

Recreation Resources

Introduction

Nearly all forest visitors, regardless of the purpose for their visit, use the motorized transportation system to reach their destination. Making changes to the NFTS (e.g. adding facilities, prohibiting or allowing motor vehicle use by vehicle type or season of use) changes the diversity of motorized and non-motorized opportunities on the forest. These visitors may be participating in motorized recreation or utilizing motor vehicles to access trailheads, facilities, destinations or geographic areas that are utilized for non-motorized recreational activities. This section of the Travel Management DEIS examines the extent to which the diversity of recreation opportunities are affected by the proposed action and alternatives and the extent to which alternatives are consistent with direction established in the SNF Forest Plan (LRMP), the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) and the Travel Management Rule.

Sierra National Forest LRMP Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

The LRMP provides goals for the recreation resource and requires a broad range of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities in balance with existing and future demand. For management and conceptual convenience, possible mixes or combinations of activities, settings and probable experience opportunities have been arranged along a spectrum or continuum. This continuum is called the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) and planning for recreation opportunities using the ROS is conducted as part of Land and Resource Management Planning. The ROS provides a framework for defining the types of outdoor recreation the public might desire and identifies that portion of the spectrum a given National Forest might be able to provide. ROS is divided into six classes: Primitive, Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized, Semi-Primitive Motorized, Roded Natural, Rural and Urban.

The LRMP uses the ROS to define desired future conditions (USDA-FS 1991; Section 4.3.3, page 4-3); establishing recreation settings for a number of management prescriptions (pages 4-9 through 4-12); as forestwide standards and guidelines (see S&G 22 “Maintain acreages in each ROS class to meet objectives show on ROS element map”); establishing Management Area program emphasis (pages 4-38 through 4-56); and in defining monitoring and evaluation requirement (see page 5.4). The breakdowns of ROS classes on the SNF are demonstrated in Table 38.

Table 38. Sierra National Forest ROS Classes

ROS class	Acres ¹	Percent of SNF
Primitive	500,800	37
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	110,500	8
Semi-Primitive Motorized	60,800	5
Roded Natural	548,700	41
Rural	124,800	9
Urban	90	0

¹Source: Recreation Opportunity Class Objective Map, LRMP

Impacts Relevant to Recreation Include

1. The compatibility of proposed changes to the NFTS with LRMP recreation and OHV management prescriptions and ROS.

2. The impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on non-motorized (i.e., quiet) recreation (dust, noise, use conflicts).
3. The amount and diversity of motorized recreation opportunity by alternative.
4. The amount of motorized access to dispersed recreation by alternative.
5. The impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on neighboring private and Federal lands (dust, noise, use conflicts).
6. Impacts to natural and cultural resources will be minimized.

Assumptions Specific to Recreation Analysis

1. The prohibition of cross-country travel is not a change to ROS (semi-primitive motorized for example), it is simply a prohibition within that ROS 'zone' to travel off of designated routes.
2. The change from an open to cross-country travel condition to a cross-country travel prohibited condition will reduce the availability of acreage for both motorized recreation as well as motorized access to dispersed recreation activities.
3. The change from an open to cross-country travel condition to a cross-country travel prohibited condition will increase the availability of acreage for non-motorized recreation as well as non-motorized access to dispersed recreation activities.
4. Proposed additions to the NFTS will have a beneficial effect on motorized recreation opportunities by providing a variety of trail riding experiences and increasing the amount of motorized recreation opportunities (loops and connectors).
5. Proposed changes and additions to the NFTS will have a beneficial effect on the amount of motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities available.
6. The SNF National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) report accurately expresses the most popular motorized and non-motorized recreation activities for use in this analysis.
7. Overall changes in the NFTS that require non-significant plan amendment(s) will result in corresponding changes in the net SPNM ROS class acres available on the SNF.
8. The area of influence (dust, noise) of motorized use on populated areas or quiet recreation opportunities is 1/2 mile from associated boundaries (e.g. wilderness, RNA, property line, urban limit line).
9. The majority of the motorized public use occurring on NFS land is occurring within the existing NFTS based on observation.
10. For each unauthorized route added to the NFTS as a road or trail for the purpose of accessing dispersed recreation, a minimum of one site is accessed. In many instances, multiple sites may be accessed through the addition of these routes to the system, but this number acts as a surrogate to determine how many dispersed areas are accessed under each alternative.
11. Impacts to natural and cultural resources will be analyzed in their respective sections.

Data Sources

1. LRMP for distribution of ROS classes
2. National Visitor Use Monitoring Results
3. GIS for data queries (ROS)

4. Sierra National Forest 1977 Off-Road Vehicle Plan

Recreation Indicator Measures

Indicator measures are intended to address how each alternative as the sum total of its proposed actions respond to the LRMP, significant issues identified in scoping and Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule: whether the motorized recreation opportunity conflicts with other recreation opportunities, specifically non-motorized opportunities; the proximity of motor vehicle use to populated areas or neighboring private and Federal lands; the quality of the motorized recreation experience; and the quality of motorized access to dispersed areas for both motorized and non-motorized uses. It also responds to the diversity of motorized access available on the unit. Impacts with natural and cultural resources (including air quality) are examined in other resource sections. Public Safety is addressed in the Transportation Section.

