#1311) roadless area be designated non-motorized. The reason for this request is to provide greater protection for the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness from illegal trespassing by snowmobilers. We also request that the Sneakfoot Meadows (#1314) and North Fork Spruce-White Sand roadless areas be designated non-motorized for the same reason. This would be a similar action to that of the Bitterroot National Forest's Travel Plan proposal to close a number of roads and areas due to their proximity to non-motorized, protected lands. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

I am asking you to close all trails and roads in Pot Mountain, Meadow Creek Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Moose Mountain, Cayuse Creek and eastern portion of Bighorn Weitas (east of Weitas Creek) to maintain the wild and remote character of these areas.

All of these areas are important to non motorized recreationists as well as wildlife. Hunters, anglers, hikers and other public lands users want places to recreate without the noise and disturbance created by off road vehicles. By closing these areas to motorized use, there will still be ample opportunity for motorized recreationists elsewhere. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—528)

I would also like to see the North Lochsa Slope, Moose Mountain, Pot Mountain, Bighorn Weitas, Meadow Creek/Upper North Fork, Rawhide, roadless areas to all motorized activity. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2786)

I support the Forest Service's proposal to close the Great Burn Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) and Mallard-Larkins IRA to all motorized vehicles during all seasons. These are especially sensitive areas with high wilderness attributes that have long deserved protection from the impacts of off-road vehicles (ORV). (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2837)

I support your recommendation to limit motorized and mechanized use in the Great Burn and Mallard Larkins roadless areas. However, other ecologically important areas should be closed to motor vehicle use. Specifically, all trails and roads in Pot Mountain, Meadow Creek Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Moose Mountain, Cayuse Creek and eastern portion of Bighorn Weitas (east of Weitas Creek) should be closed to maintain the wild and remote character of these areas. (Individual, RENTON, WA—786)

4.1.6.11 Restrict Motorized Uses within a Specific Inventoried Roadless Area

The Clearwater National Forest restrict motorized uses within the Lochsa Face Inventoried Roadless Area.

. . . we request that all of the Lochsa Face (#1311) roadless area be designated non-motorized. The reason for this request is to provide greater protection for the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness from illegal trespassing by snowmobilers. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within the Big Horn-Weitas Inventoried Roadless Area.

Any area that appeared in one of the bills introduced by former representative LaRocco-be it a proposed wilderness or a special management area-must be managed as per the settlement agreement . . . Everything from and including Weitas Creek, Little Weitas Creek and trail 20 to the east falls into that category. The Forest Supervisors letter of March 30, 1993 makes the point clear that any B-2 (or settlement agreement B-2 area, for that matter) cannot have trail reconstruction and have that area open to motorized vehicles. 531 and 167 fall into that category as do others.

The Clearwater's ORV guidelines admit that motorcycle use in Weitas Creek has increased due to recent reconstruction of trails. . . much of Weitas Creek is in management areas C-1 and C-6, trails must be closed to all motor vehicles if they have been reconstructed (see ORV guidelines pages and ATV use of any kind is prohibited even in the absence of reconstruction 1 (3 and 17). Also the forest plan ROD allocates C8S areas to nonmotorized use. The outstanding natural values, the current trail conditions, and user conflicts all dictate that all the trails in the Weitas Creek Roadless Area should be closed to all vehicles. In any case, many of those trails currently open must be closed in order to comply with forest plan standards, the settlement agreement, and the ORV guidelines. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

Weitas Creek is the most important roadless area on the Clearwater National Forest. Perhaps no place illustrates the degradation of quiet recreation as does Weitas Creek. Over the years, places that were not used by motor vehicles (or used only lightly), have been opened to that use without any NEPA.

This area has considerable abuse by vehicles in certain areas. The (current) management of this area for vehicles violates the forest plan, forest plan ROD, executive orders and the forest plan settlement agreements. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.6.1.12 Restrict Motorized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized vehicles within recommended wilderness areas.

I STRONGLY support the exclusion of motorized uses in Recommended Wilderness Areas. The exclusion is entirely appropriate and badly needed. (Individual, AMES, IA—2527)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within the Mallard-Larkins recommended wilderness.

This area (Mallard-Larkins Proposed Wilderness) is important mountain goat habitat and a popular backcountry area. Much of the area is proposed to be closed to vehicles which is positive. However, the Elizabeth Lakes area should be closed summer and winter to vehicles to protect wolverine denning and provide consistent management. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.6.1.13 Restrict Motorized and Mechanized Uses within Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wilderness areas.

The proposal to manage the Mallard-Larkins, Great Burn, and recommended additions to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness for non-motorized and non-mechanized recreation, will serve not only to provide opportunities for non-motorized recreationists, but will also protect important wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and wildlife security along the Idaho-Montana divide. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

Limiting motorized and mechanized use in the Great Burn and Mallard Larkins areas is particularly close to the hearts of my wife and I. Long after we are able to get in on our own two feet, we will be overjoyed to know that our children, grandchildren and descendants for generations to come are exploring the same wild areas that gave us so much pleasure. Beyond that, we will know that all wild things, flora and fauna, and the lakes and streams, will be protected from the growing dangers presented by motorized travel. (Individual, ARLEE, MT—2607)

I appreciate and wholly support your recommendation to limit motorized and mechanized use in the Great Burn and Mallard-Larkins roadless areas. Protecting the outstanding natural integrity of these proposed wilderness areas is extremely important. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—528)

4.6.1.14 Restrict Motorized Uses within Areas Recommended as Wilderness by Others¹

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within the Eldorado Creek proposed wilderness.

This small area (Eldorado Creek Proposed Wilderness) is all that is left of the gentler terrain on the western portion of the main block of the Clearwater National Forest. Most of this area has been heavily developed. As such, it has ecological importance. Closing the area year-round to vehicles is imperative. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within the Siwash proposed wilderness.

This area (Siwash Proposed Wilderness) contains some important coastal disjunct habitat and winter range. However, it is wide open to snowmobiles and all trails are motorized. The 601 and 602 trails meet yet have different proposed restrictions. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses within the Weir Creek proposed wilderness.

This small gem (Weir Creek proposed Wilderness) is a very wild with only one maintained trail in it. Unfortunately, the FS proposes to open the trail to motorized use. (Trail) 919 is narrow and steep and not suited to vehicle use. Winter motorized use is allowed everywhere except for, ironically, on the 919 trail and possible in winter range. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

¹ The following references to “proposed wilderness” represent the proposals of an organization. These areas were not recommended for wilderness designation by the 1987 Clearwater Forest Plan.

4.6.1.15 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict and manage motor vehicle uses within specific drainages.

IDFG fully supports the proposal to retain those areas surrounding Kelly Creek and Cayuse Creek as non-motorized. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

Please restrict and effectively manage motorized vehicle use on Kelly, upper Kelly, Cayuse, Lunde Peak, Pete King Creek, Crooked Fork, Brushy Fork, Colt Killed Creek, Wendover, Badger, Post Office, Doe, Fishing, Legendary Bear, Gravey and Indian Grave Creeks. (Individual, PULLMAN, WA—2989)

4.1.7 Roads and Trails Mapping and Analysis

The Clearwater National Forest should complete a trail inventory and analysis prior to travel planning.

If your forest has not completed a trail inventory and analysis, we request that your agency complete this prior to proceeding with the travel planning process. CBU finds that without a complete trail inventory and analysis being done prior to travel planning actions that the outcome will not identify those areas that may need mitigation and maintenance and the your agency may prefer just to close certain trails and roads without attempting to mitigate potential and real problems. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the existing network of roads and trails as the inventory.

The existing network of roads and trails in the planning area should be considered an inventory with which to develop recreational trail systems. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest is putting an unfair burden on trail users in developing the road and trail inventory.

We have never had to identify and inventory backpacking routes that we wish to remain open. Additionally, most motorized recreationists do not have the expertise or equipment required to provide a comprehensive inventory of roads and trails. We are very concerned about the burden and disadvantage that is placed on motorized recreationists by this procedure and we request that it be changed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate inventoried roads and trails for recreational values.

Each road and trail should be inventoried and viewed on the ground to determine its recreational value and any significant problem areas that require mitigation measures. Each road and trail should be evaluated for its value as a motorized loop or connected route. Each spur road and trail should be evaluated for its value including: a source of dispersed campsite(s), exploration opportunities (especially for young and older riders), destination such as an old mine and viewpoint or as access for all multiple-use visitors. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.1.8 User-created Routes

The Clearwater National Forest should address the proliferation of user-created routes.

Indeed, the incremental and ongoing proliferation of user-created routes, and the failure of the Forest Service to close administrative routes that were not intended for motorized recreation use (e.g., logging routes), is a significant cause of the current predicament faced by the Forest

Service that spurred the promulgation of the TMR in the first place. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate and designate user-created routes.

The Rule clearly empowers decision makers to evaluate the site-specific characteristics, including possible mitigation of any adverse effects, and to formalize use upon previous "user-created" routes through the designation process. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

Some stakeholder groups are asking for immediate closure of "unauthorized routes" or "user created routes" because they say these routes were not originally "planned" for recreation, and they erroneously believe they are illegal and must be closed. . . . such a viewpoint should have no bearing on this travel planning process. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The CNF also needs to accept and recognize unauthorized (i.e. user-created routes) in this process. The origin of unauthorized routes is varied, but the forest needs to identify these routes finding which routes are acceptable for inclusion into the travel plan and which routes need rehabilitation. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate routes on the Palouse Ranger District.

During the Upper Palouse ATV Project OHV users expressed the need to add certain non-classified routes to the system. The agency stated they would not consider such proposals saying that there would be an opportunity to identify and possibly add routes at a future date. To now say that that agency won't even consider those routes risks important partnerships and relationships with a key stakeholder group. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow continued uses on user-created routes that were created "appropriately."

We are asking for continued use of routes that are legitimately recognized by the agencies including those defined by the: 3-State OHV decision and route definitions (or similar definitions), RS-2477 access laws, all agency mapping including current travel plan mapping and historic and current visitor mapping. It is not fair to represent routes as "unauthorized" or "illegal" when they were created in times when it was appropriate. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should not designate user-created routes without rigorous environmental analysis.

The user-created portions of these roads should be eliminated or closed to all use. . . . No user-created or user-modified trails should be included in the roads or trails designated as open in the Preferred Alternative without undergoing rigorous environmental analysis of the current and projected impacts from that trail. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should conduct an analysis on user-created sections of Trails 625 (Johnny Basin), 167 (Windy Ridge), and 531 (Windy Bill) if they are going to be designated for motorized uses.

Forest Service planning team members explained to us that these routes (Trail 625 from road 555 to trail 167, then as trail 167 to road 250; and trail 531 from 524 at Scurvy Mt to the junction of 167 and 117/594) were not introduced as "new" trails or as a change of use because they were pre-existing non-motorized trails that have been used, albeit illegal, for many years by motorcyclists. The Forest Service has determined that years of illegal use has established these trails as motorized and, therefore, that no further analysis of the impacts of their use was required. . . .

We strongly disagree with the Forest Service's conclusions on this issue. We do not believe that illegal behavior should be rewarded, especially when that behavior is so obviously contradictory to the "overwhelming" public opinion reflected in the current Forest Plan. We contend that public disclosure of the action and a complete analysis of impacts of that action is not only warranted, but required. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should not designate user-created routes.

It is completely unfair to have a group trash a national resource and then say, "well now that we have wrecked it, we want to claim it as ours in the travel plan". This "Oh well" philosophy is promoting more and more lawless ORV users to "claim" more country. (Individual, PULLMAN, WA—34)

We believe that the Forest Service has been incredibly tardy in addressing the issue of ORV use in our forests, and that the agency has helped create the problem of illegal motorized trails by not addressing this issue earlier. It makes no sense to "grandfather" illegal ORV use, legitimizing user created ORV routes and rewarding the destructive behavior of ORV riders. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—145)

We also ask that the CNF not reward rogue ORV use by considering addition of illegally created routes to the system. These routes are unauthorized and were not properly analyzed under NEPA before their creation. These routes were not located or constructed using Best Management Practices, which leads to concerns that the environmental effects of these routes cannot be fully minimized. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restore all user-created routes.

All illegally created motorized trails should be restored to natural conditions and should not be legitimized by designating these routes during the Travel Planning process. (Individual, KOOSKIA, ID—2339)

Illegally created motorized trails must not be legitimate as designated routes, they should be restored to natural conditions as much as possible. E.g. trail to Fish Lake. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—79)

4.1.9 New Routes

The Clearwater National Forest should not consider new route proposals.

Allowing motor-use community to proposed new (additional) motorized routes-winter or summer-is not appropriate. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—79)

4.1.10 Rights-of-way

The Clearwater National Forest should acquire rights-of-way to enhance motorized recreation opportunities.

The elimination of public access to public lands through private property has also contributed to the loss of motorized access and motorized recreation opportunities. We request that agencies acquire private land and right-of-ways to provide access to public land that is now blocked off to the public. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider allowing motorized uses on Revised Statute 2477 routes.

Where RS 2477 rights are asserted, these routes may be considered for motor vehicle use. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

We would like to comment on the upcoming trail access designations within the Clearwater National Forest. We have filed several RS 2477 Public Rights of Ways within the forest with the County Commissioners that have been accepted by them and recorded on the County highway road map. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—20)

All RS2477 rights-of-way should be unrestricted. . . . All trails and roads that have been filed on and recorded should be open trails # 167-531-627-524-628-632-20-191-186-168-176-445-419-738-101-144-240-396-283-273-373-617-600-297-567-513-88-11-100-104-517-103-165-173-191-429-478-534-565-580-667 Road # 555-5428-738b-547. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—520)

If these areas get closed down completely the town of Superior and county commissioners then will look at R.S. 2477 this Stateline trail. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—358)

The Clearwater National Forest should coordinate with the county to identify Revised Statute 2477 routes.

. . . it is the responsibility of the agency proposing a closure action to adequately research those records and establish which routes meet RS2477 classification and then consult and coordinate with the County with respect to that classification. . . . We request that this planning project include adequate research of the county records and adequate formal consultation and coordination with the county to get their input on RS2477 routes. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.1.11 Closed Unless Designated Open

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt the “closed unless designated open” policy.

I am in favor of a closed unless designated open policy. This is different than a closed unless signed open policy. At ranger stations and campgrounds, flyers would be clearly available for interested people designating the open trails on a map. The burden on determining open or closed is on the rider. "I didn't know" does not become an excuse. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—221)

The IDPR (Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation) supports the elimination of cross-country travel outlined by the National Travel Management Rule. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The new USFS regulations being used here represent a real leap forward in travel planning, especially the ending of most summer time cross country travel, and the new signage assumption: closed unless marked (or mapped) open.

These new regs will save time, money will help reduce violations, will make convictions for violations easier, and will encourage all forest users to possess the current travel map. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

The Clearwater National Forest should not adopt the “closed unless designated open” policy.

We also would like to go on record that we are against any program that is used that states closed unless post(ed) open. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—20)

The Clearwater National Forest should post trails to ensure clear communication.

We do not accept oversight or "misprints" on travel maps. These errors effectively close areas for travel and must then be posted on location. Whether they are actually closed on the map and should be open or open and should be closed MAY not be clear to the motorized users. The

posted areas should accurately reflect whether the trail is open or closed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HAMILTON, MT—318)

4.1.12 Cross-Country Travel

The Clearwater National Forest should allow cross-country travel for motorcyclists engaged in “off trail exploration.”

In the North Fork drainage there are several old USFS trails, dozens of horse trails (one on almost every ridge), and thousands of elk trails. Motorcycle trail riders do enjoy riding and exploring these routes. . . . These off the system routes are never ridden more than a couple of times a year, but the exploration is a test of trail following and trail riding skill. All of these expeditions end in log jumping, brush crashing, and circling on foot while looking for any sign of the old trail. This is a lot of fun that does no damage to the trees or the brush, but can result in a lot of laughing, sweating, some scratched plastic, and torn clothing.

The new travel plan will eliminate all of the off trail exploration opportunity for motorcycle riders. With the elimination of off trail exploration, motorcycle trail riders will be losing a recreational opportunity that we all love. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate some areas for cross-country use.

This rule (National Travel Management Rule) does allow some small limited areas open for cross-country use. The CNF should consider some of these areas (like old gravel pits) for cross-country motorized use. These small areas provide an important recreation opportunity for those visitors who enjoy playing in gravel pits and reservoir bottoms. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should focus cross-country travel restrictions on problem areas.

I believe the Forest Service should not have closed the cross country travel of the forest in the broad sweeping approach that has been taken. If a given area is being abused then do something in that area alone. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—945)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict off-road vehicles to designated trails.

I fully support a management plan that restricts ORV use to specified trails, a management plan that makes it unlawful for ORVs to go cross country, a management plan that keeps the forests' health a top priority. (Individual, POCATELLO, ID—2732)

I see nothing wrong with leaving existing roads and trails open to use and prohibiting cross country travel. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—29)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the sacrifice motorized users made to support the limitation on cross-country motorized travel.

The recent closure of Forest Service lands to cross country travel was supported by most motorized user groups. That act then limits us (motorized users) to a very small part of these lands as a whole while non-motorized use is allowed forest wide. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should limit administrative cross-country uses.

The National Travel Management Rule does not limit cross-country motorized travel for authorized personnel. CNF personnel should also limit cross-country travel. Once a track is made, it can be difficult for the average visitor to distinguish the new created route from the designated route. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict non-motorized cross-country travel.

Non-motorized recreationists traveling cross-country produce similar impacts to cross-country motorcycle travel, i.e. impacts on weeds, foot prints, and disturbance of wildlife. Therefore, any areas closed to cross-country motorcycle travel should also be closed to non-motorized cross-country use. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should phase in restrictions on cross-country travel.

A reasonable process exists to move from the existing management of open to cross country travel to one of travel being limited to routes. It involves restricting cross country travel while limiting use to existing routes and then further refining the existing route system through future planning efforts. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—2058)

4.1.13 Travel to Campsites

The Clearwater National Forest should allow cross-country travel to campsites.

Allowing travel up to 300 feet off a designated route, both roads and trails, is an absolutely necessary opportunity for reasonable use of the area by the public. This access is needed for retrieval, woodcutting, and to reach dispersed campsites and the public's use of the area would be unreasonable compromised without this access. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate routes into campsites.

Allowing a 300 foot buffer for dispersed camping purposes is contrary to the intent of the Travel Management Rule and will make determining the cumulative impacts of the proposed action nearly impossible. Instead, the CNF should consider designating specific dispersed camping site spurs that can be driven to and only allowing individuals to park within one vehicle length of the road if it is safe to do so. This will make surveys for cultural and other resource impacts and the analysis of the impacts of the proposed action must simpler. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate routes into campsites in specific drainages.

Although we are asking the Forest Service to designate trails in Cayuse, Forth of July, Weitas, Fish, Hungry, (Lolo) and White Sand Creek watersheds as non-motorized, if routes are ultimately designated for motor vehicle use in these watersheds, there should be no exception to the prohibition on cross-country vehicle travel for the purpose of dispersed camping. . . .

We recommend designating specific routes to designated campsites in order to further minimize impacts to soil, water quality, and wildlife habitat along these streams and rivers. . . .

We would also point out that the trail along Kelly Creek is proposed to be designated non-motorized, so there should be no exception to the prohibition on cross-country travel for the purpose of dispersed camping along Kelly Creek. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Clearwater National Forest should shorten the travel distance into campsites.

Motorized travel up to 300 feet off of designated routes to access established campsites would be permitted. I feel that 300 feet off a route is too much. This distance should be shortened. A forest wide restriction of 100 feet would be ideal. (Individual, POCATELLO, ID—2704)

4.1.14 Access for Permittees

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access for permittees.

I would suggest that grazing management plans include access for the permittee to travel to those sites that are deemed necessary for doing the best job possible of executing his grazing plan. This would include travel even after the end of the grazing season to search for animals that are still missing. (Possibly dead or still out there). (Special Use Permittee, PRINCETON, ID—82)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access to mining claims.

My grandfather, Walter Sewell, mined in the Blacklead area in the 1930's. My family now (and since the early 1980's) makes annual trips into the area to work on their mining claim. There are several other mining claims in that area also. Again, to close this route to vehicles would make it extremely difficult to get into the area to work on these claims. (Individual, ELECTRIC CITY, WA—522)

4.2 Roads Management

4.2.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should accurately report the miles of roads in the roads system.

The Clearwater National Forest has between 4,000 and 5,000 miles of roads. It is instructive to note that, apparently, the latest numbers for road mileage are under reported. When one subtracts the amount of road obliteration from the mileage reported in the annual forest plan monitoring reports and compares that with the number of miles of roads, there is a glaring inconsistency. In other words, over the past several years, the road system mileage has decreased to a much greater extent than the road obliteration mileage would indicate. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate the status of all closed roads.

Well the time is here and all roads that have closed should be reevaluated and some of them opened up for motorized use. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—4456)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow all-terrain vehicles and motorcycles to travel Forest Service roads.

I support a travel policy that would allow ATVs and motorcycles to travel the same forest service roads on which cars and trucks are allowed. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4450)

The Clearwater National Forest should convert all roads that are closed to full-sized vehicles to all-terrain vehicle routes.

All roads to be closed to full-size vehicles should be converted to atv routes. This is a reasonable alternative for all existing roads. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should open more roads for firewood gathering.

I believe there is a need to open more gated roads temporarily during dry weather for firewood gathering. (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—92)

The Clearwater National Forest should eliminate unnecessary “redundant” roads.

Some Roads (and some trails) on the Forest provide access to the same areas and are unnecessary for forest management or recreation. We suggest the Forest develop a strategy to evaluate road redundancy. The elimination of unnecessary roads or, at a minimum, closure of

those roads and trails to motorized travel would reduce negative impacts to wildlife and improve the experience of many forest users. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should effectively manage travel on roads adjacent to streams.

I would like to see more restrictions and effective management regarding the use of vehicles on all roads especially off road vehicles (ORVs) that travel along anadromous fish resident trout streams on the Clearwater National Forest. The reasons for this being that heavy vehicle traffic and poor maintenance generate sediment that is delivered to the streams. Easy access often leads to excessive harvest of westslope cutthroat and bull trout. (Individual, PULLMAN, WA—2989)

4.2.2 Road Densities

The Clearwater National Forest should reduce road densities.

EPA believes reduction in road density, improvements in road drainage, and reductions in sediment delivery from roads are important components for improving aquatic health in streams. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should use reasonable judgment when applying road density criteria.

Road density criteria must be used with reasonable judgment and consider the mitigating effects that an adjacent block of roadless area has on a roaded area that exceeds the desired road density. Oftentimes these areas that exceed the ideal density are very valuable multiple-use motorized areas and border on large roadless areas that provide more than adequate wildlife security thereby effectively mitigating associated with the roaded area. (Motorized Recreation, HELENA, MT—138)

4.2.3 Seasonal Restrictions/Closures

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate each road separately when determining seasonal restrictions.

Closure of all roads to over-snow use should be done on each road separately restrictions, not by set dates on all roads. There are times, during hunting season the only access to certain areas is by over-snow means. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict off-highway vehicles on Deception Face Road 734B from October 1-June 15.

I am concerned about negative effects of motorized use on prime fall bull elk habitat just north of the Moose Mountains roadless area as well as the potential negative effects of motorized use to the wilderness character of that area itself. Full-sized vehicle travel is banned on road 734B from Oct 1 through June 15. This seasonal ban should include ATV's and motorcycles as well. After all, Road 734B is no vital through-route for motorized travel: it dead-ends at the trail head to Moose Mountains where motorized travel is prohibited anyway. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2744)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict uses on Upper Olevan Road 4709 seasonally consistently with other roads and trails in the area.

Road 4709 (Upper Olevan) and it's associated spurs on the Palouse Ranger District has no restrictions to motorcycles, ATVs and snowmobiles, yet it is crossed by Trail 215 that has seasonal restrictions to motorcycles, ATVs and snowmobiles. Since Road 215 is closed seasonally to large vehicles and the trail junction is well beyond the gate it is very difficult to keep motorized vehicles from accessing Trail 215 at the location of the crossing. Every other road in that general

area (*The west Side of Gold Hill*) has seasonal restrictions similar to trail 215. Changing the 4709 to be consistent with other closures would certainly be helpful in administration of road and trail closures in the Gold Hill area and help to simplify the rules for the motorized user. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.2.4 Road Construction/Reconstruction

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict road construction and motorized uses in lands with “wilderness character.”

Specifically, I believe ANY land considered to have "wilderness character" should not only be protected from motorized abuse, but should remain roadless in perpetuity. (Individual, DEARY, ID—2215)

The Clearwater National Forest should upgrade heavily traveled roads and restrict travel on roads that pose environmental threats.

We support giving priority to upgrading the most heavily used roads and restricting travel on classified roads that pose an environmental threat and cannot be maintained due to lack of funding or resources. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

The Clearwater National Forest should convert a segment of Lean-to Ridge Road 555 to trail.

Given the condition of road 555, its lack of purpose in terms of management need, and the fact that it fragments wildlife habitat, the road should be converted to a non-motorized trail beyond the work center. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

4.2.5 Road Removal/Decommissioning

The Clearwater National Forest should initiate a massive restoration effort to remove evidence of roads.

Looking at a map of roads and trails or an aerial photo reveals an alarmingly high road density in much of the CNF. If anything the project area and surrounding lands should be subjected to a massive restoration effort that removes all evidence of the areas roaded and logged. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

The Clearwater National Forest should decommission many spur roads.

Decommissioning many of these spurs (roads) would have substantial benefits to wildlife by reducing disturbance effects, expanding source habitats, and increasing big game security habitat. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should close and decommission Lean-to Ridge Road 555.

Road 555 (Beyond the Weitas Creek Bridge near the guard station) should be obliterated and closed to all motorized traffic to protect this important big game area. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.2.6 Road Restoration

The Clearwater National Forest should restore specific roads.

Other roads or road complexes that could be considered for restoration or closure include: Fish Butte (483, 481, 5545); Gravy Creek (587, 107); Weitas (555 and 103) before bridge, this steep road is unstable in places; Mush Saddle (711); Smith Ridge (700); Hidden Fix; Skull Creek; Deception/Osier Ridge. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.3 Trails Management

4.3.1 General

4.3.1.1 More Trails for Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more trails for motorized uses.

Reducing overall trail miles is not the solution to the problems you've outlined in the plan. We need MORE motorized trails and loop opportunities to disperse use and increase user satisfaction. (Individual, BOISE, ID—3973)

By providing legal, approved trails you will limit the amount of illegal trails being cut by users of the areas. These legal trails can be regulated, whereas illegal trails cannot. You cannot stop people from taking their vehicles out onto the dirt. If you close these trails, they will make new ones that may impact the environment even more. Give them a place to play, or they will find their own. (Individual, LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA—4008)

The trails leading into the Mallard Larkins and some in the Kelly Creek areas including the Stateline Trail were closed off (to motorized uses) in the past. Now that the issue is up again the proposal is to close about half of what is not open. It appears that we are step by step being shut out of our public lands. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should open overgrown trails to motorized uses.

. . . the Forest should be reopening any trails which have overgrown to motorized use. Motorized users have far too few trails already & their travel on these overgrown trails will keep them from becoming overgrown. This will save the forest money as they will not have to brush the trails & it will keep the trails open to everyone to provide greater spectrum of opportunity & diversity. This addresses two topics in the Purpose & need Statement: Balance travel opportunities with maintenance and management capability including costs; provide for a better spectrum of motorized, non-motorized, non-mechanized travel opportunities across the forest. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Clearwater National Forest should connect decommissioned roads and abandoned trails to provide more non-motorized opportunities.

If the CNF wants to provide more non-motorized trail opportunities, then I suggest that more roads be decommissioned and more abandoned trails be placed back on the trail inventory system. Decommissioned roads and short connector trails can provide outstanding mountain bike and horseback trail opportunities. These are many instances across the state where this has worked successfully in providing additional trail opportunities. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

The Clearwater National Forest should open more trails to two-wheeled motorized recreation.

Open nearly all trails outside of designated wilderness to 2 wheeled motorized recreation. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

4.3.1.2 Retain Trails for Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should retain motorized uses on existing motorized trails.

The most superior trail opportunities are already provided in the Wilderness, without doubt the most scenic and of course they are all non-motorized and non-mechanized. Therefore the only opportunities for motorized recreation are on the remaining Multiple Use Lands. In addition these motorized opportunities are also not found on other lands and based on the stated purpose

and need Forest should preserve all existing motorized trails. (Motorized Recreation Group, GRANGEVILLE, ID—336)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain technical trail bike opportunities.

I hope that you can allow for continued, technical trail bike access through trail access corridors, alternate designations (other than strict "big W" designation) or whatever means you see fit. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—1904)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain motorized trails at the edge of boundaries.

Agencies are encouraged to align non-motorized area boundaries so that they do not encroach or eliminate trails located at the edge of the boundaries. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—38)

The Clearwater National Forest should replace 170 miles of motorized trails lost in the proposal.

The loss of 170+ miles of trail to the motorized community seems to be "no big deal" to the Forest Service. Why doesn't the travel plan include a mile-for-mile replacement strategy for the motorized trails lost? (Individual, BELFAIR, WA—2515)

The Clearwater National Forest should re-establish/relocate trails that were restricted by resource management activities.

Agencies are encouraged to re-establish and/or relocate all trails and roads disturbed by other actions such as timber harvest, mining, and livestock grazing. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider opportunities for off-highway vehicles on the North Fork Ranger District.

There are some opportunities for ATVs and motorcycles on the west side of the North Fork Ranger District. The recent implementation of the Sheep Mountain-Camp 60 project is one such example. There are probably other opportunities on the west side of the North Fork District where old logging road could be utilized to provide ATV loops provided Forest Plan standards are met. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

4.3.1.3 Alternatives to Restrictions

The Clearwater National Forest should re-route problem areas in trails.

If an animal is being bothered by too much traffic then we need to reroute the trail not close it. (Individual, MOXEE, WA—47)

The Clearwater National Forest should open trails on alternate weeks.

