

# MANAGEMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT'S INTERIM PERIOD ROUTE CLOSURES Stanislaus National Forest

August 20, 2018

On August 12, 2010, the Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (“CSERC”), the Wilderness Society, and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (collectively the “Plaintiffs”) filed a lawsuit against the Forest Service challenging a 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision regarding motorized travel management on the Stanislaus National Forest (the “2009 Decision”). *Central Sierra Env'tl. Res. Ctr. et al. v. United States Forest Serv.*, Civil No. S-10-2172-KJM-AC (E.D. Cal.). In the lawsuit, Plaintiffs challenged the 2009 Decision on numerous grounds, including an allegation that the 2009 Decision failed to show how it minimized impacts on forest resources, in violation of the Minimization Criteria in Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (“TMR”) and Executive Orders 11644 and 11989.

On January 4, 2013, the Court issued an order (the “Order”) rejecting most of Plaintiffs’ claims, but finding that the Forest Service failed adequately to explain how it complied with the Minimization Criteria in Subpart B of the TMR (2013 WL 77499 at \*15).

Following the Court’s ruling, the parties engaged in settlement discussions that resulted in May 2014 in a Stipulated Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement”), pursuant to which the lawsuit was dismissed. As part of the Settlement, the Forest Service agreed to “take the necessary steps to demonstrate its application of the 2005 Travel Management Rule Subpart B Minimization Criteria, (36 C.F.R. § 212.55(b)(1-4)), to the 2009 Decision”. Settlement at page 3, paragraph 1. In the Settlement, the parties also agreed that the 2009 Decision would remain in full force and effect, with the exception of 40.34 miles of trails (86 trails segments). The Settlement stipulated that these 40.34 miles of trails would not be shown on the motor vehicle use map (“MVUM”) and would remain closed to public motor vehicle use, except as provided by 36 C.F.R. 261.13, pending completion of the Forest Service’s demonstration of its application of the Minimization Criteria (the “Interim Period”). Settlement at page 3, paragraphs 2, 3, 15.

Methods used to implement the closures during the Interim Period varied based on a variety of factors (e.g., route condition, location, and level of use). One, some, or all of the following closure methods were utilized for each of the 86 trail segments: (1) installation of trail closure signs; (2) placement of debris (slash / logs) to cover all or portions of the trails; and (3) installation of physical barriers (i.e., gate, boulders or fence).

Forest Service recreation and off-highway vehicle (“OHV”) staff visited trails closed during the Interim Period as part of routine OHV patrolling, operations, and maintenance. Visit frequency and time of year varied on a trail-by-trail basis depending on season of use, popularity of the trail, and trail location in proximity to other open motorized routes. Information provided by others (e.g., Forest Service personnel, user clubs, environmental organizations) also influenced the frequency and timing of visits to closed trails. The Forest Service followed up on reports of trail closure failures in an attempt to keep effective closures in place.

The long term success of the closure methods during the Interim Period varied. Some closures were effective in achieving no public use throughout the Interim Period. Other closures had to be redeployed multiple times. Some trail closures were damaged and traveled on by public users within days of repeated Forest Service closure efforts. Forest Service techniques used to

maintain closures included: replacement of stickers on signs or carsonites; placement or maintenance of natural debris barriers to block trail access points; replacement of vandalized or stolen signs; placement of boulder barriers where other more easily moved barricades were proving ineffective; and installation of fencing or motorcycle gates on trails where maintaining a closure was most problematic.

During the Interim Period three OHV trail restoration projects were planned, analyzed, and/or implemented that included treatments of trails (or portions thereof) closed during the Interim Period, including.

