

Step 4- Assessing Benefits, Problems and Risks of the Existing Motorized Transportation System

The purpose of this step is to:

- Assess the current transportation system and whether the goals, objectives, guidelines, suitability criteria, and established desired future conditions described in the Forest Plan can be met.

The products of this step are:

- A description of the analysis process that may lead to suggested changes.
- Summary of evaluation criteria developed by resource specialists.

The process on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (ASNFs) was handled as follows:

- 1.) evaluation criteria developed by ID Team.
- 2.) ID Team meets with ranger districts individually to share criteria and request a district interdisciplinary assessment of the transportation system on that subunit, utilizing the criteria provided. Districts then asked to provide site-specific proposals.
- 3.) ID Team reviews proposal against criteria to be used for prioritization of mitigation for the individual changes.

The evaluation criteria and discussion developed by the ID Team is contained on the following pages.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Compliance and Heritage Resources

The following categories of proposals will be considered “undertakings” with the potential to affect historic properties triggering evaluation under Section 106 of the NHPA, 36 CFR 800, the Forest Service Region 3 Programmatic Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officers of four states, and the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation:

- Construction of a new road or trail;
- Authorization of motor vehicle use on a route currently closed to vehicles and;
- Formal recognition of a user-developed (unauthorized) route as a designated route open to motor vehicles.

Key Resource Questions for Roads (from a Heritage Resources viewpoint):

1. Are proposed roads within the Area of Potential Effect to Historic Properties (according to the NHPA)? The term “Historic Properties” refers to both historic and prehistoric archaeological sites.
2. Are proposed roads within the Area of Potential Effect to Traditional Cultural Places (TCP) or areas deemed sacred or of cultural value to the ten federally recognized tribes affiliated with the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests?
3. Are proposed new roads or trails in areas that have previously been 100% surveyed for archaeological sites?
4. Are proposed designated roads user-created?

Discussion: The Travel Management Analysis will consider reducing the number and mileage of existing open roads to limit motorized access. Given the estimate that more than half of the archaeological sites in National Forests in the southwest have been or are actively being looted, any closure of roads can be considered as limiting the access for illegal looting.

The actual Area of Potential Effect must be determined by the Forest Archaeologist with the concurrence of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer. The President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) must also be consulted.

Consultation with the ten affiliated tribes will be conducted on a government to government basis between the Forest Supervisor and the elected officials of the tribes. The Forest Tribal Liaison will conduct preliminary coordination between the Forest and the tribal Cultural Resources personnel.

Any new road or the official designation of a user-created route/road/trail will require costly archaeological survey not currently included in the Forest budget and Section 106 compliance.

Suggested Process for Analysis:

Heritage Resources (HR) Risk Rating Scale:

- 1 = Not recommended due to threat to Heritage Resource - HR management value high (presents an eminent danger of resource loss)
3 = Potential threat present and protection measures can be taken - HR management value neutral (usable for management access, but other options available)
5 = No threat to Heritage Resources is present - HR management value low (resource loss is unlikely).

Note: The highest score is the preferred answer to a question.

Suggested Steps:

1. Overlay location/sites of archaeological sites on the roads layer in GIS.
2. Examine the roads proposed for vehicle use against the questions below and render a (HR) value rating according to the above scale.
3. Consult with the ten affiliated tribes.

Questions:

- A. Is this road segment within the Area of Potential Effect of an archaeological site, sacred site, or TCP that is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places? (One mile or less from the perimeter of an eligible archaeological site?)
Yes = 1
No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
No = 5
- B. Can a different road or trail be used for access to other resources?
Yes = 1
No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
No = 5
- C. Is the road or trail currently being used by motorized vehicles although it is within the Area of Potential Effect of an archaeological site, sacred site, or TCP?
Yes = 1
No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
No = 5
- D. Is a proposed new road or trail in an area that has not been previously 100% surveyed?
Yes = 1
No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
No = 5

- E. Is the proposed road or trail in an area of identified heavy archaeological site looting?
 Yes = 1
 No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
 No = 5
- F. Will the proposed road or trail require NHPA, Section 106 compliance?
 Yes = 1
 No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
 No = 5
- G. Is the road or trail considered historic according to the NHPA, Section 106 definition of terms based on the Criteria for Eligibility to the List of Historic Places?
 Yes = 1
 No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3
 No = 5

Social Issues

SI (4): How does the road system and road management contribute to or affect people's sense of place?

Most people in the southwest are aware that Native Americans have lived for at least 11,000 years in the areas which are now designated as National Forests. Evidence of their occupation of this land is scattered across the forests in the form of pot shards, flakes of beautiful rocks, pictographs, petroglyphs, standing stacked rock walls, and other examples of a life that is long past.

Many living Native Americans consider the places where their ancestors lived and died to be sacred. More and more the general public considers these sites to be important since they represent the prehistory and history of this nation. Early European settlement is represented by long-abandoned cabins and remnants of fence lines or corrals. Cultural Tourism is gaining in importance and has a potential economic impact as well as an increased sense of pride in this place.

SI (5): What are the current conflicts between users, uses, and values (if any) associated with the road system and road management? Are these conflicts likely to change in the future with changes in local population, community growth, recreational use, resource developments, etc?

The most likely conflict will be in terms of the cumulative effects to archaeological, TCP, or sacred sites if OHV camping is limited to a designated area which has not been previously surveyed.

Questions:

A. Will the road or trail be interpreted to enhance the knowledge and appreciation of the importance of the southwest's history and prehistory ?

Yes = 5

No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3

No = 1

B. Is the camping area within the Area of Potential Effect of a known archaeological site, sacred site, or TCP that is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places? (One mile or less from the perimeter of an eligible archaeological site).

Yes = 1

No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3

No = 5

C. Can the archaeological site, sacred site, or TCP be adequately monitored for damage given the current staffing level?

Yes = 5

No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 3

No = 1

**Heritage Resource Specialist Input
on the
Travel Management Analysis Resource Criteria**

Peter Taylor
Apache Zone Archaeologist
February 16, 2007

For my input on the Travel Management Analysis, I would recommend that all roads not currently active and open to the public that are within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of an identified heritage resource site remain in closed. I would define the APE of a heritage resource site, as it pertains to the Alpine, Clifton, and Springerville Ranger Districts of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests, to be a distance of 200 meters (below 7,000 ft. asl) or 100 meters (above 7,000 ft asl) from a road.

This guideline will limit adverse impacts to heritage resource sites by limiting access to those sites near roads. It will also help to protect those sites within a roadway from the detrimental effects of traffic on the road as well as the more destructive effects of road maintenance.

