



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

**Southwestern  
Region**

July 2011



# Supplemental Recreation and Special Areas Report

## Forest Plan Revision DEIS

**Submitted by:**     /s/ Sara Dechter      
**Sara Dechter, AICP**  
Social Science Analyst  
Coconino National Forest, March 27, 2013

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers, employees, and applicants for employment on the bases of race, color, national origin, age, disability, sex, gender identity, religion, reprisal, and where applicable, political beliefs, marital status, familial or parental status, sexual orientation, or all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program, or protected genetic information in employment or in any program or activity conducted or funded by the Department. (Not all prohibited bases will apply to all programs and/or employment activities.)

# Preface

The information in this specialist report reflects analysis that was completed prior to and in conjunction with the completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the revision of the 1987 Coconino National Forest Land Management Plan (the Plan). The primary purpose of specialist reports associated with the DEIS is to provide detailed information to assist in the preparation of the DEIS. As the DEIS was prepared, review-driven edits to the broader DEIS resulted in modifications to some of the information contained in some of the specialist reports. As a result, some reports no longer contain information and analysis that was updated through an interdisciplinary review process and is included in the DEIS in its entirety. This specialist report retains the additional information on the environmental consequences that was not included in the summarized information in the DEIS. However, analysis and information for this resource that is included in its entirety in the DEIS is not duplicated in this report. Efforts have been made to ensure that the retained information in the specialist reports is consistent with the DEIS. If inconsistencies exist between specialist reports and the DEIS, the DEIS should be regarded as the most current, accurate source of analysis.

## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Relevant Laws, Regulations, and Policy that Apply.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Methodology and Analysis Process .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Assumptions.....	4
Issues Addressed in this Analysis .....	5
<b>Supplemental Information for Affected Environment.....</b>	<b>6</b>
The Recreation Setting.....	6
Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities.....	6
Recreation Suitability.....	8
Recreation Special Uses.....	8
Designated Special Areas.....	8
<b>Supplemental Environmental Consequences and Cumulative Effects.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Supplemental Environmental Consequences.....	8
Supplemental Information for Cumulative Effects .....	12
<b>References .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Contributing Specialist Information.....</b>	<b>18</b>

## **Introduction**

This specialist report evaluates and discloses the environmental consequences not included in the DEIS on the recreation resource that may result from the adoption of a revised land management plan.

## **Relevant Laws, Regulations, and Policy that Apply**

All alternatives are designed to guide the Coconino NF's management activities in meeting all applicable Federal and State laws, regulations, and policies

36 CFR 261 Prohibitions;

Travel Management Rule 2005 (36 CFR 212, 251, 261, and 295);

Wilderness Act of 1963

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968

National Trails Act of 1968

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century

Safe Drinking Water Act

EO 11988 Floodplain Management;

FSM 5340.2 Law Enforcement, Objectives;

FSM 5420 Land Purchases and Donations;

FSM 7312 Facility Planning, Plans and Preliminary Project Analysis;

FSH 7309.11 Ch 40 Buildings and Related Facilities, Management;

FSM 2300 - Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management

2310 - Planning and Data Management

2320 - Wilderness Management

2330 - Publicly Managed Recreation Opportunities

2340 - Privately Provided Recreation Opportunities

2350 - Trail, River, and Similar Recreation Opportunities

2360 - Heritage Program Management

2370 - Special Recreation Designations

2380 - Landscape Management

2390 - Interpretive Services

R3 Supplement to FSM 2300 Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management;

FSH 2309.18 Trail Management Handbook

Forest Service Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines

## **Methodology and Analysis Process**

Throughout the range of Alternatives, there are three different methodologies used for delineating ROS classes: one for the Inventory, one for Alternative A and one for Alternatives B, C and D. Mapping of the ROS is not an exact science (USDA FS 2003); therefore as each ROS was developed each incorporated the best available science and GIS techniques. The original ROS mapped was created for the existing plan and is retained under Alternative A. The ROS under Alternative A underwent numerous revisions and changes through amendments to the 1987 Forest Plan.

The methodology used for the inventory of existing on the ground conditions was applied agency protocols established in 2003 (USDA 2003). The existing condition ROS mapping process was completed by TEAMS Enterprise and was reviewed, edited, and finalized through an interdisciplinary approach during the Plan Revision Process (Hill 2011)

The ROS methodology used to map the desired conditions under Alternatives B, C and D took a raster-based GIS approach which incorporated and elaborated on the 2003 theories and protocol. Through the use of map algebra, naturalness, access, remoteness, facilities and site management were incorporated to identify the spatial arrangement of recreational opportunities and ROS classes throughout the Forest (USDA 2011e).

The Wilderness Opportunity Spectrum (WOS), an extension of the ROS, was developed to address the specific recreational experiences and management complexities found within wilderness areas. Wilderness has been designated to provide for the recreational and experiential opportunities of solitude found within primitive and pristine natural ecosystems. “Primitive, as defined within the ROS context, is an extremely broad category and when applied within Wilderness, does not adequately differentiate the characteristics and attributes of the setting” (USDA 2003) Through the four unique classifications (Transitions, Semi-Primitive, Primitive and Pristine) found within the WOS, the uniqueness of these areas can be identified and managed accordingly.

