



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Pacific
Southwest
Region

R5-MB-203
April 2010



Final Environmental Impact Statement

Record of Decision

Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management

Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management

Record of Decision

Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service
Responsible Official: Tyrone Kelley, Forest Supervisor
Six Rivers National Forest
1330 Bayshore Way
Eureka, California 95501

For Further Information Contact:
Linda West, Forest Environmental Coordinator
Six Rivers National Forest
1330 Bayshore Way
Eureka, California 95501
(707) 441-3561

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Purpose and Need	1
Decision	2
Changes to Alternative 3.....	4
Comparison of Alternatives with Alternative 3, as Modified.....	5
Rationale for Decision	7
Implementation and Maintenance Costs.....	11
Environmental Effects of Alternative 3	12
Implementation of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule.....	12
Public Involvement	12
Implementation Strategy.....	13
Alternatives Considered in Detail but Not Selected	14
Alternative 1 (No Action).....	15
Alternative 2.....	15
Alternative 4.....	16
Environmentally Preferable Alternative	16
Legal and Regulatory Compliance.....	17
Land and Resource Management Plan Consistency	17
Travel Management Regulations	17
Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations	21
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.....	21
National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966	21
Clean Water Act.....	21
Clean Air Act of 1970.....	22
Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973.....	22
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA).....	23
Executive Order 13112 Invasive Species 64 FR 6183 (February 8, 1999)	23
Special Area Designations	23
Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities	24
Implementation Date.....	25

List of Tables

Table 1 ROD. Alternative 3, as modified - Seasonal Closures by Resource Concern	5
Table 2 ROD. Summary Alternative Comparison by Action.....	5
Table 3 ROD. Summary Alternative Comparison by Vehicle Type.....	7

Appendices

- Appendix A: Changes to the NFTS by Route in the Selected Alternative
- Appendix B: Response to Comments on the FEIS

Maps for Selected Alternative 3 - Modified

- Lower Trinity Ranger District Map
- Mad River Ranger District Map

Introduction

This Record of Decision (ROD) documents my decision to select Alternative 3 (with minor modifications) of the **Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)**. The Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management Project is located on the Lower Trinity and Mad River Ranger Districts of the Six Rivers National Forest (Six Rivers NF or Forest). The purpose of this Travel Management Project is to implement provisions of the 2005 Travel Management Rule (36 CFR Part 212, Subpart B) designed to enhance management of National Forest System lands, sustain natural resource values through more effective management of motor vehicle use, and enhance opportunities for motorized recreation experiences on National Forest System lands. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) discloses environmental impacts associated with the agency's Proposed Action, a No Action Alternative, and two additional action alternatives developed to meet the purpose and need and respond to issues raised by the public.

Purpose and Need

The 2005 Travel Management Rule was developed in response to increased use of the national forests by motorized vehicles and the effects of that use on ecological, physical, cultural, and social resources. From 1982 to 2000 the number of people driving off-highway motor vehicles in the United States more than doubled (70 Fed. Reg. 68264- November 9, 2005). The Six Rivers NF has also experienced growth in the use of off-highway motorized vehicles. These vehicles have been allowed to drive on National Forest Transportation System (NFTS or System) roads maintained for high clearance vehicles (approximately 830 miles), on System motorized trails (36 miles), and off road where feasible on the Lower Trinity and Mad River Ranger Districts. Off road use had led to the creation of unauthorized roads and trails (routes that are not part of the System). Project development included an inventory of unauthorized routes. Of the 255 miles of unauthorized routes inventoried, over 60 miles were identified with resource concerns, clearly highlighting the need for management of motor vehicle use to best meet the recreational needs of the public while minimizing potential resource damage.

Many of the unauthorized routes have existed and have been used by the public for a long time, but have never been assessed for their environmental impact and subsequent addition to the System through a documented process. Many of these routes were developed for purposes other than recreation access. Past timber sale projects, fire line construction, and other access needs led to the creation of many of these routes. Although some have been in use for decades, others were recently created as Forest visitors pioneered new routes to access destinations. These unauthorized routes were not

necessarily designed to best meet the public recreation or access needs, and in some cases they adversely affect important Forest resources.