We would much rather see these trails open on alternate weeks rather than have them closed to motorized access entirely. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

I would also consider alternating the use of the trail by user groups instead of closing trail systems. The Forest Service and public needs to step up and fix the problems not close the Forest for select groups. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—949)

4.3.1.4 Restrict Motorized Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should provide fewer trails for motorized uses.

Most of these trails are presently not open for motorized travel. This proposal is opening the door to industrial strength motorization of my favorite areas. (Preservation/Conservation Group, LENORE, ID—115)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in areas of historic and cultural significance.

Trails that go through areas of historic and cultural significance should not be open to vehicles to protect heritage values. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should not allow motorized uses on trails.

I do not support the use of ATVs or motorcycles on any true trails. I feel that a trail is appropriate only for foot travel or with stock. Our country is in the middle of a growing obesity crisis partly due to lack of adequate exercise. Shouldn't we be encouraging more hiking and walking instead of riding? (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4450)

Forest Service Trails are not suited for ORV's (ATV) use unless the character of the trail is changed. Trails are places where you hike or bicycle or run or ride your horse. We do non-motorized things on trails. They're not places where you drive. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

Given the number of miles of roads open to ORVs (and not full-sized vehicles) and the fact that most roads that are open to full-sized vehicles on the Clearwater National Forest, are also open to ORVs, it makes sense to close trails to motor vehicles to provide opportunities for quiet recreation and to protect wildlife, watersheds, cultural values, and rare habitats. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.3.1.5 Other**The Clearwater National Forest should avoid situations where non-motorized users must travel across motorized trails to reach a non-motorized trail.**

Of the 726 miles of non-motorized trail, one needs to travel motorized trails to access the non-motorized in some areas like Weitas Creek. Trail users desiring to avoid motorized trails have no access to non-motorized trail segments in areas like Weitas Creek where the mainline trails have been opened to motorized use. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more “self discovery” trails.

Self discovery is a wonderful concept for the trail less traveled; I think every National Forest in the nation should have a portion of primitive self discovery trails, for historic horse and hiker use. I would suggest one-fourth of all National Forests be dedicated to the primitive trail less traveled; (and one half or more Forest land dedicated to non-motorized use.) (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more trails for game retrieval or disabled hunters.

If anything you should be making more trails for these people, which can be regulated during hunting seasons for retrieval purposes or handicap hunters. (Individual, BURLEY, ID—4346)

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a motorized trail rating system.

The following sort of motorized trail identification and rating system would be very helpful to the motorized public and would allow users to match up their experience level and equipment to the most appropriate trails. This system is similar to ski trails. Note that the easiest = green, more difficult = blue, and most difficult = black. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the impacts of concentrated trail use.

In Utah I have witnessed the reduction of trails and the negative impact of said reduction on the remaining trails due to the concentration of use. The end result is the loss of valuable recreational resources and the degradation of the remaining resources. (Individual, MORRO BAY, CA—1695)

4.3.2 Trail Safety

The Clearwater National Forest should adopt a one-way trail system.

I believe the Forest could greatly improve the safety and overall enjoyment for off road users by adopting a one way trail system such as the one CA has developed. (Individual, BOISE, ID—3962)

The Clearwater National Forest should improve the surfaces of existing trails.

The trails that are currently being used on the forest needs lots of surface work to ensure safety. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—949)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider that off-road vehicles restricted from trails could become safety hazards on Pierce-Superior Road 250.

It is our opinion that care needs to be taken when closing trails to motorized vehicles not to push off road vehicles onto sections of the #250 road. Doing so would increase the number of possible future accidents. (Business, OROFINO, ID—4465)

4.3.3 Trail Designation/Inventory

The Clearwater National Forest should include all trails on the inventory.

Agencies are encouraged to return trails that used to be on trail inventories to the current inventory. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should be consistent in trail designations.

Among the listed purposes of the proposed action is "improved clarity and consistency of existing travel restrictions." EPA . . . recommend(s) that among the measures proposed to address this goal the Forest consider consistency in trail designations. For example it appears that there are instances where trails go from open to small vehicles, to open to motorcycles, etc. Where the Forest has experienced unwanted motorized use on trails, we recommend limiting trail designations to the most protective use. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

Trails that are proposed closed to vehicles or only to certain vehicles intersect those, which are proposed open. This creates management difficulties and can cause significant confusion among trail users. There is no incentive for someone riding a vehicle to stay on the trail open trail when it intersects a closed trail in a remote area. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should only designate trails where enforcement is possible.

We recommend only designating trails in those areas where enforcement patrols will be possible and within the budget constraints of the CNF. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain all existing trails on agency maps.

Existing trails, no matter the condition, should never be removed from the F.S. maps. Many of these historic routes were on the ground for a purpose at the time, possibly before the existence of the U.S. Forest Service. With future demands and advancements in technology it would (be) totally irresponsible to delete any trails that could be brought back to standard. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—941)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain all trails that are closed to motorized uses on agency maps.

We would ask that any trail closed to motorized use be kept on the official Forest Service maps and be maintained by the non-motorized user groups or the Forest Service. Failure to do so would likely result in abandonment of these trails. This could lead to increased non-motorized use of trails open to OHV users and then this whole argument would state all over again.

(County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

4.3.4 Trail Maintenance

4.3.4.1 Retain/Maintain the Trails System

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize maintenance is preferable over restrictions.

We request that maintenance actions be taken before closure actions. We believe that this is a viable alternative that would address many of the issues that are driving the pre-determined decision to closure. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain the trails network.

We are disappointed at the numerous proposed trail closures and the number of trails abandoned. With Idaho's population increasing, we should hold on to our existing trail network. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

4.3.4.2 Costs of Not Maintaining Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of restricting motorized uses on trails.

An increase in trail maintenance cost or a reduction in user opportunity will be created due to the reduction of maintained trails through the restriction of a user group who has diligently and with out cost maintained the trail system in the fore mentioned areas for all of the user groups.

(Individual, OROFINO, ID—61)

Has the USFS considered the increased maintenance costs for trails that are annually logged out by motorcycle riders, but under the new plan will be closed to motorized access? . . . For me there is no place as special as the North Fork of the Clearwater. Please don't make a bunch of changes for hikers that will not use or help maintain the trails. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

4.3.4.3 Dealing with Trail Problems

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that most problems are associated with design, not use.

I have found few trail resource problems, and if they exist, it is usually a result of poor trail design rather than a specific mode of travel, and can be repaired. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the challenges associated with maintaining trails for motorized uses.

I have worked on the Stateline Trail, primarily placing water bars and recommending reroutes to get a trail location that does not continue to braid and erode. Motorized users typically avoid these water bars by spinning the soil out on the uphill side, thus changing the route of the tread, and making the water bars useless. It is practically impossible to maintain this type of trail with motorized trail use, and the resource damage is tremendous, both on and (unofficially) off the trail. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—4463)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the expense associated with maintaining trails for motorized uses.

Trails used by two-wheeled vehicles create a u shape with an erosion path. Maintenance of such trails is more expensive as water bars need to be more massive to combat the erosion created by vehicles. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCO, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should explore alternatives for fixing resource problems associated with motorized trails.

Resource problems that exist can be fixed by building bridges, general trail maintenance, and trail reroutes which are usually in short sections of trail. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The most common maintenance requirement for 4x4 and OHV routes is the construction and maintenance of water bars/dips/mounds to divert runoff from the route. This maintenance could easily be provided by running a SWECO trail machine with a trained operator over each route once every 5 years. OHV trail maintenance and gas tax monies are available to fund this maintenance. AmeriCorps type labor could also be used. The SWECO could not be used on motorcycle single-track trails but they typically require less maintenance and water bars/dips/mounds can usually be constructed on these trails by hand work. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Agencies are encouraged to utilize all trail maintenance and upgrading management techniques, such as, bridging, puncheon, realignment, drains, and dips to prevent closure or loss of motorized trail use. Trails should not be closed because of a problem with bad section of trail. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.3.4.4 Encourage Maintenance by Motorized Users**The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized users to maintain trails so the trails are preserved.**

If the trail barely exists, due to low use, then allow motorcycle travel to continue so that the trail can remain intact, and be maintained on a regular basis rather than disappear; which they will if these trails become closed. Our tax dollars were spent to build these trails in the 1930's by the Civilian Conservation Corps., and believe we are entitled to ride and take care of them. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

With shrinking budgets the Forest Service is going to have a very hard time keeping up with trail maintenance in these areas. One of the solutions is to partner with user groups to do the work. However that support may disappear if the users know that after years of work they can be locked out of the areas they have worked so hard to maintain. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should encourage users to maintain trails.

Many miles of trails you are planning on closing are opened each year by trail bike users. You have less hunters and outfitters using your forest trails each year because of low elk numbers. Some of them maintained the trails they used so they would have decent access. . . . If a group of bikers want to help the U.S.F.S. keep a trail open for all of us to use, then lend them a helping hand, saw gas, a shovel or other resources you have available so that I and many others users can take advantage of their kindness. Please don't close off one more use of our National Forest land. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—2918)

4.3.4.5 Other

The Clearwater National Forest should maintain trails early in the year.

Agencies are encouraged to clear trails early in the year to insure maximum availability and reduction of diversion damage caused by routing around obstacles. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should address damage caused by stock use on the North Fork Ranger District.

Many of the (North Fork) district's trails suffer from trough problem created by stock users. The large amount of stock use in the area has created a trough problem that needs to be addressed through maintenance in order to encourage water runoff. Eliminating motorized travel won't fix any problems, but encourages problems because there will be a lack of maintenance funding and personnel to maintain the trail. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the consequences of non-maintenance.

We are also concerned that the proposed action abandons 158 miles of trail on the North Fork Ranger District. This not only closes the trail to motorized use, but also to non-motorized use. While non-motorized use (hiking and stock) isn't restricted from these trails, the lack of maintenance on these trails makes them unusable for non-motorized use. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

4.3.5 Mountain Bicycle Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should create more mountain bike trails outside of recommended wildernesses.

Mitigation of loss of MTB trails within the areas recommended for wilderness with the creation of mountain bike trails elsewhere in the Clearwater NF. (Individual, GARDEN CITY, ID—4377)

The Clearwater National Forest should adjust wilderness boundaries to recommended wildernesses to accommodate bicycles.

The current and future need for bicycle recreation destinations is primarily along the state line adjacent to the Lolo N.F., because of adjacency to Missoula. Boundary adjustments to the Recommended Wilderness Areas along the state line could easily be made to accommodate non-motorized, mechanized use. The state line's convenient location greatly contrasts with Pot Mountain, which has been suggested as a replacement riding areas for losing the Great Burn access. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize bicycle trails such as those along the state line are challenging and appeal to only a small group of cyclists.

Please keep in mind that trails of the character of those along the State Line are EXTREMELY rare and they are sufficiently technical to keep approximately 95% of mountain bikers off the trails, as trails of this level of technical difficulty are simply not fun for the majority of cyclists. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—1904)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize prime mountain bike trails.

The trails in the Kelly Creek drainage, North Fork, Middle Fork, and Kid Lake Creek, and the State line trail from Schley to Hoodoo pass is an incredible trip for a bicycle. Fish Lake Trail, Goose Creek Trail and Goose ridge are all great bicycle rides. The state line trail from Granite pass to pilot knob past Rhodes Peak and on over to Goat Lake and Blacklead was several years ago a hike and bike with difficult route finding. From Pilot Knob down to Crooked Fork is also a difficult trail but worthy of keeping open. From the road to Lost Lakes and down Boulder Creek is another hike and bike on portions of it. (Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—691)

4.3.6 Single-track Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should expand the two-wheeled motorized trail system.

... the two wheel motorized trail system needs to be expanded to 900 to 1100 or more miles. Plans should be made in close consultation with the motorized community. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more single-track trails, better connectivity and short loops.

... we ask for more single track trails, better trail connectivity with short 10-20 mile loop close to where we camp. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—499)

The Clearwater National Forest should designate all single-track trails open to motorcycle use.

The availability of motorized single-track trails has declined dramatically. At the same time, nearly all of the single-track trails see very little hiking or other use. Therefore, it is a reasonable alternative to designate all existing single-track trails on multiple-use lands within the project area open to motorcycle use. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should keep more single-track trails available for motorcycle use.

The evaluation needs to distinguish the difference in trail requirements and impacts between atvs and motorcycles and use that difference to justify keeping more single track trails open to motorcycles. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should do a better job identifying existing and potential single-track trails.

Existing single-track trails or potential single-track trails were not adequately identified and included in the project. (Motorized Recreation, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the uniqueness of single-track trails.

Motorized single-track trails are a uniquely different resource and experience compared to atv trails and must be recognized as such. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage, not eliminate, single-track trails.

As a responsible off road motorcyclist I do not agree with the amount of single track trail that is proposed to be eliminated. This is simply not an acceptable solution. Land managers should be focusing on efficient means of managing the existing route inventories for the enjoyment of all, not simply closing the area to motorized use as a means of management. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—1956)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict all-terrain vehicles from single-track trails.

Most of the trails proposed to be closed are single track trails that are already closed to ATVs "four wheelers." Keeping them single track with no four-wheeler access is a must. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—349)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the frustration of single-track users.

We ask that you try to understand the frustration of the users. Seemingly every time the issue of motorized access comes up, OHV use comes out on the short end especially in trails for single track use. There have already been significant areas closed to single track use that used to be open. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

4.3.7 Motorcycle Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should provide quality motorcycle trail systems.

First and foremost motorcycle trail riders need not only trails but, trail systems configured to enhance recreational enjoyment. If adequate trail mileage is provided in suitably configured trail systems riders will use them. In fact when quality trail systems with adequate mileage are available riders seldom go off of system trails. . . .

Key points for providing quality motorized trail recreation: Most trails should form complete loops. The loop concept is one of the most important principals in providing high quality motorcycle trail recreation. Complete loops should be developed that provide for the needs of different skill levels: novice, intermediate or average rider and expert i.e. trails classed as easiest, more difficult and most difficult. . . .

Trail connectivity is extremely important. One of the first actions that should be undertaken is to construct new trails to connect existing trails and create complete loops. . . .

. . . develop appropriate water crossing structures, especially on larger streams. Native timber trail bridges are effective and esthetically pleasing structures that are relatively inexpensive to construct if one has personnel with the necessary skills and motivation. . . .

Develop a number of similar trail systems with 200 to 400 miles of trail in each system. For Clearwater NF I Suggest 3 or 4 complete systems with an average of 300 miles of two wheel motorized trails in each system. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain existing motorcycle trails.

I disagree with the plan to close 178 miles of OYM trails. I feel that these trails should remain open to the public so people can still enjoy nature be allowed to travel through the woods more easily. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—119)

Leave the motorcycle trail system on the NF as is- Trail's are better than have been in 20 yr. MC use is on the down ward use- ATV is up- FS does not have the funding to maintain- work w/MC clubs to keep up. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—123)

We are very disappointed that the proposed action reduces motorcycle trail opportunities by 44% over the current situation. The CNF has closed a significant amount of motorcycle trails already. In 1991, according the IDPR OHV Statistical Survey, the Clearwater National Forest had 885 miles of trail open to motorcycle use. Current conditions allow motorcycle use on 404 miles of trail. The proposed action reduces motorcycle trail opportunities by 74% over what was historically available! (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide a variety of experiences for motorcycle riders.

Single-track challenge trails are needed for expert riders and trails type motorcycles. The needs of the public for motorized recreational opportunities include a variety of trails for different skill levels. Also, routes with minimal traffic are needed as practice routes for beginning riders. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

I know that the USFS is proud of the new ATV trail loops, but I have to say that motorcycle trail riders are not thrilled about riding ATV trails. ATV trails are too easy and very boring. We can and do share with ATVs, but please do not think the ATV loops are a place for motorcycle trail riders to go ride after you close motorized trails. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider seasonal restrictions for motorcycles.

If the closures (to motorcycle use) are to be imposed, please strongly consider seasonal closures only. The riding season on this trail system is very short now. Usually not being able to get clear around until mid July and usually ending at the end of September or early October because of snow. If the closures are imposed, please consider closing the motorized travel from the start of rifle hunting season to mid June. (Individual, KINGSTON, ID—58)

From my view I feel that these objectives (for motorcycle use) could be met by a season closure rather than a yearlong closure. Such seasons might be November 1-August 1, or September 1 closure. This would enable the spring habitat to be utilized by wildlife through most of the summer and on the turn side allow the general public or hunters to use during the early fall and hunting seasons. (Individual, PASCO, WA—2892)

I am quite concerned about the closing of the following trails (167,627,191,691,169). These trails are currently open year around and are very desirable trails to keep open. My proposal is to allow seasonal motor cycle access (June 1-October 15). (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2799)

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider statements related to motorcycle use that are included in the proposed action.

*The following paragraph appears in the Travel Planning EIS, Proposed Action, Page 4,
“For trails (OYS, OYM, OSS, and OSM), the proposed action would provide a better spectrum of trail opportunities, reduce wildlife disturbance in key areas, and protect the character of areas recommended for Wilderness designation. Generally this would be accomplished by restricting motorcycle use on some backcountry trails. This would affect trails where motorized travel is not currently restricted but does not occur (about 36 miles) or occurs at very low levels (45 miles) due to trail conditions as well as other trails that currently receive motorcycle use to varying degrees.”*

PANTRA challenges the above statement: Stating that motorized travel "does not occur" "or occurs at very low levels" on the trails proposed for closure is absurd. The trails slated for closure represent the most crucial trails for trailbike riding in the Clearwater NF. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

I have ridden everywhere in the North Fork from Weitas creek to the state line, and I agree that is truly a beautiful area with tremendous scenic value. However, the trails on the North Fork have been ridden for decades by trail bikes. If our presence over the last few decades hasn't degraded the wild character of the land, how is closing it to motorized vehicles, specifically trail bikes, going to maintain or increase its wild character? (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—2865)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of motorcycles on other users.

. . . I am concerned about losing my (off-highway vehicle) trails less traveled, because I have seen everywhere trail crew went in my wild Clearwater Forest since 1990's motorcycles have followed. Motorcycles shut me off from use because of safety and a change noise brings to my wild Clearwater country. Motorcycles take the joy and the quiet out of my journey. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

4.3.8 Trail Conversion/Decommissioning/Restoration**The Clearwater National Forest should not convert hiking and horse trails to off-highway vehicle trails.**

There should be no further conversion of hiking and horse trails to ORV trails. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

The Clearwater National Forest should restore illegally-created trails.

Restoration of illegally created trails should be done. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—76)

Illegally created motorized trails should be restored to natural condition and should not be legitimized as designated routes during the Travel Planning process. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—532)

4.3.9 Off-highway Vehicle Trails**The Clearwater National Forest should provide more trails for off-highway vehicle uses.**

In the 2005 USFS study "Off Highway Vehicle Recreation in the U.S." It says the OHV recreation is the fastest growing outdoor recreation in the country. In Idaho 52.4% of the population participate in off highway vehicle recreation...and is growing fast. If the USFS fails to plan adequate facilities for this growing activity it will be derelict in its duty to American citizens. The National Forests must significantly expand trail mileage for ORV use, not close more areas! (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—148)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more four-track trails appropriate for use by the disabled and elderly.

There are a great many two track trails open within the forest but very limited four track trail access that better helps the elderly and the disabled. We have asked several times to be given some trail access but always turned down. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—20)

The Clearwater National Forest should retain off-highway vehicle opportunities near communities.

The proposed action has retained at least seasonal access for small vehicles (ATV's) and motorcycles along roads and trails that are near/adjacent to the communities of Elk River and Pierce; and, the Proposed Action has retained OHV access in the Musselshell area, which is proximity to Weippe. The Clearwater County Economic Development Council supports the retention of OHV access points near these communities. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—2472)

The Clearwater National Forest should not provide more off-highway vehicle opportunities.

Most other users want - most Americans - as well as soil and plant damage all mean we need less ATV use and not more. Indeed, existing staff can not cope with present levels of ATV usage and the regular violations of Forest Service rules.

Please do not add more ATV access to the remote, beautiful Clearwater N. F. Send our national forests forward for coming generations' enjoyment un-degraded, undefiled by stinking, noisy, polluting, damaging ATV operators. (Individual, KLAMATH FALLS, OR—1287)

The Clearwater National Forest should significantly reduce trails available for off-road vehicle uses.

It is up to the Forest Service to stop off-road vehicles from destroying the Clearwater, and nothing short of a significant reduction in the amount of motorized trails will achieve this goal. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—528)

The Clearwater National Forest should drop the Orogrande off-highway vehicle project.

Just drop the ill-advised Orogrande ORV Project, a proposal that conflicts directly with the intention of the National Forest ORV Rule and would open more trails to motorized use on the North Fork Clearwater. (Individual, LENORE, ID—3900)

4.3.10 Loop Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should provide loop opportunities for motorcyclists.

The motorcycle groups need loops to ride and not dead ends and also a voice in any changes to be made. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—332)

Motorcyclists will use ATV trails and roads, but only as connectors to more single-track trails. Single-track trails that connect into multiple loop opportunities and are located in a remote, primitive setting is what the majority of trail-riding motorcyclists are seeking. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide different loop opportunities for novice and advanced motorcyclists.

Novice (motorcycle) trail riders need 30 to 50 mile loops, while advanced riders ride 75 to 90 mile loops in a day. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide loop opportunities for mountain bikers.

Singletrack is a mountain biker's Holy Grail and loop rides are desired over simple out and back trail options. I have examined the maps, looked at photos and imagined the incredible riding within the Great Burn RWA. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—2816)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide an interconnecting system of off-highway vehicle discovery routes and byways.

A system of OHV back country discovery routes and OHV byways could provide loops and interconnecting trails to points of interest including lakes, streams, rivers, ghost towns, and scenic overlooks. This system of OHV routes could also include connections to small towns for access to motels and restaurants and could be a significant source of economic revitalization for the project area. OHV recreation and tourism could be a significant boost to many local economies. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the advantages of providing loop opportunities.

I have looked at the proposed trail map and have concluded that the loops that will be open to motorcycles will not only be limited in number but also length. They will be limited by accessibility. What I mean is that most of the trails take off from only one specific point and end at another specific point. To get to the next starting point of the trails, a motorcyclist would either have to retrace on the same trail; which would double the environmental impact to the trail, ride many miles of public roads, or put their bikes in the back of the pickup truck and drive to the next tail head. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

Loops also allow less confrontation between user groups as it eliminates return trips. Loops also reduce wear on the trails especially when riders plan their ride to go down the technically tuff stuff rather than up. (Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—929)

The Clearwater National Forest should re-evaluate restrictions that affect loop opportunities.

The proposed action would cut off too large of an area that provides a loop or network of trails for motorized use. Should this occur, it would be a huge disservice to all who value the opportunities offered by this area of the North Fork. (Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—507)

The proposed action destroys most of those single-track looping experiences. The CNF needs to examine how each alternative will affect looping opportunities. The forest currently provides multiple looping opportunities, but each alternative affects those opportunities by either decreasing or increasing loop opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

I cannot understand how anyone can be expected to believe that the loss of 178 of the available 404 miles of trail currently open to motorcycle use is providing a "better spectrum of trail opportunities". This is especially difficult in light of some of the proposed closures to short sections of trail that cut the middle out of existing trail lops, making much of the "available" trail mileage disconnected bits of trail that cannot be linked into continuous trail route, and leaving the available trail mileage an essentially unusable hodgepodge of trail sections that cannot be ridden as trail loops. (Individual, GRAHAM, WA—2434)

Motorcycle trails have been created as a loop system in Alternative #1, which is conducive to day riding. The problem with some if not most of the longer loops involves riding on high traffic roads, specifically FS Road #250. These roads fall under the jurisdiction of the State of Idaho traffic laws which prohibit the use of unlicensed vehicles as well as unlicensed operators.

This legally prohibits under-age riders and off-highway vehicles from utilizing these trails as loops. The need exists to reevaluate the "Loop" system depicted in Alternative #1 so that riders are not jeopardizing themselves as well as other motorists on FS Road #250 while trying to complete a riding loop. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—120)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the magnitude of the proposed action's impacts on loop trails.

The bulk of proposed trail closures to motorcycle use occur on the North Fork Ranger District. The proposed action closes 146.35 miles of trail on the North Fork Ranger District. (Idaho Department of Parks & Recreation GIS Analysis of Proposed Action) These closures eliminate at least 14 different motorcycle looping opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

4.3.11 Historic Trails

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses on historic trails.

In the interim, snowmobiles should be restricted to designated routes to protect wolverine, fisher and lynx habitat as well as ungulate winter range. Historic trails should not be open to vehicles to prevent loss of cultural resources. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses on part of Fish Creek Trail 2240.

John Harlan in the 1920's identified the mouth of Willow Creek on the Fish Creek Trail 2240 as the place where Captain Lewis, September 19th, 1805 first struck Hungry (Fish) Creek. This would make part of Trail 2240 the Lewis and Clark Trail and should be closed to motorcycles for that reason alone. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

The Clearwater National Forest should reconsider the status of the historic trail up Sherman Creek.

Why would the forest managers propose the historic trail up Sherman Creek is a 4-wheeler "trail" when it is a single path? (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

4.3.12 Trail Construction

The Clearwater National Forest should consider opportunities for new trail construction.

Even if the Clearwater Forest's analysis is limited to examining "existing trails" it will likely involve some relocation to put these trails in environmentally acceptable locations. Especially if some of them are user created trails. User created trails often get to good destinations, but they don't always take the best way of getting there. "Relocation" is really new construction, it is

more than reconstruction. You'll have more flexibility, if you don't limit yourself. (Government Employee/Union, NO ADDRESS—15)

CNF should immediately begin planning to develop at least three complete trail systems within the forest specifically designed for motorcycle trail recreation. The systems should be dispersed and each should contain 300 or more miles of single track motorcycle trail for a total of 900 to 1100 miles of trail. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

Existing timber sale roads and trails should be inter-connected by construction of new trail segments or rehabilitation of existing trail segments to provide mitigation for lost motorized recreation opportunities. Connector trails should be constructed to avoid dead-end trails. These systems could provide recreation opportunities for a variety of skill levels and visitors. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Note that some new construction may be required to accomplish a reasonable system of loops. Therefore, new construction must be included in the scope of the project. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should construct trails to minimize adverse impacts and to provide access to interesting destinations.

Locate, design, construct and maintain new trails to minimize adverse impacts and insofar as practical design trails to minimize maintenance costs. This must be done without compromising the quality of the recreation experience.

Route trails so that they provide access to interesting destinations, i.e. waterfalls, lakes, old mining camps, hot springs, scenic vistas etc. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should construct two-wheeled motorized trails.

Construct two wheel motorized trails that are designed for that activity, and which are competently located, designed, constructed and maintained to effectively carry that use and reasonable manage environmental impact. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should construct a section to complete the North-South Trail.

One short section in the Smith Ridge area could be used to help make the North South trail a reality. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider new standards for trail construction.

A new standard for motorized recreational trails could be developed that would be more beneficial for the environment and motorized recreationists.

The new standard for motorized recreational trails would not necessarily follow the shortest distance and would include many curves to keep the speed down. Advantages of this approach would include: routes could easily be moved to avoid cultural resources and sensitive environmental areas; less visible on the ground and from the air; aesthetically pleasing; lower speeds and greater safety; and greater enjoyment by motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.3.13 Trail Restrictions

The Clearwater National Forest should maintain or expand its trail system.

With Idaho's population increasing and motorized users increasing, we should maintain, or possible expand, our current trail system. I believe that we can work together to help the CNF provide a safe, enjoyable, and sustainable trail system that will work for all users. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

Given not all is "fair" in the world, but trail closure is like a swift kick to a testicle, which can kind of piss a guy off. Don't take away an Idaho pastime 1000 times more important than baseball or football. Don't close existing trails we all enjoy! (Individual, KUNA, ID—3728)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict 178 miles of trails to motorized vehicles.

We are strongly opposed to the proposal to close 178 miles of trails to motorized vehicles. (Business, NO ADDRESS—2633)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide legitimate reasons for trail restrictions.

The closure of trails based on "lack of use" or "overuse" are not an acceptable reasons. If these are legitimate reasons for trail closure, there needs to be a clear definition of what the "acceptable amount of use" for a trail system is. (Individual, EAGLE, ID—2267)

One of the USFS concerns is that the CNF will be overrun by huge numbers of motorcycles in the future. Because of the high price of gas and the remoteness of the North Fork, the area should not become over used in my lifetime. If I am wrong in this matter, then do something to fix the problem when it happens. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts that will result from trail restrictions.

Closure of the existing legal use will concentrate riders on a limited number of available trail and will result in increased impacts on these remaining trails. (Motorized Recreation Group, LEWISTON, ID—91)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the challenges associated with partial trail restrictions.

Partial Access (Weitas #20). Partial trail closure on existing trails is a complicated, expensive, hard to enforce option. (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—95)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in remote backcountry where motorized and non-motorized trails intersect.

The agency constantly complains about declining budgets. It only makes sense to zone out motorized use in remote backcountry areas where non-motorized trails intersect with motorized ones, thus limiting the need for costly patrols of these areas. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict all uses if restrictions are necessary to prevent wildlife disturbance.

In the event that the USFS refuses to do a study of forest user impacts on elk in this area and the USFS goes ahead with a motorized closure of the trails listed for closure under wildlife disturbance, then these trails must be closed to ALL forest users. Eliminating motorized users only from these trails would be viewed as discrimination. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

The Clearwater National Forest should significantly reduce the miles of motorized trails.

The Forest Service must stop off-road vehicles from destroying the Clearwater National Forest, and nothing short of a significant reduction in the amount of motorized trails will achieve this goal. (Individual, PORTLAND, OR—1239)

4.3.14 Site-specific Trail Suggestions

4.3.14.1 Leave Trails Open

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorized uses in Weitas Creek.

I would leave the entire Weitas drainage open to motorized travel. Do not close trails in the middle. This will cause problems ranging from accidents to over use of trails. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—332)

I am writing in response to your proposed changes in the Travel Management Plan specifically with regards to the Weitas Creek drainage. . . . This area has truly been unique as to the length, variety and quality of trails that have been accessible to us. It is an area that offers the opportunity for both beginner and advanced riders to enjoy, besides just the opportunity of having an almost wilderness experience. . . . I appeal to you and your team, to reconsider the impact of your decision and leave it as status quo. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—22)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow motorcycle use in Weitas Creek.