For analyzing the effects of changes to the NFTS by vehicle class and season of use as well as the addition of unauthorized routes to the NFTS as roads, indicator measures were used. Mileage available for each class of vehicle is useful in analyzing the ability of NFS users to not only travel around the forest and enjoy motorized recreation opportunities but also to access non-motorized recreation opportunities, such as trailheads and dispersed recreation activities such as hunting, fishing and camping, which the SNF has determined is important based on both NVUM data and public scoping for this project. Mileage for motorized recreation is an indicator of the number and types of experiences available for motorcycles, ATVs and four-wheel drive vehicles in each alternative. The changes to motorized mileages can be used to interpret the level of change in opportunities for motorized and non-motorized users. The details of the proposed seasonal closure relate to both the months that motorized recreation will not be allowed to use designated roads, trails or areas and, conversely, the time of year that conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses will be minimized. Also, the effect on non-motorized recreation activities that are accessed by native surface roads is considered. Number of acres located 1/2 mile away from roads, trails and boundaries are used to analyze the opportunity for non-motorized and quiet recreation on the SNF. Finally, to determine the amount of dispersed recreation access provided under each alternative, a method was applied that a minimum of one site is accessed by each route (in many instances multiple sites are accessed, but one site is used as a proxy).

Measurement Indicator 1: ROS Compatibility

Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on ROS.

Method: Number of ROS acres in each class under each alternative and number of required non-significant ROS LRMP amendments (and or any associated changes to LRMP recreation and motor vehicle use management prescriptions) displayed by associated acreage changes in the LRMP by alternative.

Table 39. Summary of Additions of Trails to NFTS by ROS Class by Alternative

ROS Class	Alt 1 ¹	Alt 2		Alt 3	Alt 4		Alt 5	
		Trails	Miles		Trails	Miles	Trails	Miles
Primitive	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	0	2	0.77	0	2	1.64	2	1.64
Semi-Primitive Motorized	0	0	0.00	0	1	2.27	1	2.27
Roaded Natural	0	102	37.73	0	85	35.18	162	63.96
Rural	0	5	1.60	0	7	2.82	10	3.68

¹Existing unauthorized routes would be available for motorized use under Alternative 1, but would not be added to the NFTS.

Table 40. Summary of Additions of Roads to NFTS by ROS Class by Alternative

ROS Class	Alt 1	Alt 2		Alt 3	Alt 4		Alt 5	
		Roads	Miles		Roads	Miles	Roads	Miles
Primitive	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0
Semi-Primitive Motorized	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Roaded Natural	0	29	5.18	0	41	8.42	57	13.57
Rural	0	4	0.61	0	2	0.18	5	0.71

Table 41. Summary of Additions of Areas to NFTS by ROS Class by Alternative

ROS Class	Alt 1	Alt 2		Alt 3	Alt 4		Alt 5	
		Areas	Acres		Areas	Acres	Areas	Acres
Primitive	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Semi-Primitive Motorized	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	64.80
Roaded Natural	0	0	0.00	0	10	31.04	17	41.25
Rural	0	1	6.12	0	1	6.12	2	7.02

Measurement Indicator 2: Non-motorized Recreation Opportunity

Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on non-motorized recreation (dust, noise, use conflicts). It also addresses the opportunity for quiet recreation issue.

Method: Number of acres outside 1/2 mile of an area where motorized use is allowed (designated roads, trails and areas in the NFTS that would result under each alternative). This method was determined through a literature review of sound studies and reports (2005 “California Off-Highway Vehicle Noise Study: A Report to the California Legislature as Required by Public

Resources Code Section 5090.32 (0) Prepared for: State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division,” 2006 “Protecting Natural Sounds in National Parks: Soundscape Workshop Visitor Experience and Soundscapes Annotated Bibliography March 1-2” and 2007 “Environmental Effects of Off-Highway Vehicles on Bureau of Land Management Lands: A Literature Synthesis, Annotated bibliographies, Extensive Bibliographies and Internet Resources.”

Table 42. Acreage Outside 1/2 mile of Proposed Additions to the NFTS as a Measurement Indicator of Acreage Available for Quiet Recreation and Non-Motorized Activities without the Potential for Use Conflicts with Motor Vehicles

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Acreage Available	533,325	554,074	619,037	627,299	625,421
Total Mileage in Alternative	0	46	0	51	85

Measurement Indicator 3: Motorized Recreation Opportunity

Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS to motorized recreation opportunities by alternative.

Method:

Roads: Number of miles available by vehicle class and season of use.

Trails: Number of miles available by vehicle class and season of use.

Quality of Trail Experience: Number of miles by Trail class and degree of difficulty.

Table 43. Road Mileage Open to the Public Forestwide by Alternative (Class of Vehicle and Season of Use)

Class of Vehicle	Season of Use		Alt 1 and 3 (miles)	Alt 2 (miles)	Alt 4 (miles)	Alt 5 (miles)
	From	To				
Open to All Vehicles	Year Round		1421.5	734.54	262.94	270.49
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	Year Round		397.83	263.8	112	182.72
Open to All Vehicles	2-Apr	31-Dec	6.4	6.4	0	0.5
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-Apr	31-Dec	12.2	12.2	19.1	19.1
Open to All Vehicles	2-Apr	30-Nov	11.5	20.4	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-Apr	30-Nov	16.6		0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	16-Apr	31-Oct	0	0.5	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Apr	14-Dec	0	3.6	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-Apr	11-Jan	0	0.9	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-Apr	30-Sep	15.1	0.7	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-Apr	31-Oct	0.5		0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-Apr	30-Nov	58.6	218.45	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-Apr	30-Nov	88.53	144.84	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-May	31-Oct	0	0.5	0	0