Unlike the ROS, an accepted protocol for mapping and identifying WOS classes currently does not exist. Under Alternative A, and the 1987 Forest Plan, the WOS was created through a small interdisciplinary team and hand drawn on 1:24,000 USGS quarter quadrangle Mylar maps. These maps were scanned, geo-referenced and digitized within GIS and incorporated under Alternative A. The WOS developed for Alternative B, C and D applied modern GIS techniques, best available data, and thusly a more consistent methodology through addressing more site and value specific parameters than was used under Alternative A. Building off the raster concepts and techniques used for the ROS, the WOS under Alternative B took into consideration the natural character, types and levels of recreational use, access, remoteness and existing management directions of Wilderness Areas (See project record for detailed methodologies).

The National Visitor Use Monitoring project is a nationwide survey that is conducted on every national forest every 5 years. The surveys are in-person exit interviews and are administered at

sites that are selected from a stratified random sample based on level of use (high, medium and low) and type of site (day-use, overnight, general forest and wilderness). The sample is used to estimate Forest-level visitation data based on a model that is designed based on nation-wide trends and assumptions. This ensures that all national forest visitor estimates are comparable. The corresponding limitation is that it cannot be generalized below the Forest-wide level without supplemental collections. The reliability of the data also is dependent upon the consistent classification of sites and survey design as well as the assumption that the on-the-ground conditions are not very unusual. For example, a year with no snow and length Forest-wide fire closures would yield very low results because of an abnormal amount of canceled survey days and reduced winter recreation. This report uses data from the 2010 survey and revised 2005 data. The original 2005 data had much wider confidence intervals and higher error rates but adjustments to the estimation methodology have improved this issue. The 2000 data was a beta-test of the methodology and is not comparable to the 2005 and 2010 data because of a different sampling methodology. Visitation in this survey is measures in site visits which are “the entry of one person onto a national forest site or area to participate in recreation activities for an unspecified period of time” and National forest visits which can be composed of multiple site visits. The NVUM does not identify the type of recreation preferred by visitors or track how visitors whose desired activities is not offered are displaced. It only captures the activities of the person surveyed during the particular National forest visit being counted (USDA 2011d).

The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) is a general population telephone survey of people age 16 and older. It focuses on outdoor recreation activities wherever they may occur, not just those in the national forest or grassland. The value of this information lies in the insights it provides into overall population demand for outdoor recreation. Population-wide demands can represent broad interests, which a national forest or grassland might serve. The data shows an outdoor recreation “participation rate”, which is the proportion of people 16 or older living in the local area counties who indicated in the survey that they had participated in an outdoor activity 1 or more times during the past 12 months (USDA 2002).

INFRA is the corporate Forest Service Database that tracks data on infrastructure and permits. This database is continuously updated and so the data pulled from day-to-day may be different. INFRA data used in this report has been saved in the project record so as to freeze the raw data that was used to support analysis and effects statements. There may be data flaws associated with the databases in INFRA depending on how well the data has been maintained and how the data entered was collected.

## **Assumptions**

In the analysis for this resource, the following assumptions have been made:

- The land management plan provides a programmatic framework for future site-specific actions.
- Land management plans do not have direct effects. They do not authorize or mandate any site-specific projects or activities (including ground-disturbing actions).
- Land management plans may have implications, or environmental consequences, of managing the forests under a programmatic framework.

- The plan decisions (desired conditions, objectives, standards, guidelines, management areas, monitoring) will be followed when planning or implementing site-specific projects and activities.
- Laws, regulations, and policies will be followed when planning or implementing site-specific projects and activities.
- Monitoring will occur and the land management plan will be amended, as needed.
- We will be funded similar to past budget levels (past 5 years).
- The planning timeframe is 15 years; other timeframes may be analyzed depending on the resource (usually a discussion of anticipated trends into the future).
- Recreation demand is generated by population changes and economic conditions more strongly than by plan direction (Cordell et al. 1999).
- The budget for constructing and maintaining developed recreation facilities will be flat to decreasing in the future, except in areas that have been converted to fee sites or concessionaire contracts.
- The amount of road construction under each alternative will be dependent on site-specific needs for future projects.
- Most of the roads within areas designated not suitable for public and administrative access roads will be closed over the life of the plan but there will be some exceptions based on the need for main road access and access to private land.

## **Issues Addressed in this Analysis**

### Recreation Opportunities

- Mechanized use on trails may create no more impact than foot traffic in Botanical and Geological Areas, so should not warrant prohibition.
  - Acres of the Forest not suitable for mechanized use
- Plan direction that steers managers away from single use trails may increase user conflict in the Ft. Valley-Mt. Elden MA.
  - Indicator – Potential outcomes of plan direction on trail use and design
- The Plan may not address the imbalance of available trails between Sedona and the rest of the Verde Valley.
  - Indicator – Potential outcomes of plan direction on trail system in the Verde Valley
- The Plan does not address the need for trail connectivity for all users.
  - Indicator – Direction for coordinating and connecting community and Forest Service trails.
- The Plan does not have a desired condition to meet the needs of mountain bike users of various skill levels from beginner to “technical” riders.
  - Indicator – Potential outcomes of plan direction on the construction of mountain biking trails.