- North District Motorized Trails Project (40830), Signed Decision Memo 3/3/15:
  - o As part of this project a 0.06 mile segment of trail 16EV154 was blocked and restored, then;
  - o A 0.19 mile segment of trail was constructed to bypass the blocked and restored 0.06 mile segment of trail 16EV154 and to avoid a hill climb section;
  - o In another component of this project a 0.27 mile segment of trail 16EV248 was blocked and restored, then;
  - o A 0.53 mile segment of trail was constructed to bypass the blocked and restored 0.27 miles of trail 16EV248 and to avoid a hill climb section;
  - o Finally, a 0.13 mile segment of trail 16EV253 was blocked and restored, then;
  - o A 0.20 mile segment of trail was constructed to bypass the blocked and restored 0.13 mile segment of trail 16EV253 and to avoid a hill climb section.
- Reynolds OHV Development Project (46138), Signed Decision Memo 5/27/15:
  - o As part of this project, a 0.25 mile segment of trail 2N1905 (19EV143) was blocked and restored to allow natural revegetation to occur. Woody slash, erosion control material, rock or log barriers, and closure signs were all installed, then;
  - o A 0.34 mile segment of trail was constructed to bypass the blocked and restored 0.25 mile segment of trail 2N1905 (19EV143);
  - o Finally, a new 0.24 mile section of trail 2N1905 (19EV143) was constructed to connect the 0.34 mile rerouted section of 2N1905 (19EV143) to 2N05A to create a loop and improve the OHV route intersection at 2N05.
- Twomile Ecological Restoration: Motorized Trails (33890), Signed Decision Memo 6/14/12:
  - o As part of this project a 0.25 mile segment of 18EV56 was blocked and restored by allowing natural conditions to reestablish over time as organic matter and vegetation covers the route surface;
  - o In addition, a 0.34 mile, hill climb section segment of trail 18EV56 was reconstructed to include switchbacks.

Table 1 below includes information pertaining to each of the 86 trail segments closed during the Interim Period including: the initial closure methods, those closure method's effectiveness, any additional actions that were taken to maintain the closure, whether any subsequent NEPA decisions and implementation have occurred affecting that trail; and whether each trail would be eligible to be added to the MVUM upon issuance of the Notice of Compliance. A description of a trail or trail segment as eligible to be added to the MVUM does not mean that the trail or trail segment will be immediately included on the MVUM and opened to the public. No trails will be

added to the MVUM prior to a field visit / current trail condition survey which will confirm that the trail is in a 'green' condition (ready to use) with effective mitigation in place. If a trail is not in a 'green' condition it will not be added to the MVUM.