Class of Vehicle	Season of Use		Alt 1 and 3 (miles)	Alt 2 (miles)	Alt 4 (miles)	Alt 5 (miles)
	From	To				
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-May	31-Oct	0	2.1	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-May	14-Nov	0	0.5	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-May	30-Nov	53.59	54.19	702.44	785.18
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-May	30-Nov	12.66	16.28	264.77	196.05
Open to All Vehicles	2-May	14-Dec	0	0	13.5	13.9
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-May	14-Dec	0	0	11.5	11.5
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	16-May	14-Sep	0.3	0	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	16-May	30-Sep	0	0.9	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-May	31-Mar	0	0	3.52	3.52
Open to All Vehicles	21-May	30-Sep	0	1.2	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-May	30-Sep	0	0.18		0
Open to All Vehicles	21-May	14-Oct	0	0.6	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-May	31-Oct	22.2	6.37	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-May	31-Oct	3.6	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-May	14-Nov	0	7.95	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-May	14-Nov		33.43	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	21-May	30-Nov	8.2	217.29	212.75	221.64
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	21-May	30-Nov	23.1	80.4	82.66	82.66
Open to All Vehicles	23-May	30-Sep	1.9	0	0	0
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	31-May	14-Sep	0	7.01	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-June	31-Oct	34	0	0	
Open to All Vehicles	2-June	14-Nov	0	0	11.9	1331
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-June	14-Nov	0	0	30.83	30.83
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	2-Jun	30-Sep	1.9	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jun	31-Oct	0.7	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jun	14-Nov	5.8	2.5	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	30-Apr	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	16-Jun	30-Apr	3.7	3.7	5	5
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	14-Sep	2.7		0	

Class of Vehicle	Season of Use		Alt 1 and 3 (miles)	Alt 2 (miles)	Alt 4 (miles)	Alt 5 (miles)
	From	To				
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	30-Sep	8.2	71.15	88.25	88.85
Open to Highway Vehicles Only	16-Jun	30-Sep	0	0	1.9	1.9
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	14-Nov	0	3	0	
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	31-Oct	0	0.2	3.6	3.6
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jun	30-Nov	0	2.81	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	1-Jun	30-Sep	0	0.4	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	1-July	30-Sep	11.5	0	18.8	18.8
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jul	14-Sep	5.9	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jul	30-Sep	2.8	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jul	14-Oct	2.6	3.6	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jul	31-Oct	21.4	3.9	0.2	0.2
Open to All Vehicles	2-Jul	30-Nov	0	1.4	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jul	30-Sep	0	2.2	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jul	31-Oct	2.2	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Jul	14-Nov	0	1	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	1-Aug	30-Sep	0	2.1	5.2	6.7
Open to All Vehicles	1-Aug	30-Nov	0	1.4	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Aug	30-Apr	1.1	0	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	2-Aug	30-Jun	5	1.3	1.3	2.7
Open to All Vehicles	2-Aug	30-Nov	0	1	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	16-Aug	30-Nov	4.7	5.4	9	32.11
Open to All Vehicles	16-Aug	31-Dec	0	0		3.2
Open to All Vehicles	2-Sep	30-Nov	0	0		4.01
Open to All Vehicles	1-Oct	30-Nov	0	2.8	0	0
Open to All Vehicles	1-Dec	30-Sep	23.4	0	0	0
Total			2293.2	1945.2	1861.3	3316.3

Table 44. Trail Mileage Open to the Public Forestwide by Alternative (Class of Vehicle and Season of use)

Season of Use	Vehicle Class	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5
April 2 to November 30	ATVMT	8.07	0.00	0.00
	HCVT	1.98	0.00	0.00
	MT	0.69	0.00	0.00
May 2 to November 30	ATVMT	7.23	13.42	25.55
	HCVT	5.74	8.70	18.41
	MT	0.59	1.74	3.75
May 21 to March 31	ATVMT	0.00	0.00	0.00
	HCVT	1.05	0.70	0.99
	MT	0.00	0.00	0.00
May 21 to November 30	ATVMT	0.50	0.37	0.37
	HCVT	6.27	10.14	11.88
	MT	0.00	0.00	0.00
May 31 to March 31	ATVMT	0.00	0.00	0.00
	HCVT	0.59	0.00	0.00
	MT	0.00	0.00	0.00
August 16 to November 30	ATVMT	3.26	2.45	4.25
	HCVT	1.84	2.56	3.22
	MT	0.72	1.12	2.43

Table 45. Trail Mileage Open to the Public Forestwide by Alternative by Degree of Difficulty

Class of Vehicle	Degree of Difficulty	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
ATVs and Quads	Easy	0	11.09	0	11.35	23.09
	More Difficut	0	7.98	0	4.89	7.08
	MostDifficutlt	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal		0	19.07	0	16.24	30.17
Motorcycle	Easy	0	0.85	0	1.77	3.32
	More Difficut	0	1.98	0	1.09	2.40
	MostDifficutlt	0	0	0	0	.46
Subtotal		0	2.83	0	2.86	6.18
High Clearance Vehicles	Easy	0	9.72	0	16.99	23.71
	More Difficut	0	4.26	0	4.09	7.56
	MostDifficutlt	0	4.48	0	1.71	3.93
Subtotal		0	18.46	0	22.79	35.20
Total Mileage in Alternative		0	40	0	42	71

Table 46. Open Area Acreage Forestwide by Alternative by Vehicle Class

Season of Use	Vehicle Class	Alt 2	Alt 4	Alt 5
August 16 to November 30	ATVMT/HCVHL/HCVT	0.00	69.47	97.75
	HCVHL	0.00	1.76	1.76
May 2 to November 30	ATVMT/HCVHL	6.12	6.86	9.16
	HCVHL	0.00	0.00	1.52
May 21 to November 30	HCVHL	0.00	3.51	3.51
May 31 to November 14	ATVMT	0.00	0.00	1.97
	HCVHL	0.00	0.00	0.30
Year round	HCVHL	0.00	0.10	0.10

Measurement Indicator 4: Motorized Access to Dispersed Recreation

Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS to motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities by alternative.

Method:

Roads: Number of miles available by vehicle class and season of use.