Existing Forest Service roads that pass through heritage resource sites are not the subject of our immediate concern in the travel management analysis process. It has already been determined that these roads will have little effect on archaeological sites. This is clearly stated in the First Amended Programmatic Agreement between the State Historic Preservation Officers of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas and USFS Region 3, under Appendix I (*Standard Consultation Protocol For Travel Management*), Exemptions:

- A. The FS and the SHPOs agree that designation of existing system roads and trails, already open for motor vehicle use, will have little or no potential to affect historic properties. Such designations are exempt from further Section 106 review or consultation." System roads and trails are defined as those identified as "National Forest System Roads" and "National Forest System Trails" in the FS corporate database system, as defined in the Region 3 *Travel Management Rule Implementation Guidelines*, dated 06/12/2006. These roads and trails have Forest Service numbers, usually appear on current visitor and travel management maps, and are reported on in the FS Annual Roads Accomplishment Report and similar accomplishment reports.

While open and active roads that pass through heritage resource sites remain a concern, it is the closed roads and user created roads that pose the greatest risk to archaeological sites. These are also the roads we can do something about. We cannot save the heritage resources that are already compromised by active roads passing through them. We can, however, make an effort to save the sites that are impacted by user created and closed roads from being further damaged. These roads, if officially re-designated as open to public use, will expose the archaeological sites that are within the APE to unintentional damage from vehicles using the

roads and equipment maintaining the roads as well as intentional damage from vandalism and unauthorized artifact collection. In addition, if the currently closed roads are opened, the change of designation will require the Section 106 review process to take effect, which will involve a lengthy analysis and review process.

While I generally agree with the questions and criteria posed by Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Archaeologist Dr. Charlotte Hunter in her contribution to the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Supervisor's Office Interdisciplinary Team's key resource questions for Travel Management Analysis Resource Criteria document, I diverge from her position on the scope of the APE of an archaeological site.

On page 2, under the heading Questions, Item A, and again on page 4, Dr. Hunter suggests that the Area of Potential Effect of an archaeological site to a road should be one mile. I would take the position that the APE of an archaeological site should be significantly less than one mile. If we were to consider all roads that pass within one mile of a heritage resource site to be within the APE of the site, then most of the roads within the Forest Service road system would fall in that category.

As stated above, I propose that all currently closed roads remain closed if they pass within 200 meters (below 7,000 ft. asl) or 100 meters (above 7,000 ft asl) of an identified archaeological site.

Transportation Criteria for considering proposals & identifying needs for change

Values

1.) Does this route provide non-redundant access for administration of FS lands?

4- value

3- neutral

1- low

2.) Does this route serve as a collector for other public roads?

4- value

3- neutral

1- low

3.) Is this route involved in cooperative maintenance agreement with another organization or agency?

5- high value

3- neutral

1- low

4.) Are funds available and/or anticipated to maintain this road for the proposed level of use and operation?

4- high value

3- neutral

1- low

Fisheries questions for Travel Management analysis. Scale for all analysis is the 6th Hydrologic Unit Code Watershed.

1. What road mileage is located within 100m of a perennial or intermittent or an ephemeral stream/drainage?
(This includes both open and closed roads)

0-none

1 -0-<0.25 miles

3 -0.25-0.5 miles

5 ->0.5 miles

2. Does the watershed contain aquatic species of concern?

0 –contains no aquatic species of concern

3 –contains recreational fisheries/sensitive/native species

5 –contains threatened & endangered species or recovery habitat

Travel Management Fire and Fuels Key Resource Questions

Potential Value Questions –

1. Is the road system needed for fuels management?

Rating system:

5 = Yes, we need this road for fuels treatment access

3 = Maybe or neutral on the need of the road for fuels treatment access

1 = No, we do not need the road for fuels treatment access

2. Does the road system affect the capacity of the Forest Service and cooperators to suppress wildfires?

Rating System:

5 = The road system is needed for suppression activities

3 = The road may be needed for suppression activities

1 = The road is not needed for suppression activities

3. Does the road system contribute to airborne dust emissions resulting in reduced visibility and human health concerns?

5 = Significant contributions of dust emissions

3 = Moderate contributions of dust emissions

1 = Low contributions of dust emissions

Potential Risk Question

1. Does the road system affect risk to firefighters and public safety?

In other words, is the road needed to provide for the safety of firefighters and the public for access to private lands during fire suppression or needed for safety escape routes?

5 = The road is necessary to reduce the risk to firefighters and the public

3 = The road may be needed to reduce the risk to firefighters and the public

1 = The road is not needed to reduce the risk to firefighters and the public

Dan Mindar/R3/USDAFS
02/16/2007 03:00 PM To
Christopher S Bielecki/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES
cc
Susan N Lee/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Richard Davalos/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES
bcc

Subject
Travel Management Criterion

Chris,
After our district meeting, I am submitting edits to the Travel Management
Fire and Fuels Key Resource Questions.

Edit criterion #2

2. Does the road system affect the capacity of the Forest Service and
cooperators to suppress wildfires?
5= The road system is needed for suppression activities
3= The road may be needed for suppression activities (add or to access
water sources used in fire suppression)

Criterion #3 appears to belong elsewhere perhaps in engineering not fire
and fuels

3. Does the road system contribute to airborne dust emissions resulting in
reduced visibility and human health concerns?

Another criterion that we determined had no applicability to Alpine, but
may to other districts.

Does the road system provide an increased human caused risk of wildland
fire ignitions adjacent to private lands.

5= little or no risk
4= down wind of developed private land (north or east)
3= up wind of developed private land (south or west)
2= down wind of an at risk community (north or east)
1= up wind of an at risk community (south or west)

Dan Mindar
AFMO Fuels
Alpine Rd.
928-339-4384
Fax 928-339-4323
dmindar@fs.fed.us

Travel Management Planning and Mining Claim Access

The purpose of this paper is to identify the conflicts and issues between the 228A Surface Use regulations and the implementation of the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261, and 295) also known as “Travel Management Planning”. This paper will also provide the starting point for issuing national direction on how to resolve the conflicts.

Travel Management Rule

On November 2, 2005 the FS announced the final travel management regulations governing motor vehicle use on the national forests. Under the new rule vehicle travel will be restricted to designated roads and trail systems that are “socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable over time”.

Application of the Travel Management Rule will change the fundamental management of motorized travel on the national forests. In simple terms, application of the MVUR will change the existing vehicle travel management from, roads are:

“open for motor vehicle use, unless specifically ordered and posted as closed”,
to,
“closed for motor vehicle use, unless specifically designated and mapped as open.”

The bottom line is that by adopting the MVUR forests will be closing thousands of miles of roads.

