

# Appendix B – Implementation Plan

## Transportation Planning and Management Strategies

The proposed action includes an implementation plan that includes recommended strategies and tactics for:

- ◆ managing the designated system,
- ◆ eliminating unauthorized growth of the route network,
- ◆ signing and implementing routes and area designations,
- ◆ enforcing the new motorized travel plan,
- ◆ involving and educating the public in access and travel management,
- ◆ planning future travel management decisions,
- ◆ monitoring and adaptive management.

These recommendations are not obligatory but should be applied where practical to implement as budget and priorities allow. The recommendations inform but are not a substitute for the assessment of broader transportation issues being covered in the ongoing Forest Plan revision process. The Roads Analysis Process and public input have helped determine the list and content of these items. These measures have been finalized using additional public comments and review received from the DEIS. Signing standards designed for uniform use by State and Federal agencies in Utah will continue to be applied.

## Problems and Risks Posed by the Current Road and Trail Systems & Opportunities for Addressing Important Problems and Risks

**Lack of Adequate Funding for Road and Trail Maintenance.** The current funding level for roads and trails fall short of what is needed to fully maintaining the route systems on the forest. Future program funding is not expected to increase more than inflation and deferred maintenance needs will accumulate. The forest needs to look at options to fund and more efficiently manage the maintenance costs of the road and trail system or reduce the number of miles. The forest also needs to prevent user created expansion of the motorized road network. The Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project is a significant first step towards this end. Some options are:

1. Designate a motorized travel plan to provide greater certainty as to which routes are part of the motorized and non-motorized systems.
2. Promptly obliterate existing and future user created routes that are not part of the designated motorized travel plan.
3. Barrier or rehabilitate non-motorized routes to prevent conversion to motorized use through encroachment. Use barriers to prevent full sized vehicles from converting motorized trails to roads. Restore non-motorized trails to single tracks where possible to eliminate the impression that the route is open to motorized vehicles.

4. Gate or harden running surfaces on roads and trails that are susceptible to damage from motorized use during wet periods.
5. Prioritize available budgets based on maintenance needs and the relative importance of at-risk resource values. Not all routes require the same level or frequency of maintenance nor do they have the same potential for resource impacts.
6. Look for other funding sources to supplement the roads budget (e.g. cooperative dollars from interested road agencies, publics, or user groups, or the use of Gas tax dollars through the Public Roads program).
7. Look for opportunities to reduce the road system (e.g. Converting roads to other uses such as trails, transferring roads to other road agencies, reducing maintenance levels, or obliterating unneeded roads and motorized trails).
8. Convert roads that primarily serve private in-holding access to special use roads with permittees maintenance responsibility.
9. Consider using Recreation Enhancement Act authorities to collect user fees for motorized and non-motorized trails on the forest. Use the funds collected for trail maintenance and improvements.

**Invasive Plants.** Roads and trails, and cross-country travel facilitate the introduction and spread of invasive plants. The following actions would help to prevent establishment or provide early detection of invasive plants:

1. Designate a motorized route system to provide greater certainty about where invasive plants are likely to be introduced, perpetuate, spread, and require treatment.
2. Implement the Coordinated Weed Management Agreements for treatment and to facilitate internal and external weed education, including the development of weed management Best Management Practices. Follow the priorities listed in the [Fishlake Noxious Weed Management Environmental Assessment](#).
3. Educate and strongly recommend to the public that all OHVs be washed and free of any weed seed before coming onto the forest. This is especially critical for vehicles coming in from outside the seven counties that encompass the forest [Beaver, Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne] because new species could be introduced
4. Improve monitoring for weed outbreaks. Maintain maps of species occurrence, the timing and type of treatments applied, and status of the infestation.
5. Training of permanent and seasonal employees on weed identification and weed management Best Management Practices should become standard procedure. Implement a reward system for location of new populations.
6. Create wash stations at each District to facilitate the removal of mud and seeds from OHVs owned and operated by the Forest Service. Require regular washing of highway vehicles, especially if the rig has been in potential infestation areas off-forest.
7. Extend weed training and education to OHV user groups and public schools. Include weed management education signs at OHV kiosks and at trailheads.
8. Prioritize monitoring and treatments on high use recreation areas especially trail heads.

9. Require commercial equipment used for Forest Service contracts to be washed free of noxious weed seeds prior to entering National Forests and be washed at designated locations between work sites if working within 1 mile of known infested areas.
10. Follow the national invasive plant strategies for the Forest Service.
11. Recommend that all vehicles be washed and free of weed seed before traveling on the forest's designated motorized roads or trails.
12. Proactively use posters and public service announcements for this education campaign. Feature Taz as the poster child and the voice of prudent and responsible recreation. Use a theme: "WW"—'be Weed Warriors,' and 'Wash before you ride!' Continue giving free coupons for OHV washes at local car washes as was done in 2006 for the Rocky Mountain ATV Jamboree.
13. Develop a program to provide mud flaps imprinted with "weed warrior" or "wash and ride" themes to people who purchase ATV's or other OHV equipment.
14. The new cooperative weed management areas in the counties will have networks that could be used to provide information and education. Such activities would help create a sense of awareness with the public.

**Protection of rare plants.** The following measures would help reduce potential impacts to rare plants and their habitat.

1. Relocate routes that have individuals of Last Chance townsendia growing within close proximity of the routes' tracks.
2. Restrict motorized access to dispersed use areas, on a case-by-case basis, where occupied or potential for Last Chance townsendia and other rare plant habitats occur.
3. Do not permit fuel wood gathering or special forest products collection in areas of occupied or potential habitat for Last Chance townsendia in accordance with recovery plan (US Fish and Wildlife Service 1993).
4. Designate distinct boundaries for the open use areas that area clearly discernable on the ground for all users of the areas. This is particularly important for the Flat Canyon open use area near Richfield.
5. Mitigate possible impacts to rare plants or their habitats for populations that are discovered after this plan is approved and implemented in accordance with recovery plan (US Fish and Wildlife Service 1993).
6. Do not designate areas for firewood or special forest product collection where a population of any Forest Service sensitive or Federally listed Threatened or Endangered species is known to occur.
7. Update the GIS layer of the known locations for dispersed use sites that have allowable motorized access. This can be the baseline for dispersed use sites, and thus the basis to preclude the continual addition of new dispersed use sites in areas of potential rare plant habitat.

8. Coordinate route obliteration and physical barrier installation with the forest rare and invasive plants program manager and the forest botanist.