I am writing in response to your proposed changes in the Travel Management Plan specifically with regards to the Weitas Creek drainage. . . . This area has truly been unique as to the length, variety and quality of trails that have been accessible to us. It is an area that offers the opportunity for both beginner and advanced riders to enjoy, besides just the opportunity of having an almost wilderness experience. . . . I appeal to you and your team, to reconsider the impact of your decision and leave it as status quo. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—22)

4.3.14.1 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses on trails within the North Lochsa Slope Inventoried Roadless Area.

Fish Creek/North Lochsa Slope Proposed Wilderness² Here, the FS logged open on old trail (229) and dedicated it to ATV use even though such an action is prohibited in the forest plan. Other trails that are open violate the forest plan. . . . Also, many narrow trails closed to summer vehicle use are open to snowmobiles. This will cause resource damage and unnecessary trail widening. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses on trails within the Pot Mountain area.

The trail guide lists the trails in this area as good for hikers and stock. That guide reaffirms our recommendation that the trails in Pot Mountain be closed to vehicles. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.3.14.3 Restrict Summer Motorized Uses within an Inventoried Roadless Area

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict summer motorized uses within the North Lochsa Slope Inventoried Roadless Area.

The system of ancient, pre-European trails in this area is little understood and because of that, the forest should not place any possible historic sites or trails at risk from machines. West of here (Ant Hill Trail 225), the CNF does indeed to halt machine use, but further to the east, several routes leading south from road 500 are proposed to be kept open. These too all imperil historic resources. Within the entire Fish and Hungry Creek Roadless Area, protecting history and historical resources should be the key management goal -- and that precludes at least

² The Fish Creek/North Lochsa Slope area is not recommended as wilderness in the 1987 Clearwater Forest Plan.

summer motorized use. Such use, on Road 500 itself, does not seem to be harmful to historic preservation. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

4.3.14.4 Restrict Motorized Uses Adjacent to Wilderness

Some areas adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness are closed to vehicles in the summer, yet allow snowmobiles access to the Wilderness on trail heads that begin outside the Wilderness. These trails should be closed to all motorized use. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—532)

4.3.14.5 Restrict Motorized Uses within Specific Drainages

The Clearwater should restrict motorized travel on trails in Cayuse, Fourth of July, Weitas, Fish and Hungry Creeks.

The plan needs to go further to accomplish its stewardship role of protecting water quality, fish and wildlife by eliminating all motorized travel on trails in Cayuse, Fourth of July, Weitas, Fish and Hungry creeks. Negative impact machines have on wildlife habitat (wildlife disturbance) and water quality (watershed degradation), (weed/seed transport). (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—2848)

Trails in Cayuse, Forth of July, Weitas, Fish and Hungry creeks should be nonmotorized to protect fish, wildlife and water quality. These nonmotorized trails are needed to balance the large number of motorized opportunities available. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—704)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in Weitas Creek.

The proposed action has a mishmash of open with a very few closed trails. Weitas Creek is a prime example. For example, trail 625, which is open to ATVs, dead ends at trail 167, which is closed to ATVs. Trail 20 is segmented, from north to south as open to ATVs and motorcycles, closed to ATVs but not motorcycles, closed to all vehicles, open to motorcycles and then open to ATVs and motorcycles. The entire trail should be closed to vehicles, as should all trails that intersect trail 20. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

In Pot Mountain and at least along the east edge of the Weitas Creek roadless Area-where ultimate designation as Wilderness is admittedly less certain-too many trails remain open to machines, especially those trails leading north from Road 500. Some of this trail system, especially that at and near Saddle Camp, also has unclear and very uncertain historical uses. I think that a closer look might be taken at some of the Weitas routes proposed to be kept open, especially to determine if machine use is being allowed where historic preservation might be a bigger goal of forest planning. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

4.3.14.6 Importance of Consistency

The Clearwater National Forest should do a better job of planning in relation to trail uses.

Weitas Creek was a wild special place, one of my favorite places to go until trail crew improved the trail in the early 1990's and motorized use followed-some 4 wheeler and some motorcycle use. Opening up - then shutting out the motorcycle community is poor planning and creates aggravation for the public. Opening motorized use to non-motorized wild land with no public input also creates an aggravated public. Poor planning can aggravate many user groups. Shutting part of the Weitas Trail to motorized use can not be enforced when other parts are still open to use in a checkerboard fashion. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

4.4 Over-snow Travel

4.4.1 General

4.4.1.1. Allow Snowmobile Use

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobiling opportunities in Idaho.

. . . snowmobiling in general is taking a hard hit. If we still want in the woods anywhere in the USA we are going to have to stand with our neighbors and let our voices be heard. Please, please do not disregard my letter. Idaho or Montana, I still want these (Hoodoo, Surveyor, Blacklead Mountain, Beaver Ridge, Tom Beal, Elk Summit, Crooked Fork) to be open on both sides. (Individual, FLORENCE, MT—2238)

More land closure? Give me a break. You want to take another 200,000 acres from snowmobilers. Enough is enough. I vote and I am fed up. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—59)

Just a quick note to say that I know you will be making a big mistake by closing off our winter snowmobile areas. You might as well close off all the lakes from boating as well then because they put out more harm than snowmobiles do. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—132)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use to continue in areas with historic use.

(I) Ask that all areas that have historically included snowmobile recreation continue to do so. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—530)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict snowmobiles to designated routes.

I support the final rule that says “The Final Rule Does Not Require That Over Snow Vehicles Such As Snowmobiles Be Limited To Designated Routes.” (Individual, OROFINO, ID—335)

4.4.1.2 Restrict Snowmobile Use

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use to roaded areas.

Snowmobile use should be limited to only roaded areas where use can be effectively controlled and rules enforced. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobiles to designated routes.

. . . snowmobiles should be restricted to designated routes to protect wolverine, fisher and lynx habitat as well as ungulate winter range. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobiles to designated roads.

Snowmobiles break the silence of winter woods. Sounds from these machines can intrude upon other users up to five miles on cold quiet days. Plus the fumes pollute the air. Snow compaction affects subnival environment and can negatively impact small mammals, etc. Snow compaction can affect winter travel energetics. . . . I believe no snowmobiles should be permitted on public lands since they compromise and degrade public resources. . . . I do not expect you to ban these thrillcraft (snowmobile). But at the least, the only place that I think are appropriate for any motorized use are roads that are open to normal vehicle travel in the summer. i.e. no off road use. (Individual, RICHMOND, VT—136)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobiles from areas with wintering wildlife.

Areas with wintering wildlife such as elk and moose should be off limits (to snowmobiles). As should higher elevations where wolverine might be found (as wolverine are sensitive to motorized intrusions). (Individual, RICHMOND, VT—136)

4.4.1.3 Miscellaneous**The Clearwater National Forest should designate a winter motorized recreation corridor.**

A new (or modified) designation for a winter motorized recreation corridor would be most appropriate for the areas traditionally used by over snow vehicles. (Individual, SEELEY LAKE, MT—2558)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more groomed trails.

I would try to expand the groomed trail program through out the forest. Those areas above the wintering areas for elk and deer should be looked at very closely. A groomed snow trail is not going to stop an animal who is traveling the area from living a normal life. Animals travel the path of least resistance all the time to save energy. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—949)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide challenging alpine areas for snowmobile use.

There are plenty of wilderness areas in the immediate vicinity that allow non-motorized users the ability to enjoy themselves. Snowmobiles need the same respect. . . . Most of the areas left (for snowmobiles) are low elevation logging roads with none of the challenging alpine areas that a majority of the snowmobilers enjoy. Please don't lock us out for good, we are respectful people. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—89)

The Clearwater National Forest should not expect more snowmobile use in alpine areas; should collaborate to develop common-sense solutions.

Out of the seven areas that are proposed for closure to snowmobiling only the Beaver Ridge area and Crooked Fork are accessible part of the way via groomed trails from fairly large parking lots. The rest of the named areas are ALPINE areas accessible only by non groomed trails originating at small primitive parking areas that will accommodate limited parking. Heavy snow or low cloud cover generally prevents snowmobilers from riding in the alpine areas. The restricted and difficult access to these areas has kept the number of snowmobilers relatively static for the past decade. (1) Access is not/will not grow in these areas for the noted reasons. (2) Several years a highly popular alpine area in British Columbia faced closure due to Caribou habitat concerns. A compromise was reached by the local snowmobile club agreeing to not groom the trail into the area and to not plow a parking lot at the trailhead. The result of these common sense actions restricted/reduced the number of snowmobilers to the area and the majority of the area has remained open. A similar common sense solution would seem applicable in the Clearwater National Forest proposed travel plan. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—122)

4.4.2 Technology**The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that improved snowmobile technology has not resulted in more access.**

It is often stated that new technology has improved snowmobiles which allows snowmobilers to gain access further into the backcountry. Yes the snowmobiles have been dramatically improved but the result is easier access, not more access there has been an increase in cross country skiers

accessing the alpine areas via snowmobile with the advent of newer improved snowmobiles. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—122)

These areas (Hoodoo Crooked Fork, Surveyor, Blacklead, Beaver Ridge, Elk Summit, Tom Beal) have been used by snowmobilers for over 25 years and while the public perception seems to be that new technology is allowing more access to backcountry areas it really is just easier access to the areas already in use. In fact snowmobile use has not increased much if any in these areas in the last decade due to limited parking and ungroomed trails. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—513)

That statement that the new technology has allowed snowmobiles to access areas previously not accessible is simply not true. We have been accessing the Surveyor Creek area on snowmobiles since the early 70's. The statement is true if your only intention is to "high mark" which is an activity that the majority of snowmobilers do not participate in. (Individual, LOLO, MT—2551)

4.4.3 Seasonal Snowmobile Restriction

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use from October 1-November 4.

We are baffled by why you feel compelled to close the entire forest to snowmobiles from October 1 to November 4. This has been handled adequately in the past and is not needed for most of the forest in all but an unusual year; snow depths are self-limiting. When early snows do hit the high country snowmobiles may be the only way people can travel or meet emergencies. Some high country outfitters rely on snow machines to remove their equipment or transport their clients. Land based ORVs are not prohibited from the entire forest during this period, raising the issue of how you define the differences between over-snow vehicles and ORVs. Some low impact overland machines can also be used over snow.

The idea of closing all forest roads to snowmobiling from Oct 1 - Nov 4 is not needed and would put a real hindrance to outfitters and the public in remaining camps. (Individual, PIERCE, ID—86)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use from October 1-November 20.

The proposal is to prohibit snowmobiles forest wide from 10/1 through 11/4. This covers most of the elk hunting zones within the Forest except for units 8 and 8A which have a muzzleloader season from Dec. 2-9. In the rest of the zones on the Forest, the season ends on 11/3. However the late White-tail deer season on much of the Forest runs through 11/20. In units 8 & 8a on the Palouse RD it runs through 12/1. The roaded front portion of the Forest is heavily used this time of year during this hunt and is experiencing increased use each year it seems from both in state and out of state hunters. During this late hunt, it is common to see snow on a large percent of this roaded portion of the Forest. To help protect the mature white-tail bucks during this period when they may be more vulnerable to hunters on snowmobiles due to snow accumulation, I would like to see "Snowmobiles prohibited forest-wide from 10/1 through 11/20." (Government Employee/Union, OROFINO, ID—1429)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use from October 1-December 15.

Alternative One proposes that a large number of roads and trails be restricted from October 1st to November 4th. Previously many of these roads and trails (Alternative 0) had been closed from October 1st to December 1st. These closures helped to provide protection for big game throughout most of the fall hunting season since deer season usually goes through November and there are often late hunts for elk. A better closure period for this purpose would actually be October 1st to December 15th, since several elk muzzleloader seasons occur at the beginning of

December. Such a closure would still allow ample time for winter recreational snowmobile use that generally occurs after December 15th anyway.

There are also several roads and trails that are changed in Alternative 1 to the October 1st to November 4th snowmobile closure dates that previously had much longer restrictions. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

The Clearwater National Forest should evaluate the effects of the seasonal snowmobile restrictions on previous access decisions, including the Palouse off-highway vehicle decision.

In the west Gold Hill area there have been restrictions on travel access on several trails and roads during the fall hunting season and winter (October 1st to June 15th) for several years. . . . Since ATV and motorcycle use is also very popular in the area, it was decided in the Palouse Ranger District OHV Decision that the local trails would be opened for summer use, but that the existing fall hunting and winter closures would remain in place. This was considered good compromise for all concerned and appeared to be well accepted by the public. The proposed changes to winter snowmobile use in Alternative One would put the original (Palouse Ranger District OHV) decision in disarray by allowing Trails 15, 19, 215 and 763 to be open to snowmobiles during fall (After November 4th), but closed to other motorized vehicles such as motorcycles and ATV's. The Trails that would be open to snowmobiles would now cross several roads (1418, 4775 and 4779) that are closed to snowmobiles yearlong. Clearly this would create a confusing situation on the ground and change the intent of the original decision (See Palouse Ranger District OHV decision). If there is not an error, we suggest the Clearwater Forest examine all roads and trails that are been considered for this short snowmobile restriction (October 1st to November 4th) to determine if similar conflicts will occur. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

The Clearwater National Forest should consult with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game regarding the best dates for seasonal snowmobile restrictions.

We also support restrictions during the typical elk hunting general season framework of October 1 to November 4. However, there may be conditions under which other dates would better meet IDFG game management considerations. We recommend a provision allowing for annual consultation with IDFG to review and modify seasonal restrictions to ensure game management objectives can be met. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should apply the seasonal snowmobile restriction to all vehicles capable of traveling over the snow.

. . . we note that the scoping notice used the terms snowmobile and oversnow vehicle; we recommend that restrictions be applied to all vehicles capable of traveling over snow. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

4.4.4 Site-specific Restrictions

4.4.4.1 Allow Snowmobile Use within Recommended Wilderness Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use in recommended wilderness.

These proposed wilderness areas are very important to many riders in this part of the country. They offer great scenic beauty and an alpine riding experience that is unattainable anywhere else close to Missoula. (Individual, FLORENCE, MT—492)

All of these areas have been accessible by snowmobile for the past 25 years or more. These areas are the primary locations that Missoula areas snowmobilers ride in. These areas provide a cross section of riding skills to gain access: moderate technical riding skills (Tom Beal, Elk

Summit, and Beaver Ridge), moderate to high skilled technical ability (Surveyor, and Hoodoo) expert skilled technical ability (Blacklead Mtn. and Crooked Fork).

There are no alternative back country off trail areas for riders from the Missoula area to use in this region. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—122)

Specify to not close motorized recreation areas recommended for inclusion in the wilderness system. In general these areas include Hoodoo, Surveyor, Beaver lakes, Crooked Fork and Great Burn area.

TOM BEAL, T36 R13E, T35N R13E (mention the Walton Lakes area-eastside)

BEAVER RIDGE AREA, T37N, R16E - the area they want to close was in the original Selway Wilderness proposal and was dropped off. They are now trying to add it back in. If anyone knows the history of this there might be solid argument for keeping it open. This was another area rangers seemed surprised to learn is used by snowmobilers.

ELK SUMMIT, T35N R14E, T34N R14E

All of WILLIAMS LAKE including BLACKLEAD MT, T39N R13E, T38N R13E, T38N R14E

SURVEYOR, T40N R13E, T39N R13E (It is worth noting that the LOLO Forest already provides snowmobilers a corridor through a proposed wilderness area to access the Surveyor area within the Clearwater Forest.)

HOODOO, T42N R11E, T41N R11E

Hoodoo, accessed from Trout Creek and Surveyor, which is accessed off of Fish Creek Rd. The third access point is from Shotgun Ck which is in Idaho, which is accessed from the Lochsa Lodge. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—530)

4.4.4.2 Allow Snowmobile Use within the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile travel in the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness.

I am opposed to the section of closing access to the "proposed Great Burn Wilderness area" to over-snow vehicles. . . . This would basically close off all mountain riding locations in this area. There are no other safe areas in that general vicinity for riders to go "off trail". For the Idaho residents who access this area from North Idaho via Superior, Montana, this plan effectively closes acres than currently stated in the plan.

I would ask that you revisit this portion of the proposal, and at a minimum, at least leave that area between Goose Lake and Fish Lake open to over snow vehicles. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—38)

The Winter Travel Plan should be left as it currently is. By not allowing snowmobile use in the Great Burn Area the FS is effectively creating more unusable land. I do not believe that the Great Burn area to be penetrated by non-motorized users. If there is, and I would like to see the EIS, it is a minimal amount. Again there are enough other areas that have already been closed to motorized use. If you should decide that the Great Burn area be closed then I would suggest it be closed to all use. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1085)

I realize it (The Great Burn) is recommended for wilderness in the forest plan, but in my opinion, the area doesn't meet the criteria set forth in the Wilderness Act of 1964. (Neither does the Lolo portion.) And as long as the "wilderness characteristic" is retained, there is no sound reason to ban snowmobile use. (Individual, CATALDO, ID—716)

As for the proposed plan to close off the area along the State line north of Lolo pass to oversnow vehicles this appears to cross FS road #250, in T41n, R11E, Sec1, thus possibly reducing access to private property and recreational use in the area. (Mining, NO ADDRESS—45)

4.4.4.3 Allow Snowmobiles within Areas Adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict snowmobiles from Beaver Ridge.

On our map "G" detail map #38, you show a proposed closing of a very popular snowmobiling area near Beaver Ridge Lookout. (Section 9, 10, 2, 11). It would be a shame to loose these popular back country riding areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, STEVENSVILLE, MT—39)

4.4.4.4 Allow Snowmobile Use within Specific Drainages

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use within the Fish Creek area.

Please leave the fish creek area open for snowmobiling. My family and I enjoy this area and it should remain open to the public. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—56)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use at Fish Lake

My husband and I have a cabin on Independence Creek and we snowmobile in during the winter. Fish Lake is our favorite place to ride. . . . Only a handful of sleds go into that area. I know this because only the people that have fuel storage at their cabins can make the trip. Visitors can't haul enough fuel for those kinds of miles. (Individual, LAMONT, WA—535)

4.4.4.5 Allow Snowmobile Use within Other Specific Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobiling in the Hoodoo/Surveyor/Blacklead/Beaver Ridge/Tom Beal/Elk Summit/Crooked Fork areas.

I have been snowmobiling in the Clearwater national Forest Hoodoo, Surveyor, Blacklead MT, Beaver Ridge, Tom Beal, Elk Summit, and Crooked Fork for 20 years. I and my kids would love to keep snowmobiling this area for the future. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—506)

The Clearwater National Forest should create better parking at Schley Mountain and Hoodoo Basin and re-open the Crooked Fork Trail.

I would not only like to leave the Idaho side of the border open to cross country snowmobile use but encourage it's use by creating better parking at Schley Mountain Corridor and Hoodoo Basin and reopening of the Crooked Fork Trail out of Lolo Pass. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2242)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use within Rhodes Peak, Williams Peak, Granite Pass, and the headwaters of Kelly Creek.

I would leave the Rhodes Peak, Williams Peak, Granite Pass, and headwaters of Kelly Creek open to snowmobiling. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—332)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use within the Rhodes Peak/Blacklead areas.

In my earlier comment, I did not point out the fact that the Rhodes Peak-Blacklead Area is the ONLY place in the entire CNF where snowmobilers can find the big open hills that they love to ride. The rest of the forest is either covered by thick vegetation, is too steep to ride, or is in designated (by Congress) wilderness. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that the Lolo National Forest provides a corridor to the Surveyor area.

Please be advised that the Lolo National Forest already provides snowmobilers a corridor through a proposed wilderness area to access the Surveyor area within the Clearwater Forest. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—820)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use along the Idaho-Montana state line

I would like to see the Montana Idaho stateline remain open to all winter time travel. I do not believe that snowmobiles have an adverse effect on this terrain. (Individual, NO ADDRESS--2493)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow snowmobile use along the Idaho-Montana state line with a buffer zone.

There should be some kind of winter time use buffer zone on the Montana side of the Stateline trail and some kind of a buffer zone on the Idaho side of the Stateline trail #738. Snowmobiling needs to continue in these areas. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—358)

4.4.4.6 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Inventoried Roadless and Recommended Wilderness Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobiles from all inventoried roadless and recommended wilderness areas.

I am writing in support of the removal of snowmobile access from all currently proposed wilderness and roadless areas on the Clearwater National Forest. As an avid backcountry skier, it is important to me and many other non-motorized recreationists to have quiet winter recreation areas free from the exhaust of 200hp two-stroke engines. In an era of global climate change, I believe every step toward reducing burning fossil fuels is a positive one. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—151)

4.4.4.7 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should close all roadless areas to snowmobile use.

All of the roadless areas need to be closed to snowmobiles (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.4.4.8 Restrict Snowmobile Use within Specific Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use within specific inventoried roadless areas.

Please keep additional roadless areas off-limits to motorized use in order to keep the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness free from trespassing snowmobiles. All of the following roadless areas must be protected (not just the small portions of each as proposed by the Forest)--Lochsa Face (1311), Sneakface Meadows (1314), North Fork Spruce-White Sand (1309). (Individual, NO ADDRESS—147)

Fish Creek/North Lochsa Slope Proposed Wilderness³—This area is the most important wild steelhead stream in Idaho. It provides important year-round wildlife habitat and should be closed to vehicles in the winter, yet it is proposed to be wide open. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

In addition to the partial area closure of the Lochsa Face Inventoried Roadless Area to snowmobiles in the proposed action, the Forest Service should also close all of the Ratcliff Gedney IRA, Sneakfoot Meadows IRA, and North Fork Spruce-White Sand IRA to snowmobile use. This suggestion is made in order to reduce intrusions by snowmobiles into the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

³ This area is not recommended as wilderness by the 1987 Clearwater Forest Plan.

*Upper North Fork Proposed Wilderness*⁴. . . it is important winter habitat and should be closed to snowmobiles. It is the corridor between the St. Joe and North Fork Clearwater drainages. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The higher reaches of Pot Mountain are prime habitat for mountain goats and for wolverine denning. Keeping this area closed to snowmobiles as essential for wildlife protection. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.4.4.9 Restrict Snowmobile Use within All Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobiles from recommended wildernesses.

We are pleased to see restrictions on the over-snow use for the Hoodoo (Great Burn) area, Mallard Larkins, and the Elk Summit area. Restrictions in these areas would be consistent with existing direction in the Forest Plan to manage these areas to "maintain wilderness qualities and retain semi primitive settings" (p.111-36). Further, this would provide a consistent winter management strategy across jurisdictional boundaries (Lolo National Forest and Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness) and help to curb illegal use in these adjacent areas. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

4.4.4.10 Restrict Snowmobile Use within the Great Burn Recommended Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use within the Great Burn recommended wilderness area.

While the Montana side of the divide has been designated non-motorized for many years, there has been repeated snowmobile trespass into Montana from the Idaho side of the divide. Closing the Idaho side of the Great Burn Wilderness Study Area to snowmobiles would make law enforcement much easier, protect the wilderness character of this pristine area, and provide the opportunities for solitude and quiet enjoyment of winter recreation activities that our members seek and highly value. (Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—4209)

I am writing on behalf of Montana Backcountry Alliance (www.montanabackcountry.org), a group of traditional winter backcountry enthusiasts, to express our support for the Clearwater National Forest's decision to restrict motorized recreation in the Great Burn Wilderness Study Area. (Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—4209)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage the recommended Great Burn Wilderness in a manner consistent with the Lolo National Forest.

The fact that the Great Burn area would be designated for non-motorized use also makes it consistent with the adjoining Lolo National Forest. This is the right way to manage this area of the forest. (Individual, FLORENCE, MT—4223)

4.4.4.11 Restrict Snowmobile Use Adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile trails within one mile of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness boundary.

Areas adjoining the boundary of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness have remained open to snowmobiles, which practically invites snowmobilers to invade the wilderness. Snowmobile trails should be closed at least a mile short of the wilderness boundary. (Individual, CATONSVILLE, MD—363)

⁴ This area is not recommended as wilderness by the 1987 Clearwater Forest Plan.

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict specific roads and trails to prevent snowmobile use within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness.

In the North Fork Spruce-White Sand and Sneakfoot Meadows IRAs, the Forest Service should close trails and roads leading up to or adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness to "over-snow use" to stop illegal snowmobile incursions into the Wilderness. We recommend closing the following: road #s 111 (Elk Summit), 358 (Kooskooskia Meadows), 359 (Colt Creek), 360 (Savage Pass), 360-B (Hoodoo Lake Campground Loop B), 360-E (Hoodoo Lake Campground), 362 (Tom Beal Park), 369 (Beaver Ridge), 5600 (Storm Ridge), 5690 (East Fork Spruce Creek), 5690-A (East Fork Spruce Creek) and trail # 909 (Savage Ridge). (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—2823)

The Powell Winter Map would allow use on the old Kooskooskia Meadows route which goes into the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness about one quarter mile. Also, snowmobile use would be allowed in the Sneakfoot RNA and that is incompatible with protection of that area. Much illegal snowmobile use in the wilderness occurs because the Forest Service has failed to engage in appropriate action to close the Elk Summit road at the first bridge (over Crooked Fork), which would be very easy to do, to snowmobile use. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.4.4.12 Restrict Snowmobile Use within the North Fork Ranger District**The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use on specific main roads within the North Fork Ranger District.**

Some main roads that should not be opened for winter snowmobile access are the main roads along the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Black Canyon and Cayuse Creek (Roads 247, 250, 255, 581 and 700). Snowmobile use of these roads is particularly harmful to big game populations wintering in the North Fork of the Clearwater since most animals winter near those roads. Snowmobile use along the North Fork forces wintering big game into high elevation areas and causes undue disturbance to already stressed animals. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.4.4.13 Restrict Snowmobile Use within Specific Drainages**The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use in Ruby Creek.**

This steep rugged area has few trails. It is allocated to non-motorized management. However, winter snowmobile use seems to be allowed in a portion of Ruby Creek, which does not make much on-the-ground management sense. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use in the Weitas Creek drainage.

Much of Weitas Creek is lower elevation and/or winter ungulate range. The higher elevations provide lynx and wolverine habitat. Snowmobiles are inappropriate in this area. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

4.4.4.14 Restrict Snowmobile Use in Big-game Winter Range**The Clearwater National Forest should restrict snowmobile use in winter range.**

. . . we are disappointed that more snowmobile restrictions were not considered for winter range protection. With the possible exception of a few main roads that provide access to high elevation areas, all roads and trails should be closed yearlong to snowmobiles on winter range. Cross-country travel by snowmobile should also be prohibited in winter range areas. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.4.4.15 Clarify the Proposal

4.5 Transportation Related Structures

4.5.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should spend money for appropriate signing, closure devices and decommissioning work.

There is also a need to expend a great deal more energy and funding for appropriate signing on all authorized routes, installation of appropriate closure devices and the obliteration of unauthorized routes. Without a concentrated ground effort, any changes being proposed here will merely be a paper formality and will not accomplish the stated purposes of the proposal.

(Individual, MOSCOW, ID—144)

4.5.2 Crossings and Culverts

The Clearwater National Forest should address impacts of roads at crossings and culverts.

Also, (it) would be desirable to specifically address any impacts of roads and passage at crossings and culverts. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—504)

The Clearwater National Forest should ensure roads designated for winter use have proper drainage features.

We also recommend that consideration be given to whether roads designated for wintertime use have the necessary drainage features or sediment buffering devices to withstand heavy or light spring traffic without delivering sediment to streams. (Federal Agency/Elected Official, SEATTLE, WA—705)

4.5.3 Parking Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should construct better parking at Schley Mountain Corridor and Hoodoo Basin.

. . . I would not only like to leave the Idaho side of the border open to cross country snowmobile use but encourage it's use by creating better parking at Schley Mountain Corridor and Hoodoo Basin (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—89)

4.5.4 Sign-in Kiosks

The Clearwater National Forest should provide sign-in kiosks for motorized users.

Sign-in kiosks are routinely provided at wilderness trailheads to record the use of wilderness areas. We have never seen an equivalent facility or program and this lack of data puts motorized recreation at a disadvantage. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.5.5 Signs

The Clearwater National Forest should improve signing and provide specific information.

Signs should be displayed at key access points to public lands explaining the basics. Trailhead signs should not only list restrictions but should also tell visitors what to expect. Reinforce travel allowed and restricted at intersections. Reinforce important messages; say the same thing in a different way. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Trails designated for motorized single-track use but do not physical features to prevent ATV use should include adequate signing and barriers to inform ATV enthusiasts and prevent inadvertent use. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The difficulty of a particular route required can be identified by signing system similar to ski runs so that recreationists are made aware of the skill levels required and so that a wide variety of routes for all skill levels can be enjoyed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the temporary nature of signs and the complications of signing associated with a “closed unless posted open” approach.

Closed unless posted open is an impractical concept because signs do not last very long for many reasons including vandalism, animals and weather knocking them down, rotting of posts, etc. It is not fair to the public and will be very confusing to have somebody pull down a sign and then it is technically illegal for the public to travel on that route.

"Closed unless posted open" will have a huge annual maintenance cost that will be difficult to fund. Posting signs as required to adequately define open routes under "closed unless posted open" will be extremely unsightly which should not be considered reasonable or acceptable. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Land management agencies should standardize signs and eliminate confusion.

There is a significant need to standardized signs within and across all agencies. For example, there are often misunderstandings about seasonal motor vehicle restrictions due to the "No" symbol with the actual closure period shown below in small text that is often not seen or understood. When a picture of a motorcycle, 4x4, ATV and snowmobile are shown at the trailhead with a circle and red strike through them, it portrays to the non-motorized user that this trail is closed to motorized users. Many people do not notice the dates that are associated with the sign. This confusion created by the agencies signs creates many of reported conflicts. A standardized multiple use sign for these areas must be posted to clearly inform people of the uses allowed in these areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.5.6 Trailheads

The Clearwater National Forest should improve signing at trailheads.