Quality of Road/Dispersed Experience: Number of facilities provided as surrogate for number of dispersed sites accessed. One site per route addition for the purposes of access to dispersed recreation will be used as a proxy (in some instances multiple sites are accessed by a single route addition).

Trails: Number of miles available by vehicle class and season of use.

Quality of Trail Experience: Number of facilities provided as surrogate for number of dispersed sites accessed. One site per route addition for the purposes of access to dispersed recreation will be used as a proxy (in some instances multiple sites are accessed by a single route addition).

Table 47. Number of Dispersed Recreation Sites Accessed by Proposed Additions to the NFTS by Alternative

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Unauthorized Route Additions	0	46	0	51	85
Total Sites Accessed in Alternative	1,712	293	0	252	485

Measurement Indicator 5: Impact of Proposed Changes to the NFTS on Neighboring Private and Federal Lands (dust, noise and use impacts)

Description: This measurement indicator looks at the impact of proposed changes to the NFTS on neighboring private and Federal lands (dust, noise and use conflicts) by alternative.

Method: Number of miles of new routes proposed within 1/2 miles of populated areas, neighboring Federal land boundaries, wilderness boundaries and private land boundaries (Acts as surrogate indicates how much conflict off NFTS may occur by alternative). This method was

determined through a literature review of sound studies and reports (2005 “California Off-Highway Vehicle Noise Study: A Report to the California Legislature as Required by Public Resources Code Section 5090.32 (0) Prepared for: State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division,” 2006 “Protecting Natural Sounds in National Parks: Soundscape Workshop Visitor Experience and Soundscapes Annotated Bibliography March 1-2,” and 2007 “Environmental Effects of Off-Highway Vehicles on Bureau of Land Management Lands: A Literature Synthesis, Annotated bibliographies, Extensive Bibliographies and Internet Resources”).

Table 48. Miles of Proposed Additions to the NFTS within 1/2 Mile of Neighboring Private and Federal Lands by Alternative

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	Alt 5
Unauthorized Route Additions	0	19	0	12	26
Total Mileage in Alternative	0	46	0	51	85

Affected Environment

The Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences sections are project wide covering all analysis units.

A majority of the road network on the SNF was created in support of timber harvest activities beginning in the late 1800s. A resurgence of timber harvest in the early 1960s through the late 1980s resulted in access roads for timber management into many new areas of the forest. By the late 1980s most of the necessary timber-related access roads were in place and priorities were shifted to provide better public safety and access.

Public use of the road system has grown steadily. Driving for pleasure has become the single largest recreational use of Forest Service managed lands (SNFPA Chapter 3, p. 443). The roads provide visitor access to all types of developed and dispersed recreation.

Motorized Recreation

The SNF has been used by motorized recreation visitors since the late 1940s. Four-wheel drive vehicles were the primary mode of off-highway travel. The SNF has had an OHV Plan since off-highway vehicle controls were first put into effect in 1958. The controls were adjusted and modified over the years between 1960 and 1976 to meet the changing conditions and needs. These controls were developed with the participation of the public and were helpful in allowing motor vehicle use, while at the same time providing necessary protection to the basic resources. In the early 1970s trail bikes, motorcycles and all-terrain vehicles became popular.

An Executive Order signed by President Nixon on February 8, 1972 directed all Federal land management agencies to prepare plans to “insure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed to protect the resources of those lands and to minimize conflicts among the various users of those lands.” As a result of the 1972 Executive Order, the SNF began an environmental analysis which resulted in the 1977 ORV Plan. The plan identified an area limited to roads and “ORV trails” and an area identified as “open use.”

The California Wilderness Act of 1984 was passed by congress September 1984 and become Public Law 98-425. This Act established the Dinkey Lakes Wilderness and enlarged the John Muir Wilderness. This legislation had potential for impacting two “ORV trails” identified in the 1977 Plan; Coyote and Dusy-Ershim. The Act references the Dusy-Ershim as a primitive road.

In 1972 the State of California initiated a grants and agreements program to qualified applicants. Beginning in the 1980s the SNF was successful in obtaining State funds to maintain the system identified in the 1977 ORV Plan as well as non-NFTS opportunities not eligible to be maintained by Federal appropriated funds. One area of non-NFTS opportunities is Miami Motorcycle Area. The area has been managed over the years using State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division funds. The objective of applying this funding in the Miami area was to encourage users to stay on identified routes and discourage motorized cross-country use. Using these funds, new unplanned routes and routes with negative resource issues were actively obliterated. In addition, State funds have assisted in monitoring soil conditions, performing routine maintenance and conducting resource inventories for sensitive plants and animals.

The SNF has 98 miles of primitive roads maintained as motorized trails. These roads are shown on the recreation visitor map as Designated Off-Highway Vehicle Routes. There are directional signs to the beginning of the routes. These routes are maintained by volunteers in partnership with the SNF. Operations and maintenance on these routes is accomplished with funding assistance through a partnership with the State of California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Division. The partnership with the State of California also funds 33 miles of unauthorized routes in the areas where cross-country motorized use proposed to be prohibited.

There are 660,000 acres open to cross county motorized travel. For comparison purposes this acreage is represented by an estimate (2005 inventory) of 596 miles of unauthorized routes. There are five predominate areas where the unauthorized routes are located.