### Recreation Impacts

- Recreational shooting may disrupt the recreational opportunities of those seeking quiet recreation settings.
- The use of the term “quiet” is too broad and open to interpretation. The Forest Plan should not try to manage it.
  - Indicator – Acres provided by plan language for recreation settings with reduced noise disturbance.
- Snowmobiles may cause noise and motorized disturbance to quiet recreation settings.
  - Indicator – Acres provided by plan language for winter recreation settings with reduced noise disturbance.

### Wilderness

- The Modified Proposed Plan may not adequately meet the demand for wilderness areas and their associated primitive, undeveloped settings.
  - Indicator – Acres of designated and recommended wilderness and primitive recreation opportunity spectrum settings.
- Recommending additional wilderness areas would unnecessarily prohibit and further geographically constrain management activities and uses that would otherwise be allowed.
  - Indicator – Acres of designated and recommended wilderness.

## **Supplemental Information for Affected Environment**

### **The Recreation Setting**

The basic assumption underlying the ROS is that quality in outdoor recreation is best assured through provision of a diverse set of opportunities. Providing a wide range of settings varying in level of development, access, and other factors, insures the broadest segment of public will find quality recreational experiences, both now and in the future. Although the notion of quality is relative—a value judgment—the concept of quality can be stated for management decision purposes in this way: quality depends on what experiences the individual is looking for, how much of it is realized, and the degree of satisfaction (USDA 1990).

A recreation opportunity setting is defined as the combination of physical, biological, social, and managerial conditions that give value to a place. Thus, an opportunity includes qualities provided by nature (vegetation, landscape, topography, scenery), qualities associated with recreational uses (levels and types of use), and conditions provided by management (developments, roads, regulations). By combining variations of these qualities and conditions, management can provide a variety of opportunities for recreationists (USDA FS 1990).

### **Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities**

National Forest System (NFS) lands generally have experienced increasing demand for non-commodity uses and, in many cases, decreasing support and demand for historical commodity

industries over the past twenty years. Although recreation use on National Forest lands has increased steadily since the establishment of the U.S. Forest Service, reports showed a decline in recreation participation nationally beginning in 2001. Reasons suggested for this trend include travel concerns following the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center and the expansion of indoor recreation opportunities through the growth of computer games, the Internet, and television (Roper ASW 2004). Cordell and others (2004) also note slight decreases in several categories of outdoor recreation following September 11 (USDA 2008). Another factor contributing to declining outdoor recreation is the economic downturn starting in 2009. The Coconino National Forest in particular is a recreation hub for Northern Arizona. Many people who find the lower elevation areas too hot for outdoor recreation come to the relative comfort of the Colorado Plateau (Arizona State Parks 2007).

In 2006, a telephone survey of Arizona residents found that future demand for recreation is expected to increase to a greater extent for non-motorized activities such as visiting a wilderness area, bicycling or “on your feet” activities (hiking, jogging) than is expected for extreme sports (i.e. BMX) and motorized activities, including RV camping. At the same time the percent of the state available for these activities is decreasing because of conversion of rural and undeveloped private land to more urban settings (Arizona State Parks 2007). These opposing trends create a particular demand for preserving areas for a variety of non-motorized activities.

Most motorized recreation on the Coconino NF occurs on roads and in the Cinder Hills OHV Area. The Forest Service database shows only 14.2 miles of designated motorized trails on the Forest. However, this is actually a trail that is only available to the public for non-motorized recreation (the Waterline road) and is maintained to a standard for vehicles to provide access to facilities. There are approximately 37 miles of motorized trail on the forest that are open to the public in 3 locations Casner, Munds and Fort Valley (USDA 2011e). Some of these trails are for all vehicle widths, some for jeep only and some for single-track use. On the other hand, Travel Management designated 2,775 miles of roads for off-road vehicle use (USDA 2011e). Trails and roads typically provide different recreation experiences because they are maintained and designed differently and have different vegetation clearance requirements. Even though some of the more primitive roads on the Forest provide a more challenging recreation experience for OHV users because of the lack of recent maintenance, recreation needs are not something that roads are designed to provide. In many cases, this “challenge” results in damage to the road and nearby natural resources. Motorized trails can occupy the same route as a closed or decommissioned road but are designed to provide different experiences through their design without these negative effects.

There are a diverse group of recreational activities that take place, which have emerged only in the past decade. Some of these include rock climbing, geo-caching, downhill mountain biking and paint balling (USDA 2008). Many of these emerging uses do not yet have standards for safety and management. In addition, providing specific areas or trails for a large and diverse set of specialized activities consumes land in a way that excludes more common activities with less specialized requirements.