As our monitoring has shown, signage at trailheads is usually missing. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

Lack of regulatory signs at the trailhead is a major problem for the entire Weitas Creek Proposed Wilderness. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The directional signs (at the trailhead and along the road to the trailhead) still call these ATV roads "trails." In addition, the numbers used to identify trails and ATV roads are the same, so it's a setup for confusion. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

Land management agencies should provide trailheads for motorized trails that are located at the boundaries of urban areas.

Agencies are encouraged to provide trailheads for motorized trails that are located at the boundary of urban areas and trails that connect urban areas to public lands and form motorized recreation opportunities similar to the Paiute Trail in Utah. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

4.6 Maps

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of the motor vehicle use map.

As you well know, former Chief of the Forest Service, Dale Bosworth identified unmanaged recreation, including off-road vehicle use, as one of the top four threats facing public lands. . . . The motor vehicle use map is an important step forward in reducing this threat. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—14)

The Clearwater National Forest should publish the motor vehicle use map quickly.

. . . Please move quickly to publish the map and restrict motorized vehicles to well establish, well constructed roads and please note that this is the perspective of a Jeep owner. Please do not allow scoping issues to delay the imposition of these restrictions. (Individual, POLLOCK, ID—134)

The Clearwater National Forest should produce a motor vehicle use map that is easy to read.

Please ensure that the new MVUM is easier and plainer to read than the current maps for the CNF proposal. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should make travel maps more readily available.

Agencies are encouraged to make Travel Plan maps more readily available. Vending machines could be placed in areas that are accessible at any time of the day or week at BLM and FS offices. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should combine visitor and travel plan maps.

We recommend that the Travel Plan Map and Visitors Map be the same and that this combination map should include as much detail as possible (such as contour information) so that the public can better determine the location of roads and trails that are open or closed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Forest Service should develop national mapping standards.

Every planning action "re-invents" the line weights, color, and line styles for the different motorized and non-motorized road and trail designations. This is very confusing to the public and once again, puts motorized recreationists at a disadvantage. A national mapping standard for travel planning actions must be developed starting with proposed action in order to address this inadequacy and the environmental justice issue associated with it. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

| | |
|---|----|
| CHAPTER 5—RECREATION..... | 1 |
| Summary | 1 |
| 5.1 Recreation..... | 2 |
| 5.1.1 General | 2 |
| 5.1.2 Quality of Experience..... | 2 |
| 5.1.2.1 Noise..... | 2 |
| 5.1.3 Balance of Opportunities | 3 |
| 5.1.3.1 General | 3 |
| 5.1.3.2 Balance | 4 |
| 5.1.3.3 Non-motorized..... | 5 |
| 5.1.3.4 Motorized | 6 |
| 5.1.3.5 Single- and Two-track | 7 |
| 5.1.3.6 Recreation Visitor Days | 8 |
| 5.1.3.7 Travel Opportunity Spectrum..... | 8 |
| 5.1.4 Outfitter/Guides | 8 |
| 5.1.5 Education..... | 9 |
| 5.2 Dispersed/Undeveloped Recreation | 9 |
| 5.2.1. General | 9 |
| 5.2.2 Dispersed Campsites | 9 |
| 5.3 Motorized Recreation | 10 |
| 5.4 Mechanized Recreation (Bicycles)..... | 12 |
| 5.5 Motorized and Mechanized Recreation..... | 13 |
| 5.6 Non-motorized and Mechanized Recreation | 14 |
| 5.7 Non-motorized Recreation | 14 |
| 5.7.1 General | 14 |
| 5.7.2 Pack Stock | 15 |
| 5.8 Winter Recreation..... | 15 |
| 5.9 Multiple/Combined Uses..... | 15 |
| 5.9.1 General | 15 |
| 5.9.2 User Conflicts..... | 16 |
| 5.9.3 Safety..... | 17 |
| 5.10 Environmental Impacts..... | 18 |

CHAPTER 5—RECREATION

Summary

Chapter 5, Recreation, summarizes the many ideas and concerns that commenters raised regarding recreation opportunities on the Clearwater National Forest.

A main point of agreement was that users desire a “quality” recreation experience. There is major disagreement about what constitutes a quality experience. Some users define a quality experience as solitude and quiet, and they generally travel on foot, horseback or bicycles. Others enjoy traveling via motorized vehicles because they like the experience of driving a motorcycle, off-highway vehicle or snowmobile, and they can get to desired destinations relatively quickly. In addition, motorized vehicles provide access for individuals who are physically unable to hike or bike the forest terrain.

Many respondents who identified themselves as motorized users expressed a concern that proposed motorized restrictions on certain trails would concentrate motorized users into smaller areas. They said this would negatively impact the quality of their recreation experience.

Many commenters addressed the issue of the need for a balance of recreation opportunities. In general, respondents desired equal opportunities not only in terms of miles of roads or trails, but in terms of quality and opportunity for diverse experiences. Most commenters who identified themselves as motorized users believed non-motorized users had more recreation opportunities than motorized users. They viewed the Forest’s proposal as widening that gap. Many bicyclists expressed a similar sentiment. Some non-motorized users countered that more non-motorized trails were needed to provide a balance between motorized and non-motorized users.

A number of individuals noted the importance of education in travel management. They thought a good education program would eliminate many of the problems that have lead to the travel management planning process and proposal. They requested that the agency try to solve problems with education before resorting to restrictions.

Some commenters called on the Forest Service to recognize motorized uses as legitimate uses of national forest lands. They also requested adequate and sustainable motorized opportunities. Conversely, others asked the Forest Service to consider the negative side of motorized vehicles—noise, pollution, resource damage, etc., and limit their uses.

Bicyclists voiced their need for diverse opportunities. Most specifically requested the Forest reconsider the proposal to restrict bicycles from recommended wilderness areas because bicycles have a minimal impact on the land.

Some respondents took the opportunity to point out the impacts caused by pack stock. They believed motorized and mechanized users generally get disproportionate blame for resource problems. They wanted the Forest to recognize the impacts of horses and other pack stock on the environment.

There was much disagreement over the issue of user conflict. Many commenters insisted they had never experienced conflict, especially in areas proposed for restrictions. Others cited their own experiences with conflict. Some believed conflicts were exaggerated and contrived, and requested the Forest provide documentation to substantiate problems.

Finally, some commenters discussed mixed recreation uses and how they lead to safety concerns. They requested that the Forest avoid mixed uses in many areas.

5.1 Recreation

5.1.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should enhance recreation opportunities on the Forest.

I believe the Forest Service should be enhancing recreation in the Clearwater National Forest rather than restricting. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—3153)

The Clearwater National Forest should give precedence to preservation over recreation.

Any recreational use should be limited within the ecological carrying capacity of a protected area; most roadless areas can be categorized as fragile. In such cases preservation should take precedence over recreation. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2588)

5.1.2 Quality of Experience

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of pending trail closures on recreation experiences.

The quality of our experience has been reduced in other ways. For example, every time we ride on a road or trail we wonder or talk about whether this will be the last time and what sort of fight it will take to keep it open. This dark cloud ruins the recreation experience that is so badly needed. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize trail restrictions will lead to overcrowding and poor recreation experiences.

. . . as trails are closed to motorized recreation the use necessarily shifts to other trails. The result of course is that the trails remaining open becoming subject to overcrowding and increased need for maintenance. This phenomenon operates to further degrade the outdoor recreation experience of motorized users. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

I would like to emphasize that through the closure of these areas MVUM will only create increased user densities resulting in more conflicts, decreased motorized user camping and fishing opportunity, which is unique to the Clearwater National Forest as well as the National Forest System. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—61)

Snowmobiling and ATV's motorcycles are not going to go away. As long as there is still air to breath people will be riding these machines. The machines have become so much more environmentally friendly in the last ten years it amazing. And it (is) only going to keep getting better. By shutting down certain areas it only going to congest other areas worse. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—130)

5.1.2.1 Noise

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more quiet areas for recreation.

Locations for quiet recreation are increasingly hard to find. The effects of motors (the noise, air pollution, and erosion) creep into otherwise wild areas. They are not confined to roaded areas. Without designating large areas for non-motorized recreation, the effects of motors will continue to creep deeper into wild areas. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—359)

I had just reached the crest of the hill and looked over at a cirque lake. High lakes are special. The entire spell was broken by the whine of an ATV speeding up the trail. This is not fair. Why do I have to share my adventure with a motor especially in a roadless area that might one day become wilderness? Noise pollution can be as bad as excessive resource exploitation especially

where the land is crisscrossed by roads or tracks maintained by ORV use. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—2588)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide quiet areas for bicyclists.

There are no quiet areas set aside for mountain biking in the travel plans, as compared to quiet areas set aside for hiking and equestrian use. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

The Clearwater National Forest already provides an adequate amount of “quiet” opportunities.

An estimated 85% of our National Forests already provide Quiet opportunities through special designations and administrative closures. It might be noted that only around 5% of the recreating public that uses our National Forests are quiet type users according to Forest Service studies. We should not provide even more opportunities for this user group at the expense of removing opportunities from another legitimate recreation user group. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—181)

The Clearwater National Forest should encourage forest users who want a “quiet experience” to use wilderness areas.

We recognize the desire for a quiet experience in the forest as a legitimate value. To varying degrees, we all visit the forest to enjoy the natural sounds of streams, trees, and wildlife. Forest visitors who require an absolutely natural acoustic experience in the forest should be encouraged to use the portions of the forest which have been set aside for their exclusive benefit where they are guaranteed a quiet experience, i.e., wilderness areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

5.1.3 Balance of Opportunities

5.1.3.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should change the way it calculates acreage related to the recreation opportunity spectrum.

ROS acreage should not be included in motorized use acreage. The 1/2 mile each side of a motorized route is affected by motorized noise but cannot be used by the motorized user and therefore should not be included in motorized use acreage. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider wilderness when analyzing lands available for the spectrum of recreation opportunities.

CBU requests that you include any and all wilderness in your forest and adjacent forests that are available for non-motorized/mechanized use when analyzing the available lands for your spectrum of different available recreation opportunities. (Multiple-use Group, GALLATIN GATEWAY, MT—142)

The Clearwater National Forest should preserve all trails in the system to provide a diversity of recreation opportunities.

The Travel Plan should try to keep as many of these trails on the system to provide a greater diversity of recreation opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that more bikers and hikers than motorized users will sign in at trailheads.

The method of counting signatures in the boxes at trail heads is flawed. Trails have been closed to motorized use because the Forest Service counts more bikers and hikers than riders. The simple reason is that a hiker will walk right up to the box and sign in. A trail rider is less likely

to park his or her machine, climb off and walk up to the box - they just ride past it. (Motorized Recreation Group, MERIDIAN, ID—1423)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide opportunities for traditional methods of hunting and fishing.

....there are fewer and fewer opportunities for traditional or primitive methods of hunting and fishing. Reserving areas for hunting opportunities that do not involve off-road vehicles promotes "fair chase" hunting ethics and enhances the experience for many hunters. Similarly, fewer roads and off-road vehicle trails protects in-stream fish habitat, thus maintaining healthy populations of larger fish. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—6)

5.1.3.2 Balance

The Clearwater National Forest's proposal strikes a balance between motorized and non-motorized uses.

This plan will not only provide the needed balance between non-motorized and motorized travel in the forest, but also consistency between the Clearwater and Lolo National Forests. (Individual, FLORENCE, MT—4243)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide equal opportunities for motorized and non-motorized trail users—quantity and quality.

A reasonable goal for the split of trails should be 50/50 motorized/non-motorized. Remember that 25:1 motorized/non-motorized is justified based on actual usage. The proposed plan is way out of balance with the split of routes meeting the definition of a motorcycle or ATV trail. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

I do agree that there should be areas for non-motorized as well as motorized folks on the forest, but I don't feel motorized should do all the compromising. Why can't we, both groups motorized and non (motorized) give a little. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1082)

The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) for motorized recreationists should consist of an equivalent number, type and quality of opportunities as compared to non-motorized recreationists including access to back country recreation areas, long distance back country discovery routes, back country airstrips and destinations including historic areas, lakes, vistas, streams and rivers. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide equal opportunities for snowmobile users.

Our (snowmobile) season in that area (Lolo Pass vicinity on MT/ID border) starts the first of December, and the end of the season sometimes carries into June depending on snow conditions. We are the heavy weight winter users and we rarely encounter other human users of this area. When we do encounter others, the encounters are on the roads. We are all in this EQUAL and their needs to be areas for ALL groups to use. (Individual, POLSON, MT—2963)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide comparable trailhead facilities for motorized and non-motorized users.

The evaluation of a balance of opportunities should also include an accounting and comparison of facilities including trailhead at wilderness areas versus trailhead facilities at OHV areas. Most wilderness trailhead facilities include parking lots, horse handling facilities, kiosks with information, campgrounds, and restrooms and they are funded without any direct connection to the users. We request an adequate evaluation and consideration of these imbalances be made part of this project and actions taken that will correct these imbalances. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest has created an imbalance with the proposal.

... when you implemented the 2005 Travel Plan, it was heralded as an equitable balance for motorized and non-motorized use.a few years later, you are proposing to close more (motorized) trails. I do not see any trails designated just for OHV use. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—1077)

5.1.3.3 Non-motorized**The Clearwater National Forest provides ample opportunities for non-motorized recreation.**

The miles and percentage of non-motorized trails is excessive compared to the use that they receive and this does not consider the endless cross-country opportunities that available to non-motorized recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The CNF does not need to allocate any more trails towards non-motorized use. The CNF has 1,186 miles of trail available for hiking and pack stock. Mountain bikers have access to 1,023 miles of trail. In total, motorcycle riders currently only have access to 25% of the CNF trails. The proposed action reduces the spectrum of trail opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

While this plan proposes to close trails to motorized use to provide more non-motorized trail opportunities, there has been no information provided that would support the need for more non-motorized trails. In fact, this plan indirectly proves our assertion when it proposes to abandon 165 miles of already non-motorized trails due to lack of use. (Business, CALDWELL, D—2846)

There are dozens of trails not on the current Forest Service maps that are in existence and can be used by the non-motorized users. Therefore we see no need to create new non-motorized trails out of trails that are currently open to motorized use. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more non-motorized recreation opportunities.

Nonmotorized trails are needed to balance the large number of motorized opportunities available on the forest. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—4479)

Trout Unlimited supports a rational balance of non-motorized access on the Clearwater N.F. Trails System. We support restrictions on motorized use of the Weitas Creek Trail and we support the Clearwater NF's effort to get control of the escalating use of ORVs on the forest. (Non Motorized/Non-Mechanized Recreation, POLLOCK, ID—352)

No one has lost as much trail access as the historic horse and hiker the non-motorized user. Our non-motorized trail system is at a crisis. We are being crowded into smaller and smaller land pockets as our numbers grow. We have more than 4,000 miles of motorized road/trails used by all users, horse hikers to motorcycles and 4-wheelers and full sized vehicles, limited by ability depending on the road condition- logged in- poor clearance etc, and management. We have less than 2000 miles of trails, of this 1,398 miles open to motorized. This leaves 726 miles or a ratio of +4 to less than 1 motorized trails/roads to non-motorized trails/roads. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

Nonmotorized trails are needed to balance the large number of motorized opportunities available on the forest, so I hope you will maintain this positive stance. (Individual, HELENA, MT—4208)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more semi-primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities.

The Forest Service has dedicated several areas to ORVs without a concomitant commitment to quiet recreation or to resource concerns. Clarke Mountain, Deception Saddle, Laird Park, Boulder Creek, and Sheep Mountain have all been recently set aside for ORV use. Until this planning effort, there has been no attempt to implement the forest plan regarding semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation or meeting the executive orders. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses on roads that are currently open to provide opportunities for non-motorized recreation.

If the CNF is interested in providing a balance of use on the forest, it will cater to the large majority of people who want to protect natural resources and quiet places and limit motors to roads presently open. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

5.1.3.4 Motorized**The Clearwater National Forest provides ample opportunities for motorized recreation.**

By closing these areas to motorized use, there will still be ample opportunity for motorized vehicle users elsewhere. They currently have an unbelievable number of places to go. If they still need other areas, I suggest their leadership groups contract with private timber corporations whose lands are already severely compromised. That way they won't be degrading more wild and natural areas. (Individual, PALOUSE, WA—928)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more opportunities for motorized recreation.

Commitment must be made to provide for motorized recreation in the same manner and magnitude non motorized recreation is provided for. Bias and anti-motorized prejudice must be stricken from the plan and the planning process. The forest must learn to recognize and fairly deal with contrived conflict. Adequate systems of competently designed two wheel motorized trails must be developed that meet the present and future needs of this recreation. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more opportunities for motorized trail users.

Here are some facts, about the trail system in the Clearwater National Forest, that you either fail to recognize or are reluctant to present to the public because of the bias against motorized travel (I have enclosed documentation to support these figures). 1) Maintained Trail System Mileage - 1,411 miles; 2) rail Mileage open to motorized use per the 2005 Travel Guide - 711 miles; 3) Trail Mileage open to motorized use per Alternative = 487 miles.

As you can clearly see, the 2005 Travel Guide limited motorized access to 50% of the available trails within the system (a fair balance, if you call sharing the motorized trails with the non-motorized recreationalist who has 100% access fair). With the implementation of your proposed Alternative 1, motorized access would only be permitted on 35% of the available trails within the system. This is a far cry from the supposed balance, which you claim, you are trying to achieve. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—1077)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide motorized recreation opportunities in semi-primitive settings.

Trail closures in semi-primitive motorized areas represent a significant amount of the total available both forest-wide and area-wide. These are the highest value routes to motorized recreationists and the impact would be significant. This impact is unacceptable unless these

routes are mitigated with new routes of equal value. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Travel Opportunity Spectrum has basically eliminated semi-primitive motorized opportunities which many of us seek. . . . after reviewing the map there is basically nothing left as far as semi-primitive two-wheeled motorized travel opportunities on your forest. This proposal is a serious slap-in-the-face to the two wheeled motorized community, and seriously discriminates against what we truly enjoy. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more opportunities for motorcycle riders.

At the conclusion of this planning process, motorcycle riders will be lucky to have full access to one stream in the entire CNF. Hikers will have access to Collins Creek, Skull Creek, Quartz Creek, Isabella Creek, The Little North Fork, Weitas, Little Weitas, Cayuse, Kelly Creek, the upper North Fork, Fish Creek, Old Man Creek, Split Creek, Post Office Creek, White Sands Creek, Brushy Fork, Colt Creek, Weir Creek, Warm Springs Creek, and more. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

Another major setback to your proposal is that you nearly eliminate the use of a two-wheeled trail machine for hunting opportunities. . . . It takes a competent rider to hunt using a trail machine, and as a result I don't run into too many that do. . . . Designated wilderness already provides for these exclusive opportunities, and many of the trails outside of wilderness (whether motorized or non-motorized) also provide the same experience. Your current proposal caters mostly to horse hunters. A very small percentage of people hunt solely by foot, and are limited to a few miles. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

We need a higher ratio of trails for dirt bikers than hikers do. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—490)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide snowmobile opportunities in the Great Burn.

Snowmobiles are asking for approximately 8% of the Great Burn as play areas, with 4,005,621 acres of Designated Wilderness in Idaho and 3,442,416 acres of Designated Wilderness in Montana. It makes sense to share 8% of approximately 150,000 acres or 12,000 acres. (Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—692)

5.1.3.5 Single- and Two-track

The Clearwater National Forest should provide an appropriate number of single- and two-track opportunities.

There may be significant opportunities and challenges to make sure both meaningful 2 track and meaningful single track opportunities are provided in some type of fair and proportionate quantities to be acceptable to the recreating public rather than simply expedient to our managers. One meaningful loop opportunity for single track and one for two track motorized recreation users per ranger district would likely be acceptable to the recreating public. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2192)

. . . barely visible 2-track roads and single-track trails are invaluable to motorized recreationists and must be evaluated as such. Motorized recreationists are struggling to keep a reasonable spectrum of opportunities available and one piece of that spectrum are remote and lesser used routes. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

I would like to point out that currently only 50% of the trails in the Clearwater NF are even accessible to motorized users. In addition, far less than that 50% is open to motorcycle only. The omission of these 178 miles of trails, will greatly decrease the singletrack motorcycle opportunities available in the Clearwater NF. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—2865)

5.1.3.6 Recreation Visitor Days

The Clearwater National Forest should revise the way it calculates “recreation visitor days.”

Discussion at the 12/19/07 "Open House" indicates that those who constructed the proposed Forest Service "Alternative 1" not only ignored, but refuse to even consider that trailbike riders cover more miles per day than hikers. Whereas 200 miles of trail, 50% open to motorized use, offers a 10-mile per day hiker twenty (20) Recreation Visitor Days (RVDs), those same 200 miles of trail offers a 50-mile per day trail bike rider two (2) Recreation Visitor Days (RVDs). (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

5.1.3.7 Travel Opportunity Spectrum

The Clearwater National Forest should revise the travel opportunity spectrum to provide more opportunities for the general public.

"Travel Opportunity Spectrum" does not provide increased travel opportunities for the general public. It basically reduces the accessible area except for those who own or have access to horses. Essentially those who can hire outfitters. This denies the general public. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—2820)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more balance in the travel opportunity spectrum.

Per the 2005 Clearwater NF's 2005 Travel Guide, of the 1,411 "Maintained Trail System Mileage," barely 50% or 711 miles are open to motorized use. PANTRA challenges the Clearwater NF's contention that offering twice as many miles of trails to non-motorized users than motorized users reflects a Travel Opportunity Spectrum requiring additional closures of trails to motorized use. (Motorized Recreation Group, POST FALLS, ID—2859)

I added up the miles listed in the 2005 travel guide that are currently listed as open to motorcycles. I took out miles of trails that I know to be impassable and about 20 miles that are actually road but listed as motorcycle trail. This total comes up to 511. These trail facts do support the concept that the travel opportunity spectrum is out of balance and needs to be changed, but more trail needs to be opened to motorized use not closed. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the differences between “travel opportunity spectrum” and “recreation opportunity spectrum.”

Travel Opportunity Spectrum: Is this the same designation as Recreational Opportunity Spectrum? ROS should be evaluated on a different scale from the mode of transportation you use to access the many opportunities. (Individual, GRANGEVILLE, ID—941)

5.1.4 Outfitter/Guides

The Clearwater National Forest should not allow an outfitter to camp within the Weitas Creek Trail 20 corridor.

It is suspected that one reason for proposed Weitas Creek Trail #20 closure is because an outfitter camp is located on the trail at the intersection of Weitas Creek and Windy Creek. This outfitter should not be allowed to camp within the trail corridor. (Motorized Recreation Group, EAGLE, ID—2547)

5.1.5 Education

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize education as the key to minimizing impacts from human use.

Education is the key to minimizing impact from human usage on lands. (Individual, YORBA LINDA, CA—2695)

Most problems associated with visitors can be addressed by education. Education should be the first line of action and all education measures should be exhausted before pursuing other actions. There are situations where education is far more effective than law enforcement. Educational programs could include use of mailings, handouts, improved travel management mapping, pamphlets, TV and radio spots, web pages, newspaper articles, signing, presentations, information kiosks with mapping, and trail rangers.

. . . use education on principles such as those found in the Tread Lightly program and Blue Ribbon Coalition Recreation Code of Ethics and Principles. These efforts could include the use of pamphlets, information kiosks, and presentations. . . .

We request that agencies initiate an education campaign (loud is not cool) to promote the development and use of quiet machines. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the efforts of users to educate others.

I realize that there are some recreational land users that abuse this privilege, but most are like our family do not and are working with local clubs and state organizations to help educate people as to the appropriate use of these lands to allow us to continue the privilege of their use. (Academic, WOOSTER, OH—3511)

5.2 Dispersed/Undeveloped Recreation

5.2.1. General

The Clearwater National Forest should be managed for dispersed multiple-use recreation.

Dispersed multiple-use recreation (including motorized recreation) is the best management prescription for our National Forests. (Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—3748)

The Clearwater National Forest should disperse motorcycle use by providing undeveloped campsites that are accessible from the trail system.

Disperse (motorcycle) use by making available numerous small and widely dispersed undeveloped campsites with easy access to the trail system. Trails should also be widely dispersed. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

5.2.2 Dispersed Campsites

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more dispersed campsites along motorized routes.

There is a shortage of dispersed camping areas along all of our motorized routes. This can be confirmed by going out on any holiday weekend and trying to find a camp spot. In order to meet the needs of the public, camp spots and access to them must not be closed because of access and/or sanitation concerns. There are ways to mitigate any access concerns. Sanitation concerns can be addressed by constructing vault toilets or limiting camping to self-contained camping units which are the most popular means of camping now. Additionally, campers that are not self-contained can be required to pack wastes out by using porta-potties or similar devices. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

Dispersed campsites are very desirable camp sites. Closure of these sorts of dispersed campsites would have a very significant impact on the public and we request that they remain open. If water quality concerns are the basis for these closures, then there are reasonable alternatives to mitigate these concerns Again, we request that all reasonable camp site located along water courses remain open.

If dispersed camp sites are to be closed based on water quality concerns, then we request that the decision include a water quality monitoring program to establish the baseline water quality prior to the closure of dispersed camp sites and continue that program after the closure to establish whether any significant water quality improvement was realized. The decision should also include a provision to re-open closed camp sites when no significant improvement in water quality was realized by the closure.

If a dispersed camp site is closed, then we request that the closure be mitigated by creation of new camp sites on at least a 1:1 basis in order to avoid a significant cumulative effect on the public of too few camp sites. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize developed campsites are a low priority for the trail bike community.

Developed campgrounds with designated campsites are the very lowest priority on the list and it is questionable if the trailbike community actually needs them at all. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

5.3 Motorized Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized uses are legitimate on national forests.

For many visitors, motor vehicles also represent an integral part of their recreational experience. People come to National Forests to ride on roads and trails in pickup trucks, ATVs, motorcycles, and a variety of other conveyances. Motor vehicles are a legitimate and appropriate way for people to enjoy their National Forests - in the right places, and with proper management. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The attitude that we see toward us and our activity (i.e. motorized use) is one of hostility. We must be nuts to think that the folks that have a hold on the reins, and hence they control where we go, would be willing to think of us and our wants and needs.

We are destined to be forced into small reservations and a huge change in life because of the unwillingness of those that are in charge to act fairly and be considerate of us. (Individual, LOLO, MT—524)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide adequate and sustainable motorized recreation opportunities.

With a rapidly growing OHV population, it is very important to provide adequate and sustainable recreation opportunities. The CNF should be looking at ways to retain and improve its existing motorized opportunities, rather than reduce opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

Off-highway vehicle use is one of Idaho's most rapidly growing recreation activities. In the past five years, the number of OHVs registered in Idaho has increased 65.3%. With such a rapidly growing OHV population, it is very important to provide adequate and sustainable recreation opportunities. The Clearwater National Forest needs to retain and improve its existing motorized opportunities. (Individual, PROMONTORIES RIDGWAY, CO—3597)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage growing off-highway vehicle use.

OHV use is growing, manage it in a positive way. Like ANY other type of business, PUBLIC or private, provide what the customer wants. (Individual, GRAND JUNCTION, CO—4108)

The Clearwater National Forest should promote motorized access and use.

I would also like to point out that Clearwater County has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State of Idaho (Clearwater Tribune Jan. 10, 2008). I think it is time for the USFS to switch gears and to begin promoting the MOTORIZED USE AND ACCESS of the Clearwater National Forest. (Individual, DENNIS PORT, MA—508)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize there is more motorized trail use than non-motorized trail use on the North Fork District.

I have been riding the trails on the north fork for about five years now. I believe that in all of those summers, covering at least a thousand miles of trail, I have seen maybe thirty different people on horseback and on foot. Whereas, I have ridden with and met upwards of a hundred different motorized users on the trails. Being considered a minority in the use of these trails systems is completely fictional. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide diverse snowmobiling opportunities.

Some will say that according to the map you still have a majority of the Clearwater National Forest to enjoy, but that is not true. Most of the areas left are low elevation logging roads with none of the challenging alpine areas that a majority of snowmobilers enjoy. (Individual, BOISE, ID—2557)

Steep slopes and rugged terrain is what we seek in most of our snowmobile excursion and respectfully request that you continue to allow us to access these types of areas. Please send me a copy of the final EIS and your decision. (Individual, POLSON, MT—2963)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider survey information about hunters and motorized uses.

A more recent statewide survey of mule deer hunter opinions was conducted by the University of Idaho Department of Conservation Social Sciences (Sanyal, 2007). Nearly 50 percent of the survey respondents said they use ATVs. The two main reasons they use ATVs is to hunt with other friends that have them and to retrieve big-game animals. However, it is interesting to note that nearly 50 percent of hunters that use ATVs try to find areas to hunt that do not have ATV access. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

From 1993-2006, the opinions of more than 2,300 hunters were sampled statewide on many issues relating to motorized travel. The following is a brief bullet summary of the results of these surveys for consideration in the travel plan analysis. Further details can be provided on request.

Hunter use of ATV's and motorcycles is increasing. Mule deer hunter use of ATV's and motorcycles increased from 11% in 1998, to 17% in 2004, to 38% in 2006.

Approximately 75% of big game hunters support or would accept temporary road closures to improve big game hunting.

More than 70% of hunters support or accept the Department's motorized rule that restricts motorized use to roads capable of travel by full-sized automobiles.

Only 20% of hunters do not support limiting motorized use of Forests to designated roads and trails.

More than 55% of hunters surveyed use foot travel or horses as their primary mode of transportation while hunting.

More than 85% of hunters feel the number of roads and trails in their hunting areas are excessive or adequate. Less than 15% felt there were not enough roads and trails. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the downsides of motorized recreation.

