

Travel Analysis Technical Review Report

Subject: Travel Analysis Process for the Kiowa-Rita Blanca Ranger District
Cibola National Forest, New Mexico

Analyst: Richard Kennedy, P.E.
1184 W. Pleasant View Dr.
Pleasant View, UT 84414

Introduction

A draft of the document *Travel Analysis Process for the Kiowa-Rita Blanca Ranger District, Cibola National Forest, New Mexico* was completed in March 2009. At the requested of the Travel Analysis ID Team, a Travel Analysis Process (TAP) technical review of has been conducted. The purpose of the review is not intended to judge the merits or specifics of the recommendations in the Analysis document, but rather to assess the process and outcomes in relation to sound transportation management practices and conformance with USDA Forest Service travel management policy and procedures (CFRs, FSM, and FSH). It is also not the intent of this review to question the decisions of the development team. The purpose of this document is to document that review.

Technical Review Comments and Conclusions

Summary Conclusions: With the following possible exceptions, the document as prepared appears to meet the intent and requirements outlined in 36 CFR Part 212, FSM 7710, FSH 7705.55 –Travel Planning Handbook, and the Forest Service publication, FS-643, August 1999, *Roads Analysis: Informing Decisions About Managing the National Transportation System*.

Assignment of Road Maintenance Level

The document lists a Maintenance Level 2 (ML-2) to all of the roads in the analysis except Forest Road (FR) K1A, which was assigned Maintenance Level 1 (ML-1). Roads assigned a ML-2 are defined on Page 12 as being “roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles; passenger car traffic is not a consideration.” Roads assigned a ML-1 are defined on Page 12 as “roads that are closed to vehicular traffic intermittently for periods that exceed 1 year.”

Road Maintenance Levels (ML) are either “operational”, current day-to-day management, or ‘objective’ desired road management and as defined by a number of factors including Road Management Objectives (RMO) (FSH 7709.59). RMOs “document the intended purpose of an individual road in providing access...as well as decisions about applicable standards for the road” (FSH 7709.59, 11). Further, RMO’s “document direction for day-to-day management of a National Forest System road based on travel management decisions” (FSH 7709.55, 15.2). The TAP is not a decision document, but transportation system management decisions will be based, at least in part, on the recommendation contained in the TAP.

In discussions with Mike North, Project Team Leader, it was determined that the listed Maintenance Levels are current or existing 'Operational' road Maintenance Levels rather than 'Objective' or desired road Maintenance Levels. This difference was not discussed in the document.

1. Keeping the above in mind, in **Table 3, Benefit: Public/Recreation Access**, Page 17, a 'High' rating is defined as "A high-benefit road is frequently used by the public for recreation activities, and can be accessed by passenger car." Use by a 'passenger car' would appear to require a road with a Maintenance Level of 3 or above (see page 12).

Though there are a number of current system roads with a High rating in the inventory and the document appears to set an 'Objective' Maintenance Level for roads with a High Public/Recreation Access benefit rating (see page 12), there is no indication in the document that the Team recommended a change in road Maintenance Level as a result of the analysis.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the difference between 'operational' and 'objective' Road Maintenance Level and how this relates to what is shown in the document be discussed in the document. It is further recommended that either the rationale for not changing the Maintenance Level or a recommendation for changing the Road Maintenance Levels be provided in the document.

2. In **Table 3, Benefit: Emergency access/egress**, Page 17, a 'High' rating is defined as "High-benefit roads or motorized use trails provide primary or alternate emergency ingress and egress from populated areas. Roads that provide access to areas at high risk to life and property from fire in wildland-urban interface areas, which makes response time critical. Roads that provide access to facilities related to fires suppression." Though it is understood that a Maintenance Level 2 road is adequate for fire suppression access, "primary or alternate emergency ingress and egress from populated areas" may need to be assigned a higher Maintenance Level (ML-3 through 5) to meet the requirement of emergency ingress and egress. See #1 above for discussion of 'operational' vs. 'objective' Maintenance Level.

