

Appendix B

Non-significant Issues

Non-significant issues are points of concern identified through the scoping process that are not used in the environmental analysis. Reasons may include:

- The issue is outside the scope of the proposed action.
- The issue is already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan or other higher level decision.
- The issue is irrelevant to the decision to be made.
- The issue is conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence.
- The issue has limited extent, duration and intensity.

Comments were received from seventeen individuals either representing themselves, an organization, or another agency. Although the comments were numerous, many were similar in nature, and for that reason the issues identified through the process have been grouped. Accompanying each issue is the Agency rationale for determining them non-significant to the analysis.

Group 1 – No issues. Supportive statements

Group 2 – A number of comments expressed disagreement with the elimination of challenging motorcycle trails to create OHV or novice motorcycle trails. If novice or OHV trails need to be put in, do so in new locations.

This is an issue because the action would cause an effect on the human environment (existing recreational facility). The reason that it is not a relevant issue is that the future disposition of the Redbird Crest Trail is already determined. The primary management objective of the RCT is for OHV's <50" (Record of Decision – OHV EIS, ROD-10, and Appendix E, page E-4). While there may exist a need for additional single-track trails, that decision is beyond the scope of this analysis.

Group 3 - Disagree with the Decision to allow the use of OHV's on the Daniel Boone National Forest and, by extension, the purpose and need for the project. Continued use of OHV's on the Forest is incompatible with forest life. OHV's result in noise that should not be heard.

This issue was considered during the preparation of the OHV-EIS (Issues Found Non-significant: Issue 1). The rationale is documented at B-5. Two decisions resulted. One that made a Forest Plan amendment, and the other that made project specific decisions to designate specific routes. One of these routes is the Red Bird Crest Trail.

Group 4 - Suggested ways to do things.

Issues are specific problems, concerns, or unresolved conflict concerning the environmental effects of implementing the proposal. While all suggestions are considered, they are not considered issues concerning specific environmental effects.

Group 5 – Road and trail closures may be ineffective. If new trails are created, motorized traffic will occur on the new sections and continue on the old sections. The consequences may be a net increase in off road vehicle use.

These are general comments addressing the risk of non-compliance. They relate no concern about the potential for any particular environmental impact (except possibly grizzly bear habitat).

The OHV-EIS examined the risk of non-compliance (see page 4-35 and Appendix I) but did not include this as either a significant or non-significant issue..

The secondary impacts to soil and water, however, were considered to be a significant issue.

In actuality, user developed trails in and around the Red Bird River are not occurring, perhaps due to the dense vegetation that exists on the flood plain.

Post closure utilization of these single-track sections are not likely if a short section of the trail is completely eliminated. Motorcyclists have a difficult time negotiating diagonally or on the contour where sustained steep slopes occur in the absence of a trail prism.

Group 6 – Concern over the use of pesticides.

The use of pesticides is not part of the proposal.

Group 7 – Concern about logging.

Logging is not part of the proposal.

Group 8 – Questions.

Many of the comments were in the form of questions. They are too general in nature to make a determination of environmental issues.

Group 9 – Group 9 was developed as a significant issue.

Group 10 – Certain comments expressed opinions about the potential for environmental degradation and public safety.

These comments would appear to find fault with the project objectives of public safety and environmental protection.