The diversity of outdoor recreation, population and tourism growth and low levels of environmental education in the general public has made the management of a sustainable trail system difficult. Social trails have proliferated in the urban interface, where demand for particular trail experience has not been met and where dispersed camping is common. These trails can increase erosions and decrease vegetative cover, which as a result impacts heritage sites,

watershed conditions, wetlands resources, wildlife and overall trail experience. Even though the most common places to find these impacts is near communities, popular dispersed camping sites such as Jacks Canyon also have webs of trails created by large and frequent camp use (Dechter 2011).

### **Recreation Suitability**

Affected environment for recreation suitability is described in the Draft EIS.

### **Recreation Special Uses**

Affected environment for recreation suitability is described in the Draft EIS.

### **Designated Special Areas**

In some cases, the encounter levels are so high that they may diminish the wilderness experience of visitors. For instance, in one summer weekend morning on the Humphreys Trail in the Kachina Peaks Wilderness, volunteers counted 339 people hiking one-way with groups of 30-40 people passing regularly. These large groups and intense traffic detract from opportunities for a primitive recreation experience on this trail. In West Clear Creek, there is evidence that groups of 100 people or more are camping in the wilderness, thereby drastically reducing opportunities to solitude. Wildernesses around Sedona are regularly impacted by overflight tours whose low altitude and noise disrupt wilderness character. There is also occasional graffiti on rocks and trees and illegal activities, particularly pot farms, which are impacting wilderness character and creating safety hazards (Dechter 2011). These are a few examples on the higher end of what has been observed but they characterize the current challenges facing wilderness management in Northern Arizona.

Elden Environmental Study Area is traversed by the El Paso Natural gas pipeline. Elden ESA has the most specific recreation restrictions in place with horse traffic only permitted on the pipelines trail and mountain biking, camping and off-road driving prohibitions that have been in place for several decades. The other areas have been closed to motor vehicles but not other uses.

## **Supplemental Environmental Consequences and Cumulative Effects**

The land management plan provides a programmatic framework that guides site-specific actions but does not authorize, fund, or carryout any project or activity. Because the land management plan does not authorize or mandate any site-specific projects or activities (including ground-disturbing actions), there can be no direct effects. However, there may be implications, or long-term environmental consequences, of managing the forests under this programmatic framework.

### **Supplemental Environmental Consequences**

#### **The Recreation Setting**

##### *Alternative A*

Effects to the recreation setting for Alternative A are described in the Draft EIS.

#### *Alternative B. Modified Proposed Plan*

Alternative B, C and D differ from Alternative A and the ROS inventory because they assign an ROS class on all lands within the administrative boundary of the Forest, regardless of ownership. It is beneficial for the Forest Plan to inventory and set objectives for these lands for a number of reasons. First, it facilitates recreation work with other entities such as State Parks in maintaining a compatible recreation setting across property lines. It also simplifies the process of setting management direction for newly acquired or exchanged lands. The large majority of these lands were classified as Urban, Rural or Roaded Natural to account for the development typical of private land. Small tracts and inholdings may have been assigned a less developed ROS class if the parcel is currently undeveloped and there is no reasonable foreseeable change in the parcels character because of its remoteness or use (i.e. undeveloped pasturelands).

Access to lakes and rivers in these areas has not been reduced because of the semi- primitive ROS setting. On the ground, these areas are primarily used for grazing and low-density dispersed recreation and management would not be changed by this direction. Off-road driving, except in designated camping corridors, in these areas is already prohibited by the recent Travel Management decision. A very small area of dispersed camping corridors would be closed by future NEPA as a result of the recommendation for wilderness and the associated desired conditions. In some cases, it may be possible to close camping on only one side of the road or narrow the corridor.

Alternative B more accurately reflects the areas that have a Rural or Urban setting on the Forest and the adjacent lands when compared with Alternative A. This would allow for management that allows for community infrastructure appropriate to the scenery objectives and for a more seamless interface with city and county-provided recreation facilities. An example is the Flagstaff Water Treatment facility which is administered by a special use permit. Under Alternative A, this site has an objective of Roaded Natural, where in fact Urban is more appropriate because of the nature of structures and holding ponds (USDA 1982). Rural ROS classes from Alternative A would be retained and in some places expanded. Alternative B would better accommodate developments consistent with the setting in the nearby communities such as distribution power and telephone lines, except where Amendment 12 or 17 specifically set the ROS at a more primitive level for protection of the community's sense of place. These are often provided by special use permits.

#### *Alternative C.*

Effects to the recreation setting for Alternative C are described in the Draft EIS.

#### *Alternative D.*

Effects to the recreation setting for Alternative D are described in the Draft EIS.

### **Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities**

#### *Alternative A. 1987 Plan*

Effects to Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities for Alternative A are described in the Draft EIS.