Miami Motorcycle Area is located directly off of Highway 41. Miami Motorcycle Area began as a result of a timber harvest project in approximately 4,500 acres and now provides recreational opportunities for dirt bikes, duel sport bikes and ATVs. The area is managed and is in compliance with the 1977 ORV Plan. Per the plan, the area is open to cross-country travel. However, the SNF identified 18 miles of motorcycle and ATV non-system trails and discourages cross-country travel. There are two main staging areas, Kamook and Lone Sequoia, servicing the area with picnic tables, fire rings and vault toilets and parking that includes room for unloading equipment. Though the SNF has identified the Miami Motorcycle Area on the official recreation map since 1991, there are visitors who have ridden the trails for 40 or more years. The loop and varied skill level opportunities for motorcycle and ATV recreation provides the most popular ATV and motorcycle riding opportunities on the forest. There is a roaded experience in this area providing predominantly native surface experience with gentle to short steep slopes. There is opportunity for long riding experiences without repeating the segments and accesses a large existing road network

A few miles from the Miami Motorcycle Area, there are a few small campgrounds dotted through the area. Many motorized recreation visitors camp at developed campgrounds (Whiskey Falls, Texas Flat, Whiskers, Gags, Lower Chiquito and others) and ride the extensive network of system roads and unauthorized routes. There is extensive connectivity providing hours of riding. ATVs are the principal vehicle of choice in this area.

In Jose Basin, there is a network of roads and unauthorized routes as a result of previous timber harvesting. An annual permitted motorized event brings four-wheel drive enthusiasts together to test their skills on the rocks and routes in the area. There is a roaded experience in Jose Basin providing predominantly natural surface experience with gentle to short steep slopes with occasional boulder areas for technical driving opportunities (rock crawling) .

In Blue Canyon, an annual permitted motorized event brings four-wheel drive enthusiast together to test their skill on short steep routes and challenging rock crawling. There is a roaded experience in Blue Canyon providing a natural surface with gentle to short steep slopes with occasional boulder areas to crawl over.

It should be noted that the motor vehicle use described in Jose Basin and Blue Canyon is authorized under special use permit. Use authorized under special use permit or other authorizations (permits, mining claims, licenses) is analyzed in separate NEPA decisions and is outside the scope of this proposal.

Located northeast of the Blue Canyon area is the Nelson Mountain/Big Fir Road area. The routes in this area are a result of temporary roads and timber sales. The area began expanding as an overflow camping area as a result of Dinkey Creek, Buck Meadow and Gigantea campgrounds reaching capacity. In addition, this area is a camping and staging area for day rides over the Swamp OHV route.

Areas

There is a rough estimate of approximately 1,700 dispersed recreation sites on the SNF. These sites are scattered throughout the project area. The sites are accessed by existing roads and unauthorized routes. The creation of these sites vary from an old landing area in a timber sale to a site used as overflow camping when developed campgrounds are at capacity, to a staging area for loading/unloading horses or ATVs. There are a few sites that are utilized as an opportunity for motorized recreation and are often a granitic outcrop or dome. These areas provide various challenges for rock crawling or scenic views.

The SNF currently manages 59 motorized use areas (totaling 125 acres) where motor vehicle use is allowed. Management activities (health and safety and resource protection) are primarily for resource protection rather than user convenience. An area may be as small as a single pullout or a dispersed campsite or as large as a space for parking several large equestrian trailers. These areas do not get daily maintenance, but require more labor intensive trash collection because trash collection bins are typically not present (see Appendix K - Maps).

Non-Motorized Recreation

Non-Motorized recreation consists of hiking, walking, rafting, fishing, hunting and more experiences. The SNF manages portions of the Ansel Adams, John Muir and Monarch Wildernesses and the entire Dinkey Lakes and Kaiser Wildernesses. The Kings River Special Management area was established by Congress to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment and to protect natural and archaeological resources. There are designated wild and scenic rivers on the SNF, including Kings River (includes Middle Fork, South Fork and the main river) and the Merced River (includes the South Fork). There are other special areas (e.g. botanical, geologic and historic) on the SNF offering botanical, geologic and historic non-motorized experiences (to name a few). On the SNF there are approximately 592,000 acres where non-motorized recreation opportunities are available exclusive of motorized recreation.

Recreation Visitor Use

Visitor counts relating to motorized use were not documented in the 1977 ORV Plan. However, through the State of California Grant Applications and National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) process, the SNF has data relating to these visitors.

Table 49. SNF Visitor Activity Participation and Primary Activity As Reported In NVUM Results (2002 and 2007)

Activity	Percent of Visitors who Participated in this Activity ¹	
	FY 2002	FY 2007
Camping in developed sites	35.45	11.6
Primitive camping	2.10	2.0
Backpacking	6.05	3.6
Resort Use	5.37	3.9
Picnicking	22.59	20.6
Viewing wildlife, birds, fish, etc	26.93	21.6
Viewing natural features (scenery)	32.43	51.3
Visiting historic/prehistoric sites	6.97	4.8
Visiting a nature center	3.63	2.9
Nature Study	6.23	7.6
Relaxing	43.22	48.7
Fishing	22.81	12.3
Hunting	1.34	0.0
OHV use	3.36	1.6
Driving for pleasure	9.91	13.6
Snowmobile travel	0.53	1.2
Motorized water travel	7.05	6.6
Other motorized activities	0.63	0.9
Hiking or walking	41.21	40.5
Horseback riding	0.84	1.4
Bicycling	4.39	3.0
Non-motorized water travel	11.96	4.4
Downhill skiing or snowboarding	10.35	9.4
X-C skiing, snow shoeing	3.22	2.8
Other non-motor activity (swim, etc.)	22.86	43.8
Gathering forest products mushrooms, berries, firewood	5.31	4.3
Motorized trail Activity		0.8
No Activity Reported	13.90	4.1

¹Survey respondents could select multiple activities so this column may total more than 100 percent.