I hate off road vehicles used for "recreation". They ruin it for everybody else, they're loud, obnoxious, dangerous, smell bad, ruin topography, disrupt and kill wildlife, and our soldiers are dying to keep this country addicted to oil. (Individual, VANCOUVER, WA—869)

And no matter how responsible the user, motorized vehicle users pollute the environment with noise and emissions, contribute to erosion and sediment runoff, and disturb wildlife. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2772)

In a recent study by Utah State University, researchers found that nearly half of ORV riders prefer to ride "off established trails." Of the ATV's, 39% and of the dirt bike riders, 50% did so on their most recent rides. Unrestricted ORV use has become one of the top 5 threats to our National Forests nationwide. Unrestricted ATV use threatens our public land. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

5.4 Mechanized Recreation (Bicycles)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize key mountain bike areas.

Lolo Lolo Creek - 2 RWA's. One on each side of Lolo Pass. The eastern one contains several trail loops, poorly maintained and routed, that are enjoyed occasionally by bicyclists. The western RWA contains trail #46, an essential biking trail that eventually connects to the Stateline Trail, another essential trail for bicycling. Our access to #46 is paramount to anything else in these RWA's. Our recommendation at this time is backcountry 2.2a We would like to talk more about these areas.

Lolo Middle Clark Fork - 1 RWA, The Great Burn. We realize that this area is contentious among many groups. The Great Burn Study Group has many invested in an effort to achieve wilderness status. But record of use by bicyclists goes back to 1981, perhaps even further.

Bicyclists have long used trails here for hunting access and visitation. While we may be able to come up with a trail corridor recommendation, especially for the Stateline Trail #738, everything here is good for bike riding. (Individual, BELGRADE, MT—1)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide diverse opportunities for bicyclists.

The proposed blanket ban on bicycling in proposed Recommended Wilderness is arbitrary and capricious because it fails to take into account the value of individual trails for which there is a real demand. The Forest Service notes that a minority of the miles currently open to bicycling will be closed, but fails to acknowledge the unique experience these trails provide and the significant loss of backcountry singletrack that will result. Rather than manage exclusively for total miles open to bicycling, the agency should seek to provide diverse experiences, including those on narrow trails in wild and primitive areas. (Recreation Group, BOULDER, CO—512)

Development of MTB opportunities for longer trips and trips to recreation destinations such as lakes, peaks, or vistas. . . .

Development of MTB opportunities in a non-motorized setting within a reasonable travel distance from area communities. (Individual, GARDEN CITY, ID—4377)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the benefits of bicycle travel.

Bicycles are the answer to many forest travel issues. Due to oil prices, oil reserves, and global warming, bicycles will be increasingly important for all transportation aspects in the very near future. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—16)

I think that bikes are the future for forest travel. They are quiet and don't carry any fuel, or wreck the trail surface. They work good as an access tool for getting to climbs, they are good for fishing access, they are good for hunting. Bikes are better than hiking in many ways except for in the most rugged places, but they can be carried through those places. They get people out in the forest to enjoy the natural world. They catch on more every year. (Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—2708)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow bicycles in recommended wildernesses.

I believe that banning mechanical equipment (i.e. mountain bikes) in wilderness areas is a relatively intuitive notion, but do not support, in any way, the expansion of a bicycle-free area within the non-wilderness areas in "my" Clearwater National Forest. I do support the reasonable and prudent prohibition of snowmobiles during winter months, but do not feel that mountain bikes should be grouped in with (and therefore banned) such noisy and smoky machines. I have attended many enjoyable group mountain bike rides near Hoodoo Pass and throughout the Clearwater National Forest during spring and summer months and urge you to retain policies that continue to allow such trips. Please reconsider your proposal to restrict bicycles on the Clearwater National Forest. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—168)

The idea of losing access even to the proposed 81 mile in exchange for a restriction being lifted on 9 miles is not a fair compromise. . . . Bicycles are clean, quiet and cause minimum impact if used appropriately. There needs to be a happy medium of non-motorized travel corridors to minimize impacts, user/wildlife conflicts or a wilderness area with a mechanical non-motorized policy update rather than just slapping on a wilderness tag and shutting all user groups out. I think the greater mountain bike community, are willing to volunteer time and resources to assist with trail planning, building and maintenance. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—475)

Bicycling should be allowed to continue pending potential congressional action. The proposed policy is at odds with Forest Service management elsewhere in the country. Currently, Forest Service Regions 2,4,5,8,9 and 10 allow bicycling in Recommended Wilderness. In Idaho and Wyoming, this includes at least the Bighorn, Boise, Caribou, Medicine Bow, Payette, Sawtooth and Targhee National Forests. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—761)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize differences between bicycle uses and motorized uses.

. . . bicycles are quiet, efficient and human powered modes of transport and means of exploration that should NEVER be conceptualized or managed as similar to motorized use (neither summer OR winter motorized travel). (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—1904)

5.5 Motorized and Mechanized Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the growing need for more motorized and mechanized opportunities.

OHV trail recreation is the fastest growing recreation on Forest Service lands. . . . It is not logical, given the lack of supporting documentation of need for more non-motorized trails, that the Clearwater would propose to dramatically reduce motorized and mechanized trail mileages for the largest and fastest growing trail user segment, those on motorized and mechanized equipment. (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow mechanized and motorized uses in recommended wildernesses.

I am opposed to the exclusion of Mountain Bikes and Motorized recreation in Wilderness Study areas. I consider your action to be arbitrary and capricious. The law allows OHV recreation within Wilderness study areas. (Individual, CHICAGO PARK, CA—1585)

I strongly oppose management plans that would reduce or eliminate motorized or mechanized (bicycle) use on the Clearwater NF. (Individual, YAKIMA, WA—2446)

We've been riding these trails since the early 60's (nearly 50 years). Even after all of these years, it is obvious this form of recreation has not degraded the criteria to qualify an area for wilderness. Areas that are proposed for wilderness should not exclude historical two-wheeled motorized or mechanized access until the area is officially designated by Congress. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—500)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow mountain bikes in recommended wildernesses, and possibly motorized uses.

While I would prefer to see a designation that allows mountain bikes yet prohibits motorized vehicle use (in recommended wildernesses), I will wholeheartedly endorse keeping it open to motorized use rather than prohibit mountain bikes. I do not see mountain bike to be a significant source of damage. (Individual, SAN DIEGO, CA—3955)

5.6 Non-motorized and Mechanized Recreation**The Clearwater National Forest should utilize decommissioned roads and abandoned trails to provide more non-motorized and mechanized opportunities.**

If the CNF wants to provide more non-motorized trail opportunities, then we suggest that more roads be decommissioned and more abandoned trails should be placed back on the system. Decommissioned roads and short connector trails can provide outstanding mountain bike and horseback trail opportunities. We have seen several places across the state where this has worked successfully in providing additional trail opportunities. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

5.7 Non-motorized Recreation**5.7.1 General****The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of hikers and horses.**

Many writers including the author have repeatedly pointed out that equestrian use causes more impact than any other trail use. In a study comparing the erosion impacts of horses, hikers, bicycles and motorcycles, the sediment yields from horse trails were greater than for any other type of use (Seney and Wilson 1991). Other problems attributed to horse use are the proliferation of informal trails and manure on trails (Hammitt and Cole 1987). Excessive amounts of manure also pose a threat to water quality (Hammitt and Cole 1987). Wilson and Seney in a 1994 study in Gallatin National Forest found that users on foot (hikers and horses) make more sediment available than do users on wheels (mountain bikes and motorcycles). (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

5.7.2 Pack Stock

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the trail damage caused by stock.

Many of the (North Fork) district's trails suffer from trough problem created by stock users. The large amount of stock use in the area has created a trough problem that needs to be addressed through maintenance in order to encourage water runoff. Eliminating motorized travel won't fix any problems, but encourages problems because there will be a lack of maintenance funding and personnel to maintain the trail. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

I have been a mountain bike rider for 20 years, and can say with out any doubt that horses cause far more damage to any trail system or road then mountain bikes. If any trail is closed to mountain bikes it should also be closed to horses. (Individual, WEST JORDAN, UT—1622)

In fact some of the non-motorized users can and do create greater impacts on the forest, stock users are not limited to staying on designated trails, many create their own routes by going cross-country, cutting down trees and brush and crossing streams at inappropriate places to get to the perfect camping spot or hunting spot. . . .

Stock users have no control over where their animals decide to get rid of waste, many times the animals use streams, by lakes, the meadows and trails leaving behind many seeds of non-native plants and many noxious seeds. (Individual, HAMILTON, MT—4345)

5.8 Winter Recreation

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more winter recreation opportunities.

I would also like to see an expansion of outdoor recreation opportunities for cross country skiers and snow shoers in the Clearwater National Forest. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—1523)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access for backcountry skiing.

The backcountry skiing throughout this area is unbelievable. To access it without snowmobile use would be near impossible during the winter. Anyway, who else are we disturbing? I never see backcountry skiers/cross-country skiers in this area without a snowmobile. It is simply too far. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2690)

The Clearwater National Forest should plow the Mussellshell Road to provide access for winter recreation.

I would like to see the Musselshell road plowed in winter. This is a great winter recreation area but can't get there unless there is logging activity to keep roads open. (Individual, KAMIAH, ID—92)

5.9 Multiple/Combined Uses

5.9.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should provide more trails to spread out the various uses.

. . . there are more people using the trails not just motorcycles, but hikers and horsemen also. This concentrates more users into a smaller area. . . . instead of taking miles of trails away we should be looking at ways to add miles or open old trails so our trail systems never go away and as more folks use the trail they can be spread out over a larger area. This would lesson impact by spreading all users out and not concentrating them into a smaller more used area. (Individual, KINGSTON, ID—58)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that bicycles and horses can share the same trails.

With these photos, I am trying to give you an idea of how well bicycles and horses coexist on the same trails. I have well over 20 years of bicycling with horses and around horses and not one conflict; not even a near miss. (Individual, BELGRADE, MT—1)

5.9.2 User Conflicts**The Clearwater National Forest should recognize there are few conflicts on trails where the motorized restrictions are proposed.**

In all these years, I have not seen any problems what so ever between motorcyclists, hikers or horses on these or any trails that are being considered. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—113)

Another one of the reasons for closure was said to be user conflict. In all our years of riding these trails we have not found this to be the case. Other user's while rarely encountered, are friendly and often express appreciation to the motorcycle riders for keeping the trails open. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize there are few conflicts between winter users in areas where restrictions are proposed.

There are no other groups that use these areas in the winter due to the remoteness of the areas for skiers, snowshoers ect. So there are no conflicts between user groups. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—513)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize user conflicts exist in many inventoried roadless areas.

I have visited most of the roadless areas on the CNF and have experienced motorized user conflicts in many of them including Weitas Creek, Pot Mountain, Fish and Hungry Creek and the Kelly Creek roadless area to name a few. These areas must be protected for people and wildlife. (Individual, LA GRANDE, OR—167)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize user conflicts occur in Weitas Creek.

Once on a backpacking trip deep into Weitas Creek country, I encountered three motorcycles. Not only did their noise disturb my wilderness experience, but I was nearly run over. It turned a great day into a sad day! Okay, I exaggerate. I'm never sad in Clearwater country. But it was disconcerting because everyone knows that should those three motorcycles turn into multitude, then indeed something will have gone terribly wrong. Please be careful about policy changes that might lead to this kind of scenario. (Individual, SEATTLE, WA—2811)

In snowmobile season we do not bother the other users of the forest because i have never seen a skier or snowshoer in these areas they have other areas to use with much easier access. If these areas are closed to snowmobiles we will be forced to ride in the same areas as the skiers and then we would probably bother them. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—1428)

The Clearwater National Forest should distinguish between real conflicts versus manufactured conflicts.

It seems that barely a week goes by before some BRC member forwards us an "action alert" from various Wilderness advocacy groups encouraging their members and supporters to send comments to land managers regarding OHV management on federally managed lands.

In order to amplify our concerns of manufactured conflict vs. real conflict, we would like the planning team to consider the following statement by Art Seaman. "In managing outdoor

recreation and responding to assertions of conflict, managers need to objectively determine the seriousness of the alleged conflicts, and allocate the existing recreation opportunity in a balanced and fair manner, in accordance with the land managing agency's broad mandate under law. There is a real conflict and there is manufactured conflict. Managers themselves sometimes jump on the conflict bandwagon, driven by their own biases or striving to be peacemakers.”
(Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide documentation of user conflicts.

There is no known conflict stated by Doug Gober himself at 5:25 p.m. on the day of Dec. 19-2007. If that is the case why fix something that isn't broken. I would like to see proof of conflicts between walkers, riders, and horseback riders. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—117)

We request copies of any documentation of user conflicts in the area and request that it be categorized and weighed against the overall number of visitor-days to the area. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should resolve conflicts in a manner that is fair.

The Travel Planning Process allows closure of a route due to user conflicts. It is our position that such conflict can be resolved by closing the route to either conflicting party. It is inappropriate that conflicts always be resolved by closure to motorized users. Closure to hikers or stock users is an equally effective resolution. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

As someone who rides motorized trail bikes, horses, mtn. bicycles and hikes on forest trails I find this (user conflict) also to be a contrived issue. While on the trail on horseback the worst interactions I have ever had have been with hikers and mtn. bikes. Anti social hikers by hiding in the brush at the approach of horses then moving when you get close to them. Mtn. bikes by coming down hill at a high rate of speed and coming around a blind corner - This situation creates a real hazard. So why doesn't the FS close the trails to hikers and mtn. bikes? Trail bikes are a much better situation because one can hear them coming and be ready.

Somehow CNF staff must summon the ethics to act fairly and equitably in matters of so call "conflict". (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

5.9.3 Safety

The Clearwater National Forest should avoid mixed uses on trails in inventoried roadless areas and recommended wildernesses.

It is wrong for the Forest Service to create safety hazards to backcountry horse and hiking trails by allowing motorcycle use on mainline trails in roadless and proposed wilderness. This creates unnecessary conflicts. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

The Clearwater National Forest should avoid mixed uses on roads.

Having horseman on the Appaloosa ride and vehicles both on the Lolo road caused traffic problems, and blocked the road. Riders told me they prefer to ride on trails. They asked me to ask the CNF to open the remaining National Historic Trail to them, even though it parallels the road in places. Horsemen prefer to travel trails over roads, if given the choice. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

I firmly believe that riding a motorcycle on public roads in the north fork country is dangerous because of lack of consideration and attention by motorists due to the beautiful scenery.
(Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

The Clearwater National Forest should avoid mixed uses on trails.

Also there is a conflict problem with motorcycles and horses/mules and/or Llamas that can lead to a dangerous situation where injury or death can result. In places where there is a steep hillside and drop off; the only option for a motorcycle rider is to plow into a horse or go off the trail because of his speed and inability to stop in time. This has already happened in the loss of one horse in a horse-motorcycle conflict in the Selway Crag country. In another incident one of the horse members of the Clearwater Sheriff's Posse observed fifty motorcycles on the Weitas Creek-Cook Mountain loop. If he had met them on a blind corner with his string of pack mules, there could have been serious consequences. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4104)

Horsemen have been pushed off the trails and no longer have safe areas to ride other than wilderness. (Individual, FORT COLLINS, CO—1732)

The Clearwater National Forest should separate snowmobilers and cross-country skiers.

Leaving high-mountain areas open to snowmobilers makes it safer for cross country skiers to enjoy the forest service roads. I have no problem with leaving some lower forest service roads set aside for cross country skiers; as long as, some forest service roads accessing the high country are left open to snowmobiles. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—1055)

5.10 Environmental Impacts

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize trail restrictions will result in environmental impacts.

Closure of the existing legal use will concentrate riders on a limited number of available trail and will result in increased impacts on these remaining trails. (Individual, LEWISTON, ID—2058)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the impacts of concentrating motorized users into smaller areas.

More and more land is being closed, places that have been family retreats and gatherings for as far back as can be remembered CLOSED because a select group thinks that more people in less area is less impact. On the contrary the more people you put in one small area the greater the impact. (Individual, SALT LAKE CITY, UT – 3120)

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 6—LANDS AND SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS | 1 |
| Summary | 1 |
| 6.1 Public Lands Ownership..... | 2 |
| 6.2 Land Acquisition and Exchange..... | 2 |
| 6.3 Special Designations | 2 |
| 6.4 Remote Backcountry | 3 |
| 6.5 Inventoried Roadless Areas | 3 |
| 6.6 Recommended Wilderness | 4 |
| 6.6.1 General | 4 |
| 6.6.2 Boundaries..... | 5 |
| 6.6.3 Motorized and Mechanized Uses | 5 |
| 6.6.3.1 Uses Are Compatible..... | 5 |
| 6.6.3.2 Uses Are Incompatible | 7 |
| 6.6.4 Specific Recommended Wildernesses..... | 8 |
| 6.7 Designated Wilderness | 9 |
| 6.8 Research Natural Areas | 10 |
| 6.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers | 10 |
| 6.10 Other Designations | 10 |
| 6.10.1 National Protection Area | 11 |
| 6.10.2 National Recreation Trail | 11 |

CHAPTER 6—LANDS AND SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Summary

Chapter 6, Lands and Special Designations, summarizes many perspectives respondents raised regarding the various lands designations.

A number of commenters requested that public lands remain public—available to and shared by all people. Some perceived travel restrictions as closing national forest lands to public uses and therefore not in the public interest.

While commenters generally agreed on the need to protect and conserve Clearwater National Forest lands, they disagreed about whether or not special designations are needed to accomplish that goal. Some believed that if lands are managed “properly” the need for special designation is precluded. Others thought a special designation, such as wilderness, is imperative to ensure protection. Yet others desired wilderness designation plus non-motorized buffer zones.

Comments reflected the ongoing debate about the management of inventoried roadless areas. While some sought to have them managed for multiple uses, including motorized and mechanized recreation, others wanted the roadless character protected and motorized uses excluded.

Strong feelings were also expressed regarding wilderness recommendations. A number of commenters said Idaho has enough wilderness and no new areas should be recommended. Others desired Wilderness designation for more lands. Most commonly mentioned were the Great Burn, Mallard-Larkins and additions to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness.

There was sharp disagreement about the compatibility of motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wilderness. Many arguments were philosophical, although some presented case law to demonstrate motorized and mechanized uses could be allowed in recommended wildernesses. Those arguing for motorized and/or mechanized uses did not think the uses were environmentally damaging or that they precluded the opportunity for future wilderness designation. They also believed proposed restrictions of these uses create “de facto” wilderness. Those supportive of motorized and mechanized restrictions believed the prohibition is needed to preserve the wilderness character of the lands.

As an alternative to wilderness designation, some motorized and mechanized recreationists proposed boundary adjustments, travel corridors and/or National Protection Area status. They said the designation would protect the lands while allowing snowmobile and bicycle uses.

6.1 Public Lands Ownership

The Clearwater National Forest should keep public lands open to the public.

Public lands are exactly that public, yes they need to be managed, no they should not be abused, yes they need to be preserved forever, no they should not be preserved for only some people that can afford the outfitter or horses or the weeks of vacation to see such places on foot. If you want solitude and a wilder experience go to already designated wilderness areas. (Individual, HAILEY, ID—2094)

Public lands such as the Clearwater National Forest are to be shared by all people. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—3187)

Just wondering if this is public land or property of the US government and its friends? (Individual, NO ADDRESS—4028)

This is AMERICA, it is our land, we should be able to use it and take care of it!!! (Individual, TURLOCK, CA—4078)

As a Montana State Rep. for House District 14, I found myself again defending the rights of the public against the Government's movement to close off more public use land. We have been fighting this same issue for many years and it looks like we're going to continue, with no end in site. (State Agency/Elected Official, NO ADDRESS—4265)

6.2 Land Acquisition and Exchange

The Clearwater National Forest should retain public access when lands are exchanged.

Any time there is a land exchange between private and public entities, a public access easement or right-of-way should be required in order to offset the trend of less public access to public land over the past 35+ years and the cumulative negative impact of that trend on multiple-use recreationists. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

6.3 Special Designations

The Clearwater National Forest should be designated a Wildlife, Fish, and Plant Habitat Sanctuary Preserve.

May I suggest that the Clearwater National Forest be established as a Wildlife, Fish, Plant Habitat Sanctuary Preserve. (Individual, MINNEAPOLIS, MN—166)

The Clearwater National Forest should remove special designations from the proposal.

With regard to wilderness areas, roadless areas, national recreation areas, natural landmarks and monuments, and wild, scenic, and recreational rivers, the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service are only authorized to delineate such areas such findings to Congress. Unless and until Congress actually designates such areas under applicable law, such delineations should have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates for management of public lands.

With regard to research and natural areas and scenic by-ways, the BLM and FS can designate such areas; however such designation should have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates. With regard to critical waterways, geological areas, unroaded areas, botanical areas, and national scenic areas, the BLM and FS have no statutory authority to designate and manage such areas. Any such designations can by law have no effect on the multiple use and sustained yield mandates for management of national forests. Accordingly, these "special designations" should be deleted from the proposed alternative. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

6.4 Remote Backcountry

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized uses threaten the character of remote backcountry.

The Clearwater National Forest has some of the most remote land in the lower 48 and the increasing presence of motor vehicles in our backcountry is threatening the unique values that make the Clearwater Country unique. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—528)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in non-roaded, roadless and wilderness areas.

The remaining non-roaded, wild lands, roadless areas and wilderness areas must be fully protected from motorized abuse. (Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—2861)

In addition to the pure aesthetics and pollution concerns of increasing motorized winter use come the safety issues of mixed use on access roads and machines crossing over skiers in alpine areas. Please manage areas proposed for wilderness and currently roadless areas as the non-motorized resources they should remain. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—151)

The Clearwater National Forest is contributing to efforts to “rewild” America.

What you are succeeding at is meeting Earth First! Founder Dave Foreman's (a convicted felon) mandate to rewild half of America by making everything wilderness from Canada to Mexico. As Mr. Foreman's co-conspirator, you are indeed having great success. Shame on you! (Individual, IDAHO FALLS, ID—4111)

6.5 Inventoried Roadless Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should protect all inventoried roadless areas.

All existing roadless areas should be retained as roadless for predator habitat, watershed protection, and general recovery ability. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—79)

Roadless areas should be for habitat protection, wildlife protection, ecosystem function protection, and primitive recreation. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—4379)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect the character of inventoried roadless areas.

Proceeding with travel planning under the 2001 Roadless Rule (or the Idaho Roadless Rule if promulgated), we would caution the Forest Service from designating motorized trails in roadless areas that could jeopardize the roadless characteristics of those areas. Roadless areas are important to wildlife as well as those seeking more traditional forest uses, and we hope you will consider this during the travel planning process. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—6)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the unique attributes of inventoried roadless areas.

Roadless-no road maintenance. Roadless-no motorized "trails." Roadless-non-motorized. The quiet place. A place to honor historic values. Roadless-the second 1/2 of Forest Service land. Roadless- a non-renewable resource. Roadless is simple-it means no roads. Roadless-You earned the right to be here by the sweat it took to get here. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

The (Clearwater) National Forest has a treasure no other place in Idaho can claim, my wild place. This is why teddy Roosevelt began our National Forests, to have a quiet roadless place forever that belongs to not one of us, but all of us. I live in this wild place where you make less income because wild is more important than money to me. Money does not bring me joy or peace or fitness. Wild roadless does. (Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4166)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the uniqueness of the Pot Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area.

Pot Mountain contains important mountain goat habitat and may be the wildest unprotected area on the Clearwater. It has dramatic changes in elevation. (Preservation/Conservation Group, NO ADDRESS—532)

6.6 Recommended Wilderness**6.6.1 General****The Clearwater National Forest should recommend new wilderness areas.**

I am strongly in favor of creating as much new wilderness area as possible, even if that means closing new areas to mountain biking. In general I feel that there are large areas of under utilized lands available for riding. And while I am torn by the trade-off between more protected lands versus lost mountain biking opportunities I must strongly favor the addition of any wilderness that we can get. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—165)

The Clearwater National Forest should protect the character of wilderness quality lands.

Wilderness quality lands have vanished at an astonishing rate since the mid to late 1800s. We must protect this diminishing resource before there is not enough of it to sustain the life that depends on it, including Steelhead, endangered Chinook Salmon, elk, lynx, wolves, and mountain goats among many other animals. (Individual, PALOUSE, WA—928)

Much of the Clearwater potential to become designated wilderness, and we should protect those qualities that make it so. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2772)

When trails are left open to motor vehicles or an area open to snowmobile use within recommended wilderness it serves to promote motorized use, further compromising the Wilderness characteristics and values of recommended Wilderness areas. Managing proposed wilderness areas in this way will provide consistency with the existing motorized closures on the adjacent Lolo National Forest. (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage recommended wildernesses on a site-specific basis.

Areas recommended for Wilderness should be managed on a site-specific basis, not a "one size fits all" regional policy. Recreational uses including snowmobiling in each area should be managed pursuant to the individual Forest Plan with consideration of the current uses and overall goals and objectives for each area. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—529)

The Clearwater National Forest should allow for continued enjoyment of recommended wildernesses.

Because Congress did not require a "freeze", it did not require that only those segments of the Wilderness Study Areas already open to motorized activity should remain so, or that those segments already closed should remain so.... Instead, Congress required that the Forest Service ensure continuing opportunities for enjoyment of the study areas by use of motorized vehicles, as well as continuing opportunities for enjoyment of the study areas' character qua wilderness. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of recommended wildernesses.

In proposing more wildernesses, it will mean more wildfires burning. You won't be putting any of these fires out. More smoke will be in our populated areas; very extreme bad air quality, and trees that will not be making oxygen for our earth. (Individual, DARBY, MT—348)

The Clearwater National Forest should not recommend additional wilderness.

I am opposed to any more wildernesses anywhere. Montana and Idaho already has more than it needs. (Individual, DARBY, MT—348)

... there is so much designated wilderness in the Northwest and particularly in the state of Idaho that there is literally no reason what so ever for anyone to encounter motorized recreationists if they choose not to. (Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080)

As stewards of the public lands in Idaho, I strongly encourage you to keep this beautiful space open to all forms of outdoor recreation. This includes snowmobiles and motorcycles. By changing the designation to Wilderness, you effectively close out multiple users from using their own public lands. Please don't cater to the few loud voices of the extremists just to take the easy way. Keep our land open for all users. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2500)

6.6.2 Boundaries**The Clearwater National Forest should adjust recommended wilderness boundaries**

I would like to request a realignment of the boundaries of the area recommended for wilderness in the Plan to mitigate the loss of mountain bike trails in those areas. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—4351)

I feel the boundaries need to be adjusted on the Montana-Idaho state line trail #738. The boundaries NEED to be pushed BACK to Superior-Ninemile ranger district boundary line. To EXCLUDE the Montana Heart Lake Basin from your wilderness Proposal. Or designate the proposed wilderness as a NATIONAL PROTECTION AREA. (Individual, SUPERIOR, MT—2467)

It is said that the areas I listed above (Hoodoo, Surveyor, Beaver Ridge, Tom Beal and Elk Summit) only take up 8% of the total area proposed for wilderness. EIGHT PERCENT! Adjusting the boundaries would not take away a huge amount of the proposed wilderness, and it would keep allowing for more people to enjoy these areas to the fullest. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1437)

The Clearwater National Forest should explain changes in the boundaries of recommended wildernesses.

On the maps showing the recommended wilderness, the boundary near Pollock Ridge has been moved from what was shown on earlier maps. Pollock Ridge trail was clearly out of the recommended wilderness area on earlier maps, but seems to be within the RWA now. Was there another study or survey done for this map change? If there was, please send the dates and all pertinent information regarding the RWA boundary change.

Also the RWA boundary seems to have changed along the Little North Fork. The earlier maps showed the boundary east of Bear Creek, but now the boundary has moved to the West of Bear Creek. Was this area also surveyed? If so, please provide all pertinent information regarding this matter. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—1078)

6.6.3 Motorized and Mechanized Uses**6.6.3.1 Uses Are Compatible****The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that motorized uses are compatible with recommended wilderness status.**

The assumption seems to be that motorized recreation is automatically incompatible with RWA's. This is incorrect. Our recreation pursuits are unquestionably incompatible with designated wilderness, but may well be compatible with recommended wilderness. The test is whether or not

the specific motorized activity somehow compromises the area's future designation as wilderness. The fact that motorized recreation use has taken place in a roadless area has never slowed Congress from designating them as wilderness in the past. The Gospel-Hump Wilderness had trails and roads that were very popular with motorized recreationists, summer and winter. The Seven Devils portion of the Hells Canyon Wilderness was one of Idaho's most popular single-track riding areas, with all of the major trails maintained for bikes. Snow machines have never been shown to have discernable impacts on the RWAs in today's forest plans, yet we are being denied access to them. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize there is no legal mandate to prohibit motorized access in recommended wilderness.

There is nothing in law, regulation or recent court decisions that require U.S. Forest Service to prohibit motorized access in RWAs. To the contrary; recent court ruling suggest the agency should continue motorized uses in areas previously authorized for motorized use. Indeed, court rulings explicitly reject any claim the agency is compelled to restrict motorized access. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—529)

May 21, 2001 US District Judge Donald Malloy made a ruling on motorized use in the WSAs. Judge Molloy on page 12 of his order stated:

Congress did not require a "freeze" of all activity. It contemplated that use levels might fluctuate and that the types of motorized vehicles might change. Congress intended that existing and new or different uses should be accommodated, so long as they did not undermine an area's potential for Wilderness designation and so long as they did not undermine the area's presently existing Wilderness character.

This ruling should be applied to Proposed Wilderness and Road-less areas. We cannot find any study that was accomplished, on the Clearwater Forest that would require a closure do to resource damage or harm that would preclude it from becoming Designated Wilderness, if Congress so decides. (Motorized Recreation Group, WHITEFISH, MT—1850)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized and mechanized uses do not preclude wilderness designation.

Motorcycle, snowmobile and mountain bike use has never precluded any area in Idaho from becoming Wilderness. The Hells Canyon Wilderness, the Gospel Hump Wilderness, and the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness all had prior motorcycle and snowmobile use prior to designation. (State Agency/Elected Official, BOISE, ID—718)

According to a decision by the U.S. District Court, Congress requires the U.S. Forest Service by law to maintain a balance between wilderness protection and motorized use in Wilderness Study Areas. Given that Congress rightly expected continued motorized use in WSAs, what is the legal basis by which the Forest Service is attempting to exclude motorized use in the suggested Recommended Wilderness Areas?