#### *Alternative B. Modified Proposed Plan*

Desired conditions and guidelines for dispersed and developed recreation would direct the forest to not provide dispersed camping opportunities within 200 feet of riparian, shoreline and aquatic resources (except in the Long Valley Management Area) and would limit most developed sites near riparian areas to day use. This direction would prevent designated dispersed sites from being provided in this buffer and it would not allow for camping under special use permits. It would also prevent designation of dispersed camping corridors on the motor vehicle use map within 200 feet of these resources. In order to meet this guideline, the forest would need institute closures that prohibit dispersed camping within this buffer<sup>1</sup>. Alternative B would result in protections for water quality, soil conditions, and riparian vegetation in approximately 29,000 acres; however, there would be less area available for dispersed and developed camping near water. Because of the steep canyon topography and intense recreation use in the Long Valley Management Area, applying this desired condition would practically make dispersed camping off-limits in the southern end of the management area. The exception provided for this management area would allow for designated dispersed sites to be established based on a site-specific analysis of the capacity of the area and the trade-offs between effects to aquatic resources and the desired condition to provide semi-primitive recreation opportunities among the canyons and ridges. Long Valley is approximately 50 percent of the Upper Clear Creek Watershed. The division of the watershed between the Long Valley Management Area and the Upper Clear Creek Management Area geographically divides the emphasis of the area between recreation and protection of water quality and natural resources. There are currently wet meadow closures to motorized vehicles in this part of the Long Valley Management Area that would not be affected by this direction and would be supported by the management area's desired condition to protect meadow and wetland resources from recreation impacts. This direction would result in areas of higher recreation activities in the Upper Clear Creek Watershed being concentrated in the Long Valley Management Area and more remote recreation experiences being offered in the rest of the watershed. As a result, the quality of wildlife habitat in the areas outside of Long Valley would be improved as a result of reduced recreation disturbance.

Areas on the Forest that are allocated for higher encounter levels may see disproportionate increases in use as a result. A recent example of this is the reduction in overnight camping in Oak Creek Canyon over the last 20 years. As a result overnight camping has been displaced, to nearby locations such as the Lake Mary area and Ft. Tuthill (Coconino County facility). This has reduced the recreation impact to riparian resources and has not resulted in decreased visitation to Oak Creek Canyon or decreased overnight visitation on the Forest. It has resulted in an observable increase in overnight recreation in the Lake Mary area. Similar impacts are expected when future measures are taken to decrease user conflict and maintain semi-primitive recreation settings on the Forest.

Because of the lack of motorized trails on the Coconino National Forest, the modified proposed action provides guidance on the desired outcome of future motorized trail designations. The desired condition would influence future trail planning to create a system of trails that can accommodate multiple vehicles with some availability of single-track trails for a more semi-primitive experience. In a Minnesota study of ATV experiences, researchers found that respondents described about half of their recreation experiences as less than 30 miles of riding

---

<sup>1</sup> See Designated Areas for more discussion of this direction's effects on Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers such as West Clear Creek and Fossil Creek.

and the other half as up to 100 miles or more with an average of 4.2 hours per trip. The Minnesota study also found that ATV users were willing to pay for more trails and better signing, which represents the value they place on their trail experience (Scheider 2006). A Colorado study stated that 29 miles should be the “absolute minimum” distance provided in a trail system in order to meet desired visitor experiences. This study also found that these needs may vary by type of vehicle. For instance, motorcycles and ATVS preferred longer rides while hunters and 4x4 drivers traveled shorter distances (Crimmins 1999). These studies illustrate that Alternative B better meets the demand for recreation opportunities than Alternative A, which considers roads and the Cinder Hills OHV area as adequate motorized recreation resources.

For the Long Valley MA, the different strategy for managing recreation impacts to riparian resources is part of an overall strategy to manage camping, motorized and non-motorized recreation in a dispersed setting while managing user conflict and resource impacts. The climate relief that the area provides is attractive to visitors from Central and Southern Arizona and has the potential to attract more visitors in the future because climate modeling predicts that the number of hot days and duration of heat waves are expected to increase through the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (USDA 2010b) The MA is also able to provide space for Recreational Vehicles that have become larger than the Forest’s developed campgrounds are able to accommodate because the northern portion and ridges of Upper Clear Creek are fairly flat and the roads in good condition.

#### *Alternative C.*

Effects to Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities for Alternative C are described in the Draft EIS.

#### *Alternative D.*

Effects to Developed and Dispersed Recreation Facilities and Activities for Alternative D are described in the Draft EIS.

### **Recreation Suitability**

Effects to Recreation Suitability for all alternatives are described in the Draft EIS.

### **Recreation Special Uses**

Effects to Recreation Special Uses for all alternatives are described in the Draft EIS.

### **Designated Special Areas**

#### *Common to All Alternatives*

#### **Inventoried Roadless Areas**

There is no negative recreation effect to the roadless character of inventoried roadless areas on the Forest from the alternatives. In Alternative A, all of these areas have an ROS of SPNM or SPM, which is consistent with national Forest Service policy on preserving the recreation settings of these areas. In Alternatives B, D all of these IRAs are SPNM and in Alternative C, Hackberry, Cimarron, Boulder, Barbershop and East Clear Creek IRAs are Primitive, because they are recommended for wilderness designation, and the rest are SPNM. Alternatives B, C and D would do more to protect the roadless character of these areas than Alternative A because it allocates them to a more restrictive ROS, which would limit not only road building (the 2000 Roadless

Rule restriction) but motorized trails as well. (See Wilderness for description of the effects of Alternative C on recommended areas.)

