

# **Chapter 2**

## **Alternatives**

---

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter describes and compares the alternatives considered for the Cleveland NF travel management environmental assessment. Alternatives considered in detail and alternatives eliminated from detailed study are described. Alternatives are compared in tabular form so environmental impacts can be easily compared. Based on the issues identified through public comment during scoping, and based on further interdisciplinary team review, the Cleveland NF developed an alternative to the proposed action that was carried forward into detailed analysis. In addition to this alternative, the Cleveland NF is required to analyze a no action alternative that serves as a baseline for comparing the effects of all analyzed alternatives.

#### **2.1.1 How Alternatives Were Developed**

Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 represent a range of perspectives designed to address the issues as described in the purpose and need as outlined in Chapter 1. In addition to meetings held during the summer of 2007 at which members of the public contributed their knowledge and input to potential routes to add to the Cleveland NF transportation system, Forest Service personnel examined GIS data and aerial imagery to determine additional routes to add or remove from the inventory, then made field visits to determine the suitability of the routes. Alternative 2 was developed to meet the purpose and need and was sent to the public for comments in January 2008. Based on comments received from the public, and from further field review by Cleveland NF personnel, Alternative 3 was developed. All three alternatives are discussed below.

#### **2.1.2 Alternatives Considered in Detail**

Three alternatives are analyzed in detail. Alternative 1, which is the no action alternative, represents the continuation of cross country travel in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas. The planning area for the alternatives includes National Forest System lands on the Cleveland NF. It does not include any private, state, or other federal lands. During the environmental analysis, the Cleveland NF assumed that adjacent federal lands, such as those administered by the Bureau of Land Management, will be managed according to existing management plans and applicable federal laws, and that private lands will meet applicable state and federal land use regulations.

#### **Monitoring**

Monitoring is critical for evaluating the effectiveness of management decisions and the accuracy of analysis assumptions and conclusions. Monitoring of road and trail conditions is required, and must meet regional and/or national standards. If monitoring determines additional resource damage is occurring, steps to prevent further damage may be taken. If the mitigations are not effective or are not possible, additional road or trail closures may be required, which will require additional NEPA analysis.

Implementation and effectiveness monitoring for Part 3 of the LMP are conducted at the project level. All project activities are documented in reporting systems. Annually, a randomly selected sample of

projects and on-going activities (at least 10 percent) will be reviewed. A review team will visit the selected projects to review the effectiveness of applying LMP design criteria. If problems in implementation are detected, or if the design criteria are determined to be ineffective, then the team will recommend corrective actions. Roads added to the transportation system would be included in the sampling pool for both LMP monitoring and best management practices monitoring.

The California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division grants and agreements program requires all applicants for funding to prepare and submit a soil condition table that lists the current condition and prior year condition of roads, trails, and other areas maintained, conserved, or otherwise operated or supported with division funds. The soil condition table must include roads, trails, and other areas proposed for funding. If the applicant identifies a new project area, and the applicant does not have any data for the current or prior year, a “not applicable” designation shall be used in OHV Form G. Roads, trails, and areas shall be rated green, yellow, or red. Green means the soil standards are being met, yellow means maintenance is needed, and red means the soil standards are not being met. Trails added to the NFTS for motorized use would be monitored for trail condition as required by agreement with the California State Park Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division Grant Program using the green, yellow, red trail condition class protocol.

#### **2.1.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action**

This alternative provides a baseline for comparing other alternatives. Under this alternative current management plans would continue to guide management of the area. No changes would be made to the current transportation system and no cross-country travel prohibition in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas would be instituted. Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule would not be implemented, and no motor vehicle use map would be produced. Motor vehicle travel by the public would be limited to designated routes and areas. Unauthorized routes would continue to have no status or authorization as part of the transportation system.

Alternative 1 would result in the Cleveland NF having a transportation system that consists of 206.6 miles of roads for highway-legal-only vehicles, 37.8 miles of routes for highway legal and non-highway legal vehicles, 11.2 miles of trail for all vehicles (that is, four-wheel drive, vehicles 50 inches or less in width, and motorcycles), 23.2 miles of trail for vehicles 50 inches or less in width, 1.8 miles of trail for motorcycles, and 2,160 total acres of open areas (Table 2.9).