The Forest recognizes the need to regulate unmanaged motor vehicle travel by the public. This process has focused on managing public motor vehicle use on the Six Rivers National Forest, with full public involvement, to provide for recreational access, a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities, and protect Forest resources. The 2005 Travel Management Rule directs the Forest Service to end broad scale cross country travel and limit motor vehicle use to designated roads, trails and areas. The following key points were identified as the underlying need for taking this action at this time (the Purpose and Need is described in Section 1.3 of Chapter 1 of the FEIS):

- There is a need to regulate motor vehicle travel by the public. The proliferation of unplanned, unauthorized, non-sustainable roads, trails and areas adversely effects the environment. The 2005 Travel Management Rule, 36 CFR Section 212, Subpart B, is intended to prevent resource damage caused by unmanaged motorized travel by the public.
- There is a need for limited changes to the transportation system in order to provide a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities and to provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities. If unauthorized routes are not added to the System and designated open for public use, motor vehicle use on these routes would be prohibited (36 CFR 261.13) and motorized access to many dispersed recreation activities would be precluded.

Decision

Based on the analysis in the FEIS, public comments, and the associated planning record, I have decided to implement Alternative 3 (with minor modifications). This alternative best meets the purpose and need for this project, is within the scope of analysis, and responds to the issues of access and motorized recreation opportunity while providing for natural resource protection and public safety.

This decision will limit public motor vehicle travel to designated National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads and trails. In order to maintain a reasonable level of motorized recreation access and opportunities on the Lower Trinity and Mad River Districts, the following actions are included:

- Add 65 miles of NFTS motorized trails subject to vehicle class and season of use restrictions.
- Allow mixed use on 16 miles of NFTS passenger car roads
- Change maintenance level to allow mixed use on 2 ½ miles NFTS roads
- Change vehicle class on 4 miles of NFTS trails
- Remove 6 miles of motorized use from NFTS trails

- Establish season of use on 13 miles of existing NFTS trails on the Mad River District consistent with NFTS access roads: May 1 to Nov 15

A complete listing of unauthorized routes added to the NFTS can be found in Appendix A of this ROD. Vehicle class, season of allowed use, and required mitigations are also listed. Appendix A of the FEIS, includes five tables which list route specific data for 1) added unauthorized routes (with and without mitigations); 2) trails co-located on closed roads; 3) mixed-use; and 4) changes to System trails.

This decision is based upon a careful consideration of all the information available in the administrative record, field data collected, analysis conducted and described in the FEIS, and public comments received throughout this process. Alternative 3, as modified, will provide site specific, on-the-ground management actions that make important steps to provide for user needs and safety as well as important environmental protection. This environmental analysis process was conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), direction provided in the Forest Service Manual, and is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Forest Plan.

Throughout this process, scoping comments identified many routes the public wanted added to the NFTS that had not been included in the Proposed Action (see *Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study* below). Only a few of these routes were within the scope of analysis, as the public identified many routes that were already system foot trails; Alternative 3 included the addition of these unauthorized routes to the NFTS as motorized trails to meet the Alternative theme of expanded motorized recreation. Totalling seven miles, these additional routes are located (from north to south) as a companion trail along Lone Pine Ridge above Horse Linto Creek (six segments); in the Titlow Hill area (two segments) to access dispersed recreation opportunities; a companion trail along the Pilot Ridge Jeep Trail (15 segments); and lastly a single route in Hettenshaw Valley which provides access to the northern extent of the Bradburn trail (7E04).

This decision is limited to the specific actions identified in Alternative 3 as modified. Decisions on future changes to the NFTS will be made in response to a variety of factors. Unauthorized routes not included as part of this decision may be considered in future project level NEPA analysis.