Issues - Effect on Locatable Minerals Management

Some of the roads currently used by mining claim operators are not going to be designated as open and will therefore be considered “closed”. If access on a closed road is authorized in a current plan of operation, then the closed designation does not apply. The MVUR states that motor vehicle use that is specifically authorized under a written authorization issued under Federal law or regulations should be exempt from the rule.

However, how do we manage access on roads that are closed to the general public under the MVUR, but were previously used by an operator whose activities and access met the exemptions from a notice and plan of operations?

228.4(a)(1)(i)

“Operations which will be limited to the use of vehicles on existing public roads or roads used and maintained for National Forest System purposes;”

Issue – Reasonable Access

The operator (miner, claimant, contractor ...) has a statutory right of reasonable access to their mining claim and public land open to mineral entry. If an operator wants to use a closed road

we should first determine if that access is reasonable. However, we need to be careful, particularly if the road was built by miners.

Issue – How do we “document” closed road use by an operator?

If the use of the road is currently covered by an approved plan then the MRUR only applies to the general public and not to the operator.

In a case where there is no significant surface disturbance and the operation was exempt from filing a NOI or a plan, what should we use to “document” the use of the closed road?

We could issue a simple fire-style waiver to only the claimant or the operator. This would prevent the claimant/operator from being cited by a zealous LEO.

Issue- Does a road closed under the MVUR still meet the 228.4(a)(1)(i) exemption?

Is a closed road still an “existing public road or road used and maintained for National Forest System purposes”? If not, does the use of the road no longer qualify as an exemption? How do we now authorize use of the road?

Issue – Does closed road use require at least a minimal plan of operations?

In this case, their use of the road is authorized by the plan of operations and the miner would be responsible for maintaining the road.

Issue – How do we minimize the increased work load on our mineral administrators?

Recommendations

1. Minerals people need to get involved with the travel management planning. I recommend a forest develop maps that show where mining claims are located and roads regularly used by miners.
2. If there is a cluster of active mining claims along or at the end of a road, get it designated as an open road. Don't go looking for trouble by closing roads regularly used by miners.
3. Include mining groups in travel mgt planning. Discuss the use of a simple waiver for use of closed roads. Emphasize they would have near exclusive use of the road.
4. Special Use permits? Don't even think about it.
5. Decide if motorized use of the closed road is reasonable.

A Related Issue -Roadless Area Access

According to what I was told by the WO Ecosystem Management staff expert for roadless area management, the 2001 rule only applied to road construction or reconstruction. If a proposed use is on an existing road, the rule does not apply.

The Roadless rule preamble states that:

“Access for the exploration of locatable minerals pursuant to the General Mining Law of 1872 is not prohibited by this rule. Determination of access requirements for exploration or development of locatable minerals is governed by the provisions of 36 CFR 228A.”

Provided 6/20/2007 by:

Mike Doran
Locatable Minerals Program Leader
USDA, Forest Service
Minerals and Geology Mgt.
1249 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 200
Boise, ID 83709
Ph: (208) 373-4132
FAX (208) 373-4111

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE

Current Condition Lands

Access for all authorized Federal and non-Federal land uses located on the Forests is addressed as part of the analysis and/or permitting process, and

Within the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests there are numerous situations on the Ranger Districts where motorized access to non-Federal lands is either not authorized and/or over existing transportation system roads. Many unauthorized access routes as well as some of the authorized access roads may not be in the best locations resulting in some adverse impact to natural resource values.

Desired Future Condition Lands

The Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests motorized transportation system provides:

Adequate access for all authorized Federal and non-Federal land uses located on the Forests while protecting adjacent natural resource values, and

All non-Federal lands within the proclaimed National Forests Boundaries with the minimum authorized access required by law while protecting adjacent natural resource values.

Current Condition Minerals

Access for all approved locatable and leasable mineral operations on the Forests is addressed as part of the analysis, approval, or permitting process, and

Access for all approved common variety and salable mineral operations on the Forests is addressed as part of the analysis and permitting process.

Desired Future Condition Minerals

The Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests motorized transportation system provides:

Adequate access for all approved locatable and leasable mineral operations on the Forests while protecting adjacent natural resource values, and

Adequate access for all approved common variety and salable mineral operations on the Forests while protecting adjacent natural resource values.

Key Resource Questions for Roads needed for Lands and Minerals:

1. Are sufficient system roads being retained (where they already exist) and identified (where needed) to facilitate current and future access to private lands and mineral deposits?
2. Are roads managed as open to motorized vehicles to allow reasonable access for eligible private landowners and those requiring access for mineral production?

Discussion: The Travel Management Analysis will consider reducing the number and mileage of existing open roads to limit motorized access. We must recognize the right to legal access to private lands that are eligible under ANILCA, instances where there is no other means of legal access across adjoining non-Federal land, or environmental consequences dictate access is best across NFS land. Some of the identified access roads could be reasonably managed as closed to public entry. The extraction of locatable minerals may be addressed in an approved Plan of Operations if roads are located within the mining claim. Outside of a valid mining claim access would either be over an existing road in the Forest Transportation System or permitted on a case-by-case basis.

Suggested Process for Analysis:

1. Overlay the private lands within the proclaimed A-S NF's on the roads layer in GIS.
2. Examine those roads proposed for closure against the questions below and render a VALUE rating according to this scale:
 - 5 = Access requirement high (access right guaranteed by ANILCA).
 - 3 = Access requirement neutral (access available through other legal means, or use of existing Forest Transportation System roads)
 - 1 = Access requirement low (access should be through other legal means not involving FS).

Is this road segment the only access to this non-Federal land or locatable mining claim?
Yes, this is the best/logical access to the land = 5
No, other routes are available = 3
No, an alternate route is judged better = 1

3. Examine those roads proposed for closure against the questions below and render a RISK rating according to this scale:
 - 1 = Access requirement risk low (stable and/or low maintenance needs)
 - 3 = Access requirement risk neutral (moderate in stability/maintenance needs)
 - 5 = Access requirement risk high (unstable and/or high maintenance needs)

Is the road segment in compliance with soil & water Best Management Practices?
Yes, this road segment is relatively stable with minimal maintenance needs = 1
No, some instability or reconstruction needed for continued use = 3
No, major maintenance/reconstruction needs = 5

Is the road segment relatively stable with minimal maintenance needs?

Yes, little if any disturbance necessary = 1

Yes, deficiencies could be corrected with reasonable disturbance/cost = 3

No, correcting deficiencies would require high disturbance/high cost = 5

This process would help identify those roads needed for permanent legal access to non-Federal lands. It does not address the question of whether they should remain in open or closed status to the public in general. That is not a big issue as the status can be changed concurrent with those needs of the respective land owner or public road agency that may eventually accept responsibility for the road. The Sitgreaves has a very limited number of locatable mining claims so the impacts would be minimal. There are also a very limited number of mill site claims on the Apache so the impacts would be minimal.