**Managing Seasonal Closures.** Public compliance with seasonal closures has been poor in the past. Offenders often willfully violate the closure or are unaware of the travel plan requirements. A recommendation from this analysis is that seasonal closures should be gated where feasible. Gates should improve compliance, plus they offer an added benefit that the season of closure can be extended past April 15<sup>th</sup> if the snow, route, or habitat conditions warrant extra protection in a given year.

**Managing Dispersed Recreation.** Dispersed recreation needs to be better managed in select areas across the forest. This issue can be addressed in the Forest Plan revision effort for affected Geographic Areas. Problem areas include the UM Creek drainage, Tidwell slopes, Big Flat, Big John Flat, Mill Creek, Salina Creek near Beaver Creek, and the area from Koosharem Creek south and west to Bean Hill on Monroe Mountain. Dispersed camping and access is also an issue in boreal toad habitat near Barney Reservoir. Potential needs include designating dispersed camping sites, adding bathroom facilities, hardening or closing sites, building alternate sites, relocating sites and placing barriers to keep campers a minimum distance from perennial streams, and possibly using rest rotations for sites. Displacement effects should be studied and considered prior to improving or closing sites. Follow recommendations developed for the dispersed recreation strategy once completed. The strategy is based on a forest-wide assessment that was conducted in the summer of 2006.

**Managing Temporary Routes.** Several of the currently unauthorized routes that have been converted to motorized roads and trails by users started out as temporary access roads for Forest Service timber sales, juniper chainings, Dixie harrow treatments, water pipelines and improvements, fence lines, mining, powerline corridors, and firelines. The forest should assure that temporary roads and treatment areas are rehabilitated and do not encourage or allow the use or creation of new motorized routes.

**Public Forest Service Roads (PFSR).** The original Dixie and Fishlake Roads analysis report recommended numerous roads to include into the PFSR program, which allows for expenditures of gas tax funds for road maintenance costs. Contrary to what is claimed in that report; those roads were never discussed and brought forward as an interdisciplinary team recommendation. There are numerous potential management, resource, and recreation impacts that need to be evaluated before pursuing any of the options identified. An example of a hydrologic and aquatics concern is that many of these roads currently impact riparian zones and streams given their current locations in and adjacent to channels. The road prism template may need to be enlarged and reconstructed in order to qualify as a PFSR, which would lead to greater resource impacts. In addition, the Forest Service would lose some of the discretionary authority over the road use and management, which could lead to creating or perpetuating adverse resource impacts. Therefore, adding roads to the PFSR program should be applied with these considerations in mind and should rely on an interdisciplinary process.

**Aquatic Restoration.** Reducing or eliminating the alteration of normal slope hydrology and stream hydraulics by roads and motorized trails is an important prerequisite to protect aquatic systems across the forest. Actions that need to be taken includes the following:

1. Roads and trails that encroach on stream channels, riparian areas and wetlands that cannot be relocated or realigned should be redesigned to minimize impacts to the fullest practical extent. Encroaching and riparian routes should be obliterated when excess to long-term transportation needs, or if the route cannot be redesigned to prevent undue resource damages. Relocate routes out of wetland areas, where possible or use measures to restore the hydrology of the wetland. Examples include raised prisms with diffuse

drainage such as French drains and setting road-crossing bottoms at natural levels of wet meadow surfaces. The normal slope hydrology should be restored in riparian areas and wetlands that have been dewatered by the road system.

2. Numerous road and trail surfaces and ditchlines on the forest currently drain directly into ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams. It is a standard Best Management Practice to safely drain intercepted water before reaching channels, which includes having enough undisturbed slope between the end of the drainage structure and the channel to allow re-infiltration of water, and the filtering and detainment of sediment.
3. Stream crossings should be designed to safely pass streamflow and debris associated with the 100-year floods. This includes aligning the crossings consistent with the channel pattern, using inlet control, and not appreciably widening or narrowing the active channel dimensions as the stream flows through the structure. It is also important to drain the route surface and ditchlines prior to reaching the crossing. Route crossings should be constructed so that they do not have potential to divert streamflow down the driving surface, or so that intercepted water can quickly and safely be returned to the channel. The impacts from sediment or contamination related to direct vehicle contact with water on forded crossings should be weighed against the risk of catastrophic failure that a constructed structure would create. For streams with wide floodplains, it is often not feasible or desirable to pass all of the Q100 flow through one structure. A structure can also be designed to pass the Q100 flows and debris over the crossing in addition to through – vented fords are an example. Wet crossings should generally not be forded if the stream has or is at risk of having aquatic nuisance species introduced or becoming infected with whirling disease. Uses of structural designs that result in natural or simulated stream bottoms are preferred to promote fish passage. The number of channel crossings should be reduced when possible to minimize the potential for adverse impacts to aquatic resources. Natural channels should always be restored on routes that will be obliterated or where a barrier will close an area to all use.
4. Routes should not be allowed to intercept, concentrate, or reroute excessive amounts of water and sediment on or below the road or trail. Cross drainage on ditched and outsloped routes should be frequent enough that the normal downslope movement of water is essentially uninhibited. This helps prevent the loss of route surface materials and prevents the creation of gullies below the culvert or cross-drain outlets. Motorized routes that are obliterated or closed with a barrier should have frequent self-maintaining cross drainage installed as part of the closure.
5. Routes above or on slopes sensitive to mass failures should be evaluated to determine if relocation, redesign, or obliteration is needed to prevent the route from triggering mass slope failures.

Obliteration methods should use passive and active restoration techniques. Passive techniques rely on removing the human induced disturbance mechanisms and then relying on natural recovery. Active restoration techniques potentially include use of a Dixie Harrow in sagebrush or a disc or seed drill in grass vegetation types. Steeper slopes and larger prisms typically require the use of excavators and dozers. Regardless of the method used, stream crossings should be restored and self-maintaining drainage installed where needed. All obliterations should use signs, barriers, or front-end obliteration to prevent motorized use from reestablishing on the obliterated prism. Obliteration and barrier installation within the rare plant study area will require coordination with the forest rare and invasive plants program manager, and the forest botanist. The following design criteria should be applied:

During obliteration, stream crossings should be restored using the following design criteria:

1. Timing restrictions for cutthroat and important recreational fisheries will be coordinated with the Division of Water Rights through the stream alteration permit process where necessary and with the forest fisheries biologist.
2. The width of the excavated channel must include the natural channel bankfull width and floodplain features as indicated above and below the crossing. This restores the natural stream hydraulics and reduces the potential for eroding and rejuvenating the channel side slopes.
3. The slope of the channel must match the stream grade that existed prior to construction of the route. The stream grade above and below the crossing, old soil organic layers and stumps, and the presence of streambed materials that are coarser than the road fill can be used as indicators (to supplement topographic cues) of the original terrain. Restoring the channel gradient reduces the potential for channel downcutting (scouring) and rejuvenation of channel side slopes.
4. The channel side slopes (breaklands) to the crossing must be returned as closely as practical to natural contour. This helps promote revegetation and minimizes the potential for sediment production and delivery to the channel.
5. As much fill as possible should be removed before displacing and removing the crossing structure. This reduces the volume of fine sediment that can be entrained by the stream.
6. Silt fences, straw bales, stream diversion or pumping water around crossings should be used to minimize turbidity increases. Sediment captured by traps should be removed before dismantling the traps. This reduces the volume of sediment delivered downstream.
7. Uprooted vegetation, logs, weed-free straw, seeding and fertilization, plantings, and geotextiles (as needed) should be used to reduce surface erosion and promote revegetation on the recontoured slopes.
8. Rock or log grade control structures should be used if desired for fisheries enhancement or to prevent downcutting in situations where the original stream gradient is difficult to determine or re-establish. Log and rock structures must be keyed into the banks a minimum of 3 feet. Logs should be at least 14 inches in diameter. The top of the grade control structures should be the same elevation as the bottom of the restored channel. For log structures on perennial streams, a minimum 3-foot wide piece of filter cloth should be placed and nailed to the upstream side of the log and sealed with bed material.

*Road obliteration between stream crossings will be done using the following criteria:*

1. The brushing of roads and trails grown in with vegetation should avoid cutting below the route surface and should be the minimum width necessary for safe passage of support vehicles. If a dozer is used, the brush should be pushed for at least 200 feet before sidecasting to prevent creating a continuous windrow or berm of slash on the outside edge of the route.
2. Natural contours should be restored on all route segments that have unstable fill or cutslopes. The bench portion of the road (usually the inner-half of the total road width including the ditch if present) should be de-compacted by ripping to a minimum depth of 12 to 18 inches before placing excavated fill against the cutslope and on the prism. Fill material should not be stacked against seeps that are still present during the summer and fall. Though not anticipated, if end hauling of material is needed, the Forest Service will

- approve safe disposal sites. The topographic features of swales and draws will be reestablished if crossed by the existing route prism. These measures reduce the potential for route related mass erosion.
3. The ditchline will be drained across the road or trail by waterbars that will be no further than 50 feet apart on route segments where the route cut and fill slopes are stable. The waterbars should be constructed so that they drain the water off the route at roughly the same grade as the ditchline and the prism. This often requires that the skew of the waterbar be greater than 30 degrees relative to a direction perpendicular to the direction of travel. The depth between the top of the berm and the bottom of the waterbar will be about 3 feet. The intent of this measure is to assure that the down slope drainage is restored and that the waterbars are self-maintaining.
  4. Uprooted vegetation, and existing available logs and slash should be scattered on the road prism to reduce surface erosion and promote revegetation, but should not be placed so that it slows the drainage of waterbars.

**Conversion of Motorized Routes to Non-motorized Trail.** Any road or trail to be converted to non-motorized use should be made hydrologically inert prior to closing the route to motorized use. This includes installation of self maintaining drainage, stabilizing unstable cut and fill slopes, and removing structured stream crossings as described above in the BMPs for route obliteration.

**Barriers to Aquatic Species Migration.** Route crossings that create barriers to migration of aquatic organisms and small mammals should be inventoried at the site scale. These data should be assessed at fine and broad scales to determine which structures need to be maintained to avoid hybridization of native species with non-natives, and which structures should be redesigned or removed to accommodate passage and reduce the potential risk of catastrophic failure. The inventory should be used to assign priorities for mitigation and restoration. The desired species, life stages, and seasons of passage must be identified as well as detailed site surveys conducted so that the crossing structure can be properly designed to allow aquatic species passage. [NOTE: Road crossings in native cutthroat watersheds were surveyed and assessed for aquatic organism passage in the summer of 2006.]

**Invasive Plants and Aquatic Nuisance Species.** Maps displaying known and suspected whirling disease positive water bodies or other aquatic nuisance species should be developed and made available to resource managers and the public. Management tactics and behaviors need to be modified in locations where whirling disease or other aquatic nuisance species are a concern. New infections could be present even in waters thought to be clean, however, so all waters should be treated with caution. Spreading whirling disease or other aquatic nuisance species can have disastrous ecological and economic effects. Management requirements include:

1. Dedicating equipment such as engines, water tenders, and helicopter bambi buckets to infected or uninfected water bodies, but not both.
2. In general, water should not be transferred between any drainage, but particular care should be given to not transfer water from an infected stream, lake, or reservoir to uninfected water bodies.
3. In general, thorough cleaning, and drying of water-handling equipment before being released from the road maintenance, fire, or other water use activities. If equipment cannot be thoroughly dried, disinfect with bleach solutions or other measures. This includes finding a location to safely dispose of the bleach and rinse water. Additional

measures may be necessary under certain circumstances, such as equipment coming from areas near Zebra mussel infestations.

4. Replace low water fords in infected water bodies with bridges or culverts. Structured crossings should also be used where there is potential for introducing whirling disease into the uninfected waters.
5. There are numerous other aquatic plants and animals that can be spread directly by automobiles, boats, wildlife and livestock, or humans. The occurrences of these species and pathways through which they can disseminate should be identified so that management actions can be adjusted as needed, and so that the public can be informed as to how they can help prevent new infestations.
6. Machinery used for obliteration or to install large signs, gates, and barriers should be washed and inspected before being hauled to the project area. This aids equipment inspections and helps prevent new infestations of invasive species. If the equipment works in weed-infested areas or waters with aquatic nuisance species, then equipment should be washed in a suitable designated location prior to moving to the next site. Treatment of equipment that has been used in whirling disease positive water bodies should follow the guidelines established by the forest. These requirements should be coordinated with the forest invasive plants coordinator and fisheries biologist. Routes proposed for obliteration within 1 mile of inventoried invasive plant locations are noted in the fishlake\_travel\_plan\_changes.mdb Microsoft Access database, which is located in the electronic project file.

**Maintenance Level (ML) 2 and unauthorized Roads.** The data presented in Appendix C of the Dixie and Fishlake Roads Analysis consistently indicate that the greatest potential for impacting water resources is associated with the maintenance level 2 system roads and unauthorized roads that are much more abundant than ML 3, 4, and 5 roads. Most of the total number of stream crossings, and encroaching or riparian roads are associated with level 2 and unauthorized roads. Therefore, it is important that the condition and needs for this portion of National Forest transportation systems be evaluated and addressed over time. The trail system is another key component of the transportation system that should be considered.