This decision also includes the implementation of mitigation measures designed to minimize, reduce, or eliminate impacts on public health, and sensitive natural and cultural features. Required mitigations are identified for each added route in Appendix A. Route specific information for the implementation of noxious weeds site mitigations is located in *Section 3.9.4 Environmental Consequences* of the FEIS. Design criteria for the siting and implementation of waterbars are located in *Appendix B, Best Management Practices* of the FEIS. Required mitigations to protect cultural features are identified by cultural site in Table 3.11-15 of the FEIS. The decision includes the implementation of mitigation measures designed to reduce or minimize risks to public safety. Mitigations

for passenger car roads proposed for mixed use are identified by route in Appendix A, Table 3 of the ROD and in Table 3.18-0 of the FEIS. In order to address site-specific resource and safety concerns, routes subject to mitigation will not be open for public use, and will not be displayed on the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) until the required mitigations have been implemented.

The dust abatement mitigation outlined in Chapter 2 (petroleum based capping) is the most protective mitigation identified by the California Air Resources Board. It is one of a larger suite of acceptable dust abatement mitigations which include, but are not limited to, speed controls, capping with several inches of non-asbestos rock, chip/sealing, and asphalt paving. The Six Rivers National Forest identified routes that intersect potential asbestos-bearing soil types and prescribed capping – the most protective mitigation measure – to prevent human exposure to NOA dust. If new information suggests a different mitigation measure would be more appropriate based on the EPA’s “Naturally Occurring Asbestos: Approaches for Reducing Exposure” paper (March, 2008), this decision will be reconsidered and further NEPA analysis may be required.

This decision includes monitoring activities. They are described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2 of the FEIS and detailed in Appendix H of the FEIS and will be used to determine the effectiveness of travel management actions. In addition, this monitoring will serve to provide information useful for future management of public motorized vehicle use on the designated system.

All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted in the design of the Selected Alternative. In addition, design features and mitigation measures have been developed where necessary to avoid, minimize, or correct existing impacts on resources affected (or potentially affected) by implementation of the Selected Alternative.

This decision is based on the best available science. The resource analyses disclosed in Chapter 3 rely on a thorough review of relevant scientific information.

While Alternative 2 was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS, Alternative 3, as modified, was chosen in response to the many public comments received during this process. Alternative 3, as modified, provides additional access, and further minimizes risks to public safety.

Changes to Alternative 3

Following public comments on the Draft EIS, a number of resource and safety concerns were identified. In order to provide an alternative consistent with the expanded motorized recreation theme, Alternative 3 was slightly modified in response. Changes to Alternative 3 are as follows:

- The addition of unauthorized route JM722 to the NFTS is eliminated. Route JM722 was proposed for addition to the NFTS under Alternative 3 as a motorized trail open to high clearance vehicles. A subsequent field review and analysis determined that the season of use restriction (proposed as mitigation to prevent spread of Port Orford cedar root disease) was not adequate. No other routes were subject to POC closure, therefore POC closure dates are not part of this decision. See the analysis as documented in the FEIS, *Section 3.10 Port Orford cedar*.
- Allowing mixed-use on several passenger car roads (with high risk of crash probability and severity) is eliminated. Specifically, allowing mixed-use on three segments of 7N02, two segments of 6N01, and one segment of 29N30 (proposed under Alternative 3) has been eliminated. All six segments are documented in the Mixed Use analyses and summarized in the FEIS, *Section 3.18 Transportation*.

The following seasonal restrictions will be implemented under Alternative 3, as modified.

Table 1 ROD. Modified Alternative 3 - Seasonal Closures by Resource Concern

Resource	Reason for Restriction	Open Period
Wet Weather	Facility protection & minimize sediment mobilization; or accessed by NFTS road subject to wet weather closure	Lower Trinity Ranger District: June 1 - Oct 31 Mad River Ranger District: May 1 – Nov 15

Comparison of Alternatives with Alternative 3, as Modified

Tables from the FEIS *Section 2.4 Comparison of Alternatives* are revised here to include Alternative 3, as modified, to facilitate their comparison.