TMR Recreation criteria

1) Is this a primary access route?

1 No

3

5 Yes

2) Would the route provide opportunities in an area of high demand or provide a unique opportunity that is in limited supply in the local area?

1 Potentially serves a small number of users or similar opportunities provide in the immediate area.

3

5 Serves area of high demand and/or unique opportunity not provided in the surrounding area

3) What is the likelihood of creating a significant problem at another location if the route is not designated?

1 High likelihood of creating a problem by displacing existing users to another location

3

5 Little to no likelihood of creating a problem elsewhere by displacing users.

4) Does the existing route provide a loop opportunity and/or adequate mileage for a motorized trail?

1 No opportunity for loop route, less than 20 miles in length or would require extensive construction.

3 Some new construction required for loop opportunity, but only short connection between existing routes, length of 20 – 30 miles or possible loop with county jurisdiction road segment.

5 Existing loop (s) all forest service jurisdiction and length of 30 miles or more

5) What are the effects of noise and other disturbances caused by developing, using, and maintaining roads on the quantity, quality, and type of roaded or unroaded recreation opportunities?

1 Numerous effects and/or disturbances

3

5 Few effects and/or disturbances

6) Is access to this route adequate for rescue, administrative, and law enforcement personnel and vehicles?

1 No

3

5 Yes

7) What are the forest visitors' attachments to the area, how strong are their feelings and are alternative opportunities and locations available?

1 limited attachment to the area, limited alternative opps and locations

3

5 strong attachments to the area, unlimited alternative opps and locations

8) Can traffic/use conflicts be mitigated on this route or is there an absence of conflict?

1 there is conflict, can not be easily mitigated

3

5 there is an absence of conflict and/or conflict can be easily mitigated

Key Resource Questions for Roads (from a vegetation management/fuelwood viewpoint):

1. Are sufficient system roads being retained (where they already exist) to facilitate future silvicultural treatment on suitable lands?
2. Are sufficient roads managed as open to motorized vehicles to allow reasonable access for the fuelwood gathering public?

Discussion: The Travel Management Analysis will consider reducing the number and mileage of existing open roads to limit motorized access. In our zeal to reduce road density we need to recognize the long-term need for continued access to suitable lands for future vegetative management, including commercial or service contract treatment. While such access could reasonably be managed as closed for public entry between management entries, the interim extraction of fuelwood and miscellaneous forest products through our existing permit system must also be considered.

Suggested Process for Analysis:

1. Overlay location/sites of suitable lands on the roads layer in GIS. (Suitable lands are land class codes of 500 or 600 on slopes less than 40%, including woodland areas where mechanical vegetation treatment is considered appropriate for forage production, encroachment control, or fuelbreaks).
2. Examine the proposed route against the questions below and render a VALUE rating according to this scale:
 - 5 = Veg management value high (needed for management access).
 - 1 = Veg management value low (not necessary for management access).
 - 3 = Veg management value neutral (usable for management access, but other options available)

Is this road segment 1,000 feet or less from the perimeter of a suitable stand?

Yes. Is this the only such access for this suitable stand?

Yes = 5

No, but it is judged better than the alternative access = 5

No, other routes are available = 3

No, alternate route is judged better = 1

No. Would this route be a logical link (with extension to the suitable stand) for the flow of future wood products to a level 3 or higher haul route?

Yes = 5

Yes, but there are other alternatives = 3

No = 1

3. Examine the proposed route against the questions below and render a RISK rating according to this scale:

5 = Veg management risk high (unstable and/or high maintenance needs)

1 = Veg management risk low (stable and/or low maintenance needs)

3 = Veg management risk neutral (moderate in stability/maintenance needs)

Is this road segment in compliance with soil & water Best Management Practices?

Yes. Is this road segment relatively stable with minimal maintenance needs?

Yes = 1

No, some instability or reconstruction needed for continued use = 3

No, major maintenance/reconstruction needs = 5

No. Is this road segment relatively stable with minimal maintenance needs?

Yes, correcting deficiencies would require high disturbance/high cost = 1

Yes, deficiencies could be corrected with reasonable disturbance/cost = 3

No = 5

Gayle Richardson/R3/USDAFS
02/15/2007 03:50 PM To
Christopher S Bielecki/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES
cc
Susan N Lee/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Robert S Taylor/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES
bcc

Subject
Key Resource questions

Chris,
In reviewing your key point questions from the vegetation management/fuelwood viewpoint I have a suggestion.

Under #1 for the suggested process. It suggests that we overlay location/sites of suitable lands on the roads layer in GIS.

The problem is that there is no way to identify the suitable acres from a database as this data has not been input for all location/sites. Many have codes 510 -590 or 610-690 or no code at all.

The other problem is that suitable lands also should include slopes over 40%. I believe our Forest Plan still includes these stands as part of the suitable base.

I would suggest that we eliminate #1 as the important items for roads are covered in #2, # and the fuels key questions.

Thanks, Gayle

Monica Boehning/R3/USDAFS
02/16/2007 04:53 PM To
Christopher S Bielecki/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc

James Copeland/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, William H Ripley/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES,
Gayle Richardson/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Joseph A Hamrick/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES,
Raymond Rugg/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, James Pitts/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES
bcc

Subject

Fw: Travel Mgmt. Rule Veg criteria

After Alpine's TMR meeting today, for your due date of today, here are 4 edits recommended to the list of "Key Resource Questions for Roads from a Vegetation management/fuelwood viewpoint"

A.) Drop all references to "suitable lands" or "suitable stands" , and drop Suggested Process #1 entirely.

Rationale: See points stated in my e-mail below, as well as Gayle Richardson's e-mail to you dated 2/15/07. Moreover, FSH 2409.13 Chapter 20 also states that suitability for timber production is to be reviewed every 10 years and may be redesignated as suitable or unsuitable if certain criteria are met. For example, ALL of our LMP Mgmt. Area #2 (Woodlands on all slopes) are currently classified as "Unsuitable" because pinyon-juniper sites were not considered land capable of producing industrial timber or wood product. But these regulations direct us to consider changing that classification should a demand develop for such species, and the technology emerges to utilize it as an industrial wood. So only focusing on sites classified as "suitable" now automatically excludes some important fuelwood interests. Because suitability is so rigidly defined by law and regulation, but subject to change from one NEPA project to the next, and is not even easily mapped in GIS nor well coded in the database, it is just too problematic to use for this analysis.