Based on the reported number of visits to National Forest System land on the SNF during fiscal year (FY)² 2002 and 2007 it can be determined the number of visitors who spent some time driving for pleasure, used off-highway vehicles during their visit and the primary activity for visitors who participated in off-highway vehicle use. Based upon the data, when primary motorized uses are combined, including: OHV use, driving for pleasure and other motorized activities in FY 2002 14 percent of the visitors to the SNF responded they participated in motorized uses. In FY 2007 the data indicates there was a 26 percent reduction of primary motorized use on the SNF. Even with a reduction of primary motorized use on the SNF, the visitors participating in the survey, 17 percent responded they participated in motorized uses.

It can also be determined the number of visitors who spent some time in non-motorized uses, including: backpacking, fishing, hiking, walking, horseback riding, bicycling and other non-motorized activities. In FY 2002, 75 percent of the visitors to the SNF responded that they participated in non-motorized uses. In FY 2007 participation in non-motorized activities was

² The USDA Forest Service fiscal year begins October 1 and ends September 30

reported as 92 percent (See Table 50). Use of a motor vehicle is the primary form of access to non-motorized recreation activities on the SNF.

Table 50. Approximate SNF Visitors by Type of Main Activity as Reported in NVUM Results (2002 and 2007)

Type of Use	NVUM Categories	Percent as Main Activity 2002	Approximate Visitors in 2002	Percent as Main Activity 2007	Approximate Visitors in 2007
Camping	Developed Camping	35.45	660,384	11.6	132,182
	Primitive Camping	2.10	39,120	2.0	22,790
Hunting	Hunting	1.34	24,962	0.0	
Motorized Uses	OHV use	3.36	62,592	1.6	18,232
	Driving for Pleasure	9.91	184,609	13.6	154,972
	Other Motorized Activity	0.63	11,736	0.9	10,256

Environmental Consequences

The Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences sections are forestwide covering all analysis units.

This section analyzes each of the alternatives for direct, indirect and cumulative effects of 1) prohibition of cross-country wheeled motor vehicle travel, 2) adding facilities and 3) changing existing NFTS facilities.

Alternative 1 – No Action

Of all the alternatives, Alternative 1 will provide the most motorized opportunities with fewest limitations. No facilities will be added to the NFTS. Motorized cross-country travel will continue outside of areas depicted in Figure 1 with a probable increase in the number of motorized recreation routes.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Continued Cross-country Travel

Alternative 1 does not prohibit cross-country travel by wheeled motor vehicles and therefore has the greatest effect to ROS compatibility. There are 10.6 miles of unauthorized routes in the Primitive ROS class in addition there are 10.3 miles of unauthorized routes located in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class.

Non-motorized recreation opportunity will remain at the current level of over 592,000 acres closed to motorized use. These areas closed to motorized use consist of Congressionally-designated wilderness areas, the Kings River Special Management Area, wild and scenic rivers and other special areas on the SNF.

Motorized recreation opportunity on the forest will predominately occur on the 98 miles of primitive roads managed as motorized trails where the greatest challenges and primitive motorized experience is offered. There will be continued use in the area open to cross-country travel for motor vehicles with a probable proliferation of motorized recreation routes.

Motorized access to dispersed recreation will continue in areas outside of those depicted in Figure 1 and would be limited to areas accessed from NFTS roads and trails in the higher elevations.

The impacts of allowing cross-country motorized use include continued noise, dust and physical presence. Of the five alternatives, this alternative has the greatest potential for conflict with the neighboring private and Federal lands. Of the estimated 590 miles of unauthorized routes, there are 208 miles within 1/2 mile of private property.

Without a cross-country prohibition, proliferation of motorized routes is likely to continue.

Currently, 208 miles of unauthorized routes are located within 1/2 mile of private property; noise and dust created by the motorized visitors will continue to impact the residential areas adjacent to the SNF. The impact will continue as long as motorized cross-country travel is allowed. In addition, the lack of controls and enforcement capability for this type of widespread use may result in resource degradation and overuse. Over time, this may affect the quality of the experience for responsible motorized recreation visitors. The existence of unauthorized routes in themselves do not provide for a quality recreation experience. The SNF would be severely challenged to meet standards and keep areas open under this scenario. This alternative is the least sustainable of all alternatives.

Addition of Facilities

No facilities will be added to the NFTS, however, 660,000 acres would remain accessible to motorized recreation. As a result, this alternative provides the most total acres and for comparison purposes and the most miles of routes available to motorized recreation.

Effects of the Existing NFTS

There will be no changes to the existing NFTS. The current NFTS roads are defined under the Sierra National Forest 1999 Road Closure Plan (with some modifications) and implemented by Forest Order R5-83-3.

Cumulative Effects

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with the past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix E. Future analysis of unauthorized routes providing a recreational experience or motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make additions to the NFTS. Some future timber and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

Of the alternatives, Alternative 2 proposes adding the third highest number of miles of unauthorized routes to the NFTS.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Prohibition of Cross-country Travel

ROS is compatible with the intent of the LMRP for Roaded Natural and Primitive. There is a direct beneficial effect for the Primitive ROS class because 10.6 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use. There is a direct beneficial effect in the in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class because 9.87 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use.

Compared to Alternative 1, there would be a four percent increase in acreage available for quiet recreation and non-motorized activities without the potential for use conflicts with motor vehicles.

Motorized recreation opportunity would be focused on a designated system. Motorized access to dispersed recreation would be decreased compared to Alternative 1, due to the prohibition of use on 474 miles of unauthorized routes.

The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel on the SNF would result in a reduction of noise, dust and vehicles. There is a significant reduction in the direct affect to adjacent private property in lower elevations of the SNF due to the prohibition of motorized cross-country travel. One negative impact would be that direct access for motorized recreation from adjacent private property would no longer be available (i.e. routes from private property directly onto National Forest System lands would be prohibited).