In existing legislation, Congress designated areas as Wilderness that in fact contained motorized use areas, structures, maintained roads and sections of paved roads. (Individual, DENVER CO—1940)

The Clearwater National Forest should not alter uses on existing trails to retain wilderness character.

The Forest should not be altering existing uses on trails, such as eliminating 81 miles of motorcycle use, in order to retain the character of lands recommended for Wilderness. Either the lands presently have Wilderness character or they do not. (Individual, RIDGWAY, CO—3597)

The Clearwater National Forest should not restrict mechanical and motorized uses in recommended wildernesses.

I would like to offer the following comments to your plan to eliminate mountain bikes and motorized users from Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWA). This would result in Wilderness areas by decree. This is NOT how Congress set up the process to determine what is and what isn't a wilderness area. (Individual, GRANITE, CO—2273)

SAWS (Snowmobile Alliance of Western States) contends that snowmobile activities, which currently exist in RWAs, in no way could possibly "compromise wilderness values of the potential wilderness area", and therefore these areas must remain open to snowmobile use. (Motorized Recreation, RENTON, WA—2939)

The Clearwater National Forest should not change traditional travel in recommended wildernesses until the land is designated as wilderness.

There is no need to change the travel plan in proposed wilderness. When it becomes or if it becomes wilderness then manage it as such. In the meantime leave it alone. If it is managed as wilderness and it never becomes wilderness a precedent is set and nothing mechanical or motorized will ever be allowed. (Individual, PIERCE, ID—86)

There have been concerns mentioned about protecting Wilderness characteristics in the Kelly Creek area. We would like to point out that over 30 years of motorized access has not done anything to degrade this area or keep it from being considered as potential future wilderness, until such time that Congress creates a wilderness in this area we think that historical uses should be allowed including motorized access. There are those that believe these trail closures are nothing more but a movement towards "de facto wilderness." (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

6.6.3.2 Uses Are Incompatible**The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized and mechanized uses in recommended wildernesses.**

. . . the plan to close proposed wilderness to machine use in both summer and winter is a good and even necessary idea. It means that CNF management will match that of the Lolo NF. It means that, in the long run, conflict within these areas, places that will, some day, certainly be classified as Wilderness, will be reduced, and reduced now. (Individual, MOSCOW, ID—321)

We commend the CNF's Proposed Action for prohibiting over-snow vehicles (OSVs) on approximately 200,000 acres of Recommended Wilderness and proposed additions to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness. This is a very positive step and serves as an essential minimum baseline for limiting motorized use in potential wilderness. We strongly urge you to keep intact these closures throughout the planning process and into the final decision. (Preservation/Conservation Group, BOISE, ID—343)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict over snow vehicles from recommended wildernesses.

IDFG supports restrictions for over snow vehicle use in areas recommended for Wilderness, as well as to reduce disturbance to wildlife in some winter range. (State Agency/Elected Official, LEWISTON, ID—702)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage off-road vehicles in recommended wildernesses.

Off-road vehicles, which are generally prohibited in designated wilderness areas, but frequently enjoyed within proposed wilderness areas, must be properly and effectively managed by the

Forest Service in non-wilderness areas, including proposed or recommended wilderness areas. (Motorized Recreation Group, NO ADDRESS—505)

6.6.4 Specific Recommended Wildernesses

The Clearwater National Forest should recommend the Great Burn for wilderness designation.

I have recreated in the Great Burn, both in MT and ID, all my adult life. This is a very special and pristine area which harbors many species of wildlife. It deserves a wilderness status. If it experiences the continued degradation from motorized use, I am afraid its wilderness status could be lost forever. (Individual, LOLO, MT—4187)

I am writing in support of your proposed ban of all motorized use in the Great Burn Proposed Wilderness Study Area. This is the best possible decision you make for the Great Burn! (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2358)

The Clearwater National Forest should manage the Great Burn, including Cayuse Creek, as recommended wilderness.

Cayuse Creek was included as part of the Great Burn Wilderness in legislation in the early 1990's. The Cayuse Creek watershed needs to be managed as a Forest Plan B-2 Management Area (recommended Wilderness). (Preservation/Conservation Group, SPOKANE, WA—4306)

The Clearwater National Forest should not recommend the Great Burn area for wilderness designation.

I have been into the Great Burn area in both summer and winter. It is probably one of the poorest examples of a wilderness area you can find. It is roaded up, and has mines, it is burned up, and the only people that use it in the winter are snowmobilers because, unless they helicopter in, it is too far and hard of a climb to get in any other way. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2532)

The Clearwater National Forest should remove the Idaho portion of the Great Burn and the Elk Summit areas from recommended wilderness status.

It is our opinion that the Idaho portion of the Great Burn and the Elk Summit addition to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness should be removed from the RWA status. Some of our members have ridden the Elk Summit-Tom Beal park area for over 30 years. Many of our members and colleagues from Montana ride the length of the divide between Montana and Idaho in the Great Burn. On the south end of the Great Burn experienced snowmobilers enjoy extreme riding in the areas of Williams Peak, Rhodes Peak, Shale Mountain, Leo Lake, Smoky Lake and Kid Lake.

Nothing is lost by removing RWA status from these areas. They can be managed as they are today with no negative resource impacts. In the meantime the motorized/mechanized recreationists who so highly value these areas can continue to enjoy them. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2438)

The Clearwater National Forest should not recommend the Elk Summit area as an addition to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness.

It is our considered opinion, as stated in our earlier comments, that the entire Elk Summit addition to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, including Tom Beal Park, should be removed from RWA status. It fails to meet even the basic criteria for future designation with its extensive evidence of human use and man's work (roads and structures). It has a long history of motorized winter recreation use reaching back into the 1960's. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—1422)

Both Idaho and Montana snowmobilers use the Elk Summit area. Those areas where snowmobile use takes place should be dropped from the RWA. (Motorized Recreation Group, BOISE, ID—2932)

6.7 Designated Wilderness

The Clearwater National Forest should manage public lands so wilderness designation is not needed.

Please note that my family and I enjoy recreating on Public Lands multiple times each year. Wilderness designation within our forest will only serve to protect the land from people, not for the people. Properly managing our Public Lands for the people is preferred. (Individual, SAN JOSE, CA—2022)

The U.S. Congress should designate specific lands as wilderness.

I urge that each of the following areas with acres be designated as Wilderness:

Mallard Larkins-396,000, Hoodoo-375,000, Meadow Creek, Upper North Fork 93,000, Siwash-17,000, Pot Mountain-78,000, Moose Mountain-36,000, Bighorn Weitas 357,000, North Lochsa Slope-174,000, Weir Post office Creek-38,000, North Fork Spruce Whitesand-54,000, Lochsa Face-114,000, Eldorado Creek 15,000, Rawhide-11,000, Sneak foot Meadows-39,000, Lolo Creek-27,000, Rackliff Gedney-141,000 (Individual, MINNEAPOLIS, MN—166)

The Clearwater National Forest should limit motorized uses near wilderness boundaries.

Please try to limit motorized use near the wilderness boundary as people will invariably violate the boundary. (Individual, DIXIE, ID—3767)

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in “buffer areas” around designated and recommended wildernesses.

I would encourage the use of buffer areas around proposed wilderness and wilderness areas to help ensure compliance. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2629)

The Clearwater National Forest should not recommend more lands for wilderness designation.

By making the land "wilderness" the rights of Americans are being taken away from many people to go into the back country and enjoy what this great country has to offer. Many people cannot take a week off work to go backpacking for 25-50 miles in the back country. By allowing motorized vehicles into these areas, a greater number of people can enjoy the mountains in a more spread out area. I can cover more ground and get to many more places on four wheelers and snowmobiles in one day than anyone can cover hiking in a week. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—130)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize that bicyclists support wilderness designation.

The Region One forest planning policy, banning bicycles from recommended wilderness, has pigeonholed bicyclists as opponents to wilderness. This is an unfortunate and untrue side effect of the policy. Most bicyclists actually support and enjoy wilderness, and ride in the wild zones near wilderness because the feelings and experience is similar. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

6.8 Research Natural Areas

The Clearwater National Forest should restrict motorized uses in Research Natural Areas.

All Research Natural Areas need to be closed to vehicles, as do riparian areas (RHCAs). (Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937)

6.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Clearwater National Forest should designate specific streams as Wild and Scenic Rivers.

I urge that each of the following Streams be designated as a National Wild River, and from source to mouth: Hungry Creek, Forth of July Creek, Hemlock Creek, Kelly Creek, Cayuse Creek, North Fork of the Clearwater (River) Strychnine Creek, Poorman Creek, Torpid Creek Cloverleaf Creek, Squaw Creek, Papoose Creek, Parachute Creek, Palouse River, Potlatch River, Beaver Creek, Walton Creek Weitas Creek, Isabella Creek, Quartz Creek, Fenn Creek, Elk Creek, Salmon Creek, Orofino Creek, Lolo Creek, Eldorado Creek, Walde Creek, Crooked Fork Creek, White Sands Creek, Pete King Creek, Canyon Creek, Deadman Creek, (and) Fish Creek. (Individual, MINNEAPOLIS, MN—166)

6.10 Other Designations

The Clearwater National Forest should consider alternative special lands designations.

The inclusion of bicycles in Proposed Wilderness Designated area travel restrictions puts me in an awkward position of opposing a move toward permanent protection of the land. If an alternate designation that would accomplish what the Wilderness Act does and protects bicycle access could be developed, I would be extremely happy. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—1904)

There are other options available that can protect the area while still allowing people to enjoy the area (Great Burn). These options include designating it a national conservation area, a national protection area and/or a national scenic area. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—319)

Alternative land designations such as National Protection Area, National Recreation Area, and National Conservation Area should be explored. Wilderness is not precluded in these designations, but integrated where appropriate.

One can picture the Mallard Larkins / Great Burn National Protection Area. A large patchwork of well respected lands mixed with wilderness, managed for sustainability, and accepted by a broad cross-section of the public. (Recreation Group, BOZEMAN, MT—516)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider a “1E Primitive Lands” designation for the Great Burn area.

I am writing this in regards to the travel plan for the Great Burn area along the Idaho Montana border.

That designation is 1E primitive lands. It has the wilderness feel but still allows the traditional use of snowmobiles in the great burn. Particularly Goose Lake, Fish Lake and the Kelly Creek area. These areas are also important to me from the Mountain biking standpoint. I love to ride bikes and sleds in these areas because it is challenging. And you don't see other users in there. Please take a look at this designation and it is already here in Idaho. (Individual, COEUR D ALENE, ID—2400)

6.10.1 National Protection Area

The Clearwater National Forest should consider National Protection Area designation for areas recommended as wilderness.

Congress is responsible for the designation of wilderness. There has not been a wilderness designated in the West for years. It is obvious that this land designation is ineffective, polarizing and a waste of taxpayers resources. I would request that these areas be designated as a Protected Area with limited motorized use and management. The level of use in these areas is usually increased with the designation of wilderness because trailheads are developed, roads improved to provide access. (Individual, LOLO, MT—2551)

I believe a good way to satisfy all parties concerned would be to make the area a "National Protection Area" where rules could be set to closely protect the assets involved. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2926)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider National Protection Area designation for areas historically used by backcountry snowmobilers.

I personally, as well as the membership of the Missoula Snowmobile Club, strongly believe that establishing boundaries around the areas historically used by backcountry snowmobilers (specific range, township, and section of each area are clearly noted in our club comment) and designating them as a NATIONAL PROTECTION AREA is an equitable "middle ground" solution for all parties. I am not an expert on the fine points of National Protection Area designation but what information I have found it appears a NATIONAL PROTECTION AREA is defined quite similar to Wilderness designation, the exception: allowing bicycle and and snowmobile use and some mechanized trail maintenance. One example of an existing area designated as a NATIONAL PROTECTION AREA is an area known as JAMES PEAK in Colorado. (Motorized Recreation Group, MISSOULA, MT—327)

6.10.2 National Recreation Trail

The Clearwater National Forest should develop a network of national recreation trails for motorized users.

We request a network of national recreation trails for motorized recreationists equivalent to the Continental Divide Trail (CDT), Pacific Crest Trail, National Recreation Trail and other national non-motorized trails that travel a long distance and interconnect with other forests such as the Backcountry Discovery Trail, the Modoc Backcountry Discovery Trail, and the California State Motorized Trail System and the Idaho Centennial Trail. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

| | |
|--|---|
| CHAPTER 7—SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS | 1 |
| 7.0 Summary | 1 |
| 7.1 Social | 2 |
| 7.1.1 General | 2 |
| 7.1.2 Physical Limitations Related to Age | 2 |
| 7.1.3 Physical Limitations Related to Disability | 2 |
| 7.1.4 Discrimination | 3 |
| 7.1.5 Families | 3 |
| 7.1.6 Future Generations | 3 |
| 7.1.7 Health | 4 |
| 7.1.8 Traditional Uses..... | 5 |
| 7.1.9 Working Users..... | 5 |
| 7.2 Economic..... | 5 |
| 7.2.1 General | 5 |
| 7.2.2 Businesses | 5 |
| 7.2.3 Communities | 6 |
| 7.2.4 Local/Rural Economies | 7 |
| 7.2.5 States | 8 |

CHAPTER 7—SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

7.0 Summary

Chapter 7, Social and Economic Considerations, summarizes the comments that were received regarding social and economic issues and concerns.

A number of comments reflected, or directly addressed, people's values. Some valued the Forest for its intrinsic values and processes and tended to favor preservation and non-motorized opportunities. Others valued the Forest for its benefits to humans. In general, they tended to favor use and motorized opportunities. Many of the comments appeared to be rooted in these two divergent world views.

For some, the travel planning proposal violated a sense of fairness. They thought the proposal to restrict motorized access in some places was not fair to the elderly or the disabled who did not have the physical ability to access the Forest via non-motorized methods. Others said the proposal was unfair to working individuals who did not have the time to access much of the Forest using non-motorized means. Some believed the proposal placed an unfair economic burden on people because some individuals would have to hire someone like an outfitter and guide to access certain forest areas. In contrast, others believed the proposal was fair because it provided more non-motorized "quiet" opportunities, corrected a situation whereby motorized uses had become established without proper National Environmental Policy Act analyses and contributed to the preservation of the Forest.

A number of commenters believed the proposal would deter family outings or discourage young people from spending time in the Forest. Some described the joy afforded by traditional family motorized outings and lamented that the proposal would eliminate or limit travel to traditional locations via traditional means. Others countered that the proposed restrictions preserved the national forest for future generations and made it possible for families to share non-motorized experiences. They also reminisced about their families' non-motorized experiences. Some commenters believed encouraging non-motorized recreation benefited society by encouraging exercise and discouraging oil consumption.

Some respondents speculated about the economic ramifications of the proposal. They were concerned that proposed restrictions would have adverse impacts to local businesses and communities, many of which were already struggling due to declines in the timber industry. In Idaho, commenters were concerned about the impacts of proposed motorcycle restrictions on the towns of Orofino, Pierce and Weippe. In Montana, commenters said snowmobile restrictions could have adverse effects on Lolo, Lolo Hot Springs, Superior and Alberton. Some believed the economic ripples would be felt by the states of Idaho and Montana. On the other hand, some respondents saw economic opportunities and an economic future in non-motorized recreation and believed local economies could adapt to the proposal.

A number of requests for specific social and economic data and analyses are presented in Chapter 2 of this report.

7.1 Social

7.1.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should consider a variety of social factors.

The evaluation must adequately consider the growing popularity of motorized recreation, the aging population and their needs for motorized access, and the increased recreation time that the aging population has and looked forward to enjoying public lands in their motor vehicles. (Motorized Recreation Group, HELENA, MT—138)

The Clearwater National Forest should be managed so there are no traces of human visitation.

We want to be able to enter the forest and leave it again with no trace that we have been there. That means no ruts, no new trails hacked through the vegetation and no other disturbance to show that man has intruded. (Individual, PORTLAND, OR—1300)

7.1.2 Physical Limitations Related to Age

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access for older people.

By closing the trails you are discriminating against the older people who would like to see the country now that they have time and paid all those taxes and fees through the years to help pay for the trails. (Individual, BURLEY, ID—4346)

As we get older, we are not able to hike as much so riding the 4-wheelers allows us to get into places we would not be able to otherwise. Please keep the roads and trails of the Clearwater and all other areas in Idaho open to motorized vehicles. It would be a shame for us to not be able to enjoy the forest and scenery of our own state. (Individual, POST FALLS, ID—3970)

I am a 69 year old Veteran and I have a hard time walking. If you take away my motorized transportation I will never be able to see the out doors any more. I enjoy going in to the out doors as often as I can. (Individual, GREEN RIVER, WY—1573)

As a general comment, I would like to state that as I age, access to back country areas by motorized means is becoming the only way I can manage. I no longer have the time due to a demanding work schedule or the physical ability due to the aging process, yet being able to visit remote and un-commercialized and un-crowded areas is becoming increasingly important as a way to experience nature and to recharge. The overly restrictive nature of wilderness and wilderness study areas would make this access impossible for me and for many like me. (Individual, SANTA BARBARA, CA—1602)

7.1.3 Physical Limitations Related to Disability

The Clearwater National Forest should provide access for individuals with physical limitations.

Please use common sense and avoid implementation of a “no motorized activity” policy on the Clearwater.

As a senior citizen with a replaced hip, I resent the attitude which regulates public lands to be accessible to only the wealthy and those in a physically superior status. (Individual, MERIDIAN, ID—2376)

It hurts to think that our great state is trying to limit the access that I have to the great Idaho forests that I call home. I have a father that is disabled by the loss of a leg and by using the

access of OHV's we can once again go out into the world that my father has raised me in and the land that I love to see. (Individual, BOISE, ID—3656)

I am handicapped and use an atv to get around to see my country and by eliminating atv use in these areas you have violated my right to see this land that I fought for. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—3536)

7.1.4 Discrimination

The Clearwater National Forest should not discriminate against motorized users.

Limiting access to many of the trails in the Clearwater National Forest discriminates against the disabled people who aren't exactly physically fit or have injury's that don't allow them to hike for many miles. Sure, if they can ride a motorcycle or an ATV then they can ride a horse. The fact of the matter is that most of these people live in urban places and don't have the space for two to five horses needed to take the whole family on a trip to the backcountry. That's why they ride motorcycles. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—62)

Managing public land for the benefit of those very few who are young and strong or own horses is exclusionary at best and might even be a violation of ADA laws. (Motorized Recreation Group, MERIDIAN, ID—1423)

I am 60 years old and have been riding dirt bikes for 45 years. This means I have put up with relentless persecution by tree-huggers for 45 years. Persecution is wrong. It doesn't make any difference whether it is over race, religion or how we use the forest. I feel that your proposed trail closures amount to nothing but persecution of dirt bikers. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—2913)

7.1.5 Families

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of off-road riding to families.

Off road riding has become good clean fun families can do together. Closing areas and eliminating these kinds of activities will only reduce family experience and leave kids with other activities that are not of interest to the community. My family of 5 enjoys camping and riding in the NW and are respectful of the environment. We have met many others who enjoy the same activities and are also very family oriented. (Individual, VANCOUVER, WA—1616)

I am very much for off-road vehicles because they are an inexpensive, great way for families to interact with each other while enjoying the outdoors. And in our society today with kids really knowing nothing but video games, internet, and not knowing the freedom of playing outside like many of us were able to do growing up, the wilderness is becoming even more important. (Individual, MIDDLETON, ID—4070)

7.1.6 Future Generations

The Clearwater National Forest should be preserved for future generations.

The Clearwater National Forest is a rare and very valuable piece of land in our overdeveloped nation, and should receive a greater measure of protection in order to preserve its remaining nature for future generations. (Individual, PULLMAN, WA—2989)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide motorized recreation opportunities for future generations.

We just discovered we are going to be first time grandparents, and you are telling me, my grandchildren can not, and possibly will not, be able to enjoy the same wonderful memories my children and us experienced for twenty seven years? (Individual, OROFINO, ID—351)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide winter motorized recreation opportunities for future generations.

Winter outdoor motorized recreation needs to be preserved for this and future generations. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—235)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide traditional motorcycle recreation opportunities for future generations.

This proposed change will also hinder future generations to enjoy these areas via motorcycle like many generations have in the past. Many traditions have formed, like yearly motorcycle rides, father/son fishing trips on the Weitas Creek, and family outings that involve riding on these trails. If portion or all parts of these trails are closed many people's lives will be negatively affected and many of mine and families like mine will lose an important part of their life. Both past and future. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—356)

It (riding motorcycles) keeps our children strong so that they do not need to get a high from drugs or gangs to belong. Riding motorcycles teaches children and adults to face your fears so you do not need to prove yourself in other more destructive ways. (Individual, FREMONT, CA—2505)

The Clearwater National Forest should provide non-motorized recreation opportunities for future generations.

We will continue to hike the trails and carry our packs until that is no longer possible. It will become our greatest joy to know that our grandchildren, and their children, will be discovering for themselves those forests, rivers and peaks that have brought us so much happiness. We deeply appreciate your effort to limit motorized and mechanized use. (Individual, ARLEE, MT—1260)

The Clearwater National Forest should consider the impacts of trail closures on young people.

I would like to ask anybody and everybody to consider what closing the trails will actually do to our young generation. We have been able to enjoy the trails and forest all our life and if we take these opportunities away from our children what will they have to do with there lives (but) sit at home and watch TV, play destructive video games, go out at night and get in unlawful trouble. We can go on and on but the bottom line is our younger generation needs help now and in the future giving them the opportunity to hike, backpack, fish, and ride motorcycles/ATV's. (Individual, DALTON GARDENS, ID—2417)

7.1.7 Health

The Clearwater National Forest should encourage physical activity.

Obesity is encouraged in people that sit and ride all day. You don't lose weight be sitting on a spouting, polluting loud engine all day. Get people out to move their limbs and they will be healthier. The Health Department says to move to improve your health. (Individual, FLORHAM PARK, NJ—99)

With the obesity epidemic getting worse every year across American, is it not the job the Clearwater National Forest to encourage Americans to ride bikes as opposed to closing 178 miles of trails to them. (Individual, BOISE, ID—2363)

7.1.8 Traditional Uses

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the tradition associated with off-highway vehicle recreation.

OHV recreation is a tradition and heritage passed on to us by our fathers who fought in WWII. After returning home, they purchased surplus military jeeps and newly invented Tote Goat (invented in 1945) scooters to access many back country roads and trails that are now locked up in guaranteed-to-burn wilderness areas and other unjustified closed areas.

OHV recreation is not only a form of recreation but it's also a way of life we have a right to enjoy with family and friends on as many trails as absolutely possible as long as we do it responsibly. You folks have a responsibility to carry out the public trust in managing the forest equally for motorized recreation at least as much as for non-motorized recreation, but unfortunately you have tragically failed. (Individual, IDAHO FALLS, ID—4111)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize walking and horseback riding as the traditional ways of accessing national forests.

I value natural sounds and solitude. Traditional uses such as walking and riding horseback should be preferred way to visit and enjoy our National Forests. (Individual, LA Grande, OR—167)

7.1.9 Working Users

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of trail restrictions on working users.

... by restricting and closing these areas (trail systems) the working class user that only has weekends off would never be able to enjoy some of these areas because of not having enough time on a weekend to hike or walk in far enough to enjoy the whole trail system. (Individual, KINGSTON, ID—58)

7.2 Economic

7.2.1 General

The Clearwater National Forest should discourage oil consumption.

In this time of \$100/barrel oil, and soon to be \$3.50/gallon gas, isn't it time we put the brakes on motor vehicle use anyway? (Individual, PORTLAND, OR—1298)

7.2.2 Businesses

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of tourism to local businesses.

The infusion of tourist dollars are critical to maintain the viability of many of our regional small business. Our members know that these tourist come from many other states to experience the recreation opportunities available in Clearwater County. (Business, WEIPPE, ID—2734)

Our Clearwater County Communities have suffered greatly from the reduced availability of timber harvests. Our economy needs tourist dollars to maintain basic community services. Many of our guests come to this region because of the availability of numerous off highway motor vehicle trails. Tourists who trailer in or rent off highway vehicles also spend dollars in many local businesses that a backpacker or even horse riders would. The non-motorized user of backcountry trails is likely to have specialty equipment and light weight provisions that would

likely be purchased outside of the local area. Further restrictions of motorized vehicle use in the Clearwater National Forest is detrimental to our business and not required to achieve the USFS Travel Plan objectives. (Business, PIERCE, ID—2548)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of off-highway vehicle use to local businesses.

Lastly the economic impact cannot be ignored. Hundreds of people and millions of dollars are involved in the off-road community. The Forest Service has a responsibility to consider the impact on local business during the determination of access. (Individual, HAYDEN, ID—701)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of snowmobile use to local businesses.

My family and friends very much enjoy snowmobiling and frequently go to these areas. When we do go we all buy gas at the local gas stations, get food for lunches, we stop at local restaurants for dinner afterwards. If you reduce the areas that we can go I know it will affect the local businesses that rely on snowmobilers for their livelihood. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—1427)

. . . I own a snowmobile parts business in Idaho and depend on snowmobiling and Idaho snowmobilers for my business to survive. This, as well as other recent closures is really hurting my business as well as the many other snowmobile businesses in the area. This closure in particular will most certainly end several jobs in the area and hurt our fragile snowmobile based economy. (Business, BOISE, ID—2557)

I find that this travel plan will harm what we are trying accomplish-to build on tourism-by limiting our winter recreation for tourism. As you know, it is important for the small business owners in our area to stay open during the long winter months. (State Agency/Elected Official, NO ADDRESS—4265)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize motorized recreation benefits local businesses more than non-motorized recreation.

Motorized recreation has a positive impact on several businesses in the local area. There are fewer non motorized recreation individuals and they do not impact as many local businesses. They often purchase backpacking or skiing specially items that are only available outside our rural area and they do not spend as much in our communities. (Business, WEIPPE, ID—2734)

Our Clearwater County Communities have suffered greatly from the reduced availability of timber harvests. Our economy needs tourist dollars to maintain basic community services. Tourists who trailer in or rent off highway vehicles also spend dollars in many local businesses that a non-motorize vehicle tourist would not. (Business, WEIPPE, ID—2734)

7.2.3 Communities

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on the communities of Pierce, Orofino and Weippe, Idaho.

The economic effects on communities such as Pierce, Orofino, Weippe and others, where designated routes are not identified, will be significant. (Motorized Recreation Group, LEWISTON, ID—339)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on the communities of Pierce and Weippe, Idaho.

I am writing this email as the President of the Pierce-Weippe Chamber of Commerce. At our general meeting on January 9, 2008, the consensus of the members present was that restricting motorized vehicles in the National Forest was detrimental to business in our two communities.

The members voted unanimously to express our opposition to the motor vehicle restrictions in the proposed Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan. (Business, WEIPPE, ID—2734)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the impacts of the proposal on the community of Pierce, Idaho

Pierce is a major launching point for people visiting that area of the Clearwater National Forest. Much of our business is supplemented by these visitors going out to ride these trails. As the timber industry in the area is not what it use to be, this business from these visitors are very important to our business and this community. We are not the only business that will be affected negatively. (Business, NO ADDRESS—2633)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on small towns in Montana.

There is a very large economic impact to small towns such as Superior. Restaurants, Bars, Gas stations, Motel, Grocery store, Mechanics and Parts stores to name a few stand to have large loses if these areas are closed to snowmobiling in the Hoodoo area. (Individual, NO ADDRESS—2739)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on the towns of Superior and Alberton, Montana.

The towns of Superior and Alberton are located at access points to Hoodoo and Surveyor for snowmobilers. There are people from all over the United States that come to Montana to snowmobile in these areas. Closure of these highly sought after areas will have a significant impact on these communities that cannot be mitigated with other recreational activities because these areas are too remote for other winter uses. (Individual, LOLO, MT—2551)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on the towns of Lolo and Lolo Hot Springs, Montana.

The town of Lolo and Lolo Hot Springs Resort rely on winter recreation (the majority of which is snowmobiles) for a major part of there revenues. The closure of Tom Beal, Beaver Ridge and Elk Summit will have a significant impact on these businesses. (Individual, LOLO, MT—2551)

Limiting the areas for recreation in the National Forest will have a negative impact on our business. Our business depends upon snowmobile recreation during the winter months to survive. We have customers coming from all over the US to snowmobile in the Lolo Pass Area. Lolo Hot Springs Resort is dependent upon recreation on the public lands of the Clearwater National Forest and we would request that you consider the impact of limiting access to these areas to snowmobiling. (Business, LOLO, MT—2883)

7.2.4 Local/Rural Economies

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of motorized recreation to rural economies.

Motorized recreation is a huge economic engine that generates billions of dollars of sales and services, and tens of thousands of jobs. Recreation tourism is fast becoming one of the few sources of revenues for small, rural communities like those found in the region of the Clearwater National Forest (Business, CALDWELL, ID—2846)

We feel that trourism is a top priority for our area's economy, and hope that we will continue to have places for all visitors to recreate. (Business, OROFINO, ID—4465)

Motorized OHVs (off highway vehicle) owners represent a valuable resource for local economies. Please, PROMOTE motorized use of our area, and do not continue to remove the Clearwater National Forest from anyone's tourist plans for the future. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—700)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the importance of recreation in rural economies where timber industry has declined.

The drastic cutbacks in timber harvest by the Forest Service were devastating to the economy of Clearwater County. Since then, we have taken steps to rebuild our economy. One of these steps includes businesses that support motorized recreationists. The local OHV dealers are one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy.

The local motels, restaurants, gas stations, parts houses all seen an increase in business related to OHV users. There are even businesses being developed that will take people out on guided OHV tours.

We are a proud and independent people in Clearwater County and would love to be able to provide for ourselves but increased restrictions to OHV travel will make it harder to do that. (County Government, OROFINO, ID—925)

The Forest Service is a very big reason the economy of the Clearwater region is in the situation it is in. Logging has been reduced to such a small amount of the economy; some other source of revenue is required to bring the region out of the slump. The biggest resource that is available at this time is motorized recreation. The country and many business's see the OHV potential for much needed funds. (Motorized Recreation Group, OROFINO, ID—4380)

The economic impact of the area would be another blow by the hand of the Forest Service. The Forest Service has allowed the forestry industry to dwindle to the point of non existence. They told us that nothing could be done so we better rely on tourism and recreation. Where these empty words or does the Forest Service really support our area? I do not believe that there will be a corresponding increase in non-motorized use to offset the reduction of motorized use. (Individual, OROFINO, ID—1085)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the need for local economies to evolve.