B.) Suggested Revision: This issue of access for timber harvest /silv. treatments may be better covered on the TMR Transportation Criteria list of key questions, by modifying #2 on that list to read, "Does this route provide adequate access to areas feasible for logging, thinning, reforestation, pest management, and fuels reduction activities?" The important word here is "feasible". We're not saying that we need roads open everywhere just in case a future wildfire might someday need to have trees planted, or a pest epidemic might occur anywhere in the future. But if the road accesses areas which are feasible for such activities to be

done with motorized vehicles, then it is a high to moderate value road for silviculture/timber interests.

However, one fundamental question we need clarified please. If these criteria are to help determine roads that should be left open for PUBLIC access, then why even discuss timber/silv. management needs, which are always going to be some sort of ADMINISTRATIVE access. Whether logging, thinning, reforestation, pest control efforts, fuels reduction work is done either by force-account, or by service contract, or by timber sale, or by stewardship contract, or by cooperative agreement, they all would still be approved and commissioned by the USFS for implementation. The general public would not be out there doing these activities. Only forest-wide or district-wide permits for fuelwood or other small wood products would actually be implemented by public citizens. Or could we now be facing limited administrative access that needs to be considered in these criteria also? Can you please clarify?

C.) Addition possibly needed to the TMR Veg. Mgmt key question list: Is

this road/ATV trail needed to access permanent Forest Health/Pest Management monitoring plots installed by the USFS Arizona Zone Entomologists/Pathologists or related specialists? 5= Yes, this is the only access and must be reached by truck or ATV annually to safely transport monitoring equipment. 3= Yes this is the only access, but will only be needed occasionally and personnel can be issued an administrative vehicle access permit as needed. 1 = No, this road is not needed because a nearby road will be kept open and personnel can walk in safely to perform adequate monitoring on foot. Chris - I will need time early next week to consult with the AZ Zone Pest folks about this one. So I must make this a draft addition for now, with the right reserved to make edits pending their input. Thanks.

D.) Numerical ratings: On the TMR Veg. Mgmt. list of key questions the ratings of high to low (5-vs-1) are not used consistently for beneficial rankings versus adverse rankings. For example a value of 5 is used in some places as a high desire to keep a road open. But elsewhere the value of 5 is used to mark high cost or resource disturbance, which is actually a low desire to keep a road open. Like under the BMP part of question #3 - if a road IS compliant with BMPs and IS stable with minimal maintenance needs, shouldn't that road be ranked as a 5 for high value?

~~~~~  
Monica Boehning - Silviculturist, Apache Zone

Apache-Sitgreaves Natl. Forests  
Alpine RD (928) 339-4384 = primary office  
Springerville RD (928) 333-4372  
Internet: mboehning@fs.fed.us

~~~~~

----- Forwarded by Monica Boehning/R3/USDAFS on 02/16/2007 02:49 PM -----

Monica Boehning/R3/USDAFS

02/15/2007 05:48 PM

To

Christopher S Bielecki/R3/USDAFS, James Copeland/R3/USDAFS

cc

William H Ripley/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Gayle Richardson/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES,

Joseph A Hamrick/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Raymond Rugg/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES,

James

Pitts/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES

Subject

Re: Travel Mgmt. Rule Veg criteria

Chris - Regarding the definition of lands "Suitable" for Timber production in the TMR Veg. Mgmt. Key Resource Question Criteria, the definition given there is far from inclusive of all sites in our LMP that are truly classified as "Suitable" for LMP Mgmt. Area #1. Land class codes (Timber Component Codes in RMRIS database) that are listed as "Suitable" are codes 500, 510, 520, 521, 600, 630, 640, 650, 660, & 670. These also DO include slopes over 40%, and are based on the timber resource land suitability classification process directed by FSH 2409.13 - Timber Resource Planning Handbook, WO Amendment 2409.13-92-1 (Ch. 20) which is still current. "Suitability" classification of each veg. site is determined at the project analysis level, with a Silv. certification of consistency with NFMA. The problem is, we have many many sites that have no Timber Component Codes of any kind input for them in the database. So doing a query based on timber suitability would miss a LOT of the forest acreage, and thus a LOT of roads accessing them may be missed as needed to keep in our system for future silv. treatments! I will present this information at Alpine's TMR Criteria Review meeting tomorrow, but hopefully the Silv. on each district has also detected this shortcoming and reported it to you. I just alerted Gayle of it this PM, and she's in complete agreement. (Neither of us can figure out what Doug was thinking when he wrote this up, but he might have had a less than obvious reason.) I'll put some thought into a replacement Key Question or how to work around this dilemma. And the way I see it, all "Unsuitable" lands where we are using silv. veg. treatments for doing WUI fuels reductions should be covered by the Fire and Fuels Key Resource Questions &/or Transportation Criteria. Silv. veg. treatments being done for

terrestrial Wildlife Habitat benefits on Unsuitable lands is another question I have.
Thanks, ~MB

~~~~~  
Monica Boehning - Silviculturist, Apache Zone  
Apache-Sitgreaves Natl. Forests  
Alpine RD (928) 339-4384 = primary office  
Springerville RD (928) 333-4372  
Internet: mboehning@fs.fed.us  
~~~~~

Social/Economics

RISK

Does the ROS class (or classes) allow motor vehicle use?

- 1-no
- 3-
- 5-yes

Does the management area or areas allow motor vehicle use?

- 1-no
- 3-
- 5-yes

Is the route in an Inventoried Roadless Area?

- 1-no
- 3-
- 5-yes

Could the route encourage encroachment into wilderness, primitive area or IRA?

- 1-no
- 3-
- 5-yes

Is significant funding needed to allow motor vehicle use on this route?

- 1-no improvements or only signing needed (overall signing of system may require considerable funding but nothing out of ordinary require for this route)
- 3-low-cost improvement likely needed
- 5-significant funding likely needed to provide parking, improve crossings, clear and maintain route

Do adjoining landowners support motor vehicle use?

- 1-no
- 3-
- 5-yes

Social/Economics

VALUE

Is the route/areas of local, regional, or national significance?

- 1-local
- 3-regional
- 5-national

Are adequate parking and trailhead facilities available?

- 1-no existing trailhead or suitable undeveloped areas with potential for parking
- 3-no existing trailheads but adequate space for easily developed parking
- 5-some existing trailheads/parking areas and other space for easily developed parking

Do users of the area or route support motor vehicle use?

- 1-no, there are conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users of the area or route
- 3-neutral, there may be conflicts but they could be minimized
- 5-yes, there are no conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users

Does the route provide access to range or wildlife improvements and is needed for their maintenance?

- 1-no
- 3-yes, but alternate routes may be better
- 5-yes

Watershed questions for Travel Management analysis 5/17/07.