Addition of Facilities

The additional trails contribute to the variety of the riding experience (Motorcycle 7 percent, ATV and Quads 50 percent and four-wheel drive 43 percent). This alternative has the greatest range of difficulty (Easy 50 percent, Moderate 36 percent and Difficult 13 percent). In some areas the riding experience is enhanced due to extended riding time with access to loops and a larger network of roads and trails.

Addition of the proposed routes and area would be compatible with Roded Natural and Primitive ROS classes as intended in the LMRP. Predominant use would be in Roded Natural ROS class. There would be 0.77 miles of proposed additions located in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class. Proposed mitigation for this effect is adoption of a non-significant amendment to the LRMP that would change 0.65 acres in the ROS Element map from Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized.

Of the 46 miles of unauthorized routes proposed for designation in this alternative, 19 miles are located within 1/2 mile of private property. This alternative would have the highest percentage (41 percent) of proposed new NFTS facilities (roads/trails/areas) within 1/2 mile of private property.

This alternative was designed for recreational motorized experience with less emphasis on access to dispersed recreation. Many dispersed recreation sites (an estimated 290 out of an estimated 1,700) would remain accessible by the existing NFTS roads and proposed routes in this alternative. There would be one area (6 acres) authorized for parking and ATV use. Only Alternative 3 has a greater negative impact than Alternative 2 for access to dispersed recreation opportunities.

Changes to the Existing NFTS

Changes to the seasonal open period provides additional protection to resources and provides for stabilized tread for a beneficial recreation experience. Changes in allowed vehicle class provides benefits to motorized recreation visitors by providing more roads for travel by non-highway legal vehicles. This also would provided more connectivity between motorized trails resulting in longer loop opportunities.

Thirteen miles of NFTS roads would be converted to NFTS trails. These miles are currently being managed as motorized trails, with 6 miles managed as ATV trail and 7 miles managed for high clearance vehicles. The opportunity allows for continued motorized recreation on these routes and additional connectivity between roads and motorized trails resulting in longer loop opportunities.

Cumulative Effects

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with the past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix E. Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily re-routes to protect a natural or cultural resources. Future analysis of unauthorized routes providing a recreational experience or motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make other additions to the NFTS. Timber and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Alternative 3

Of all the alternatives, Alternative 3 would provide the least motorized recreation opportunity in terms of diversity and miles of routes available for motor vehicle use.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Prohibition of Cross-country Travel

The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel on the forest results in the reduction of noise, dust and vehicles.

The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel on the forest reduces noise, dust, vehicles and also reduces the diversity of motorized recreation experience in the lower elevations. There would be a significant reduction (an estimated 208 miles of unauthorized routes within 1/2 mile of private property would be prohibited from use) in the direct affect to adjacent private property in lower elevations of the SNF. One negative impact would be that direct access for motorized recreation from adjacent private property would no longer be available (i.e. routes from private property directly onto National Forest System lands would be prohibited).

Uses in the ROS classes would be compatible with the LRMP. This is an improvement because 10.6 miles of unauthorized routes located in the Primitive class and 10.3 miles of unauthorized routes in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized would now be closed to motorized travel.

Compared to all other alternatives, there would be an increase in acreage available for quiet recreation and non-motorized activities without the potential for use conflicts with motor vehicles.

There would be a less diversity of riding opportunities in rolling foothill topography. There would be a loss of access to dispersed recreation as all dispersed recreation sites that are accessed by an unauthorized route would no longer be immediately accessible by motor vehicle (though non-motorized access would remain available). There would be a negative effect to the riding experience for loop opportunities and experience level with the least connectivity between existing NFTS roads managed for high clearance vehicles and fewer opportunities for a variety of experience on a varying degree of slopes and tread materials.

Addition of Facilities

No facilities would be added; there would be no additions to the NFTS roads trails or areas. There would be no unauthorized motorized routes within 1/2 mile of private property

Changes to the Existing NFTS

No roads would be converted to trails nor changes in vehicle class or season of use for the NFTS.

Cumulative Effects

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with the past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix E. Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily re-routes to protect natural or cultural resources. Future analysis of unauthorized routes providing a recreational experience or motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make additions to the NFTS. Timber and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Alternative 4

Of the five alternatives, Alternative 4 proposes adding the second highest number of miles of unauthorized routes to the NFTS.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Prohibition of Cross-country Travel

ROS is compatible with the intent of the LMRP for Roded Natural and Primitive. Predominant use is in Roded Natural. There would be a direct beneficial effect for the Primitive ROS class because 10.6 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use. There would be a direct beneficial effect in the in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class because 9.0 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use.

Compared to Alternative 1, there would be an increase in acreage available for quiet recreation and non-motorized activities without the potential for use conflicts with motor vehicles. Motorized access to dispersed recreation is decreased with prohibition of use on 469 miles of unauthorized routes.

The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel on the SNF results in the reduction of noise, dust and vehicles. There is a significant reduction in the direct affect to adjacent private property in lower elevations of the SNF due to the prohibition of motorized cross-country travel. One negative impact would be that direct access for motorized recreation from adjacent private property would no longer be available (i.e. routes from private property directly onto National Forest System lands would be prohibited).

Addition of Facilities

The additional miles of NFTS roads provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities. The additional miles of NFTS trails contribute to the variety of the riding experience (Motorcycle 75 percent, ATV and Quads 39 percent and four-wheel drive, 54 percent). This alternative has the smallest range of difficulty (Easy 72 percent, Moderate 24 percent and Difficult 4 percent). In some areas the riding experience is enhanced due to extended riding time with access to loops and a larger network of roads and trails.

Addition of the proposed routes and areas would be compatible with Roded Natural and Primitive ROS classes as intended in the LMRP. Predominant use would be in Roded Natural ROS class. There would direct negative effect to the Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class due to the addition of 1.64 miles of proposed trails. Proposed mitigation for this effect is adoption of a non-significant amendment to the LRMP that would change 1.4 acres in the ROS Element map from Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized.