If fewer folks want to buy and ride machines because of concentrated use—no offense to you dealers out there, your days are numbered anyway—I think that's great. Local economies need to evolve along a substantial path anyway. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—151)

7.2.5 States

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic impacts of the proposal on the states of Idaho and Montana.

We register our machines with your state and your decision will have an economical impact for both Idaho and Montana. (Individual, POLSON, MT—323)

I believe that the tourism that the area brings into both States of Idaho and Montana are very important to the local economies, therefore that should be considered when proposing future travel plans. (Individual, LOLO, MT—2759)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the revenue to the state of Idaho that is generated by Montana snowmobilers.

The revenue coming into Idaho from out of state registration tags helps upkeep trails and other maintenance throughout the national forest. Coming from Missoula, if the Clearwater area is closed I will not be interested in riding Idaho. Therefore I will have no need to purchase a registration every year. I know a lot of other snowmobilers feel the same way. (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2690)

The Clearwater National Forest should recognize the economic contributions of bicycles to the Montana economy.

Nearly 150,000 Montanans ride bicycles off-road each year, translating into a per capita rate that ranks eighth nationally. Last year, bicycling in Montana generated more than \$58 million on equipment and trip-related expenditures (Outdoor Industry Foundation). (Individual, MISSOULA, MT—761)

APPENDIX A—ACRONYMS

Although the agency has tried to avoid using acronyms in this report, many respondents opted to use acronyms in their comments. Report writers generally opted not to change the acronyms or add parenthetical notations. This list is provided to provide clarification for readers.

| | |
|--------|--|
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| AKA | Also Known As |
| ATV | All-terrain Vehicle |
| BHA | Backcountry Hunters and Anglers |
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| BRC | Blue Ribbon Coalition |
| CAA | Clean Air Act |
| CBU | Citizens for Balanced Use |
| CNF | Clearwater National Forest |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| DEIS | Draft Environmental Impact Statement |
| EA | Environmental Assessment or Environmental Analysis |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| FEIS | Final Environmental Impact Statement |
| FHA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FLPMA | Federal land Policy and Management Act |
| FS | Forest Service |
| FWS | Fish and Wildlife Service |
| GIS | Geographical Information Systems |
| IDPR | Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation |
| IDFG | Idaho Department of Fish and Game |
| IMBA | International Mountain Bicycling Association |
| INFISH | Interim Inland Native Fish Strategy |
| IRA | Inventoried Roadless Area |
| LCAS | Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy |
| MC | Motorcycle |
| MTB | Mountain Bicycle |

| | |
|---------|--|
| MUSYA | Multiple-use Sustained Yield Act |
| MVU | Motor Vehicle Use |
| MVUM | Motor Vehicle Use Map |
| MWA | Montana Wilderness Association |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| NFMA | National Forest Management Act |
| NFS | National Forest System |
| NPDES | National Pollution Discharge Elimination System |
| PACFISH | Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds |
| ORMV | Off-road Motorized Vehicle |
| ORV | Off-road Vehicle |
| OSA | Open Seasonally to All Vehicles |
| OSM | Open Seasonally to Motorcycles |
| OSS | Open Seasonally to Small Vehicles |
| OSV | Over-snow Vehicle |
| OYA | Open Yearlong to All Vehicles |
| OYM | Open Yearlong to Motorcycles |
| OYS | Open Yearlong to Small Vehicles |
| PANTRA | Panhandle Trail Rider's Association |
| RMO | Riparian Management Objective(s) |
| RNA | Research Natural Area |
| ROD | Record of Decision |
| ROS | Recreation Opportunity Spectrum |
| RS 2477 | Revised Statute 2477 |
| RVD | Recreation Visitor Day |
| RWA | Recommended Wilderness Area |
| SAWS | Snowmobile Alliance of Western States |
| TMDL | Total Maximum Daily Load |
| TMP | Travel Management Plan |
| TMR | Travel Management Rule |
| TOS | Travel Opportunity Spectrum |
| USFS | United States Forest Service |
| WSR | Wild and Scenic River |

APPENDIX B—SITE-SPECIFIC ROUTE SUGGESTIONS

Introduction

The following series of tables displays site-specific road, trail and/or area management suggestions received during the travel planning comment period. Suggestions received since the end of the comment period (February 29) are being considered but are not displayed in this report.

The report is organized geographically by District and further categorized according to the type of suggestion: General, Road or Trail.

Legend

| | |
|--|--|
| District | 2—Palouse, 3—North Fork, 5—Lochsa, 6—Powell |
| Type | Indicates whether the suggestion was <i>General</i> or for a <i>Road</i> or <i>Trail</i> . |
| Route Name in INFRA¹ | Existing system routes are referred to by the official road or trail number. Suggested routes are assigned a working number for tracking purposes. |
| Suggested Restriction | Three codes appear under the heading “Suggested Restriction:” <i>Trav Code</i> (summer travel), <i>SNO</i> (over-snow) or <i>BIC</i> (bicycle). These codes characterize the suggestion. <i>Trav Code</i> indicates pertains to summer travel and is further refined through a series of codes. |

| Trav Code | Meaning |
|------------------|--|
| <i>NS</i> | No Suggestion Received |
| <i>RYA</i> | Restrict Yearlong to All Vehicles |
| <i>OYA</i> | Open Yearlong to All Vehicles |
| <i>OYS</i> | Open Yearlong to Small Vehicles (ATVs, Motorcycles) |
| <i>OYM</i> | Open Yearlong to Motorcycles |
| <i>OSA-1</i> | Open Seasonally to All Vehicles (Full-size vehicles restricted 10/1-6/15; no restrictions on ATVs or motorcycles) |
| <i>OSS-3</i> | Open Seasonally to Small Vehicles (Full-size vehicles restricted yearlong; ATVs & motorcycles restricted 10/1-6/1) |
| <i>OSS-11</i> | Open Seasonally to Small Vehicles (Full-size vehicles restricted yearlong; ATVs & motorcycles restricted 11/1-5/1) |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Suggested By | This is the number assigned to a respondent who made the suggestion. It may not include all of the parties who made the same suggestion. |
| FS Clarification | These are notes of clarification for the interdisciplinary team. |

¹ INFRA refers to the Forest Service infrastructure database.

Public Suggested Routes and Restrictions by District

Clearwater NF Travel Plan

This report shows suggestions received during scoping to add routes, obliterate routes, or change route restrictions.

LEGEND FOR REPORT

District Ranger District where the suggestion is located: 2 = Palouse, 3 = North Fork, 5 = Lochsa, 6 = Powell

Type Indicates whether the suggestion was General (for broad area) or for a Road or Trail

| Route No | Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested | Suggested Restriction | | | SuggestedBy Suggestion | FS Clarification / Note |
|---|--|--|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | Trav Code | SNO | BIC | | |
| For existing system routes this is the official route number and name. For other suggested routes this is a working number and name to keep track of the suggestion. | | These are codes to summarize the restriction suggested. Trav Code is for summer vehicles, SNO for oversnow vehicles, and BIC for bicycles. See below for the codes used. | | | This identifies who made the suggestion along with some additional info about the suggestion if it's not clearly captured in the codes at left. At least one of the parties making this suggestion is listed here. Since the same suggestion was often received from several parties not all parties are typically listed. | This shows any Forest Service notations intended to clarify the suggestion. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - Don't restrict at all NS - No Suggestion received for this vehicle type RYA - Restrict Yearlong to All vehicles OYA - Open Yearlong to All vehicles OYS - Open Yearlong to Small vehicles (ATV's and motorcycles) OYM - Open Yearlong to Motorcycles OSA -1 Open Seasonally to All vehicles (Full size vehicles restricted 10/1 - 6/15, no restrictions on ATV or motorcycle) OSS - 3 Open Seasonally to Small Vehicles (Full size vehicles restricted yearlong, ATV's and Motorcycles restricted 10/1 - 6/1) OSS - 11 Open Seasonally to Small Vehicles (Full size vehicles restricted yearlong, ATV's and Motorcycles restricted 11/1 - 5/1) | | | | | | |

District**GENERAL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | <i>All Roadless Areas</i> | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Restrict all motorized in roadless areas | |
| | <i>Snowmo in Recommended Wild</i> | NS | 0 | NS | ISSA 1422, 2438, 2461 Don't restrict snowmobiles in recommended wilderness | |
| | <i>Snowmo in Great Burn</i> | NS | 0 | NS | Hendrick,G 4265; Don't restrict snowmobiles in Great Burn | |
| | <i>Selected Roadless Areas</i> | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Restrict all motorized in Pot Mtn, Meadow Creek/Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Moose Mtns, Cayuse Creek, and East side of Weitas Creek roadless areas | |

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | <i>Trails</i> | NS | RYA | NS | Multi Restrict oversnow vehicles on trails | |

District 2**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 4709 | UPPER OLEVAN CREEK | OSS-3 | NS | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Change road and spurs to match other routes in area including Trail 215 | |

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 15 | WATERHOLE CREEK | NS | YR | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 READ LETTER - Multiple roads and trails - snomo restrictions and road/trail coord | |
| 221 | OLD SAMPSON | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 223 | EAST DENNIS | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | trail wasn't in this table |
| 289 | BRUSH CREEK | OSS-11 | NS | NS | PANTRA 693 | |

District 3**GENERAL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | Skull Creek | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Restrict all routes? | See Letter |
| | Deception/Osier Ridge | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Restrict all routes? | See Letter |
| | Great Burn | NS | NS | 0 | MMBA 691 Retain mtn bike trails from Great Burn to Cedars | |

ROAD

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 103 | LOLO WEITAS | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | Not specified but assume this is the section in Weitas Cr beyond Beaver Dam Saddle |
| 247 | BEAVER - NORTH FORK | NS | RYA | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Section in winter range | |
| 250 | PIERCE SUPERIOR | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Black Canyon Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 250 | PIERCE SUPERIOR | NS | RYA | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Section in winter range | |
| 252 | SKULL CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 Skull Creek Area Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 255 | DECEPTION SADDLE | NS | RYA | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Sections in winter range | |

District 3**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 295 | LAKE CREEK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 547 | HEMLOCK RIDGE | OYA | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 555 | LEAN TO RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937: Espinosa/Jageman 144; WS/ICL 2823 Convert to non-motor trail or obliterate past Weitas GS | |
| 555 | LEAN TO RIDGE | OYA | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941, Stark,W 335 | |
| 557 | WEITAS BUTTE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 560 | LIZ BUTTE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 580 | GORMAN HILL | RYA | RYA | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 581 | TOBOGGAN RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 581 | TOBOGGAN RIDGE | NS | RYA | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Sections in winter range | |
| 700 | SMITH RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 700 | SMITH RIDGE | NS | RYA | NS | Espinosa/Jageman 144 Sections in winter range | |

District 3**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 711 | MUSH SADDLE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 715 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 715 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 720 | FLY HILL | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 737 | LAUNDRY CREEK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Entire Deception / Osier area Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 5052 B | BLUE RIDGE B | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | |
| 5170 C | RED CLOUD RIDGE C | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | |
| 5180 C | GOLD COIN C | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | |
| 5227 A | SEVEN MILE POINT | OYS | NS | NS | PANTRA 693 Open to motorized to allow access to proposal for Trail 1020 (called 102P in suggestions) | |
| 5428 | RAWHIDE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; GBSG 496 Consider restriction or restoration | |

District 3**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 5428 | RAWHIDE | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | <i>Tamarack Ridge</i> | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718 | Resurrect old trail presumably for motorcycle use |
| | <i>Tamarack Creek</i> | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718 | Resurrect old trail presumably for motorcycle use |
| 11 | DAN LEE RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 11 | DAN LEE RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 17 | CABIN POINT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823; GBSG 4306 Suggestions vary from entire trail to just the segment within Weitas Creek drainage. | |
| 20 | WEITAS CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; Chinn,B 533; Espinosa/Jageman 144 | |
| 20 | WEITAS CREEK | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 20 | WEITAS CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Reggear,M 120; PANTRA 693 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 20 L | JOHNAGAN CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 20 M | TINKLE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 20 R | WINDY JAM RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 76 | TRAPPER GULCH | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 Open to ATV traffic | |
| 88 | SYLVAN RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; FOC 937 Parts of trail are too narrow for ATV | |
| 88 | SYLVAN RIDGE | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987; Stark,W 335 | |
| 100 | FOOTROT CORRALS | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Reingold,B 500 | |
| 101 | INDIAN HENRY RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 101 | INDIAN HENRY RIDGE | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 103 | WEITAS BUTTE | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Clouse,W 75 | |
| 104 | HEMLOCK CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Reingold,B 500; IDPR 718 IDPR - also shows STO segment | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 104 | HEMLOCK CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 106 | JUNCTION CREEK | OSM | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941 Restrict trail seasonally if necessary but don't completely exclude motorcycle travel | |
| 106 | JUNCTION CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Albright,W 1077; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 112 | ROCKY RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | IDFG 702, 19; FOC 937 | |
| 112 | ROCKY RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941 | |
| 123 | FLAME RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 124 | TRAIL CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 144 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; GBSG 496; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 144 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | PANTRA 693; Browning,D 1085; Deyo,A 2987 1078 | |
| 154 | JACKKNIFE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | CCSO 2635 | |

District 3

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 154 | JACKKNIFE CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | ClwCo 925; Browning,D 1085; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 160 | LARSON POINT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 165 | CAVE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Stark,W 335; Restore current storage (STO) trail as active motorcycle trail | |
| 167 | WINDY RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; IDFG 702; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 167 | WINDY RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | PANTRA 693; Reggear,M 120; Deyo,A 1078 | |
| 169 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | CCSO 2635; ClwCo 925; FOC 937 FOC restrict all; others restrict beyond Cold Springs Peak. | ClwCo and CCSO just beyond Cold Springs Pk. FOC full length |
| 169 | POT MOUNTAIN RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | PANTRA 693; Anderson,J; 2799; Reingold,B 500 Open Cold Springs to Fly Hill | |
| 173 | WEITAS RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; TVTMA 2547; Hafer,R 941 | |
| 176 | FLAT MOUNTAIN | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Called Tr 76 in suggestion but 176 obviously intended | |
| 176 | <i>Flat Mountain</i> | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718 Open STO section from Kelly Forks to Rd 5297-A and on to ATV trailhead | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 176 | FLAT MOUNTAIN | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | Assumed to be the section currently open to ATV |
| 191 | JUNCTION MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | TVTMA 2547; Emery,J 1423; Hafer,R941 | |
| 191 | JUNCTION MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; FOC 937,; Peterson,M 349 | |
| 200 | <i>Fourth of July Creek</i> | OYM | NS | NS | Dart,B 2846; IDPR;718 Open this trail not currently on maps | Was system trail a long time back, not maintained in years. |
| 240 | SMITH RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 283 | LOST RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Reingold,B 500; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 285 | SNOW CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Reingold,B 500; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 297 | NORTH FORK DOWN RIVER | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 297 | NORTH FORK DOWN RIVER | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 373 | NORTH FORK OF THE CLEAR | RYA | NS | NS | Chinn,B 533; FOC 937; GBSG 496 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 373 | NORTH FORK OF THE CLEAR | OYM | NS | NS | Dart,B 2846; IDPR 718; Stark,W 335 | |
| 373 A | UPPER NORTH FORK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718 Restore trail to active maintenance and motorcycle use. | |
| 381 | CHAMBERLAIN MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718 Restore storage trail to active maintenance and motorcycle use. | |
| 396 | BLACK MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 410 | GOOSE RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Reingold,B 500; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 410 | GOOSE RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 414 | GOOSE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 414 | GOOSE CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | ClwCo 925; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 419 | FISH LAKE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823; Espinosa/Jageman 144 | |
| 419 | FISH LAKE | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |

District 3

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 427 | MOOSE MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | ClwCo 925 | |
| 428 | HANSON RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Deyo,A 2987 Restore current storage (STO) trail as active motorcycle trail | |
| 429 | OSIER RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 429 | OSIER RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718, ClwCo 925; Emery,J 2723 | |
| 445 | ELIZABETH MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Bursi,J 3597; Albright,W 1077 Put the segment now classed as storage (STO) trail back in service as a motorcycle route. | |
| 445 | ELIZABETH MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | Assume this suggestion would apply to the storage (STO) section also. |
| 478 | POLLOCK RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 478 | POLLOCK RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; ClwCo 925; Bithell,T 2723 | |
| 490 | BRUIN HILL | OYM | NS | NS | Reingold,B 500 | |
| 513 | DEER CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 513 | DEER CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Brent,K 522; IDPR 718; PANTRA 693 | |
| 517 | BIGHORN POINT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 517 | BIGHORN POINT | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 524 | SCURVY MOUNTAIN | OYS | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 524 | SCURVY MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 531 | WINDY BILL | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; WS/ICL 2823; IDFG 702 | |
| 531 | WINDY BILL | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; PANTRA 693 | |
| 532 | CAYUSE CREEK & MONROE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; Espinosa/Jageman 533; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 532 | CAYUSE CREEK & MONROE | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; TVTMA 2547; Reingold,B 500 | |
| 534 | LUNDE CREEK - ROCK GARD | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Dart,B 2846; | |
| 534 | LUNDE CREEK - ROCK GARD | RYA | NS | NS | CCSO 2635; GBSG 496 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 539 | POTATO CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Reingold,B 500; Emery,J 1423 | |
| 539 | POTATO CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; CCSO 2635 | |
| 565 | RAPID CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 565 | RAPID CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; PANTRA 693; Deyo,A 2987, 1078 | |
| 567 | KELLY CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; Peterson,M 349; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 567 | KELLY CREEK | NS | NS | 0 | Ryan,D 516 | |
| 567 | KELLY CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; PANTRA 693; Deyo,A 2987, 1078 | |
| 580 | BUGLE POINT | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; PANTRA 693; Hafer,R 941 | |
| 589 | PORPHYRY PEAK | RYA | NS | NS | PANTRA Equestrian use recommended | Storage trail now |
| 593 | RASPBERRY CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 594 | RASPBERRY BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; WS/ICL 2823; Ashmore,A 4306 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 599 | BALD MOUNTAIN LAKE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; WS/ICL 2823; Ashmore,A 4306 | Called 559 in some comment - actually 599 |
| 600 | WASHINGTON RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 601 | CLARKE MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; | |
| 601 | CLARKE MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | | |
| 617 | CAVE POINT | OYM | NS | NS | CCSO 2635; Stark,W 335; | |
| 617 | CAVE POINT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; ClwCo 925; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 625 | JOHNNY BASIN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; IDFG 702; Sikes,L 625 | Called 626 in some comments - assumed they meant 625 |
| 625 | JOHNNY BASIN | OYM | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941 | |
| 627 | COOK MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 627 | COOK MOUNTAIN | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; IDPR 718; Webster,C 26 | |

District 3

TRAIL

| Route No | Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested | Suggested Restriction | | | SuggestedBy Suggestion | FS Clarification / Note |
|----------|--|-----------------------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | Trav Code | SNO | BIC | | |
| 628 | JOHNAGAN MOUNTAIN | RYA | NS | NS | PANTRA Equestrian use recommended | Storage trail now |
| 632 | SMITH BUTTE | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,W 1077; Deyo,A 2987, 1078; Albright,M 929; Stark,W 335 Restore storage trail to active status. Several suggestions both for motorized and non-motorized and for different trail sections. | Section to consider is from Road 555 to Trail 167 |
| 634 | WINDY CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Reingold,B 500; PANTRA 693 | |
| 638 | LOOKOUT MONROE | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987 1078; Bursi,J 3597; Albright,W 1077 Adopt trail into system as motorcycle route | Long ago FS trail |
| 649 | LIZ BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823; Ashmore,A 4306 | |
| 649 | LIZ BUTTE | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Hafer,R 941; TVTMA 2547 | |
| 650 | YOKUM CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941 | |
| 650 | YOKUM CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823; | |
| 667 | LEAN TO POINT | OSM | NS | NS | Johnson,E 37 | |
| 667 | LEAN TO POINT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; Espinosa/Jageman 144; WS/ICL 2823 | |

District 3**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 667 | LEAN TO POINT | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Hafer,R 941 | |
| 670 | BURST CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 674 | LARCH BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 687 | PRECEPTOR POINT | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335 | |
| 690 | MOOSE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | ClwCo 925 | |
| 691 | JUNCTION LOOKOUT | OYM | NS | NS | Hafer,R 941; Anderson,J 2799; Burnham,R 2466 | |
| 738 | STATE LINE <i>State Line</i> | NS | NS | 0 | MMBA 691; RyanD 516 Open to mtn bikes | |
| 738 | STATE LINE | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335; Karpe,R 95; Gulette,M 358 | |
| 738 | STATE LINE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 760 | LITTLE MOOSE RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496 | |
| 760 | LITTLE MOOSE RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Albright,M 929; Reingold,B 500; Emery,J 1423 | |

District 3

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 1020 | SEVEN MILE POINT | OYM | NS | NS | PANTRA 693; Bursi,J, others Adopt trail into system as motorcycle trail | Suggesters called it 102P. Old system trail 102 is not maintained now. |
| 1060 | BARNARD CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Bursi,J; Deyo,A 2987, 1078; PANTRA 693 Adopt trail into system as motorcycle trail | Not on any old maps, may be associated with old sheep allotment in Scurvy Mtn area |
| 2410 | WEITAS RIDGE SOUTH | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt section of old Trail 241 north of Lolo Motorway into system as motorcycle trail. | |
| 5320 | NEVER AGAIN RIDGE | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078; Albright, M 2726 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | Once part of trail 532 way back |
| 9001 | WEITAS MIDDLE | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 9002 | LITTLE WEITAS BUTTE SOUT | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 9003 | LITTLE WEITAS BUTTE | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 9004 | WEITAS BUTTE NORTH | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | |
| 9005 | BENNETT CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | PANTRA Equestrian use recommended | Old sheep driveway |
| 9005 | BENNETT CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Deyo,A 2987, 1078 Adopt into system as motorcycle trail | Old sheep driveway |

District 5**GENERAL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | Areas Adacent to SBW | NS | RYA | NS | WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles in Lochsa Face, Ratcliff/Gedney, Lochsa Face, Sneakfoot Meadows, North Fork Spruce/White Sand roadless areas | See ICL Map |

ROAD

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 317 | COOLWATER | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 331 | IDAHO POINT | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 460 A | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | MP 0.9 to end |
| 460 B | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0 TO 1.3 |
| 460 C | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | entire route |
| 460 D | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0 to .43 |
| 460 E | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | entire route |
| 460 H | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0-.35 |

District 5**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 481 | VAN CAMP TRAIL | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 483 | MIDDLE BUTTE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 485 | BOUNDARY PEAK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 McClendon, Middle and Fish Butte area roads - Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 486 B | WALDE SADDLE B | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0 to .5 |
| 486 H | WALDE H | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0 TO 1.33 |
| 486 L | WALDE L | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | 0 TO .42 |
| 561 | CASTLE BUTTE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 587 | MARTEN CREEK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 5102 C | BOUNDARY C | OSA-1 | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | Needed for access to suggested Swede Creek Connector |
| 5102 E | BOUNDARY EVE | OSA-1 | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | Needed for access to suggested Swede Creek Connector |

District 5**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 5114 B | BRADFORD CONNECTION B | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | |
| 5116 | LOLO TROUT CREEK | OYA | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 | |
| 5514 | WALDE CREEK | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY | |
| 5544 | BRUSH HILL | OSA | NS | NS | IDFG 702, 19 Restrict all motorized during hunting season | |
| 5545 | BIMERICK MEADOWS | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 5546 | LOWER DEADMAN | OSA | NS | NS | IDFG 702, 19 Restrict all motorized during hunting season | |
| 75222 | WALDE MTN EAST | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY; Valley Cats | Valley Cats called it 486A loop. |

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | <i>Big Hill Connector</i> | OYS | NS | NS | Valley Cats Proposed new ATV Trail Jct Road 101 T33N R6E S21 to Jct Road 5515 T33N R6E S28, about 0.64 mile long | |
| 2 | LOCHSA DOWN RIVER | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 | |

District 5**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 31 | ELDORADO CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 32 | AUSTIN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 48 | AUSTIN RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 58 | AUSTIN CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 107 | CANYON CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 110 | SOUTH FORK CANYON CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 111 | APGAR CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 116 | DEADMAN CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 116 A | FRENCHMAN BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 142 | DEADMAN RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 192 | DEADMAN FORKS | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |

District 5**TRAIL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 201 | GROUSE RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 203 | SHERMAN CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 203 | SHERMAN CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | Stark,W 335: PANTRA 693 | |
| 204 | SKOOKUM CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | PANTRA 693 | |
| 204 | SKOOKUM CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 225 | ANT HILL | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; | |
| 229 | FISH BUTTE SADDLE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823; Eastman G&M 4104, 4166 | |
| 231 | CASTLE BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 241 | WILLOW CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 705 | UPPER DEADMAN | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 708 | PETE KING RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |

District 5

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|---|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 2230 | FISH BUTTE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 2240 | FISH CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937: WS/ICL 2823; Eastman E&M 4104 | |
| 9006 | HIGGINS HUMP HILL CLIMB | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY Adopt into system as ATV trail | |
| 9007 | HIGGINS HUMP | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY Adopt into system as ATV trail | |
| 9008 | HIGGINS HUMP CONNECTOR | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY Adopt into system as ATV trail | |
| 9009 | RYE PATCH CREEK CONNEC | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY Adopt into system as ATV trail | |
| 9010 | SOUTH WALDE CONNECTOR | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY, Valley Cats Adopt into system as ATV trail | Valley Cats called this the 708-486 Connector |
| 9011 | EAST WALDE CONNECTOR | OYS | NS | NS | PLAY Adopt into system as ATV trail. PLAY called it the 486 - 486L Tie In | |
| 9012 | SWEDE CREEK CONNECTOR <i>Swede Creek Connector</i> | OYS | NS | NS | Soles,B 100-109, 3987 Adopt user created route as ATV trail | |

District 6**GENERAL**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| | Beaver Ridge | NS | NS | 0 | MMBA 691; Develop mtn bike opportunities in this area of recommended Wild | |

ROAD

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 107 | SADDLE CAMP | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 107 | SADDLE CAMP | OYA | NS | NS | Peterson,J | |
| 107 | SADDLE CAMP | NS | 0 | NS | ISSA 1422, 2438, 2461 Drop snowmo restriction | |
| 111 | ELK SUMMIT | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snow incursions into SBW | |
| 111 | ELK SUMMIT | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 358 | KOOSKOOSKIA MEADOWS | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |
| 358 | KOOSKOOSKIA MEADOWS | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 359 | COLT CREEK | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |

District 6**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 359 | COLT CREEK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 360 | SAVAGE PASS | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |
| 360 | SAVAGE PASS | RYA | RYA | 0 | FOC 937 | |
| 360 B | HOODOO LAKE CMPGRD LO | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |
| 360 E | HOODOO LAKE CAMP GRD | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |
| 362 | TOM BEAL PARK | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW | |
| 362 | TOM BEAL PARK | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 369 | BEAVER RIDGE | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snowmobile incursions into SBW. | |
| 581 D | BLACKLEAD MOUNTAIN | RYA | RYA | NS | GBSG 496 Restrict motorized traffic on the user created track beyond the official end for Road 581-D | |

District 6**ROAD**

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 581 D | BLACKLEAD MOUNTAIN | OYA | NS | NS | Brent,K 522; Cole,W 1980, 4457 Re-open the user-created road beyond the ridge to the saddle where Trails 508 and 513 join. | |
| 588 | HORSESHOE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937 Consider restriction or restoration | |
| 595 | CROOKED FORK CONTOUR | NS | RYA | NS | GBSG 496 Restrict snomo to reduce risk of travel into Great Burn | |
| 5600 | STORM RIDGE | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snow incursions into SBW | |
| 5690 | EAST FORK SPRUCE CREEK | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snow incursions into SBW | |
| 5690 A | BULL | NS | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 Restrict oversnow vehicles to stop snow incursions into SBW | |
| 5950 | LEE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 Restrict motorized traffic since road follows route of old trail with cultural value. | |

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 34 | BRUSHY FORK | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |
| 35 | BLACKLEAD | NS | NS | 0 | Ryan,D 516 | |

District 6

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 46 | | NS | NS | 0 | Ryan,D | Lolo NF Trail |
| 117 | MARTEN HILL | RYA | NS | NS | Ashmore,A 4306; WS / ICL 2823 | |
| 249 | CAYUSE CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Meehan,M 2865; TVTMA 2547 Improve water crossings instead of restricting motorized traffic | |
| 249 | CAYUSE CREEK | RYA | RYA | NS | GBSG 496; CCSO 2635: WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 256 | GRAVEY CREEK | RYA | NS | NS | GBSG 496; Chinn,B 533 | |
| 256 | GRAVEY CREEK | OYM | NS | NS | IDPR 718; Reingold,B 500 | |
| 508 | WILLIAMS PEAK | OYM | NS | NS | Dart,B 2846; IDPR 718; TVTMA 2547 | |
| 508 A | RED LEAD MINE | OYM | NS | NS | Cole,W; Brent,K 522 Adopt trail into system as a motorcycle route | Access to a mine |
| 909 | SAVAGE RIDGE | RYA | RYA | NS | FOC 937; WS/ICL 2823 | |
| 919 | POST OFFICE RIDGE | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |

District 6

TRAIL

| <i>Route No</i> | <i>Route Name in INFRA or Name Suggested</i> | <i>Suggested Restriction</i> | | | <i>SuggestedBy Suggestion</i> | <i>FS Clarification / Note</i> |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | <i>Trav Code</i> | <i>SNO</i> | <i>BIC</i> | | |
| 940 | RUDD-MOORE LAKES | RYA | NS | NS | FOC 937 | |

APPENDIX C—ATTACHMENTS

Introduction

Some commenters find it valuable to supplement their comments with attachments. In some cases the attachments are journal articles, supporting photos, or maps of specific routes. While these items aren't coded per se, they are included in the administrative and they are available for the interdisciplinary team's review.