#### **2.1.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action**

Alternative 2, the proposed action, was developed initially from information gathered at public meetings during the summer of 2007 and from preliminary analysis by the interdisciplinary team. After subsequent field review by Cleveland NF personnel, this alternative was refined to exclude route segments that were inaccurately mapped and to update route segment lengths based on better GIS data. Therefore, Alternative 2 as described below is slightly different than the proposed action that was sent to the public for scoping. Alternative 2 would:

1. Prohibit cross-country wheeled motorized vehicle travel by the public off designated National Forest System roads, trails, and areas, except as allowed by permit or other authorization in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas.
2. Add approximately 7.7 miles of trail to the Cleveland NF transportation system. Approximately 2.5 miles of existing, unauthorized trails and 5.2 miles of new trail construction would be added to the Cleveland NF transportation system to maintain a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities in the conversion of the Corral Canyon OHV area from one in which cross-country motorized travel is legal to one in which all motorized travel must occur on designated routes (see Table 2.1).

3. Add approximately 4.87 miles of routes for highway-legal vehicles to the Cleveland NF transportation system to maintain dispersed recreation motorized access (see Table 2.3).
4. Establish a 2.0-acre open riding area adjacent to Corral Canyon OHV campground and establish a 0.2-acre open riding area adjacent to the Wildomar OHV trailhead where young riders can learn safe vehicle operation (see Table 2.2). All other OHV use in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas would be restricted to designated routes.
5. Amend the LMP to adjust land use zones and recreational opportunity spectrum designations on approximately 20 acres of land to reflect existing on-the-ground conditions.

Alternative 2 would result in the Cleveland NF having a transportation system that consists of 211.5 miles of roads for highway-legal-only vehicles, 37.8 miles of routes for highway legal and non-highway legal vehicles, 13.1 miles of trail for all vehicles (that is, four-wheel drive, vehicles 50 inches or less in width, and motorcycles), 25.3 miles of trail for vehicles 50 inches or less in width, 5.3 miles of trail for motorcycles, and 2.2 total acres of open areas (Table 2.9). Implementation of this alternative would lead to publication of a motor vehicle use map reflecting the changes in the transportation system described above.

**Table 2.1: Motorized trail additions in Alternative 2.**

Name	Approx. mileage	Type	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
SDTR-1	1.00	User created	ATV and motorcycle.	Yearlong
SDTR-2	0.50		ATV and motorcycle	
901a OHV Skye Valley alternate	0.64		All vehicles	
903b Bronco Peak loops	0.36		Motorcycle only	
Corral motorcycle	3.64	Proposed new	All vehicles	
911a Gunslinger loops	1.55	Proposed new	All vehicles	
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.69</b>	--	--	--

**Table 2.2: Open area additions in Alternative 2.**

Name	Approx. acreage	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
Corral Camp	2.0	ATV and motorcycle.	Yearlong
Wildomar	0.2	No other classes permitted.	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.2</b>	--	--

**Table 2.3: Road additions in Alternative 2 for access to dispersed recreation sites.**

Name	Approx. mileage	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
Buckman North	0.28	All highway legal vehicles	Yearlong
Buckman South	0.35		
Corte Madera	0.06		
Cottonwood	0.50		
Deer Flats/Knob Hill sites	0.10		

Deer Park	0.02		
High Point site	0.14		
Kitchen Creek 1	0.33		
Kitchen Creek 2	0.09		
Laguna Rec.	0.18		
Miners Road	0.04		
Old Horse Meadow	0.12		
Pine Creek 1	0.03		
Pine Creek 2	0.21		
The Narrows	0.55		
Timbers Edge	1.80		
Upper Santa Ysabel	0.03		
Yellow Rose Spring	0.04		
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.87</b>	--	--

### 2.1.2.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 is a version of Alternative 2 that was modified based on field review and public comments to scoping. Major differences between this alternative and Alternative 2 include removal of proposed designation for routes that intersect threatened or endangered species habitat and removal of proposed designation for routes that intersect riparian conservation areas, as well as the designation of 12.8 acres of rock outcrops as open for motorized vehicle use in the Corral Canyon OHV area. Alternative 3 would:

1. Prohibit cross-country wheeled motorized vehicle travel by the public off designated National Forest System roads, trails, and areas, except as allowed by permit or other authorization in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas.
2. Add approximately 6.2 miles of trail to the Cleveland NF transportation system. Approximately 1.0 mile of existing, unauthorized trails and 5.2 miles of new trail construction would be added to the Cleveland NF transportation system to maintain a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities in the conversion of the Corral Canyon OHV area from one in which cross-country motorized travel is legal to one in which all motorized travel must occur on designated routes or in smaller designated open areas (see Table 2.4). Inspect and improve mitigation measures to prevent access to adjacent unauthorized routes (see Table 2.5).
3. Add approximately 1.32 miles of routes for highway-legal vehicles to the Cleveland NF transportation system to access dispersed recreation opportunities (see Table 2.7). Install mitigation measures to prevent access to adjacent unauthorized routes (see Table 2.8).
4. Establish a 2.0-acre open riding area adjacent to Corral Canyon OHV campground, designate several areas totaling 12.8 acres adjacent to existing and proposed trails in the Corral Canyon OHV area as permissible for motorcycle and bike trial riding, and establish a 0.2-acre open riding area adjacent to the Wildomar OHV trailhead where young riders can learn safe vehicle operation (see Table 2.6). All other OHV use in the Corral Canyon and Wildomar OHV areas would be restricted to designated routes.
5. Amend the LMP to adjust land use zones and recreational opportunity spectrum designations on approximately 10 acres of land to reflect existing on-the-ground conditions. As per Forest Service policy and regulations, this amendment would be non-significant .