Of the 51 miles of unauthorized routes proposed for designation in this alternative, there are 12 miles within 1/2 mile of private property. This alternative would have the lowest percentage (24 percent) of proposed new NFTS facilities (roads/trails/areas) within 1/2 mile of private property.

Many dispersed recreation sites (an estimated 250 out of an estimated 1,700) remain accessible by the existing NFTS roads and proposed additions in this alternative. There would be 11 areas (37 acres) authorized for parking and ATV use. Alternative 4 would have less access to dispersed recreation opportunities than Alternatives 1 or 2.

Changes to the Existing NFTS

The change to the seasonal open period provides additional protection to resources providing stabilized tread for a beneficial recreation experience. The change in allowed vehicle class provides benefits to motorized recreation visitors by providing more roads for travel by non-highway legal vehicles which also provides more connectivity between motorized trails resulting in longer loop opportunities.

Thirteen miles of NFTS roads will be converted to NFTS trails. These miles are currently managed as motorized trails with 6 miles managed as ATV trail and 7 miles managed for high clearance vehicles. The opportunity allows for continued motorized recreation on these routes and additional connectivity between roads and motorized trails resulting in longer loop opportunities.

Cumulative Effects

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with the past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix E. Some future new trail construction will occur, primarily re-routes to protect a natural or cultural resource. Future analysis of unauthorized routes providing a recreational experience or motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make other additions to the NFTS. Timber and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Alternative 5

Of the five alternatives, Alternative 5 would provide the maximum additions for motorized opportunities. This alternative responds to the impacts to motorized access issue by providing additional motorized trails, providing additional combined and mixed use roads and providing more access to dispersed recreation activities than alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

Direct and Indirect Effects

Prohibition of Cross-country Travel

ROS is compatible with the intent of the LMRP for Roaded Natural and Primitive. Predominant use is in Roaded Natural. There would be a direct beneficial effect for the Primitive ROS class because 10.6 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use. There would be a direct beneficial effect in the in Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class because 9.0 miles of unauthorized routes would not be subject to motor vehicle use.

Compared to Alternative 1, there would be an increase in acreage available for quiet recreation and non-motorized activities without the potential for use conflicts with motor vehicles. Motorized access to dispersed recreation is decreased with prohibition of use on 435 miles of unauthorized routes.

The prohibition of cross-country motorized travel on the forest results in the reduction of noise, dust and vehicles. There is a significant reduction in the direct affect to adjacent private property

in lower elevations of the SNF due to the prohibition of motorized cross-country travel. One negative impact would be that direct access for motorized recreation from adjacent private property would no longer be available (i.e. routes from private property directly onto National Forest System lands would be prohibited).

Addition of Facilities

The additional miles of NFTS roads provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities. In areas where additional trails are proposed, the trails contribute to the variety of the riding experience (8 percent motorcycles, 44 percent, ATV and Quads and 48 percent four-wheel drive.) This alternative has a range of difficulty (Easy 70 percent, Moderate 24 percent and Difficult 4 percent) that is more balanced than Alternatives 2 or 4.

Addition of the proposed routes and areas would be compatible with Roded Natural and Primitive ROS classes as intended in the LMRP. Predominant use would be in Roded Natural ROS class. There would be no direct negative effect to the Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS class due to the addition of 1.64 miles of proposed trails. Proposed mitigation for this effect is adoption of a non-significant amendment to the LRMP that would change 1.4 acres in the ROS Element map from Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized to Semi-Primitive Motorized.

Of the 86 miles of unauthorized routes proposed for designation in this alternative, there are 12 miles within 1/2 mile of private property. This alternative would result in 31 percent of proposed new NFTS facilities (roads/trails/areas) within 1/2 mile of private property.

Many dispersed recreation sites (an estimated 485 out of an estimated 1,700) remain accessible by the existing NFTS roads and proposed routes in this alternative. There would be 20 areas (113 acres) authorized for parking and ATV use. Alternative 5 would have less access to dispersed recreation opportunities than Alternative 1 and more than alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

Changes to the Existing NFTS

The change to the seasonal use period provides additional protection to resources providing stabilized tread for a beneficial recreation experience. The change in allowed vehicle class provides benefits to motorized recreation visitors by providing more roads for travel by non-highway legal vehicles which also provides more connectivity between motorized trails, resulting in longer loop opportunities. Compared to alternatives 1 and 3, this alternative increases the roads open to all vehicles by 165 miles and allows 47 miles of combined use on passenger car roads.

Thirteen miles of NFTS roads will be converted to NFTS trails. These miles are currently managed as motorized trails with 6 miles managed as ATV trail and 7 miles managed for high clearance vehicles. The opportunity allows for continued motorized recreation on these routes and additional connectivity between roads and motorized trails resulting in longer loop opportunities.

Cumulative Effects

The direct and indirect effects disclosed above contribute to cumulative effects along with certain past, present or reasonably foreseeable future actions identified in Appendix E. Some future new trail construct will occur, primarily re-routes to protect a natural or cultural resource. Future analysis of unauthorized routes providing a recreational experience or motorized access to dispersed recreation sites could make other additions to the NFTS. Timber and fuel projects may make changes to the NFTS system on a case by case basis. The combined effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions are not expected to be significant.

Compliance with the Forest Plan (LRMP) and Other Direction

Alternatives 2, 3, 4 and 5 are consistent with:

Sierra National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and best meets LRMP objectives for this area.

Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212, 251, 261 and 295): The SNF Travel Management EIS is designed to implement the requirements of the November 5, 2005 Rule for Travel Management.