Table 2 ROD. Summary Alternative Comparison by Action

Item	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 3 as modified	Alt. 4
Cross Country Travel – Action Proposed	No change to current management	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited
Cross Country Travel – Available Acres Outside Wilderness	365,000 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres
Additions to the NFTS Motorized Trails	0 miles	58.37 miles	65.19 miles	64.84 miles	0 miles
Motorized Trails Added – Inventoried Unauthorized Routes	0 miles	55.54 miles	62.30miles	61.95 miles	0 miles

Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management

Item		Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 3 as modified	Alt. 4
Motorized Trails Added – Co-Located on Closed Roads		0 miles	2.83 miles	2.89 miles	2.89 miles	0 miles
Changes to NFTS	Motorized Use Removed from Trail	0 miles	5.82 miles	5.82 miles	5.82 miles	0 miles
	Change in Vehicle Class from Motorcycle to <=50"	0 miles	3.85 miles	3.85 miles	3.85 miles	0 miles
Changes to Vehicle Class from Highway Legal Only to Mixed Use (Both Highway-Legal and Non-Highway Legal Allowed)	Passenger Car Roads which Meet High Clearance Conditions	0 miles	2.43 miles	2.43 miles	2.43 miles	0 mile
	Passenger Car Roads with Medium or Low Risk Mixed Use Safety Conditions	0 miles	16.09 miles	16.09 miles	16.09 miles	0 miles
	Passenger Car Roads with High Risk Mixed Use Safety Conditions	0 miles	6.87 miles	6.87 miles	0 miles	0 miles
Seasonal Restrictions	Wet Weather (Lower Trinity Ranger District)	n/a	June 1- Oct31	June1- Oct31	June1- Oct31	n/a
	Wet Weather (Mad River Ranger District)	n/a	June1- Oct31	May1- Nov15	May1- Nov15	May1- Nov15

Table 3 ROD. Summary Alternative Comparison by Vehicle Type.

Item		Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 3 as modified	Alt. 4
Motorized Trails Added To National Forest System	Unauthorized Routes Open to High Clearance Vehicles, includes ATV's and Motorcycles	0 miles	32.05 miles	33.59 miles	33.24 miles	0 miles
	Unauthorized Routes Open to ATV's & Motorcycles	0 miles	23.49miles	23.49 miles	23.49 miles	0 miles
	Unauthorized Routes Open to Motorcycles Only	0 miles	0 miles	5.22 miles	5.22 miles	0 miles
	Co-located on NFTS closed roads Open to ATV's & Motorcycles	0 miles	2.83 miles	2.83 miles	2.83 miles	0 miles
	Co-located on NFTS closed roads Open to Motorcycles Only	0 miles	0 miles	0.06 miles	0.06 miles	0 miles
	Total	0 miles	58.37 miles	65.19 miles	64.84 miles	0 miles

Rationale for Decision

Considerations in reaching this decision included the purpose and need for action, the issues, the Forest Plan, current policies and regulations, the Forest’s recreation niche, the analysis in the FEIS, public comments received, and the range of alternatives. Recreation use and public access, which was identified as a significant issue was considered throughout this process. Although the decision will reduce the amount of motorized recreation opportunity available (compared to the existing condition), the decision compensates for this reduction by adding as many desired routes as possible to the NFTS while minimizing environmental impacts. Alternative 3, as modified, will provide both increased motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities and increased motorized recreation opportunities (4WD, ATV, and motorcycle trails of varying difficulty), compared to the existing NFTS.

In consideration of how this decision affects the Forest’s recreation niche, it was found that Alternative 3 best supports the Forest’s Northcoast tourism-provider recreation niche ‘Rivers to Ridges for Fun and Renewal.’ This niche emphasizes travel routes and access for dispersed non-motorized recreation activities (e.g. camping, woodcutting, rafting, hiking, fishing) and motorized recreation. For some forest visitors, use of a vehicle is only necessary to transport them to their desired recreation experience; for others however, use of the vehicle in the outdoors is their desired recreation experience.

The addition of unauthorized routes and the designation of mixed-use NFTS passenger car roads in Alternative 3, as modified, facilitate exploration and dispersed recreation while providing for resource protection.