**Maintenance Level 1 Roads.** The forest has a yet unidentified number of roads listed as maintenance level 1 or “stored” that have simply been overgrown with vegetation or abandoned. These roads may pose a risk to aquatic resources. Roads should only be managed at level 1 if they are hydrologically inert and have an adequate number of self-maintaining drainage structures such as dips and waterbars. This especially means that the road should have no stream crossing structures present and that the natural channel dimensions and contours be restored. Also, any remaining cut or fill slopes should not be prone to mass failure.

## Route Designation Implementation Considerations

The full transition to a new travel plan will take several years due to the size and complexity of the existing motorized and non-motorized route network, and due to the inherent number of tasks involved in implementing public education, signing requirements, gate and barrier installation, physical route closures, and updating INFRA and ATM. Following are recommended actions or items that should be considered during project planning and implementation.

1. The forest should continue considering funding for the out year budget cycles that will be needed to implement the enforcement, public education, signing, barriers, gates, road closures, and INFRA and ATM updates that will be required to fully implement the new

- motorized travel plan. Multiple sources of federal, State, and private funding are potentially available for the various tasks that will be required.
2. The Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) will show where it is legal to ride, but will not indicate what skill level is required on a given route or area. The current version of MVUM will be difficult to use for navigation. The forest should develop partnerships to print and distribute free recreation maps that show more geographic references, that include environmental protection and safety messages, and that show route difficulty levels. The Forest Service should communicate to the public that having a travel map is as necessary for motorized travel as having game proclamations is when going hunting or fishing. The forest should develop partnerships to fund and publish the annual updates to the Motor Vehicle Use Map.
  3. The forest should prioritize and manage its use of law enforcement to make sure that the most coverage is given when the likelihood of travel violations are greatest such as on State and National holidays, during antler collection and rifle hunting seasons, and on weekends. The forest should also prioritize enforcement based on the importance of at-risk resource values that require protection.
  4. Penalties for travel plan violations should be increased to the maximum extent practical. The Forest Service will continue to work with local officials and court jurisdictions to support these efforts.
  5. Given the continued rise in use and availability of GPS technology, the Forest Service should provide the motorized travel plan, dispersed campsites, and designated areas for forest products collection as GPS background files for common GPS file formats. The background files should be made available on the forest Internet web page. The travel plan should include a UTM grid to facilitate use with GPS technology. Also, the NRCC signing option to include a UTM location on trail signs should be implemented.
  6. A portion (16 to 47 percent depending on the alternative) of existing dispersed campsites is located further than 150 or 300 feet from designated open routes. Some of these may need to be reevaluated to determine whether a route needs to be designated to the site or if the site should be reclaimed. The general assumption used in the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project is that most dispersed camping issues will primarily be dealt with in separate NEPA analyses and through Forest Plan revision. Route designation should consider that significant changes in existing dispersed recreation opportunities would broaden the project scope.
  7. None of the alternatives, including No Action, create single-track routes for exclusive use by motorcycles or mountain bikes. Based on project scope, most of the focus for the route designation project is to determine if a route should be open or closed to motorized use. Assigning multiple refinements in the designations of vehicle types beyond the 50-inch rule would expand the project scope and create unnecessarily delay to closing the forest to motorized cross-country travel. However, the forest is open to evaluating the merits of single-track proposals on a case-by-case basis.
  8. Side-by-side ATVs, Utility machines, Type II ATVs reference motorized ATVs that are designed for operation over unimproved terrain. They drive like a car or golf cart and have a steering wheel. They are designed with a front seat in which two or more people can sit side by side. On the Fishlake National Forest, we have seen an increase in the use of these machines over the past 12 to 18 months. Our trail patrol and field going officers estimate that approximately 2-3% of the use on the forest is via these machines. Under the new OHV rule, the definition of a motorized trail is a route 50 inches or less in width,

- or a route that is over 50 inches wide that is identified and managed as a trail. Most motorized trails have been designated for vehicles 50 inches or less in width. As time permits, the forest will conduct an on-the-ground review of each motorized trail and identify which routes can be safely navigated by side-by-side vehicles. In future printing of the MVUM those routes will be identified as being managed as a trail for use by motorized vehicles in excess of 50", provided resource impacts are not an issue. A special designation will be used if the forest decides to allow Type II ATVs on a trail, but not full sized vehicles.
9. It is important that the travel plan contain a clearly worded disclaimer that states that many of the designated routes, especially those that were previously non-system routes, are not engineered to any given design standard for any particular use. Ultimately the forest should assign NRCC difficulty levels to the designated route system to better advise the public as to the conditions that they are likely to encounter on a given route. For safety reasons, the expert routes should be the first priority for signage.
  10. Implement the recommendations from the mixed-use safety assessment for routes that allow mixed use of licensed and unlicensed vehicles. Recommendations from that report include site-specific hazard assessments on a few routes, and improved signing and sight distance requirements on mixed-use roads.
  11. Secure Utah Department of Transportation permits for any routes that use State highway systems or right-of-ways.
  12. The forest needs to maintain an Accident Surveillance Program that complies with Manual direction (FSM7731.52) and aggressively work to correct safety deficiencies. OHV accident data collected should especially include accidents that involve cross-country travel or collisions with full size vehicles.
  13. The motor vehicle use map will be the legal document that designates the open motorized travel network and use areas, along with the accompanying travel rules and restrictions. Signage on the ground will be used to help the public and reinforce the travel map, but is not the enforcement mechanism. Except for roads that are signed as open to street legal vehicles only, physical closures such as gates, barriers, or obliteration are preferred over signs as the primary means to indicate which routes are closed to motorized use.
  14. Use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) platforms should be explored to aid with enforcement of the travel plan, especially during high use periods such as holidays and hunting seasons. UAVs could be used jointly with other enforcement agencies and national forests, and for other natural resource management purposes. A proposal for a feasibility study can be submitted to San Dimas Technology Center for consideration.
  15. Use barriers and create adequate parking and turnarounds at the end of motorized routes that transition to non-motorized trails. These measures are needed for public service and to prevent the conversion of non-motorized trails to motorized routes. Physical barriers are also recommended to clearly indicate where a motorized road transitions to a motorized trail.
  16. When feasible, sign future closures on site at the entry points for the route being affected. Include a contact name, number and address, and reason for closure. Ideally, this should be done during the planning stage before the project is implemented. This improves the opportunity for public comments and may catch users that would be missed through normal public notifications.