#### *Effects Common to Alternative B, C and D*

#### **National Trails and Scenic Byways**

The General Crook Trail has very similar direction to Alternative A. Because of Travel Management decision, it was not necessary to carry forward motorized vehicle prohibitions and the desired condition of a non-motorized trail that emphasizes foot and horse travel was retained. The 200 foot protective corridor and protections for site markers were carried forward as well. There would be no difference in effects between these alternatives and Alternative A as a result.

### **Supplemental Information for Cumulative Effects**

The cumulative effects analysis time frame is 10-15 years

**Table 1. Recreation – Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions and Effects**

Name of Project	Description & Relevant Effects	Timeframe of Effects	Relevant Measure
<b>Proposed Fossil Creek Comprehensive River Management Plan (CRMP)</b>	Protect and enhance the values for which the river was designated without limiting uses that don't interfere with those values. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting access</li> <li>• Limiting number of visitors</li> <li>• Year round fees</li> <li>• No campfires</li> <li>• Dispersed camping outside of WSR corridor</li> <li>• Middle Fossil Creek ( Summer) - day use only</li> <li>• Fossil Springs – consider group limits and/or permitted access; designated dispersed sites</li> <li>• Old Dam to Waterfall Wild Segment - day use only; no designated trails; recreation use discouraged</li> </ul>	Future	Amount/quality of recreation availability for camping and motorized use
<b>AZ State Parks</b>	Management of State lands may require fees and/or permits, especially as State budget shortfalls continue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Users could opt to visit non-fee/non-permit areas on adjacent forest lands</li> <li>• Users could be displaced out of area entirely, opt to recreate within home area</li> </ul>	Ongoing/Future	Amount of recreation availability for day use, camping, and motorized use
<b>Travel Management Rule (TMR)</b>	Identifying a system of roads, areas, and trails across the entire forest to remain open to motorized use and which will be socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable over time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease in motorized dispersed camping</li> </ul>	Decision in Winter 2011: Implementation ongoing	Amount of recreation availability for camping and motorized use

Name of Project	Description & Relevant Effects	Timeframe of Effects	Relevant Measure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concentration of motorized dispersed camping</li> <li>Decrease in roads available for recreation and access to the public.</li> </ul>		
<b>A-S NF – Forest Plan Revision (Alternatives Developed)</b>	<p>Alt A - A variety of recreational opportunities are provided, including motorized, non-motorized, developed, and dispersed. Construction of new recreation facilities to meet growing demand is an emphasis. Several areas are managed for more primitive experiences including Escudilla, Bear Wallow, and Mount Baldy Wilderness Areas, and the Blue Range Primitive Area (BRPA). No new areas are recommended for wilderness designation</p> <p>Alt B - New recreation developments are limited; the emphasis is on maintaining existing developments. Alt B recommends new areas for wilderness designation, including the BRPA and additions to Escudilla and Bear Wallow wilderness areas.</p> <p>Alt C - A variety of recreational opportunities continue to be provided with an emphasis on motorized and developed recreation opportunities. New recreation facilities may be considered to meet increasing demand. Alt C recommends additions to Escudilla Wilderness.</p> <p>Alt D - A variety of recreational opportunities continue to be provided, with an emphasis on non-motorized opportunities. There is no emphasis on developing new large facilities; some limited development that complements dispersed recreation may occur. Alt D recommends 6 new areas for wilderness designation (including Leonard Canyon which is partially on the Coconino NF), additions to the 3 existing wilderness, and recommends the BRPA for wilderness designation.</p>	Future	<p>Amount of recreation availability for day use, camping, and motorized use</p> <p>Amount of wilderness recreation opportunities available</p>
<b>Kaibab NF – Forest Plan Revision (Proposed Action)</b>	<p>Dispersed camping not permitted within 1 mile of developed campgrounds and cabins.</p> <p>Kaibab DEIS shows no decrease in ROS</p>	Future	Amount of recreation availability for day use, camping, and