Alternative 3 would result in the Cleveland NF having a transportation system that consists of 207.9 miles of roads for highway-legal-only vehicles, 37.8 miles of routes for highway legal and non-highway legal vehicles, 13.1 miles of trail for all vehicles (that is, four-wheel drive, vehicles 50 inches or less in width, and motorcycles), 23.8 miles of trail for vehicles 50 inches or less in width, 5.4 miles of trail for motorcycles, and 15.0 total acres of open areas (Table 2.9). Implementation of this alternative would lead to publication of a motor vehicle use map reflecting the changes in the transportation system described above.

Many routes that were listed in Alternative 2 were dropped from consideration in Alternative 3. Buckman North, Buckman South, Cottonwood, Miners Road, the Narrows, and Yellow Rose Spring were dropped from consideration because they either would have intersected habitat for the arroyo toad and/or they would have intersected riparian conservation areas (see Table 2.12). Proposed motorized trail additions SDTR-1 and SDTR-2 were removed for this alternative and replaced with 12.8 acres of open area in the Corral Canyon OHV area.

**Table 2.4: Motorized trail additions in Alternative 3.**

Name	Approx. mileage	Type	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
901a OHV Skye Valley alternate	0.64	User created	ATV and motorcycle.	Yearlong
903b Bronco Peak loops	0.36		All vehicles	
Corral motorcycle	3.64	Proposed new	Motorcycle only	
911a Gunslinger loops	1.55	Proposed new	All vehicles	
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.19</b>	--	--	--

Public scoping comments identified a number of locations at which past mitigation measures designed to limit motorized access on approximately 11.50 miles of unauthorized routes have proven insufficient to ensure resource protection. As part of Alternative 3, barriers that are already in place will be inspected and improved to increase effectiveness (Table 2.5).

**Table 2.5: Trail mitigation to prevent unauthorized use of adjacent routes in Alternative 3.**

Name	Approximate mileage
901a Sky Valley Alternate	0.30
902DE	0.60
903DE	0.60
Bronco Flats	0.60
Goat enclosure	1.50
Salazar Canyon	1.60
Sky Valley 1	0.90
Sky Valley 2	0.40
Stokes Valley 1	0.50
Stokes Valley 2	2.60
Wildomar OHV	1.90
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.50</b>

**Table 2.6: Open area additions in Alternative 3.**

Name	Approx. acreage	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
Corral SDTR	12.8	Motorcycles and bikes	Yearlong
Corral Camp	2.0	ATV and motorcycle. No other classes permitted.	
Wildomar	0.2		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.0</b>	--	--

**Table 2.7: Road additions in Alternative 3 for access to dispersed recreation sites.**

Name	Approximate mileage	Permitted vehicle class	Season of use
Corte Madera	0.06	All highway legal vehicles	Yearlong
Deer Flats/Knob Hill sites	0.10		
Deer Park	0.02		
High Point site	0.14		
Kitchen Creek 1	0.08		
Pine Creek 1	0.03		
Timbers Edge	0.86		
Upper Santa Ysabel	0.03		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.32</b>	--	--

Barriers to prevent continued unauthorized use are proposed for approximately 2.50 miles of unauthorized adjacent routes that were not recommended for inclusion in the transportation system in Alternative 3. Methods proposed for these locations include installation of barricades and other obstacles, potentially including boulders and downed trees (Table 2.8).

**Table 2.8: Proposed mitigation to prevent unauthorized use of adjacent routes in Alternative 3.**

Name	Approx. mileage	Mitigation activity and location
Buckman South	0.30	Barricade before stream crossing
Cottonwood	0.30	Barricade for turnout
Horse Meadow	0.10	Barricade for turnout
Kitchen Creek 1	0.20	Barricade partial closure
Kitchen Creek 2	0.10	Barricade for turnout
Laguna Rec.	0.20	Close at road
Pine Creek 2	0.20	Barricade for turnout
The Narrows	0.20	Close at road
Timbers Edge	0.90	Barricade partial closure
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.50</b>	--

## **2.2 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Chapter 3 describes the environmental consequences of the alternatives in detail. This section of Chapter 2 compares the alternatives by summarizing key differences between the alternatives and provides a summary of the effects analysis for all alternatives (Table 2.9). Table 2.10 compares indicators for new trails proposed for designation in the Corral Canyon OHV area under each alternative. Table 2.11 compares indicators for existing and proposed designated open areas under each alternative. Finally, Table 2.12 compares indicators for roads under each alternative.