17. Census points should be added at motorized and non-motorized trailheads and kiosks to collect motorized and non-motorized user comments on system safety, needed improvements, and customer satisfaction.
18. To reduce the potential for user conflicts, the forest should increase education (including maps) of areas that emphasize non-motorized recreation and areas that emphasize motorized recreation so that the public can anticipate the type of opportunities available prior to arriving on-site.
19. Districts should consider maintaining a time stamped inventory and photo log of travel restriction signs. These data can be very useful in court when prosecuting violators.
20. The forest should consider drafting management plans for the proposed open use areas. The plans should anticipate the types and levels of management and monitoring the Forest Service is going to need to provide. Special hazards such as potential for flashfloods in Flat Canyon, treacherous terrain, or other safety hazards should be identified. Emergency contacts and procedures could also be outlined. At a minimum, this information could then be used to build a disclosure statement for the travel map regarding the inherent hazards. How the forest will manage user created features such as jumps, high-marking areas, and motocross type loops should also be addressed.
21. The travel rules and travel map should be seamless (i.e. consistent) across other land ownerships and as simple to understand as possible. This very important element improves understanding, acceptance, adherence, and enforcement of the new travel rules. The forest will need to validate and possibly adjust the motorized travel plan and travel rules in order to be consistent with the Bureau of Land Management and other National Forests in Utah. The travel map and rules on the Teasdale portion of the consolidated Fremont River district should be consistent with the remainder of the Fishlake National Forest.
22. The monitoring plan should evaluate and document the implementation and effectiveness of the project design requirements and resource protection measures. This information should supplement and not duplicate information collected for INFRA and EMS. The forest should conduct statistically designed samples that will allow extrapolation of violation rates and unauthorized trail use.
23. The forest should update maps that display where gathering of special forest products is allowed to reflect resource protection needs, especially for rare plants and heritage resources.

## Known Needs for Future Transportation Planning Projects

**Accord Lakes Private Lands Through-route:** Private landowners in the Accords Lake inholding desire an ATV permissible travel way to access the forest route network to the south and west. Similarly, the Forest Service desires public right-of-way through Accord Lakes so that motorized users can access the forest route network to the east of the private lands. The SUFCO mine heavily uses State Highway 10 for coal transport restricts ATV access. An existing closed motorized route above Dam 4 on Salina Creek could be used to make a motorized loop. However, opening this route would be contingent on obtaining right-of-ways through private lands in order to be in the public's best interest. This project is located on the Richfield Ranger District.

**Barney Lake Dispersed Camping and Road Relocation:** Barney Lake is stocked with native Bonneville cutthroat trout and is important boreal toad habitat. Motorized vehicle use has been

identified as a problem due to shoreline use which is increasing sedimentation and reducing water quality in the reservoir which may impact the fisheries, eliminating or damaging riparian, wetland, and shoreline vegetation, reducing cover for boreal toads, and causing direct mortality of boreal toads. Vehicle use has created a maze of trails that creates the impression to users that any vehicle use is acceptable. Access needs to be evaluated and managed to eliminate vehicle use on shorelines, reduce the potential for boreal toad mortality, and provide a clearly defined access route for vehicle users to use to and past Barney Lake, while clearly indicating areas where motorized use is unacceptable.

**Black Flat Crossing:** The Right Fork of UM Creek on the Fremont River Ranger District is currently whirling disease free, but is put at risk by a forded crossing at Black Flat. Based on internal and public scoping and input from livestock permittees, the forest anticipates building a bridge that will allow ATV passage, but that will close the Right Fork to full sized motorized use. Another potential alternative would close the Right Fork to all motorized use, which would require a reroute of the Great Western Trail through Sheep Valley.

**Chalk Creek Trail 326 Reroutes:** A potential trail realignment upslope could eliminate the second and third crossings on Chalk Creek below Copleys Cove. A section of road with vertical fillslopes that fall into the creek could then also be bypassed and obliterated. There are also several opportunities to harden the trail prism and improve the cross-drainage.

**Daniels Canyon Trail 129 Reroute:** The portion of the motorized trail in Daniels Canyon that follows the private land boundary is poorly located. This access is a desired part of the transportation plan, but needs to be relocated to reduce wetland and water quality impacts and to improve safety.

**Danish Meadows Private Land Access:** There is a need to provide at least ATV access to private inholding located in section 28, T25S, R3E. This could be accomplished by obliterating the last ½ mile of the road, which travels down steep valley side slopes, and then extending Forest Road 1509 down the ridge contours as a motorized trail for roughly 1 mile (or less) towards the private land.

**Forest Access to Junction, Utah:** The current access route from National Forest lands to Junction, Utah is very rough. The town would like alternate or improved access.

**Great Western Trail Reroutes:** Short route relocations are needed on the Fremont River District to reduce potential impacts to Last Chance townsendia, which is a Threatened plant.

**Kents Lake Road cutoff / loop:** The Kents Lake road on the Beaver Ranger District is a main arterial access route that closed to ATVs. This restriction creates some discontinuities in the motorized network available to ATVs. Some new construction or reopening of abandoned routes may be needed to more the system more manageable and to provide better ATV riding opportunities.

**Sevenmile Creek Trail Reroute:** The final phase of the Gooseberry highway construction project will pave the Sevenmile Creek road that is located on the Fremont River Ranger District. This project will disconnect contiguous access for some OHV routes, which may necessitate the need to provide alternate access. The 640 road along the west side of lower Sevenmile Creek will and should be obliterated in either case, which will require that a new access to the Tasha horse and foot trail be constructed from the parking area just off Highway 25. Cattle movement can be facilitated along the new Sevenmile road location along the east side of the creek.

**Quitcupah Creek Trail Route:** The GIS inventory of routes will need to be updated to reflect the access decisions from the final selected alternative, which was Alternative D. Upon completion of the project, ATV will be allowed to use the constructed cattle trail that will parallel the main road.

**Public Right-of-Ways / Easements:** There are numerous roads and motorized trails on the forest that travel through or from private inholdings where the forest does not currently have a legal right-of-way. This situation affected many of the proposed route designations. The patented lands in the Tushar Mountains are a good example. Districts need to determine and prioritize routes where public right-of-ways are needed to make the forest route network more logical and manageable, and are needed to provide desired motorized recreation opportunities.

**Access Related Planning:** Suitability assessments for dispersed camping and collection of firewood collection of other forest products may need to be conducted in some areas to protect sensitive plant and cultural resources or critical wildlife habitats. This could result in closing additional segments of routes to dispersed camping, firewood gathering, or collection of other forest products.

## Public Education Strategies

### Objectives

1. To increase awareness among forest visitors and local publics of how motorized and non-motorized access to the Fishlake National Forest will be changing and why.
2. To encourage and promote responsible and appropriate visitor behavior while using motorized trails and roads.
3. To encourage stewardship of public lands through partnerships with organized motorized and non-motorized user groups.