Name of Project	Description & Relevant Effects	Timeframe of Effects	Relevant Measure
	acres but increases in RN, SPM, SPNM and P, because Alternative A does not have ROS for the North Kaibab  Some alternatives proposed recommending new wilderness.		motorized use  Amount of wilderness recreation opportunities available
<b>Prescott NF – Forest Plan Revision (Proposed Action)</b>	Objectives: Add 2-5 developed recreation areas within 10 years of plan approval.  Within 10 years of plan approval, create up to 4 designated dispersed camping areas where impact to natural resources can be controlled, and use can be restricted to the designated area  Within 10 years of plan approval, develop a partnership with Arizona Game and Fish Department to create and operate 1 designated target shooting area. Restrict recreational target shooting where recreational shooting has potential to create safety problems.  Over a 10-year period following Plan approval, relocate, add protective measures or rehabilitate 2 to 5 recreation areas or locations (including trails ) that show evidence of resource damage.  Discourage and rehabilitate unauthorized travel routes.  Wilderness group size restrictions	Future	Amount of recreation availability for day use, camping, and motorized use  Amount of wilderness recreation opportunities available
<b>Coconino County / Flagstaff Regional Plan</b>	The Flagstaff Regional Plan is a development and preservation guide for the City and its surrounding region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses on designation of open space, emphasizing recreation</li> <li>• Trails projects on/adjacent/connecting to USFS lands</li> </ul>	Current and under revision	Protection of areas near cities for general public recreation opportunities and trail connectivity
<b>Yavapai County Comprehensive Plan</b>	official guide for the development of the area of jurisdiction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis open space/recreation</li> </ul>	Current and under revision	Protection of areas near cities for general public recreation opportunities
<b>Sedona Community</b>	The plan guides the city in making	Present	Protection of areas

Name of Project	Description & Relevant Effects	Timeframe of Effects	Relevant Measure
<b>Plan</b>	<p>decisions about new development and re-zonings, preparing new regulations and ordinances, initiating more specific planning programs, and setting priorities and funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space (trails, recreation)</li> <li>• Potential of land acquisition</li> </ul>		near cities for general public recreation opportunities and trail connectivity
<b>Beaver Creek Vision 2020</b>	<p>Community Vision (called <i><b>Vision 2020</b></i>) is to serve as a guide to Yavapai County in making decisions and setting priorities in order to promote orderly development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve open space/recreation opportunities by land acquisition/exchange</li> <li>• Increased recreation access</li> </ul>	Present	Protection of areas near cities for general public recreation opportunities and trail connectivity
<b>Flagstaff Area Monuments General Management Plans (Walnut Canyon, Sunset Crater, Wupatki)</b>	<p>Comprehensive direction for resource preservation and visitor use; a basic foundation for decision making for the monuments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day use only (SUCR - adjacent USFS Bonito Campground)</li> <li>• Some road closures (WUPA – Black Falls Crossing Road; SUCR – USFS road to O’Leary Peak; )</li> <li>• Offering guided hikes</li> <li>• Inaccessible trails at WACA</li> <li>• Hiking, biking, horseback riding not allowed at WACA</li> <li>• Limited access (quotas/shuttle)</li> </ul>	Present	Amount of recreation availability for day use, camping, and motorized use
<b>AZ Dept of Transportation &amp; U.S. Bicycle Route System (USBRS)</b>	ADOT in partnership with USBRS – Northern AZ/Route 66 system	Future	Amount of recreation availability for cycling opportunities.

## References

- Arizona State Parks. 2007. 2008 Arizona Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan. Partnerships Division, Arizona State Parks and Land and Water Conservation Fund. 282 pp. [http://azstateparks.com/publications/downloads/SCORP\\_2008\\_Final.pdf](http://azstateparks.com/publications/downloads/SCORP_2008_Final.pdf)
- Crimmins, T. 1999. Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle User Survey: Summary of Results . Colorado State Parks OHV Program. [www.outdoorlink.com/amtrails/resources/motors/motCoOHVsurvey/html](http://www.outdoorlink.com/amtrails/resources/motors/motCoOHVsurvey/html)
- Cordell, H.K., B.L., McDonald, R.J. Teasley, J.C. Bergstrom, J. Martin, J. Bason, and V.R. Leeworthy. 1999. Outdoor recreation participation trends, pp. 219-321. In: H.K. Cordell et al., Outdoor Recreation in American Life: A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends. Sagamore Publishing, Champaign, IL. 449 p. <http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/viewpub.jsp?index=767>
- Dechter, Sara. 2011. Personal communications with Brian Poturalski, Jennifer Burns, Jerry Gonzales, Michael Anderson, and Bill Shoemaker on social trails and recreation impacts to wilderness character from 6/17/2011 to 6/22/11.
- Hill, Nicole. 2011. Coconino National Forest Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Inventory Report.
- Roper A.S.W. 2004. Outdoor recreation in America 2003: Recreation's benefits to society challenged by trends. Recreation Roundtable. 22p. Available online at: [www.funoutdoors.com/files/ROPER%20REPORT%202004\\_0.pdf](http://www.funoutdoors.com/files/ROPER%20REPORT%202004_0.pdf)
- Schneider, I.E. and T. Schoenecker. 2006. All-terrain Vehicles in Minnesota: Economic impact and consumer profile. University of Minnesota Tourism Center.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 1982. ROS Users Guide (FSM 2311). Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resources. Washington, D.C. 38p.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 1990. ROS Primer and Field Guide. Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness Resources. Washington, D.C. Available online at: [http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5139544.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5139544.pdf)
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2002. National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE): 2000-2002. The Interagency National Survey Consortium. Coordinated by the USDA Forest Service, Recreation, Wilderness, and Demographics Trends Research Group, Athens, GA and the Human Dimensions Research Laboratory, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN. Associated Data available online at: <http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/trends/Nsre/nsre2.html> and <http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/trends/Nsre/NSRE200562303.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2003. Final ROS Mapping Protocol.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2008. Economic and Social Sustainability Assessment: Coconino National Forest.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2010b. Southwestern Region Climate Change Trends and Forest Planning. Southwestern Region.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2011d. 2005 National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) Report (Revised).