3. Is the route located in a watershed with a state listed 303(d) impaired stream or lake?
1 - no
3 – yes all other causes
5 –yes – sediment
4. Is the route within a protected municipal watershed?
0 –no
5 -yes
5. How much of the route is located on sensitive (highly erosive) soils?
1 -<15%
3 -15-35%
5 ->35%
6. What is the road-stream crossing density in the watershed?
1 -<0.60 crossings/square mile
3 -0.61 – 1.63 crossing/square mile
5 ->1.63 crossings/square mile
7. How many stream crossings per mile on the road?
1-0
3-0-2
5->2
8. What is the road density in the 6th code HUC?
1 -<1.9 miles/sq mile
3 -2.0-3.5 miles/sq mile
5 ->3.5 miles/sq mile

Methodology:

Question numbers 1 will be answered using the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality's biannual surface water assessment. The 303(d) stream listings are compiled and monitored by the state of Arizona per requirements in the Clean Water Act. This question identifies roads that are located within 6th code HUC watersheds that have streams listed as either: impaired, non-attaining, or unique waters.

Question 2 pertains to whether there is a road lies within a nationally recognized protected municipal watershed. There are no such designations on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest so this question will not be answered for each individual road but it should be noted that this issue was considered in this analysis.

Question 3 addresses site specific risks associated with each road segment. This question identifies the percentage of each road which lies on highly erosive soils. Roads with over 35% of their length on high erosion soils are a high risk, 15-35% a moderate risk and less than 15% a low risk.

Question 4 concerns the amount of times a roads and streams cross in a watershed. This is an issue as road-stream interactions are sources for direct sediment inputs into stream channels. The scale of analysis for this was the 6th code watershed. The values used to rank watersheds as high, medium, or low risk were based upon splitting the values for each 6th code watershed across the forest into the top, middle, and lower third according to crossing densities.

Question 5 is another that is specific to the road or site and not the watershed in question. This question determines the amount of stream crossings per mile of road. The categories are based upon a moderate hazard (0-2 crossings/mile) being just above and below the average crossings per mile (1.2) for all roads analyzed.

Question 6 addresses road density within a watershed. This includes both open and closed roads. The numbers for ranking each watershed are based upon the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest Plan standards.

All questions will be further analyzed in the following manner:

Question 1 will be the primary filter for all other questions. Any road located in a 6th code watershed with a state listed 303(d) stream due to sediment will automatically receive a high risk rating. Any roads in a 6th code watershed with a designated unique water will also automatically receive a high risk rating. Any road in a 6th code watershed that is listed due to a pollutant other than sediment (*E. coli* for the roads in question) will receive a moderate rating for question one and the higher of question one and the average of questions 3-6 will be the final risk rating for that road segment.

The majority of roads analyzed will not fall in a watershed with a listed 303(d) stream for the remaining roads, questions 3-6 will be averaged to yield a composite ranking that will determine whether the road is a high (5), medium (3), or low (1) watershed risk.

Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests
Travel Management Rule
Watershed Desired Future Conditions
Dustin Walters, Hydrologist

The desired future conditions for watershed resources (including soil, water, and air) in regard to travel management are movement toward a set of standards for certain indices. These indices are all applicable to the 6th code watershed and include:

- Reduce road mileage in watersheds that have EPA listed 305(b) or 303(d) streams or lakes.
- Reduce road mileage in protected municipal watersheds.
- Reduce road mileage in watersheds so that no more than 35% of unsurfaced road mileage goes through sensitive (highly erosive) soils.
- Reduce road/stream crossings to 2.0 crossings per squared mile.
- Reduce road densities to 3.5 miles per squared mile (both open and closed roads).

**Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants Criteria for Travel Management Screening
(these apply to individual road or route segments, and are risk rankings)**

1. Are proposed, endangered, threatened, or sensitive terrestrial or aquatic species found on or near the route? (pts for each instance).
 - 5 – Proposed, threatened, or endangered (PTE) species are within 5 miles downstream along a perennial stream or 3 miles downstream along an intermittent stream (for Chiricahua leopard frog only); or designated territories (PACs, Breeding Areas, other) overlie or within 50 yards of the road.
 - 3 – Sensitive species present (designated occupied streams, or designated territories (PFAs, other) overlie or are immediately adjacent; or PTE species designated territories are within ½ mile.
 - 3 – Individual locations of sensitive species, or PTE species with very small home ranges (ie: frogs, swwf), are within 300 feet of route.
 - 1 – Sensitive species within 5 miles downstream (frogs) or within ½ mile (PFAs, designated territories, eyrie) or other single locations are within 1350 feet of route.
 - 0 – No sensitive species present and sensitive frogs, snails, and mussels are not within 5 miles downstream along a perennial stream or 3 miles along an intermittent stream.

2. Is the route located near sensitive habitats (wildlife quiet areas, wildlife closure areas, calving areas, wet meadows, critically time sensitive areas, etc)?
 - 5 – Sensitive habitats are found on the route.
 - 3 – Sensitive habitats are located within 500 feet of route.
 - 0 – Sensitive habitats are not present.

3. Does the route travel through riparian areas?
 - 5 – The route is within 20 meters of riparian areas and perennial streams, or crosses such an area at 2 or more sites.
 - 3 – The route crosses a riparian area, and the amount of disturbance is at one point only.
 - 1 – The route does not pass within 20 meters of a riparian area, and there is adequate vegetation to buffer potential sedimentation issues.

(edited on 7/25/07 by ct)

Proposed, Threatened, and Endangered Species

Mexican wolf
Lesser long-nosed bat
Black footed ferret
Jaguar
SW Willow Flycatcher
Bald Eagle
Brown Pelican
Mexican spotted owl

Chiricahua leopard frog
Gila Chub
Little Colorado spinedace
Spikedace
Apache Trout
Gila Trout
Loach Minnow

Sensitive species

Springville pocket mouse
White Mtns ground squirrel
NM jumping mouse
Northern goshawk
Common Black-hawk
Mountain Plover
W. Yellow-billed Cuckoo
Peregrine Falcon
Mexican garter snake
Narrow-headed garter snake
SW toad
Northern leopard frog
Lowland leopard frog

Little Colorado sucker
Roundtail chub
California floater
Three Forks springsnail
Goodings onion
Blumer's dock
Arizona willow

The ranger district processes are summarized on the following pages.

Travel Management Rule Alpine Ranger District Summary of Analysis of Desired Condition

The Alpine Ranger District initiated its Travel Management Rule (TMR) interdisciplinary analysis per Forests direction in 2006. The District Ranger and other members of the District Leadership Team attended public meetings in Alpine, adjacent communities, and on several occasions met with interested members of the local public for on-the-ground meetings. The public input from these meetings was incorporated into our process for developing our transportation system proposal.