The following list is a summary of following is a summary of the items that were attached to letters and e-mails of comment.

List of Attachments

Individual, MISSOULA, MT—97: 1) Stan Spencer business card, 2) Missoula-Idaho map, 3) Surveyor/Crooked Fork,/Blacklead Mountain map, 4) Beaver Ridge map, 5) Tom Beal/Elk Summit map

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—100: 2 maps – Rosebut Loop – 76 Trail

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—101: 1) 88 Trail to Road 547X, 2) Road 547X to 5216A, 3) Road 547X or 88 Trail

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—102: 2 maps - Road 538 C

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—103: Browns Creek Ridge - Bradford Loop

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—104: Browns Creek Ridge - Bradford Loop

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—105: 1) road map, 5170C Red Cloud Ridge, 2) 5170C - Red Cloud Ridge GPS coordinates, 3) Hemlock Butte map

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—106: 1) Road 5180-S, 2) map, 3) GPS coordinates

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—107: 2 maps of proposed Bradford Loop

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—108: 2 maps of proposed Bradford Loop

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—109: 2 maps of proposed Bradford Loop

Individual, MISSOULA, MT—313: 1) comment form, 2) travel plan motorized winter use/bicycles alternative 1 map

Individual, FRENCHTOWN, MT—329: 1) Historic snowmobile areas affected by travel planning proposal for the CNF, 2) Travel Plan Motorized Winter Use/Bicycles map

Individual, LOLO, MT—347: 1) map of proposed action showing historic snowmobile areas, 2) Designation of James Peak National Protection Area

Individual, FLORENCE, MT—492: Proposed action map

Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—496: 1) 9 maps, 2) Key to Great Burn Study Group map

Preservation/Conservation Group, MISSOULA, MT—496: Mapped recommendations for Clearwater National Forest travel planning dated August 21, 2007. NOTE: These maps go with trail list in letter # 496.

Individual, LOLO, MT—501: 1) map of proposed action showing historic snowmobile areas, 2) area list

Individual, ELECTRIC CITY, WA—522: Please see attached map and description. 581-D Spur Road to Black Lead Summit and 513 Pack Road to Black Lead Saddle.(# on this road (trail) is 513 on old maps).

Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—691: Scenic photos, map of trails important to mountain bike community

Individual, BOZEMAN, MT—692: 26 pages photos, 4 pages of maps

Motorized Recreation, POST FALLS, ID—693: Panhandle Trail Riders' Association (PANTRA) Proposed "Pro Access" Alternative for the North Fork, Powell and Lochsa Districts of the Clearwater National Forest.

99999 (13 pages)

County Government, OROFINO, ID—925: The attached documents show the loops that we are currently riding with descriptions and mileage estimates. The other pages list each road or trail along with current condition, desired condition and proposed condition under Alternative 1.

Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—929: Enclosed is a smaller copy of your alternative 1 map for the North Fork. I have highlighted in pink - the trails that I have been motorcycle riding since 1975. . . . I have marked in orange the only trails south of the north fork river that I would give up to provide non motorized experiences for others. I had to pencil in some trails that got left off of this map.

Individual, CLARKSTON, WA—929: Comment Form: North Fork Ranger District Travel Planning Open House

Preservation/Conservation Group, MOSCOW, ID—937: Enclosed is a map of HR 1975 (the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act) for the Clearwater National Forest.

Individual, LEWISTON, ID—1077: 1) 1992 CNF Map & Alternative 1 map with loops with Wayne Albright's original letter, 2) 2005 Travel Guide, 3) Travel Plan EIS - Proposed Action

Motorized Recreation, OROFINO, ID—1078: 1) Elizabeth 445, 2) Bernard Creek, 3) Never again Trail, 4) motorized riding loops descriptions

Individual, ELLENSBURG, WA—1080: 1) VITAE for Joseph Wernex, 2) article "Developing Trail Systems for High Quality Trailbike Recreation."

Motorized Recreation, BOISE, ID—1422: Map of areas that should be open or removed from RWA status. He (Supervisor Reilly) asked us to draw maps outlining those areas that we felt should remain open or be removed from RWA status. Those maps are attached to these comments.

Individual, MISSOULA, MT—2532: Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan, Alternative 1 - Proposed Action - Winter Use D, E, F, G

Individual, LEWISTON, ID—2726: 1992 CNF Alternative 1 map with loops (maps with original Wayne Albright letter)

Individual, LEWISTON, ID—2727: CNF Alternative 1 map with loops (maps with original Wayne Albright letter)

Individual, OROFINO, ID—2987: Map showing suggested loop trails

Motorized Recreation, BOISE, ID—4449: Enclosed is a map outlined in Black with areas traditional ridden by snowmobilers. 1) Tom Beal Elk Summit Map, 2) Beaver Ridge Map, 3) Tom Beal Elk Summit Map, 4) Lochsa River Corridor Map, 5) Beaver Ridge Map, 6) Beaver Ridge Map, 7) Crooked Fork Blacklead MT. Map, 8) Crooked Fork Map, 9) Surveyor Blacklead MT. Map, 10) Missoula West, Montana-Idaho Map

Motorized Recreation, OROFINO, ID—4456: Road and Trail Inventory Worksheets. 1) Road 460 D, 11-T to 460 B Tie in Road commonly known as: Alternate to the Chitwood Mine, Roby Cabin from the 460 D Road; 2) 79-T Trail commonly Known As: Higgins Hump Trail; 3) 460 H tie in to 460 C; 4) 486 B 460 A tie in trail; 5) 486-486 L Tie in Road; 6) 486 A to the 75222 road; and 7): 153 Trail.

Individual, WEIPPE, ID—4457: 1) Road to Blacklead Saddle; 2) Shoshone, Clearwater and Idaho Counties, Idaho-Including portions of Hoodoo, Moose Mountain, Bighorn, East Weitas, and Weir, Post Office Creek Roadless Areas; 3) Blacklead mtn Prospects; 4) mining claims contour map; 5) Little Papoose claims; 6) New Red Lead mining claim map; 7) Goat Creek Structure specs; 8) old trail contour map; 9) authorization request; 10) route proposal form blank; 11) route proposal form The Miners Trail; 12) 513 road map; 13) Blacklead whitebark pine restoration project area map; 14) Blacklead L.O. Point Township & Range

APPENDIX D—FORM LETTERS

Introduction

Organized responses represent the majority of total responses received during the public comment period associated with the release of the Clearwater National Forest's travel management proposed action.

An organized response campaign is defined as five or more responses from distinct individuals that contain identical content. Once an organized response campaign letter is identified, a "master" is entered into the database with all of the content information. All responses with this master text are then linked to the master with a designated "form" number. Any additional text in a response is also coded and the information entered into the database.

Organized responses are identified with a number. Seven organized response campaigns were identified for this project. The letters associated with each campaign follow.

Form 1**Speak Out for the Clearwater National Forest - The Wilderness Society Campaign****Subject: Please Promote Responsible Recreation in the Clearwater National Forest**

Dear [Decision Maker],

RE: Clearwater Travel Plan Revision

The Clearwater National Forest has some of the most remote land in the lower 48 and the increasing presence of motor vehicles in our backcountry is threatening the unique values that make the Clearwater country unique.

From the rocky peaks and lush green forests to the crystal clear rivers, the Clearwater Forest provides important habitat for a number of species, including the endangered Chinook Salmon and Steelhead. In addition to these aquatic species, the Clearwater provides important habitat for elk, lynx, wolves, and mountain goats to name a few. Because of its remote character, the Clearwater has as much or more potential wilderness land than any other forest in Idaho.

I appreciate and wholly support your recommendation to limit motorized and mechanized use in the Great Burn and Mallard Larkins roadless areas. Protecting the outstanding natural integrity of these proposed wilderness areas is extremely important. In addition to closing these areas, I also ask that you close other ecologically important areas to motor vehicle use. Specifically, I am asking you to close all trails and roads in Pot Mountain, Meadow Creek Upper North Fork, Rawhide, Moose Mountain, Cayuse Creek and eastern portion of Bighorn Weitas (east of Weitas Creek) to maintain the wild and remote character of these areas.

All of these areas are important to non motorized recreationists as well as wildlife. Hunters, anglers, hikers and other public lands users want places to recreate without the noise and disturbance created by off road vehicles. By closing these areas to motorized use, there will still be ample opportunity for motorized recreationists elsewhere.

It is up to the Forest Service to stop off-road vehicles from destroying the Clearwater, and nothing short of a significant reduction in the amount of motorized trails will achieve this goal.

Thank you for your time, and I sincerely hope you will consider my comments.

Sincerely,

Form 2

SAWS (Snowmobile Alliance of Western States) Action Alert 1

Abigail Kimbell, Chief
U.S.D.A. Forest Service
201 14th St., S.W.
Washington, DC 20024

Chief Abigail Kimbell,

My family and I enjoy outdoor recreation on land managed by the U.S. Forest Service throughout the Northern Region as do many others. For my family, this recreation includes responsible snowmobiling. I have a major concern about how this Region is proposing to manage almost 4 million acres of Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWA) in Montana.

According to the Regional Forester’s Office, all RWAs will be immediately closed to motorized vehicles upon completion of the Revised Forest Plan. I believe such management of RWAs is not only unwise, but also unlawful.

Areas recommended for Wilderness should be managed on a site-specific basis, not a “one size fits all” regional policy. Recreational uses including snowmobiling in each area should be managed pursuant to the individual Forest Plan with consideration of the current uses and overall goals and objectives for each area.

Current procedures have not allowed for adequate site-specific analysis. According to the agency’s current planning documents, these areas will be closed to motorized use upon the completion of the Forest Plans. However, under the new Forest Service planning regulations, the program-level Forest Plan revision procedures will not include site-specific analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act necessary to support closure of existing uses in these areas.

FACT: There is nothing in law, regulation or recent court decisions that require U.S. Forest Service to prohibit motorized access in RWAs. To the contrary; recent court rulings suggest the agency should continue motorized uses in areas previously authorized for motorized use. Indeed, court rulings explicitly reject any claim the agency is compelled to restrict motorized access.

It should be noted that most of these RWAs currently have motorized use occurring in them. It seems to me, that if motorized uses don’t preclude the Forest Service from recommending them as designated Wilderness, then the management criteria resulting from that conclusion should allow motorized uses where appropriate.

Recreation in RWAs should be managed pursuant to site-specific planning based on the current condition and needs of the recreating public.

I respectfully request that your staff look into this matter immediately.

Signature_____

Name_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Form 3

SAWS (Snowmobile Alliance of Western States) Action Alert 2

Ask that all areas that have historically included snowmobile recreation continue to do so. Areas that will be at highest risk are those that currently border wilderness, recommended wilderness or areas adjacent to closed NF for whatever reason (areas such as Surveyor and Hoodoo). Specify to not close motorized recreation areas recommended for inclusion in the wilderness system. In general these areas include Hoodoo, Surveyor, Beaver Lakes, Crooked Fork and the Great Burn area.

Specifics from map information to include in your comments:

- TOM BEAL, T36 R13E, T35N R13E (mention the Walton Lakes area-eastside)
- BEAVER RIDGE AREA, T37N R16E - the area they want to close was in the original Selway Wilderness proposal and was dropped off. They are now trying to add it back in. If anyone knows the history of this there might be a solid argument for keeping it open. This was another area rangers seemed surprised to learn is used by snowmobilers.
- ELK SUMMIT, T35N R14E, T34N R14E
- All of WILLIAMS LAKE including BLACKLEAD MT, T39N R13E, T38N R13E, T38N R14E
- SURVEYOR, T40N R13E, T39N R13E (It is worth noting that the LOLO Forest already provides snowmobilers a corridor through a proposed wilderness area to access the Surveyor area within the Clearwater Forest.)
- HOODOO, T42N R11E, T41N R11E

If you have other specific points, both in Montana and Idaho, which are currently used to access a riding area in the Clearwater mention it. A few identified areas thus far are two on the Montana side of the border - Hoodoo, accessed from Trout Ck and Surveyor, which is accessed off of Fish Creek Rd. The third access point is from Shotgun Ck which is in Idaho, which is accessed from the Lochsa Lodge.

If you or anyone you know rides the Blacklead Mtn. please make sure you mention it, Clearwater rangers were not aware that snowmobilers use the area. Blacklead Mtn. area is not bordered by an existing wilderness or proposed wilderness.

Elk Summit is not expected to be completely shut off as previously shown due to a misprint on the website. A corridor along the road will most likely remain open.

Form 4**Blue Ribbon Coalition Action Alert****Subject: Comments on Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan**

Lois Foster, Travel Plan Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Lochsa Ranger District, Kamiah Ranger Station
Rt. 2 Box 191
Kamiah, ID 83536

I would like to make the following comments on the Clearwater National Forest Travel Plan. The comment is made using the "issues in the form of questions" format. Please consider these questions in the Alternative development and please also include a full discussion of each question in the EIS. I also request the EIS include a discussion and brief analysis of previous Congressional Wilderness designations so the public may understand how the existence of motorized uses actually impacts Congress's ability to designate Wilderness. I also request that the Clearwater provide a true range of management Alternatives, including one "action" alternative that, at the very minimum, does not reduce the current motorized and mountain bike opportunity.

Question 1) In *Montana Wilderness Assoc. v. U.S. Forest Service*, the U.S. District Court of Montana found that Congress required the Forest Service to strike-and maintain-a balance between wilderness character and motorized use in WSAs established by that Act. Given that Congress envisioned motorized uses in Wilderness Study Areas they established, what is the Forest Service's rationale for excluding motorized uses in Recommended Wilderness Areas (RWAs)?

Question 2) If the existence of motorized uses does not preclude an area from being designated as an RWA, then what is the Forest Service's rationale for eliminating motorized uses in RWAs?

Question 3) What level of motorized or mountain bike use would disqualify an area from being a RWA?

Question 4) In the Eastern Wilderness Act, Congress designated areas Wilderness that contained motorized uses, structures, maintained roads and even sections of paved roads. Has the Forest Service studied the level of motorized uses that actually precludes Congress from designating an area Wilderness?

YOUR NAME
YOUR ADDRESS

Form 5

Clearwater Country Threatened by Motorized “Wreck”reaction – Friends of the Clearwater Campaign

Talking Points you may want to include in your comment

- •Motorized recreation should not be allowed in any roadless areas on the Clearwater NF, including Weitas Creek, Pot Mountain, Fish and Hungry Creeks and the wild areas south of the Lochsa adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. These areas are of immense value for anadromous (chinook & steelhead) and resident (bull trout, cutthroat trout) fisheries and wildlife
- •Illegally created motorized trails should be restored to natural condition and should not be legitimized as designated routes during the Travel Planning process
- •The Weitas Creek backcountry includes three major stream systems-- Weitas, Cayuse and Fourth of July Creeks, which flow into the North Fork Clearwater. During the roadless area evaluation of the late 70s and early 80s, Weitas Creek was considered the most important unroaded area on the Clearwater for wildlife. Hemlock Creek, a tributary of Weitas Creek, is a proposed research/natural area. In one of the few upper elevation areas, near Weitas Butte, there is a unique higher-elevation stand of ancient cedars
- •Pot Mountain contains important mountain goat habitat and may be the wildest unprotected area on the Clearwater. It has dramatic changes in elevation
- •Fish and Hungry Creeks are the most important steelhead streams in all of Idaho. This roadless area should be closed to motorized vehicles to protect the watershed
- •The trail to Fish Lake was opened to motorized use without any environmental analysis or public participation. Resource damage caused by motorized recreation is extensive there and needs to end
- •Some areas adjacent to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness are closed to vehicles in the summer, yet allow snowmobile access to the Wilderness on trail heads that begin outside of Wilderness. These trails should be closed to all motorized use
- •All Clearwater NF roadless areas are crucial recovery habitat for rare predators. In order for grizzlies to recover, these areas must be closed to motor vehicles. Wolverines and lynx need large areas free from snowmobiles. Already, the Clearwater NF has dedicated areas such as Deception Saddle, Clarke Mountain, Sheep Mountain and almost all of the Palouse Ranger District to off-road vehicles. Roadless areas must be closed to motor vehicle to effectively provide wildlife habitat, protect watersheds, and give rare species the chance to recover.

Form 6**Speak Up Loudly for Quiet Recreation! – Idaho Conservation League Campaign**

Main Points

- The Idaho Conservation League strongly supports the Forest Service's commonsense proposal to close the Great Burn and Mallard-Larkins Proposed wilderness areas to off-road vehicles and snowmobiles. This action will protect the wildeness character of these pristine areas.
- Trails in Cayuse, Forth of July, Weitas, Fish and Hungry (sic) creeks should be nonmotorized to protect fish, wildlife and water quality. These nonmotorized trails are needed to balance the large number of motorized opportunities available.
- The Forest Service needs to close the Lochsa Face, North Fork-Spruce White Sand and Sneakfoot Meadows roadless areas to snowmobiles to stop illegal snowmobile use of the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness.

Form 7

Unknown Origin

Dear Mr. Lois Foster:

I hope the Clearwater will re-evaluate the proposed action and reconsider the closure proposals. The OHV community is very interested in working with the Clearwater to develop stronger volunteers programs, and work with IDPR to get more help from their Trail Rangers, as well as possible grant funds to do major repairs or new construction.

Off-highway vehicle use is one of Idaho's most rapidly growing recreation activities. In the past five years, the number of OHVs registered in Idaho has increased 65.3%. With such a rapidly growing OHV population, it is very important to provide adequate and sustainable recreation opportunities. The Clearwater National Forest needs to retain and improve its existing motorized opportunities.

I support the Pro Access Alternative as proposed by PANTRA and their proposed increase of trails mileage to open motorized use.

The Pot Mountain Ridge Trail #144 is another of the premier single-track trails for motorcyclists on the North Fork Ranger District. This trail provides one of the most scenic rides in Idaho. The Trail is proposed for yearlong closure to motorcycle use from Chateau Rock to the Pierce-Superior Road #250. This trail is limiting to motorcyclists due to the skill level required to navigate the trail. Rocks and narrow trail tread combined with technical switchbacks limit the number of motorcyclists capable of using this trail. The trail provides a very valuable expert-level trail motorcycling opportunity. Every year our trail rangers cut a significant amount of downfall out of the trail. If this trail is closed to motorcycles, it will eventually disappear due to a lack of use and maintenance. The Pot Mountain Ridge Trail #144 should remain open to motorcycle use.

At this time, no evidence has been uncovered to justify holding motorized recreation to a higher environmental standard than other activities, be they recreation or non-recreation. The Clearwater Forest should therefore treat motorized recreation in the same manner as non-motorized recreation and provide an equal amount of opportunity for motorized use as non-motorized use. Currently the Clearwater provides far more visitor days units for non-motorized recreation. The Clearwater should remedy this situation by opening more trails to motorized use to correct this imbalance in the opportunity spectrum.

Trails 102P (and road 5227) need to be designated as open to motorcycles for beginning trailbike riders.

Trail 638 Lookout Peak needs to be designated as open to motorcycles.

Trail 165 should be open to motorized use.

The entire length of Trail 445 should remain open to motorized use as shown on the 1987 Forest map.

Barnard Creek and Never Again Ridge Trails should remain open to motorized use over their entire lengths.

The Forest Service also recognizes that OHV use is a valid use of public lands. The USDA Forest Service also recognizes that over 23% of the US population in 2004 enjoyed OHV recreation and that has grown significantly since 2004. How will the proposed action address this increased need for OHV trails?

The proposed action presented does not take into account the severe economic impact of a closure based alternative to the surrounding communities, not since it does not expand motorized routes does it comply with the rule. Please rewrite the alternative to take into account the following explanation written in the "Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule" part 295, page 6825/6. "Even after designations are complete, the rule will have no direct economic impact because designations merely will regulate where and, if appropriate, when motor vehicle use will occur on NFS roads, on NFS trails, and in areas on NFS lands. The Department expects that some user-created routes will become designated roads and trails, after site-specific evaluation. The overall network of routes designated for motor vehicle use would then expand. These designated routes will form a more stable base for long-term management and will receive increased maintenance, through agency resources and cooperative relationships, thereby expanding opportunities for motor vehicle users." Clearly the intention of the Final Rule was to expand opportunities for OHV use, and maintain a stable economic base for the surrounding communities, in contradiction to the objectives illustrated in the current alternative.

The proposed action indicates the EIS that is to be prepared is not likely to comply with NEPA as it will examine only variations on one concept: reducing mileage available to motorized access. As explained in NEPA regulation #1505.2(e), and EIS "includes all reasonable alternatives, which must be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated, as well as those other alternatives, which are eliminated from detailed study with a brief discussion of the reasons for eliminating them." As written, the narrow nature of this proposed action precludes both the formulation and the consideration of alternatives in the EIS other than an alternative that has a negative impact on the off-road enjoyment of the Clearwater National Forest.

As noted in the proposed action on page 3: "Provide for a better spectrum of motorized, non-motorized, and non-mechanized travel opportunities across the forest in recognition of the need to retain the character of lands recommended for Wilderness designation and the National Forest's ability to provide for non-motorized recreation opportunities that are not available on other land ownerships."

The Forest should not be altering existing uses on trails, such as eliminating 81 miles of motorcycle use, in order to retain the character of lands recommended for Wilderness. Either the lands presently have Wilderness character or they do not. The Forest cannot manage lands as defacto Wilderness, only Congress can make that determination through Wilderness designation.

APPENDIX E—CODING STRUCTURE

Introduction

To group like comments in the database, categories or codes were used. The following list describes how comments were grouped.

CLEARWATER NF TRAVEL PLAN ACTION CODES

Processes

PRCSS 10000-19999

- 10000 – Decisionmaking process and methods
 - 10100 – Role/Authority
 - 10200 – Coordination/Consultation with Other Agencies
 - 10300 – Coordination/Consultation with Tribes
 - 10400 – Consistency with laws, rules, policies, etc.
 - 10500 – Influences on decisionmaking
- 11000 – Decisionmaking Philosophy (*How*, not *what*, to decide)
 - 11100 – Multiple Use Management Emphasis
 - 11200 – Ecosystems Management Emphasis
 - 11300 – Preservation (Hands Off Management)
 - 11400 – Adaptive Management Emphasis
 - 11500 – Use of Public Comment (Vote, Majority, Forms)
- 12000 – Public Involvement
 - 12100 – Agency Communication
 - 12110 – Adequacy/Availability of Information
 - 12111 – Access to web-based information
 - 12112 – Clarity of web-based information
 - 12113 – Access to paper copies
 - 12114 – Clarity of paper information
 - 12120 – Public Meetings/Hearings/Open Houses
 - 12130 – Outreach/Education
 - 12140 – Collaboration
 - 12200 – Adequacy of Comment Period
 - 12300 – Adequacy of Entire Timeframe
 - 12400 – Objections, appeal, litigation
- 13000 – Use of Science; Best Available Science; Adequacy of Analysis (General, Multiple) (*if a resource is specified, code to the resource*)
 - 13010 – Best science doesn't support PA
 - 13020 – Where is science to support PA?
 - 13030 – Suggested sources of best science
- 13100 – Cumulative Effects/Combined Effects Analysis
- 14000 – Agency Organization, Funding and Staffing
 - 14100 – Funding, General
 - 14120 – Funding to Implement Travel Plan
 - 14130 – Funding to Enforce Travel Plan
 - 14200 – Staffing General
 - 14210 – Staff Training, Education
 - 14220 – Volunteers

Alternatives and EIS

ALTER 20000-24999

- 20000 – Purpose and Need; Need for an EIS, Scope of proposal
- 21000 – Document General
 - 21200 – Technical and Editorial (spelling, grammar, clarity, organization)
 - 21300 – Map(s) quality / availability
 - 22000 – Forest Plan (Desired Conditions, Goals, Objectives, Standards, Guidelines)
 - 22100 – Forest Plan Revision
 - 22200 – Proposed Forest Plan Amendments
 - 23000 – Alternatives General
 - 23100 – Alternative Development/Method/Scope
 - 23200 – Alternatives Not Analyzed in Detail
 - 23300 – Alternatives Developed By Others
 - 23400 – Suggestion for New Alternative
 - 23500 – Specific Alternatives Evaluated

Natural Resources Management

NRMGT 30000-39999

- 30000 – Area Management / Prevention of Impacts General/Multiple (Protect, Save, Don't Destroy, etc. when lacking a more specific resource or management recommendation)
 - 30100 – Monitoring, Inventories, Mapping, GIS
 - 30200 – Enforcement (Includes illegal activities on NFS land)
- 31000 – Physical Elements
 - 31100 – Water/Watershed Management
 - 31120 – Buffers, Riparian, Wetlands
 - 31130 – Dams and river/stream flow
 - 31200 – Soils Management
 - 31210 – Slope Stability Design
 - 31220 – Erosion Control / Topsoil
 - 31300 – Visual Resources Management
- 32000 – Biological Elements, Ecosystem Function
 - 32100 – Listed Species, Species of Interest, Concern, etc.
 - 32200 – Wildlife/Animals Management
 - 32210 – Breeding Programs, Stocking, Reintroductions
 - 32220 – Harvest Levels and Methods
 - 32230 – Wildlife Structures (ponds, waterholes, barriers)
 - 32240 – Domestic Livestock Management
 - 32300 – Vegetation Management
 - 32310 – Pesticides and Herbicides
 - 32320 – Cultivation, Maintenance
 - 32330 – Noxious Weeds
- 33000 – Timber Resource Management
- 34000 – Fire and Fuels Management; Wildland Fires (general)
 - 34100 – Fuels Reduction
- 36000 – Minerals, Oil & Gas, Exploration or Extraction
- 37000 – Other Activities Mgmt (Multiple, Special Use, Infrastructure)
 - 37100 – Permitting (except recreation permits)
 - 37200 – Valid Existing Rights
 - 37300 – Special Forest Products Collection (seed, plants, etc.)
 - 37400 – Heritage Resources Management
 - 37500 – Communication Sites and Facilities
 - 37600 – Utility Corridors

Transportation System Management

TRANS 40000-44999

40000 – Transportation System Mgmt General (and general access, multiple or if no other topic specified)

- 40100 – Roads/Trails Analysis (Mapping, Inventory)
- 40200 – Non-system and User-Created Roads/Trails
- 40300 – Rights-Of-Way/RS 2477
- 40400 – Motorized Cross-Country Travel (off-trail, off-road)
 - 40410 – Summer
 - 40411 – Travel to Campsites (300 ft)
 - 40420 -- Winter
- 40500 – OHV Managed Use Areas (play areas)
 - 40510 – Summer
 - 40520 – Winter
 - 40521 – Seasonal Snowmobile Closure (Oct 1-Nov 4)
- 40600 – Closed unless posted open / Open unless posted closed

41000 – Roads Management General (code specific road uses to the use)

- 41100 – Road Designation
- 41300 – Seasonal Restrictions/Closures
- 41400 – Road Construction, Reconstruction
- 41500 – Road Maintenance
- 41600 – Road Removal/Decommissioning/Close/Remain Closed

42000 – Trails Management General (code specific trail uses to the use)

- 42100 – Trail Designation
- 42200 – Trail Type
 - 42210 – Motorized
 - 42220 – Non-motorized
- 42300 – Seasonal Restrictions/Closures
- 42400 – Trails Construction, Reconstruction
- 42500 – Trails Maintenance
- 42600 – Trails Removal/Decommissioning/Close/Remain Closed
- 42700 – National Historic or Recreation Trails
- 42800 – Loop Trails

45000 – Transportation Related Structures (Signs, Bridges, Culverts, Gates, Safety-barriers, Habitat Linkages, Trailheads, Etc.)

46000 – Specific Route Suggestions (General)

- 46610 – Roads
- 46620 – Trails
- 46630 – Areas

47000 – Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM)

Recreation Management

RECRE 50000-59999

50000 – Recreation Management, General/Multiple

- 50100 – Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (balance of opportunities)
- 50300 – Recreation Permitting
 - 50310 – Commercial
 - 50320 – Non-commercial
- 50400 – User Education, General/Multiple
 - 50410 – Access and Travel Management education

52000 – Developed Recreation / Recreation Facilities

- 52100 – Campgrounds/Picnic Areas
- 52200 – Launch Sites (Rafts, Kayaks, Canoes)

53000 – Dispersed / Undeveloped Recreation Management

- 53100 – Motorized Recreation General
- 53200 – Mechanized Recreation (Bicycling)
- 53300 – Non-Motorized, Non-Mechanized Recreation
 - 53310 – Horses/Stock
- 53400 – Multiple/Combined Recreational Uses (user conflict)
- 53500 – Undeveloped Campsites

Lands and Special Designations

LANDS 60000-69999

60000 – Public Land Ownership/Boundaries

61000 – Land Acquisition and Exchanges

62000 – Special Designations

62100 – Roadless Areas

62200 – Designated Wilderness

62300 – Research Natural Areas

62400 – Wild and Scenic Rivers

62500 – National Historic Landmarks

62600 – Recommended Wilderness

Social and Economic

SOCEC 70000 – 79999

70000 – Social/Economic Actions or Activities

70100 – Economic Impacts to Local Businesses

70200 – Economic Impacts to Local Communities

71100 – Access for Traditional Uses (General)

71110 – Access for Traditional Uses (Tribal)

Other

OTHER 80000 – 80200

80100 – Questions Posed

80200 – Citations/References

Attachments

ATTMT – 99999

APPENDIX F—PREPARERS

List of Contributors

Project Coordination

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Colleen Fahy | Database Management |
| Elayne Murphy | Coding and Writing |
| Maple Stuivenga | Database Support and Data Entry |

Coders

Colleen Fahy
Amy Larson
Zilia Lewis
Elayne Murphy
Sonny Riley
Kathy Thompson

Data Entry and Clerical Support

Debbie DiTunno
Gordon Fitzwater
Donna Kinzer
Margaret Riley
Sonny Riley
Amy Shrenk
Janet Steiner
Maple Stuivenga

Report Writing

Elayne Murphy
Doug Gober (Appendix B, Site-specific Route Suggestions)