**Table 2.9: Alternative comparison for Cleveland NF transportation system changes.**

	Alternatives		
	1	2	3
Highway legal only (miles)	206.6	211.5	207.9
Highway legal and non-highway legal (miles)	37.8	37.8	37.8
Trail, all vehicles: 4WD, ATVs, and motorcycles (miles)	11.2	13.1	13.1
Trail, only ATV and motorcycle (miles)	23.2	25.3	23.8
Trail, only motorcycles (miles)	1.8	5.4	5.4
Open areas (acres)	2160	2.2	15.0

**Table 2.10: Alternative comparison for new trails proposed for Corral Canyon OHV area.**

Name	Approximate mileage			T&E habitat	In RCA?	100 ft. from stream?	Recreation opportunity	ROS
	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3					
SDTR-1	0	1.00	0	No	No	No	Motorcycle route across rock outcrops	SPM
SDTR-2	0	0.50	0					
901a OHV Skye Valley alternate	0	0.64	0.64	No	No	No	Vehicles 50" or less	SPM
903b Bronco Peak loops	0	0.36	0.36					
Corral motorcycle	0	3.64	3.64	No	No	No	Motorcycle Route	SPM
911a Gunslinger loops	0	1.55	1.55	No	No	No	Vehicles 50" or less	SPM
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7.69</b>	<b>6.19</b>	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 2.11: Alternative comparison for designated open areas.**

Name	Approximate acres			T&E habitat	In RCA?	100 ft. from stream?	Recreation opportunity	ROS
	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3					
Corral Canyon SDTR	0	0	12.8	No	No	No	Trial riding	SPM

Corral Camp	0	2.0	2.0	No	Yes	No	Youth practice	
Corral Canyon OHV area	1800	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	X-country riding	
Wildomar trailhead	0	0.2	0.2	No	No	No	Youth practice	
Wildomar OHV area	360	0	0	Indirect	Yes	Yes	X-country riding	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2160</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>

**Table 2.12: Alternative comparison for road additions for access to dispersed recreation sites.**

Name	Approximate mileage			T&E habitat	In RCA?	100 ft. from stream?	Recreation opportunity	ROS
	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3					
Buckman North	0	0.28	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Buckman South	0	0.35	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	Yes	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Corte Madera	0	0.06	0.06	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPNM
Cottonwood	0	0.50	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	Yes	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Deer Flats/Knob Hill sites	0	0.10	0.10	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Deer Park	0	0.02	0.02	No	Yes	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
High Point site	0	0.14	0.14	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Kitchen Creek 1	0	0.33	0.08	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	RN
Kitchen Creek 2	0	0.09	0	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	RN
Laguna Rec.	0	0.18	0	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Miners Road	0	0.04	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	Yes	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Old Horse Meadow	0	0.12	0	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	RN
Pine Creek 1	0	0.03	0.03	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Pine Creek 2	0	0.21	0	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
The Narrows	0	0.55	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	Yes	Dispersed Rec.	RN & SPNM
Timbers Edge	0	1.80	0.86	No	No	No	Dispersed Rec.	RN
Upper Santa Ysabel	0	0.03	0.03	No	Yes	No	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
Yellow Rose Spring	0	0.04	0	Arroyo toad	Yes	Yes	Dispersed Rec.	SPM
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>

## **2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM ANALYSIS**

Throughout the scoping process, commenters suggested addition alternatives that they suggested the Cleveland NF analyze as part of the route designation process. The following describes an alternative that was considered but eliminated from detailed study.

### **2.3.1 Public-generated additions and alterations**

During the scoping period a number of individuals recommended additions to and alterations of the transportation system. These additions and alterations included construction and/or designating single track trails and loops on the Trabuco Ranger District, new trails in the Wildomar OHV area, separate parallel trails for motorcycles and vehicles less than 50 inches wide along Bear Valley Road on the Descanso Ranger District, and a parallel trail to create a one-way loop on the Kernan Cycle trail.

These suggestions do not meet the purpose and need for the project (section 1.2) and are beyond the scope of the action (section 1.1.3). However, the route designation process is not a “one time” event. Routes that are consistent with LMP direction will be added to the inventory and may be evaluated for potential addition to the transportation system at a future date, based on adequate funding and available resources.