In February, 2007, district personnel met to review quad maps and the existing GIS database Road Systems layer (ML1-5) and again in March, 2007 to recommend desired conditions for travel management on the District. An interdisciplinary approach was taken in this process. All District quad maps were reviewed individually as well as each road identified on the maps. The location of heavily used dispersed camping sites were identified, as well as the route to access these sites. Our publics were very clear that one of their highest priorities was the opportunity for quality dispersed recreation and camping. The Districts' goal was to balance an adequate distribution of open roads and dispersed recreation opportunities with responsible and professional resource protection. The District identified the desired transportation system (open roads) utilizing both coarse and fine filters including:

- Input from Permittees, Forest visitors and public meetings, and District expertise.**
- TMR Implementation Guidelines – Rev 1 – 3/23/2007.**
- General resource guidelines (watershed, fisheries, roads, wildlife, etc).**
- Interaction/coordination with neighboring Springerville District and Gila National Forest, Quemado and Glenwood Ranger Districts.**
- LRMP Standards and Guidelines.**
- Laws, Regulations, Policy relating to Wilderness, Primitive Areas, and Inventoried Roadless Areas.**
- Current road status/safety/condition/resource concerns.**
- Current recreation uses and opportunities.**
- Rights of Ways (granted/acquired).**
- Permitted uses (range management, utilities).**
- Steep slopes & sensitive soils.**
- Known cultural resources.**
- TES habitats & other wildlife resources.**
- Relation to stream channels, riparian areas and wet meadows, T&E species**
- Parallel or duplicate routes.**
- Potential conflict with other established recreation opportunities such as hiking, horseback riding, or bicycles paths.**
- Is the route, area or corridor within a protected municipal watershed.**

**TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE
INITIAL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED ACTION
Black Mesa Ranger District
9/18/2007**

Basic Criteria Guidelines for Developing Proposed Action

1. Input from Permittees, Forest visitors and public meetings (7/2006)
2. TMR Implementation Guidelines – Revision 1 -- 3/23/2007
3. A series of meetings with district staff representing range, wildlife, timber, silviculture, fire, lands and recreation – winter and spring of 2006
4. TMR Implementation Guidelines – Revision 2 – 7/13/2007

Key Issues and Guidelines Considered in Proposed Action Development

**Road/motorized trail currently in INFRA data base system, numbered. Existing data base reflects many roads as Level 1, but are presently managed as Level 2 (not decommissioned). Unless shown for closure and removal, data base needs to be cleaned up to reflect Level 2 and included in Existing Direction .

**Historic campsites have been located/GPS'd for 85% of Level 2-5 roads and motorized Trails, need more extensive data collection to confirm all sites.

**District proposed action overlayed with Mexican Spotted owl habits and Goshawk Post Fledging areas to review areas of concern.

**Previous heritage resource clearances were overlayed on areas proposed for corridors and areas to determine anticipated level of cultural clearance needed. Para-archeological program on Black Mesa RD expected to cover majority of this need. Additional funding source may be Arizona State Parks OHV grants for TMR route designation.

** Considered resource conflicts where roads cross drainages and eliminated dispersed camping and corridors in those areas.

**Considered dispersed camping in portion of the district along the Mogollon Rim; high recreation demand, close to water-based recreation, high elevation, mixed conifer that provides the summer climatic relief for the majority of the Black Mesa RD forest visitors (Phoenix and Tuscan metro areas). Considered the existing recreation management in the Rim Lakes Recreation area with 180 + sites designated.

** Considered corridor camping and areas in the northern portion of the district; lower recreational demand; remote from the Phoenix metro area, farther from water-based recreation, little climatic relief in summer, lower elevation, Pinion/juniper vegetation type and lower standard of roads. Portion of the district with more hunt related camping and activities than general camping or day use.

** Considered providing a diverse spectrum of recreation opportunities; from highly developed fee sites to designated dispersed sites to corridors and areas where public has a sense of exploring, discovery and self reliance.

**Considered potential conflicts with dispersed camping in close proximity to residential areas of Heber, Overgaard and Forest Lakes along the forest boundary. (FR 51, FR 50, FR 86, FR 160, FR 99, FR 504)

**Considered road safety where speeds and visual distance may be unsafe and/or provide a lower quality recreation experience on Level 3 Forest or County roads (FR 504, FR 86, FR 34, portions of FR 99).

**Considered private land access and current or historical access conflicts and permitted use conflicts when developing proposed action.

**TRAVEL MANAGEMENT RULE
INITIAL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED ACTION
CLIFTON RANGER DISTRICT**

7/24/07

Basic Criteria Guidelines for Developing Proposed Action

5. Input from Permittees, Forest visitors and public meetings, and District Expertise
6. TMR Implementation Guidelines – Revision 1 -- 3/23/2007
7. Specific Resource Guidelines (Watershed, Fisheries, Roads, Wildlife, etc).
8. Interaction/coordination with neighboring Districts (Glenwood RD)
9. TMR Implementation Guidelines – Revision 2 – 7/13/2007

Key Issues and Guidelines Considered in Proposed Action Development

**Road/motorized trail currently in INFRA data base system, numbered. Existing data base reflects many roads as Level 1, but are presently managed as Level 2 (not closed to public use). Unless shown for closure, data base needs to be cleaned up to reflect Level 2 and included in Existing Direction (Criteria Guide CG #5).

**Historic campsites have been located/GPS'd for 85% of Level 2-5 roads and motorized Trails, need more extensive data collection to confirm all sites. Groups of sites used for determination of corridor options (CG #2, #5) and accurate locations (CG #1).

**Roads/Motorized trails overlayed on sensitive soils and slope, resources at risk to impacts, and private lands to assist in determination of suitability for fixed distance corridors, closure to dispersed camping with or without designated sites (CG #1, #2, #3, #5). Roads that currently have seasonal closures in place address resource issues (FR 515, FR 836/704).

**Road safety issues considered relative to dispersed camping opportunities along State highways (Highway 191 and 78), or where speeds and visual site distance may be an issue on Level 3 Forest or County roads (FR 217, FR 475) (CG #2, #3).

**Previous heritage resource clearances referenced by District personnel and to be overlayed on areas proposed for corridors to determine anticipated level of cultural clearance needed. Para-archeological program on Clifton expected to cover majority of this need (CG #2, #3, #5).

**Input and recommendations for consideration of private land conflicts, permitted use conflicts, and consistency with neighboring district considered when developing proposed action (CG#1, #4, #5).

Travel Management Springerville Ranger District Summary of Analysis of Desired Condition

Please note update to Districts Desired Condition on page 3.

In February, March and early April of 2007, the Springerville Ranger District used an interdisciplinary approach to identify desired conditions for Travel Management on the District. Several meetings were held with District Staff and substaff, Law Enforcement, Fire Prevention Technicians and other District folks familiar with on the ground road conditions. These meetings were held to recommend desired conditions for travel management on the District.