**TABLE 1: INTERIM CLOSURE TRAILS**

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
17DC484	FR9501	CAL	0.09	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. Stickers peeled off from heavy snow load. Staff replaced stickers and/or carsonites in the summers of 2015, 2016, and 2017.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV130		CAL	0.81	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. Stickers peeled off from heavy snow load. Staff replaced stickers and/or carsonites in the summers of 2015, 2016, and 2017. Additionally, in July 2016, recreation staff blocked the main entrance with logs and slash.	Yes - Local Riders		Low Impact barrier; Hardened Drain Dips; Tread Harden; Drain Dips.	Yes. Fully Implemented; 11/1/2011	No	Yes
17EV275		CAL	0.02	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	Yes	No	Trail is overgrown and difficult to locate at this time. No use has been occurring. In order make accessible for use, the overgrown vegetation would need to be cleared.	None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	No, this trail is currently un-ridable and the Forest will not publish this trail on the MVUM until the trail maintenance is completed to put it into a green condition (see footnote 1 above).
17EV275		CAL	0.01	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. Stickers peeled off from heavy snow load. Staff replaced stickers and/or carsonites in the summers of 2015, 2016, and 2017.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV278		CAL	1.06	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. Stickers peeled off from heavy snow load. Staff replaced stickers and/or carsonites in the summers of 2015, 2016, and 2017. Additionally, in July 2016, recreation staff blocked the main entrance with logs and slash.	Yes - Local Riders		Harden Drain Dips; Tread Harden; Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 5/13/13	No	Yes
18EV292		CAL	0.08	May – Nov.	Sign	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. Locked gates or debris blocks were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate rendering it unsuccessful. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols. Despite the Forest's efforts, users continued to use the trail.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18EV293		CAL	0.06	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. The initial signs were not adequate to keep use from occurring so in August 2016 recreation staff blocked access to the trail with rock barriers to prevent motorized travel and dispersed camping. The rock barriers placed in 2016 have been successful in blocking access and preventing public use of the trail.	No	Since the time the rock barriers were placed vegetation has begun to reestablish. Prior to reopening the trail, this vegetation will need to be cleared."	None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	No, this trail is currently un-ridable due to vegetation encroachment. The Forest will not publish this trail on the MVUM until the trail is cleared of vegetation.
18EV295		CAL	0.30	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	Yes.	No	It is hard to access the trail via 06N29Y because 06N29Y is rutted and overgrown with brush.	None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
18EV295A		CAL	0.06	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	Yes.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18EV536	FR9441	CAL	0.18	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. The initial signs were not adequate to keep use from occurring so in August 2016 recreation staff blocked access to the trail with rock barriers to prevent motorized travel and dispersed camping. The rock barriers placed in 2016 have been successful in blocking access and preventing public use of the trail.	Yes - Jeep Club and District Law Enforcement	Ongoing challenge to keep jeepers from driving through stream channel and camping near the creek with motor vehicle.	Rock Barriers	Yes. Fully Implemented; 8/10/16.	No	Yes
19EV111		CAL	0.12	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. The initial signs were not adequate to keep use from occurring. As such, in August of 2015, staff installed wood fence barriers, but users tore them down. In August 2017, staff blocked access to the trail by placing boulder barriers. These boulder barriers have been successful in blocking access and preventing public use of the trail.	Yes - Other (Non-OHV) District Staff		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
19EV111A		CAL	0.14	May – Nov.	Sign; Summer 2014, Interim Closure stickers were placed on carsonite signs.	No. The initial signs were not adequate to keep use from occurring. As such, in August of 2015, staff installed wood fence barriers, but users tore them down. In August 2017, staff blocked access to the trail by placing boulder barriers. These boulder barriers have been successful in blocking access and preventing public use of the trail.	Yes - Other (Non-OHV) District Staff		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV317		GR	0.06	Year Round	Sign	No. Visitors removed signs and A-frames after installation (5/24/2014). Staff checked on signage weekly and re-installed signs and A-frames. Re-installed signs and A-frames were used as shooting targets. Staff efforts were unable to keep signs in place to maintain notice of closure. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols. Locked gates or debris blocks were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate or debris block rendering it unsuccessful.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV321		GR	0.05	Year Round	Sign	No. Visitors removed signs and A-frames after installation (5/24/2014). Staff checked on signage weekly and re-installed signs and A-frames. Re-installed signs and A-frames were used as shooting targets. Staff efforts were unable to keep signs in place to maintain notice of closure. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols. Locked gates or debris blocks were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate or debris block rendering it unsuccessful.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
17EV425	FR6550	GR	2.27	Year Round	Sign and "A-Frame" Barricade	No. Visitors removed signs and A-frames after installation (5/24/2014). Staff checked on signage weekly and re-installed signs and A-frames. Re-installed signs and A-frames were used as shooting targets. Staff efforts were unable to keep signs in place to maintain notice of closure.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