### Communication Tools

*Objective 1: Increase awareness among forest visitors and local publics of how motorized and non-motorized access to the Fishlake National Forest will be changing and why.*

- ★ Submit news releases to newspapers in affected communities explaining the new motorized travel plan. Solicit ideas from local paper publishers on how best to communicate these changes to the public.
- ★ Hold open houses in affected communities to unveil and explain the new motorized travel plan.
- ★ Make presentations to chapter meetings of organized motorized and non-motorized user groups.
- ★ Continue to maintain a web page on the Forest World Wide Web site that communicates critical information about the motorized travel plan and provides hotlinks to National Map.
- ★ Provide content for webmasters of sites that feature Fishlake National Forest motorized recreation to include on their sites and ask that they provide hotlinks to the forest web page.
- ★ Include key education points on the motorize use map since motorized users will have to consult this map to know what routes and areas are designated as open.
- ★ Consider hosting a media day to show the current situation and contrast it with the desired condition. Contact Chad Booth of “At Your Leisure,” a TV program on local channel 4 that presents opportunities for outdoor recreation. Elements of the story may include the demand for places to ride OHVs and how we are meeting the demand for the future, as well as the fact that appropriate motorized use can be an enjoyable, family experience.

- ★ Enlist the aid of Kelly Rigby, videographer in the BLM State Office, to film locally and edit an 8-12 minute video that would be suitable for presentation to school and community groups.
- ★ Make sure that kiosks are provided at major forest entry points that have copies of the motorized use map available for review.
- ★ Provide paper tablemats for use at local restaurants. The mats could include contact and travel plan information users need to “Know before you go”. The map could also feature the Paiute Trail System and encourage proper trail etiquette and resource protection.
- ★ Traveler Information Stations could be used to inform the public of the need to have a motorized use map and to inform them of current route conditions. Travel Information Systems are AM frequency radio stations that broadcast information to travelers, tourists, etc. The long-range system is called a 1610 AM Traveler Station and has a range in our area of +10 miles. This comes with 7 minutes of airtime but can be upgraded to 15 minutes. The cost is about \$7,000 and could be placed in the S.O. to broadcast information to I-70 travelers. There is also an Info Max Station that is a short-range system that transmits on the 530 AM frequency. The range is only ¼ mile but the idea is for people to pull into the parking lot at the Supervisors Office or one of the districts, see the directional sign, and turn on their radios for information. This system comes with 5 minutes of airtime and costs \$695 but is upgradeable to \$1,095.
- ★ Have partners purchase billboard space on the north and south ends of the Sevier Valley on Interstate 70. The boards could advertise “Got Map?”, “Stay on the trail!”, or some other slogan that conveys the message that a motorized use map is needed to know which routes are open to motorized use. The billboard could be used to compliment the 1610 AM station.
- ★ Make free pamphlets that are available outside at the S.O. and district offices and to supplement the radio station information. They could also be placed in motels, Bed and Breakfasts, gas stations and restaurants. Trail Rangers could hand them out to trail users.
- ★ Making the motorized use maps free would greatly enhance the likelihood that the public would be aware of the new travel plan. The maps should be available outside of our offices and trail rangers and field-going personnel should give them to forest users.

*Objective 2: “To encourage and promote responsible and appropriate visitor behavior while using motorized trails and roads.*

- ★ Prepare news releases for print and electronic media that will focus on how access designation may reduce damage to land and resources. Prepare a letter to be sent to all key contacts in the OHV community.
- ★ Develop a brochure, (or a less expensive pamphlet), specifically targeted at organized user groups to increase awareness of the proposed trail system, explaining how access designation will meet their needs while protecting resources.
- ★ Buy and distribute Tread Lightly brochures and messages. Make them available at the Supervisor’s Office, all district offices, visitor centers, trailheads and all kiosks on the forest.
- ★ Install Tread Lightly signposts on the forests near trailheads and staging areas, wherever none currently exist.
- ★ Attend meetings of organized user groups to maintain good rapport and to reiterate Tread Lightly and Leave No Trace messages.
- ★ Call on the user groups themselves to help police one another. Provide them with Tread Lightly brochures and litterbags.
- ★ Host an educational event on the forest for motorized users to highlight a specific trail. We might have an educational “treasure hunt” or a “poker run,” when users have to follow certain trails to get to each station to collect points. All those completing the trail will receive a special gift, such as a Tread Lightly bandana, license plate, or other trinket.

- ★ Partner with local radio stations to run “Right Riding” spots to reach visitors and local publics.
- ★ Continue to work with jamboree events organizers and the Paiute ATV Club to stress proper trail etiquette.
- ★ Continue grade school and high school programs that present ATV safety and trail etiquette.
- ★ Develop a program for the Twin Creeks Campfire presentations at Fish Lake.
- ★ Highlight non-motorized recreation opportunities on brochures and maps so that these users can avoid motorized areas and reduce the potential for conflicts.

*Objective 3: “Encourage stewardship of public lands through partnerships with organized motorized and non-motorized user groups.”*

- ★ Hold an event on Trails Day or Public Lands Day in September that focuses on maintaining a trail or improving a staging area.
- ★ Continue offering opportunities for user groups to recognize their inherent “ownership” of public lands by scheduling work days when they may participate by maintaining and cleaning up trails.
- ★ Work with the Dedicated Hunters program to implement improvements or restoration that reduces resource impacts associated with motorized and non-motorized recreation.
- ★ Partner with other agencies with who we share common borders, to sponsor events when users may come together to volunteer on the trails that they use.
- ★ Continue “Adopt a Trail” maintenance agreements with organized user groups and individuals to maintain specific trails. As part of the agreement, allow them to name their trail. Officially adopt these trail names and use them on signs marking them on the forest.
- ★ Work with Paiute Trail Webmaster to develop a web page dedicated to safety, etiquette and preservation. Ask other user groups who may have a website to provide a link to National Forest sites, and Leave No Trace.

## Monitoring Plan

The monitoring plan will evaluate and document the implementation and effectiveness of the project design requirements and resource protection measures. This information should supplement and draw from information that has to be collected for INFRA and the Environmental Management System. To help gauge compliance, the forest should consider conducting a statistically designed sample that would allow extrapolation of violation rates and unauthorized trail use. The following table includes items that will be monitored for a minimum of three years after the new motorized travel plan is implemented. Findings should be reviewed by the Forest Leadership Team (FLT) annually and summarized in a report in year 3. The FLT will modify this plan as needed based on the annual findings from EMS and this monitoring.