District quad maps were reviewed and corrections made where needed.

Roads to remain open and heavily used dispersed areas were indicated on District quad maps.

Numerous factors were considered for determining which roads to designate as open for public travel. The primary consideration was the existing condition of the roadway (whether resource damage is occurring through use of the roadway). Proximity to streams or drainages (particularly those with Threatened & Endangered species) was considered. Numerous other factors were considering including such things as the need for access to developed recreation sites, water developments and access for fire suppression. During the analysis, the District also recognized the demand for and need to provide dispersed recreation opportunities. Consideration was given to the distribution of open roads available to the public for these activities. The District wanted to provide access for these activities to be spread fairly evenly across the District.

During review of the quad maps, the District Team tried to always answer the question “Why” when classifying a road as open or roads recommended as closed to public travel. Why should this roadway be designated as open? For example, if a road is in fairly good condition, provides access for dispersed recreation, is not causing resource damage in proximity to TES streams or drainages and may only need minor maintenance, the Team designated it as open on the quad map. Roads in a poor location (in or immediately adjacent to a TES stream or drainage), not well drained (surface currently eroding) with erosion directly impacting the stream and which would require more than minimal maintenance, were not designated as open on the quad maps.

The District receives a high level of dispersed recreation generally from April through November. Numerous popular areas for dispersed camping occur across the District. Most of these areas are less than 10 acres. They are so popular that names have been given to the sites. Examples include Brady Park, Potato Patch, Gillespie Flat, etc. Many of the sites are utilized by small groups. For example, approximately 6-8 separate fire rings occur at Brady Park. Other dispersed sites occur as scattered individual camping sites across the District.

On the ground measurements were taken to determine the median distance of dispersed camping sites from roadways at several concentrated dispersed camping sites. Very few dispersed camping sites were in excess of 400 feet from roadways. Most dispersed camping sites were between 200 and 250 feet of the roadway.

The District recognizes the demand for dispersed camping and wants to maintain this recreational opportunity which is important to forest users. To accommodate existing and future demand for dispersed camping, the District proposes to primarily use the following two methods; 1) Facilitating camping through roadside parking and 2) Designation of small areas to allow for dispersed camping.

1) The District recommends allowing roadside camping (where design speed allows for safe camping), along level 2-4 roads designated as open on the attached quad maps.

2) In some areas of concentrated dispersed camping, such as Brady Park, dispersed camping sites are slightly greater than 300 feet from the roadway. The District would designate small (generally less than ten acre concentrated dispersed sites) areas open for dispersed camping. These small concentrated areas are identified on the quad maps in green. Some of these areas are too small to be mapped to scale and would be represented by a map symbol and corresponding signs on the ground to facilitate public identification of open areas. For implementation, the method of signing used at Black Mesa on the Rim may be appropriate (i.e Camping allowed within xx feet of the roadway). The District will continue to identify dispersed camping areas and reflect their location on the map throughout the process.

It is assumed that the dispersed camping areas (described in 1 & 2 above) would be available when use will not result in resource damage.

In some cases, the District may want to designate specific routes / sites to allow for motorized camping. Designation of small concentrations of dispersed camping sites as areas, (as described in # 2 above) is expected to accommodate most of the identified need on the District.

In addition, the District is still considering designation of larger scale areas to be open to all OHV use.

DISTRICTS UPDATED COMMENTS

After the Districts participation in the Round 2 of public meetings, listening to public comments, the District reconvened and developed a new desired condition that will best protect the resource and still allow for public access to their Forest.

The overriding premise of this alternative is **not** to try and identify all the camp sites the public currently uses, but to identify the areas where the District does not want the public to camp (because of resource concerns) and allow the remainder of District to be open to camping. A 400 foot corridor on either side of open roads would be open to motorized dispersed camping with the exception of;

- Closure areas like Big Lake Rec. closure, Greer closure, St Peters Dome, Murray Basin, Baldy Wilderness,...
- No camping within 100ft of live water like streams, springs, wet meadows...
- Set a distance from livestock waters?

This alternative would allow the public the greatest flexibility in deciding where they want to camp and would also allow fuel wood gathers the ability to gather wood with minimal restrictions to what is currently practiced.

SUMMARY

In summary, the District Team tried to provide an adequate distribution of open roads and dispersed recreation areas while providing resource protection.

This is the Springerville Districts' initial effort of identifying the desired condition for travel management on the District. It is expected to be refined throughout the process based on public input, further ground truthing and use of the evaluation criteria developed by the Travel Management IDTeam.

Travel Management Rule Lakeside Ranger District Summary of Analysis of Desired Condition

The Lakeside Ranger District initiated the Travel Management Rule (TMR) interdisciplinary analysis per Forests direction in 2006. The District Ranger and other district employees attended public meetings in Show Low and Pinetop on August 3rd, in Pinedale on August 30th, in Vernon on September 19th, and in Taylor on September 21st. At these meetings maps were made available for individuals to designate which roads they would like to see closed or left open. It was also announced at several of these meetings and in local newspaper articles that the maps were available to the public at the district office during normal business hours for their input. On several occasions the District Ranger along with other District staff met with interested and concerned citizens in the District office. The public input from these meetings was considered during our process for developing our transportation system proposal. There were equal opposing opinions as to the closing or leaving open of roads depending upon individuals differing uses of National Forests lands.

On February 1, 2007, the TMR Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) met with 10 Lakeside district employees. The meeting involved a review of the TMR process to date, a discussion of additional information needed, and a review of draft evaluation criteria to be used by the IDT. A series of dates were established in order to evaluate every district motorized travel way by the middle of March.

District personnel from all functional areas met on February 22, 2007 and periodically thru March 6th. The existing GIS database Road Systems layer displayed on quads were reviewed. Roads were reviewed to be listed as obliterated, level 1 closed to the public for administrative use or level 2 open to the public. Numerous factors were considered. These factors considered: sensitive species, threatened or endangered species, fire suppression needs, range improvement needs, future and current vegetation management needs, wildlife improvement needs, historical public use, fuel wood gathering needs, wildlife management needs such as hunter access, public input gathered in the last year, and of course road density.

On March 7th district personnel gathered to review all roads in an interdisciplinary setting and to iron out differences between functional areas. Representatives from wildlife, fire/fuels, recreation, range, Gis, and Archaeology attended these meetings. General consensus were made on most issues by the differing District personnel. Unattainable consensus was on certain roads was solved by the District Ranger making final decisions. The reasons were written on every map to assist GIS in display. Gis then made the corrections and submitted the district recommendation to the Supervisors Office.