Recommendation: The need for private property and/or public emergency ingress/egress should be addressed in relation to recommended Road Maintenance Level.

Based on the above discussions and observations, a list of recommended 'objective' Road Maintenance Levels, by route number, was prepared. See attached **Table 1.**

Recommended Objective Road Maintenance Levels.

Closing

Please note that the professional opinions, conclusions, and recommendations included in this report are based on a review of the draft copy of the *Travel Analysis Process for the Kiowa-Rita Blanca Ranger District, Cibola National Forest, New Mexico* provided by Mike North, USDA Forest Service - TEAMS Enterprise, Project Liaison Officer, via email attachment on March 26, 2009. The subject document was reviewed in regards to current USDA Forest Service policy and in accordance with generally accepted transportation management practices. No warranty is expressed or implied. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me. I appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project.

Respectfully Submitted,



Richard A. Kennedy, P.E.
Geotechnical, Environmental, and Transportation Engineer



Attachment: Table 1. Recommended Objective Road Maintenance Levels
Biographical Sketch

Table 1. Recommended Objective Road Maintenance Levels

Route Number	Access Recreation	Access Emergency	Operational ML (Current)	Recommended Min. Objective ML
K87		H	2	3
K87A		H	2	3
K100	H		2	3
K120A		H	2	3
K600 (all sections)	H	H	2	3
K601	H	H	2	3
K602	H	H	2	3
R107		H	2	3
R800	H	H	2	3
UMIL011	H		N/A	3
URBL220	H		N/A	3

Note: Recommended Minimum Objective Maintenance Levels are based on criterion outlined on **Table 3, Benefit assessment criteria**, Pages 16-18, and on **Table A2: Existing System Roads Risk and Benefit Assessment, Appendix A**, in the document *“Travel Analysis Process for the Kiowa-Rita Blanca Ranger District.”*

Richard A. Kennedy, P.E.
4/17/2009
1184 W. Pleasant View Dr., Pleasant View, UT 84414
Hm: 801-782-9555; Cell: 810-391-2997
Email: geoteck@hotmail.com

Biographical Sketch

Education

Technical:

Certificate of Civil Technology, 1971, Idaho State University School of Technical Education

Undergraduate:

Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering, BSCE, 1974, University of Idaho

Post Graduate:

Environmental Engineering, Ground Water Hydrology, Oregon State University, 1988, No degree

Specialized Certifications:

Licensed Professional Engineer (PE), Idaho, Utah

Professional Experience

1975-1977	USDOT Federal Highway Administration, Transportation Engineer (GS-9)
1977-1980	USDA Forest Service, Transportation/Materials/Geotechnical Engineer (GS-9) Kootenai NF, Libby Montana
1980-1987	USDA Forest Service, Materials/Geotechnical Engineer (GS-11) Nez Pierce NF, Grangeville, Idaho
1987-1989	USDA Forest Service, Materials/Geotechnical Engineer (GS-11) Willamette NF, Oakridge, Oregon
1989-1991	USDA Forest Service, District Resource Assistant (GS-11) Willamette NF, Rigdon RD, Oakridge, Oregon
1991-1997	USDA Forest Service, Assistant Forest Engineer (GS-12) Bridger-Teton NF, Jackson, Wyoming
1997-2002	USDA Forest Service, Regional Geotechnical Engineer (GS-12) Intermountain Regional Office (R4), Ogden, Utah
2002-2005	USDA Forest Service, Regional Transportation and Development Engineer (GS-13) Intermountain Regional Office (R4), Ogden, Utah
2005-2006	USDA Forest Service, Regional Hazardous Materials Engineer (GS-13) Intermountain Regional Office (R4), Ogden, Utah
2006-Present	Consulting Engineer, Geotechnical, Environmental, and Transportation Engineering Pleasant View, Utah