<b>Table B-1. Monitoring Plan for the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project</b>		
<b>Task</b>	<b>Type of Monitoring</b>	<b>Responsible Staff Area</b>
Continue motorized use monitoring on the Paiute ATV Trail and the Great Western Trail systems.	Trend and Validation	Public Services
Track implementation and timing of route obliteration, installation of gates and barriers, and signage. Revisit at least 5 to 10 percent of the projects within three years to determine the effectiveness of the closures and signage.	Implementation, Effectiveness	Forest & District Recreation, Watershed, Engineering

Summarize travel plan violations by type and number and by user demographics and locations.	Trend and Effectiveness	Forest & District Recreation, Law Enforcement, Public Services
Accident summaries from the surveillance program specified in Manual direction (FSM7731.52) should be summarized and reported.	Baseline and Trend	Engineering and Law Enforcement
Summarize user comments from trailhead census locations and from comments submitted by the public.	Effectiveness	Forest & District Recreation, Public Services
Catalog and review photos from past and future aerial photo flights and digital orthophotos of the open use areas to monitor for changes in the presence of vegetation and to determine if use is remaining contained within the assigned boundaries. Conduct the same process for a sample of heavily used dispersed camping areas to verify whether the designation is effective and/or abused.	Trend, Effectiveness	Watershed, Vegetation, Public Services
Update issue indicators for the EIS primary issues in year 3 to determine trend and proportion of the project implemented.	Implementation	GIS, Resource Specialists
Resource specific monitoring of motorized route and use impacts should be included in the monitoring summary. The results from monitoring Last Chance townsendia occupied habitats (see plant Biological Assessment) and Pine Creek (see fisheries Biological Evaluation) are a required part of this element.	Effectiveness	Resource Specialists

## Adaptive Management Process

The forest is aware that the current inventory of roads and trails being used for the route designation project is not 100 percent correct or complete. The forest anticipates that in spite of intensive quality control and review, there will be errors. Some undesirable unintended consequences may result from the final configuration of the travel plan and associated travel rules and definitions. Adjustments may be needed to make the transportation system compatible with adjacent landowners. For example, final edge matching will be required once Richfield BLM completes their motorized travel planning. In addition, roughly 16 to 46 percent of the inventoried dispersed recreation sites are inaccessible from inventoried designated routes, depending on the alternative. Routes currently not in the inventory may need to be added and designated as part of the implementation process. And opportunities for Type II ATVs or single-track designations may be considered. An adaptive management process is outlined below to allow adjustments to the final decision that will maintain the validity and integrity of the analyses and public disclosure presented in the FEIS. This includes pre-defining actions for the disposition of routes discovered after the decision date, for correcting errors, and adjusting the route designations that lead to undesirable, unintended consequences. A screening process is presented below for this purpose. The screens address the relevant subset of roads analysis questions identified in the supplemental roads analysis that was prepared for the route designation project. The screening process would assure that a given addition or closure of a route is consistent with the roads analysis recommendations and NEPA requirements. This screening is designed to be conducted using interdisciplinary input and review and would be documented as supplementary information to the Final EIS project file. As such, Forest Supervisor signatory authority would still be required. The process would only be valid for the first five years of implementation. Being able to manage the route system adaptively is necessary to minimize impacts from unintended and unforeseen consequences and changing conditions.

<b>Implementation Plan Crosswalks to Roads Analysis and Significant Issues*</b>		
<b>Screen</b>	<b>Addresses Roads Analysis Questions</b>	<b>Rationale / Problem Statement</b>
Is the route subject solely to Forest Service jurisdiction and maintenance?	GT(1), GT(2), GT(3)	The restrictions and use designations are primarily controlled by the agency that has jurisdiction over the route, even if the route is located on National Forest System lands.
Is the route visible on aerial photography taken on or before 2005 and/or can the existence of the route otherwise be verified by the line officer as occurring on or before the decision date?	EC(1)	The FEIS and ROD disclose that user routes created after the decision date will automatically be obliterated, unless a separate NEPA analysis and decision are completed. New digital imagery from 2004 is already available and a new photo flight for the Fishlake National Forest will be flown in 2005. These data provide additional means to verify the validity of pre-existing routes and provide useful baselines for monitoring.
Does the route, use of the route, or potential for dispersed camping or collecting forest products off the designated route have a low potential for impacting historic or pre-historic cultural sites? Does the proposed route action have or not need cultural resource clearance?	PV(2), PV(4), SI(3), SI(4), SI(5), SI(7), SI(9), SI(10), CR(1)	Cultural resource clearances generally must be obtained even when roads analysis or detailed NEPA documentation is not needed.
Does the route, use of the route, or potential for dispersed camping or collecting forest products off the designated route have a low potential to impact populations of or habitat for Species of Interest, Species of Concern, sensitive, threatened, or endangered plants or animals? Does the proposed route occur in an area with adequate surveys for sensitive, and/or threatened or endangered species?	EF(1), EF(2), TW(1), TW(2), TW(3), TW(4), PV(1)	Biological Evaluations and Biological Assessments generally must be obtained even when Roads Analysis or detailed NEPA documentation is not needed.
Is the route located outside of areas with winter travel restrictions?	EF(1), TW(1), TW(2), TW(3), TW(4), UR(2), UR(3), PV(1)	Winter use restrictions are being designated to prevent motorized use in Research Natural Areas and to protect critical mule deer winter range and non-motorized recreation opportunities. The over-snow closure areas are an inherent part of the travel rules and assumptions. Adding routes could change the intent of the closures.