17EV426	FR4688	GR	0.73	Year Round	Sign	No. Visitors removed signs and A-frames after installation (5/24/2014). Staff checked on signage weekly and re-installed signs and A-frames. Re-installed signs and A-frames were used as shooting targets. Staff efforts were unable to keep signs in place to maintain notice of closure. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols. Locked gates or debris blocks were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate or debris block rendering it unsuccessful.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigations required.	No	Yes
18EV34		GR	1.27	Summer – Fall	Signs installed 5/25/2014	No reported incidence of use occurring during the Interim Period.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
19DC149	FR9849 6	GR	0.28	Summer – Fall	Signs installed 5/25/2014	No reported incidence of use occurring during the Interim Period.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
19EV138	1S1933	GR	0.37	Summer – Fall	Signs installed 5/25/2014	No reported incidence of use occurring during the Interim Period.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
19EV143	2N1905	GR	0.25	Summer - Fall	Sign and Debris Block	Yes.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Drain Dips	Yes*. Trail was re-routed with drainage dips as part of Reynolds OHV Development Project (46138). This reroute and drain dip installation replaced the need for the originally prescribed mitigation measures.	Yes; Reynolds OHV Development Project (46138)	Yes reflecting the changes implemented by the Reynolds OHV Development Project (46138)
19EV154	FR9847 2	GR	0.67	Summer – Fall	Signs installed 5/25/2014	No reported incidence of use occurring during the Interim Period.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigations required.	No	Yes
15EV43G		MW	0.51	Year Round	Sign and Debris Block	No. Although signs were not vandalized, they have been regularly ignored. During routine patrols, staff have, on at least 3 occasions, re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 4/15/12	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
15EV46		MW	0.28	April 15 – Dec 15	Sign, Boulder Barriers and Debris Block	No. Staff routinely visited and re-blocked or re-signed the route as needed. Despite our staff's efforts, the signs, and physical barriers were repeatedly vandalized or removed. This trail is in a very remote, difficult to manage area. Most common users in the area are locals whom the Forest has not been able to deter from using the trail.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 3/15/13	No	Yes
15EV47A		MW	0.12	April 15 – Dec 15	Sign and Debris Block	No. Staff routinely visited and re-blocked or re-signed the route as needed. Despite our staff's efforts, the signs, and physical barriers were repeatedly vandalized or removed. This trail is in a very remote, difficult to manage area. Most common users in the area are locals whom the Forest has not been able to deter from using the trail.	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 3/15/14	No	Yes
15EV48		MW	0.64	April 15 – Dec 15	Sign and Debris Block	No. Staff routinely visited and re-blocked or re-signed the route as needed. Despite our staff's efforts, the signs, and physical barriers were repeatedly vandalized or removed. This trail is in a very remote, difficult to manage area. Most common users in the area are locals whom the Forest has not been able to deter from using the trail.	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 3/15/14	No	Yes
15EV54		MW	0.18	April 15 – Dec 15	Sign and Debris Block	No. Staff routinely visited and re-blocked or re-signed the route as needed. Despite our staff's efforts, the signs, and physical barriers were repeatedly vandalized or removed. This trail is in a very remote, difficult to manage area. Most common users in the area are locals whom the Forest has not been able to deter from using the trail.	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 3/15/14	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16E182A		MW	0.19	April 15 – Dec 15	Sign and Rock Barriers	No. The originally placed signs and rock barriers were successful but the recreation staff had to remove the physical rock barriers to allow permittees access to their allotment. Once the rock barriers were removed, public motorized users began to freely access the trail. Although the closure signs have remained in place, they are ignored. Gates were not installed because they would impede cattle movement in the area, they are prone to theft, and cost prohibitive.	Yes - CSERC	The first approximately 150 feet of trail 16E182A provides access to a dispersed campsite. The next 0.11 mile section travels along the Thompson Meadow fence line. The MW OHV Restoration Project (41430) included, as an action, the blocking and restoring of this 0.11 mile segment of 16E182A. The effort to block and restore the 0.11 mile segment was, however, reversed after implementation and it was reopened in order to allow permittees access to their allotments. Access to Thompson Meadow requires travel along the entire length of 16E182A (not just the portion by the meadow). Once the physical barriers were removed to allow permittee access, the public began to access the entire trail. Permittees typically access Thompson Meadow via 16E182A from the northwest intersection of 16E182A and 16E182.	Drain Dips; Rock Barriers	Yes. Fully Implemented; 5/11/16	Yes; MI-Wok OHV Restoration (41430))	Yes.
16EV112		MW	0.17	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign	No. Signs are regularly ignored. Closure signs are located at the end of 03N05 where the route becomes trail 16EV112. The problem here, has been that the closed 0.17 mile segment of trail 16EV112 (located from the end of 3N05 to the intersection with 16EV115) provides the only turn around opportunity for vehicles travelling on 03N05. For this reason, 16EV112 was never physically blocked. Vehicles ignore the closure sign in order to be able to turn around.	No	The remainder of 16EV112, from the intersection with 16EV115 down to private property boundary was not designated in the 2009 Decision. This section of trail 16EV112 has been blocked with debris several times since 2009 to prevent unauthorized use. These debris blocks have been unsuccessful at preventing use. Users have repeatedly removed these debris blocks.	Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 9/1/13	No	Yes
16EV115		MW	0.95	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.



TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16EV123		MW	0.33	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV124		MW	0.15	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV152		MW	0.33	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate rendering it unsuccessful. Furthermore, the Forest Service could not physically block this trail with debris because it provides access to private (SPI) land.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV152		MW	0.56	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate rendering it unsuccessful. Furthermore, the Forest Service could not physically block this trail with debris because it provides access to private (SPI) land.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV154		MW	1.13	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigations required.	Yes. North District Motorized Trails (40830)	Yes, reflecting the changes implemented by the North District Motorized Trails Project (40830).

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16EV160		MW	1.31	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden; Boardwalk	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV176		MW	0.04	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols.	No		Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 12/8/15	No	Yes
16EV178		MW	0.66	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks. Information regarding the closure was also installed on a nearby OHV Area Kiosk, and staff provided verbal education to the public during patrols.	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 12/8/15	No	Yes
16EV213		MW	0.06	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV223		MW	1.35	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have had to replace the signs twice per year. The initially installed debris blocks were removed for cattle grazing access by Range staff. This route is currently managed by the Range department.	Yes - CSERC		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented 8/1/11	No	Yes
16EV243		MW	0.31	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Padding	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16EV248		MW	0.93	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	Section needing tread hardening was blocked and restored, then re-routed after separate NEPA decision; 10/13/15.	Yes; North District Project Motorized Trail (40830)	Yes, reflecting the changes implemented by the North District Motorized Trails Project (40830).
16EV249		MW	0.28	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	Yes. Fully Implemented; 9/16/12	No	Yes
16EV251		MW	0.32	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	Yes. Fully Implemented; 8/1/11	No	Yes
16EV253		MW	0.89	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	Hardened drain dips and Drain dips were Fully Implemented. The section needing tread hardening was blocked, restored, and re-routed after separate NEPA decision; 10/13/15.	Yes; North District Motorized Trail Project (40830)	Yes, reflecting the changes implemented by the North District Motorized Trails Project (40830).
16EV254		MW	0.51	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV255		MW	0.43	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV258		MW	0.09	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	Yes. Fully Implemented; 7/11/2011	No	Yes
16EV259		MW	0.45	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV259A		MW	0.17	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Padding	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV265		MW	0.12	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. The route was blocked three times, then staff installed boulder and fencing which successfully closed the route.	Yes - CSERC		Rock Barriers, Tread Harden	Yes. Fully Implemented; 8/1/12	No	Yes
16EV266		MW	0.21	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Padding, Barriers (rock, log or fence)	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16EV266A		MW	0.03	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		OHV Cattle guards	Yes. Fully Implemented; 2/20/12	No	Yes
16EV269		MW	0.22	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. The route was blocked three times, then staff installed boulder barriers and fencing which successfully closed the route.	No		Tread Harden	Yes. Fully Implemented; 2/20/12	No	Yes
16EV272		MW	0.53	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV306		MW	0.16	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV318		MW	0.45	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV407	03N01 Y	MW	1.69	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV411	31623G	MW	0.41	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
16EV54		MW	2.36	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. The route was closed and signed three times then staff installed a motorcycle gate which successfully closed the route.	Yes - CSERC		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Most of the mitigation has been completed with the exception of the upper two ephemeral drainages.	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
16EV78		MW	0.19	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
16EV81		MW	0.54	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Low Impact Barriers	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
17EV11		MW	0.40	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the topography of the route entry point. Users would have been able to circumvent a gate rendering it unsuccessful. Furthermore, the Forest Service could not physically block this trail with debris because it provides access to a private land parcel.	No		Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 11/5/12	No	Yes
17EV118		MW	1.37	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 9/8/13	No	Yes
17EV120		MW	0.11	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	None	No	Yes
17EV130		CAL	0.81		Signs and Debris Block (scattered wood)	No. This is a mixed use (motorized and non-motorized) trail which is part of the Mokelumne Coast to Crest trail. Users repeatedly remove the scattered wood blocks. The district considered blocking the entrance with large boulders but that has not yet been implemented.	No		Low Impact Barriers, Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 11/1/2011	No	Yes
17EV160		MW	0.15	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV202		MW	0.38	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV205		MW	0.25	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Annual Maintenance	Yes. Fully Implemented; 5/13/13	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
17EV231		MW	0.32	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV241		MW	0.27	April 15 – June 01; Oct 15 – Dec -01	Sign	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized or are just ignored. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. The Forest Service could not physically block access to this trail because it provides access to PGE / FERC related facilities.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV261A		MW	0.07	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV264		MW	0.14	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
17EV60		MW	0.55	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18DC453	EV681	MW	0.09	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18EV100		MW	0.08	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Barriers; Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 10/5/13	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
18EV270		MW	0.36	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18EV276		MW	0.10	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Barriers	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
18EV309		MW	0.04	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
18EV34		MW	0.65	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes
18EV454	31818G	MW	0.15	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented. 5/30/16	No	Yes

TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
18EV455	31821C	MW	0.20	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Barriers; Harden Drain Dips; Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
18EV56		MW	1.38	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Tread Harden; Drain Dips	Section needing hardened drain dips, tread hardening, and drain dips was blocked and restored, then re-routed after separate NEPA decision; Signed Decision Memo 6/14/12:	Yes; Twomile Ecological Restoration: Motorized Trail Project (33890).	Yes, reflecting the changes implemented by the Twomile Ecological Restoration: Motorized Trail Project (33890).
18EV57		MW	0.86	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Harden Drain Dips; Tread Harden; Drain Dips	Yes. Fully Implemented; 10/30/14	No	Yes
18EV67		MW	1.68	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Low Impact Barriers, No Vehicle Signs, Tread Harden, Barriers (rock, log or fence)	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.



TRAIL ID	OLD TRAIL ID	RD	MI	PRIMARY SEASON OF USE	INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD	DID INITIAL CLOSURE METHOD REMAIN IN PLACE? ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN	ANY INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ABOUT CLOSURE STATUS? IF YES, WHO?	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION / COMMENTS REGARDING THE ROUTE	2009 DECISION PRESCRIBED MITIGATION	PRESCRIBED MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED?	SUBJECT OF OTHER NEPA DECISIONS?	ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> TO BE DISPLAYED ON MVUM AT THIS TIME?
18EV88		MW	0.03	NA	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Tread Harden Ephemeral Drainage (Rush Creek)	No; Tread hardening of the ephemeral drainage was not implemented because this short section of 18EV88 crossing Rush Creek was closed, blocked and restored due to safety concerns and resource issues.	No	No. This segment of 18EV88 no longer exists or travels over the creek
18EV95		MW	0.33	May 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		Hardened Drain Dips, Tread Harden, Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
19EV101		MW	0.57	June 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	Yes	No		Harden Drain Dips; Drain Dips	No	No	No, the mitigations prescribed in the 2009 Motorized Travel Management Decision have not been implemented.
19EV29		MW	0.47	June 15 – Nov 01	Sign and Debris Block	No. Signs have been regularly vandalized. In response to the vandalism, staff have been forced to replace the signs once or twice per year. During their routine visits, staff have also re-installed or reinforced damaged debris blocks. Despite these efforts, users have repeatedly destroyed the debris blocks or staff have observed signs that users have just driven cross-country around the debris barriers. Locked gates were not installed due to funding constraints and the evidence of unsuccessful debris blocks. Because this trail is on a ridge, users would have been able to circumvent a gate just as easily as the debris blocks.	No		None	Not Applicable, no mitigation required.	No	Yes

Legend

RD= Ranger District; CAL = Calaveras, Mw = Mi-Wok, GR = Groveland      NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act  
 Mi = Miles  
 MVUM= Motor Vehicle Use Map

<sup>1</sup>MVUM ELIGIBLE = Trail is eligible if 2009 prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented or if none were prescribed. Note: No trails will be added to the MVUM prior to a field visit / trail condition survey which will confirm that the trail is currently in a 'green' condition (ready to use) with effective mitigation in place.

MVUM ELIGIBLE = Trail is eligible if 2009 prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented or none were prescribed. Note: No trails will be added to the MVUM prior to a field visit / trail condition survey which will confirm that the trail is currently in a 'green' condition (ready to use) with effective mitigation in place.

---