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2011e. TMR Recreation Specialist Report

## **Glossary<sup>2</sup>**

**Accessibility** - A term referring to the degree to which recreation opportunities, facilities, or programs meet current legal, social, and design requirements to be utilized by persons of varying physical and mental abilities.

**Developed Site** - A discrete place containing a concentration of facilities and services used to provide recreation opportunities to the public and evidencing a significant investment in facilities and management under the direction of an administrative unit in the National Forest System.

**General Forest Area (GFA)** - General Forest Areas are all lands available for recreation use and outside of Wilderness, developed sites, trails and administrative sites. The General Forest Areas are comprised of concentrated use areas [CUAs] (see Concentrated Use Areas). CUAs can include front- and/or backcountry campsites, parking areas, pullouts and landings, river and road corridors, lake surfaces, and day use areas such as OHV areas, climbing areas, target shooting areas, etc. Amenities or constructed features inside GFAs are primarily for resource protection.

**Heritage Sites/Assets** - Remnants of past cultures that remind us of the centuries-old relationship between people and the land (from National Heritage Strategy); property, plant, or equipment that are unique for one or more of the following reasons: (1) historical or natural significance; (2) cultural, educational or artistic/aesthetic significance; or (3) significant architectural characteristics.

**Infra** - The Corporate Integrated Inventory System (CIIS). An integrated database for collection, storage, and use of feature, land unit, facility, utility, work item, cost, accessibility, and real property data. For recreation management, INFRA provides the opportunity to enter information to derive O&M costs, recreation funding shortfalls, recreation use data, accessibility information, and constructed feature inventory conditions. INFRA brings together tabular and spatial technology. INFRA provides information critical to utilizing the Meaningful Measures for Quality Recreation Management system.

**National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM)** - A systematic process to estimate annual recreation and other uses of National Forest lands through user surveys. See NVUS, below. The NVUM process includes a survey to develop statistically accurate estimates of national Forest visitor use; the survey began in 2000 and will continue indefinitely, during which 20% of all national forests will participate in a given year. Use information is gathered in five categories: day use developed sites (DUDS), overnight use developed sites (OUDS), general Forest areas (GFAs), Wilderness and viewing corridors.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rfa/glossary.shtml>

**Niche** - Niche is the specific focus area within which the unit is most suited to add value to the agency and society and from which features in recreation sites facilitate the unique opportunities and benefits. Niche is the best “fit” in which to operate sites given the context in which they exist. It is simply another term to reflect how the broader agency role or mission is narrowed to provide a more precise interpretation of how the broader mission will be delivered by the recreation sites and opportunities on a specific unit within its unique context.

The Forest’s niche has been referred to as the overlap between “assets” and customer demand, both existing and potential, including new market segments. Assets may include geology, topography, climate, vegetation, and history that make the Forest attractive for specific activities and experiences. Assets are also “special places” that make the Forest unique and highly valued by communities. Frequently, these places have been nationally recognized by designations such as Wilderness Areas, Scenic Byways, Historic Sites, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or National Recreation Areas.

**PAOT** - An acronym for Persons-At-One-Time; a measure of facility or site designed recreation carrying capacity, particularly for developed sites. National conventions include 5 persons per family picnic/camp unit, 3.5 persons per parking lot stall at a trailhead or visitor center, 1.5 persons per motorcycle parking stall and 40 persons per tour bus parking stall.

**Recreation Capacity** - A measure of the number of people a site can reasonably accommodate at one time, sometimes measured as PAOT.

**Site Type** - The type of recreation site. Recreation sites are divided into several categories (i.e., “Family Campground”, “Fishing Site”, “Trailhead”, “Interpretive Site Minor”, “Horse Camp”, etc.).

**Special-Use Authorization** - A permit, term permit, temporary permit, lease, or easement, or other written instrument that grants rights or privileges of occupancy and use subject to specified terms and conditions on National Forest System land.

**Wild & Scenic River** - A river selected for nomination and/or designation through the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 for possessing outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural or other similar values.

**Wilderness** - A Congressionally-designated area that is part of the National Wilderness Preservation System established through Wilderness Act of 1964; generally larger than 5000 acres and retaining its primeval character, where nature and its forces work undisturbed by human activity.

## **Contributing Specialist Information**

Noah Bard, Information Services Specialist, M.S. in Applied Geospatial Sciences [2013];  
Experience: Recreation Technician (Interpretation), Recreation Technician (GIS), Data Services Specialist (GIS)

Emily Williams, Planning Specialist, Masters of International Administration, [2008] Experience:  
U.S. Dept of State, Foreign Affairs Economic Officer (international economic policy, international environmental policy, environmental conflict resolution, negotiation)