<b>Implementation Plan Crosswalks to Roads Analysis and Significant Issues*</b>		
<b>Screen</b>	<b>Addresses Roads Analysis Questions</b>	<b>Rationale / Problem Statement</b>
Is the route located outside of critical winter range habitat for mule deer?	TW(1), TW(2), TW(3), TW(4)	Critical mule deer winter range is a significant issue that affected the design of the proposed action and alternatives in the route designation EIS. At a minimum, the need for seasonal closures should be considered if located in critical winter range. However, in general, the forest should strive to reduce route densities in critical mule deer winter range.
Is the route located outside of unroaded and undeveloped areas and areas with semi-primitive non-motorized Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings?	EC(2), EC(3), UR(1), UR(2), UR(4), UR(5), UR(6), RR(1), RR(2), RR(3), RR(4), RR(5), RR(6), PV(1), PV(3), PV(4), SI(1), SI(2), SI(8)	Designating unauthorized roads as open to motorized use when in inventoried roadless areas triggers the need for additional roads analysis and NEPA documentation. Motorized trails are permitted within roadless, but should be evaluated in detail if the trail is located in a semi-primitive non-motorized ROS setting, as this would require a management Area Forest Plan amendment (for management areas, this only applies to the 1986 plan).
Is the route located outside of routes or areas with special designations?	AQ(14), EF(1), PV(1), PV(2), PV(3), RR(5), SI(3), SI(5), SI(8), SI(10), TW(4), UR(5), WP(2)	Forest Plan amendments or consultation with other agencies may be required to make changes to routes or areas with special designations.
Is the route location further than 300 feet from perennial channels, greater than 150 feet from intermittent channels, and more than 50 feet from ephemeral channels except where the route converges on streams at crossings?	AQ(4), AQ(5), AQ(6), AQ(8), AQ(9), AQ(10), AQ(11), AQ(12), AQ(13), TW(1), TW(2), TW(4)	Forest Plan monitoring and the roads analysis reveals that routes located within a riparian influence zone (approximated as 300 feet from channels) create the greatest road and trail related impacts to water resources. To meet the intent of the conclusions from the effects analyses, the forest should have no net increase in riparian routes and should redesign or relocate routes with known impacts. Riparian routes that are excess to transportation system needs or where impacts cannot be mitigated should be obliterated.

<b>Implementation Plan Crosswalks to Roads Analysis and Significant Issues*</b>		
<b>Screen</b>	<b>Addresses Roads Analysis Questions</b>	<b>Rationale / Problem Statement</b>
Is the route adequately cross-drained, especially prior to crossing channels?	AQ(1), AQ(2), AQ(3), AQ(4), AQ(5), AQ(6)	Adequate cross-drainage minimizes the potential for a route to intercept, reroute, and concentrate surface runoff and groundwater. This minimizes the potential for altering slope hydrology and inducing erosion on or below the route. Frequent cross-drainage, especially prior to channel crossings hydrologically disconnects the route network from the stream network, which reduces the potential for cumulative watershed impacts.
Are the design / capacity of channel crossings adequate to safely pass the sediment and debris associated with 100-year return interval floods?	AQ(3), AQ(4), AQ(6), AQ(9), AQ(10)	Channel crossings with inadequate capacity to pass flood flows and debris can breach or fail catastrophically. This can lead to severe channel widening and deepening that cause impacts to water quality and aquatic habitats. To be consistent with the conclusions from the effects analyses, the forest should reduce the number of existing crossings through road relocation and/or minimize the potential risks where possible.
Do the crossings permit movement of desired aquatic life and small mammals during the desired seasons and animal life stages?	AQ(4), AQ(7), AQ(9), AQ(10), TW(1)	Fragmentation of aquatic habitat is a prevalent concern forest wide. The forest should strive to reduce aquatic migration barriers, except where needed to protect isolated populations of native fisheries from interbreeding and competition with non-native species.
Does the route have minimal risk of elevating or creating unique concerns for the spread of invasive plants or aquatic nuisance species?	EF(1), EF(2), EF(4), AQ(12), AQ(13)	Invasive plants and aquatic nuisance species can adversely impact terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Some such as whirling disease cannot be eradicated once introduced.
Is the route further than 300 feet from jurisdictional wetlands?	EF(1), AQ(1), AQ(6), AQ(8), AQ(10), AQ(13), AQ(14), TW(1), TW(4)	Wetlands must be protected in order to comply with Clean Water Act requirements and to maintain important hydrologic and ecological functions.

<b>Implementation Plan Crosswalks to Roads Analysis and Significant Issues*</b>		
<b>Screen</b>	<b>Addresses Roads Analysis Questions</b>	<b>Rationale / Problem Statement</b>
Is the route located on stable landforms and not hydrologically above slopes that are inherently prone to mass soil movements?	AQ(3)	Routes that add to inherent landslide risks create the potential for significant environmental impacts that should be field evaluated, documented, and analyzed in detail. Unstable landforms include but are not limited to slopes with soils derived from North Horn formation sediments that have gradients greater than 25 percent?
Is the route design and planned use consistent, particularly with regards to public safety?	GT(4)	The route should be passed through the hazard assessment matrix used for the mixed-use safety analysis (Bond 2006). Doing so may trigger the need to do additional, more site-specific hazard analysis and risk reduction.
Is the route designation and use consistent with the operational control and procedure for <a href="#">OHV Use</a> in the forest EMS?	EF(1), EF(2), AQ(2), AQ(3), AQ(4), AQ(5), AQ(7), AQ(10), AQ(14), TW(1), TW(4), GT(4)	Choosing an action that is not compliant with the EMS would create a non-conformity that would have to be corrected.
* When adding routes, a “No” answer to any question triggers the need for additional evaluation and documentation and possible mitigation. With the exceptions of questions asking if cultural, wildlife, and plant surveys are adequate, a “No” answer for routes being closed generally indicates social or resource values that would be improved by the action.		

<b>Screen for NEPA Sufficiency and Consistency based on the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project Final Environmental Impact Statement</b>	
<b>Screen</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
Does the route pass the Roads Analysis screening process directly or with mitigation if needed?	The roads analysis screens capture the critical issues and questions identified in the original and supplemental roads analysis reports and in the Fishlake OHV Route Designation Project EIS. The screens are a disclosed part of the proposed action that will allow the forest to use adaptive management during implementation of the new travel plan. If a given route has issues that cannot be mitigated then it likely involves complicating factors that fall outside the stated assumptions in the roads analysis and the FEIS. Consequently, further site-specific evaluations and documentation by one or more resource specialists or an interdisciplinary team would be required. Additional scoping may also be needed depending on the specifics of the given situation. The screens incorporate the design elements needed to assure that the potential for cumulative impacts is minimized.
Does the route pass the “ <u>F</u> inding of <u>N</u> o <u>S</u> ignificant <u>I</u> mpact” tests for significance?	This test for significance is a design feature of the screening process only. The motorized designations for the current inventory of routes are explicitly covered by the original route designation FEIS, where a FONSI is not applicable. The concept of and test for significance is only relevant to the screening process for roads and trails that exist prior to the decision date, but that are inventoried after the decision date. It is important to note that illegally created routes can be obliterated without additional NEPA if the requirements for Biological Evaluations, Biological Assessments, cultural resource clearances, and water quality permits are met.
* This screen is to be used when making the decision on whether to open or close a route to motorized use and if so, with what restrictions or mitigation. A “No” answer to either question indicates that adding or removing the route would lead to adverse resource impacts and/or would be inconsistent with the stated assumptions and disclosures made in the final EIS. Thus, new NEPA documentation is needed.	