This decision addresses the significant issue that public motorized use of roads and trails as described in the Proposed Action will negatively affect non-motorized recreation opportunity and Inventoried Roadless Area character. This decision includes the prohibition on cross-country travel which will reduce detrimental effects of cross-country motorized use on natural resource conditions. Of the 24.59 miles of inventoried unauthorized routes within IRAs located within the project boundary, 3.79 miles of routes are adopted by this decision, which provide unique recreation opportunities on the Forest. In addition, 3.16 miles of motorized use is removed from existing NFTS motorized trails located in IRAs within the project boundary. As discussed in the FEIS, *Section 3.15.4 Environmental Consequences*, the effects of this decision to roadless character are minor beneficial.

This decision responds to the significant issue that unauthorized motorized routes proposed for addition to the NFTS are poorly located and may cause adverse impacts to plants, wildlife, wildlife habitat, water quality, soils, and other natural resources. The direct, indirect and cumulative effects identified in the EIS were taken into consideration in this decision. Routes with resource concerns that could not be readily mitigated are not part of this decision. Mitigations required on routes being added to the NFTS, which will minimize or eliminate adverse effects on resource conditions, will be implemented before routes are added to the system.

Specific considerations for such things as scope of analysis, component actions, season of use, implementation and maintenance costs, and the implementation of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule were also important aspects of this decision, and are discussed below.

Scope of Analysis

The scope of this project was narrowly focused on the prohibition of cross-country travel and limited changes to NFTS roads and motorized trails to improve motorized recreation opportunities on the Lower Trinity and Mad River Ranger Districts. Project parameters were developed early in this project to focus this effort and keep changes to the NFTS within the capability of the Forest. The interdisciplinary team used these parameters in the development of the Proposed Action and all Action Alternatives (including Modified Alternative 3). The parameters for additions and changes to the NFTS were as follows:

1. Previous decisions on the NFTS do not need to be revisited to implement the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212.50(b)). Allowing continued motor vehicle use of the facilities in the NFTS in accordance with existing laws and regulations does not require NEPA.

- a. Considerations for changes to existing NFTS roads are limited to proposing mixed use (both highway legal vehicles and non-highway legal vehicles allowed) on segments of roads currently maintained for passenger cars. Where the road segments will continue to be maintained for passenger cars the following is required: 1) segments must provide loops and/or linkages within or between the existing and proposed NFTS motorized trail networks, including mixed use roads; 2) segments must be no more than 3 miles long; 3) vehicle operators must hold a valid driver's license; and 4) use is subject to California Vehicle Code Regulations (CVC) for "Combined-use Highways." Where prior roads analysis has recommended, the proposal may lower maintenance level to provide for high clearance vehicles rather than passenger cars.
 - b. Considerations for changes to existing NFTS motorized trails are limited to 1) changes in allowed vehicle use; and 2) identification of allowed season of use where NFTS road(s) which access the motorized trail are closed seasonally.
2. User-created roads, trails, and areas are not NFTS facilities; they are unauthorized. Proposals to add these to the NFTS require a NEPA analysis and decision.
 - a. Considerations for additions to the NFTS are limited to 1) inventoried unauthorized routes; and 2) motorized trails on existing NFTS closed roads. Unauthorized routes are considered for addition only when 1) they have high recreational value; 2) they were inventoried and identified by the public and/or the agency during steps 1 and/or 3 of the Travel Management process also known as OHV Route Designation; and 3) they do not have resource concerns or other conflicts (or resource concerns can be readily mitigated). Routes proposed for addition may either 1) provide access to dispersed recreation opportunities or 2) contribute to the diversity of motorized recreation opportunities. Only routes outside of Wilderness, Research Natural Areas (RNAs), and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classification of Semi-primitive Non-motorized are considered. Dead-end routes, routes leading to/ or ending in private property or without public access, and redundant (or duplicate) routes are not considered. Existing NFTS horse/foot trails are not considered. Consideration within Inventoried Roadless areas is limited.
 3. The unauthorized routes not included in the Proposed Action or action alternatives are not precluded from future consideration for either addition to the NFTS, conversion to other uses, or restoration to a natural condition.
 4. Any activity associated with contract, permit, lease or other written authorization is exempt from designation under the Travel Management Rule (36 CFR 212.51

- (a) (8)) and is not part of the proposal (e.g., mining activity, etc.). Such actions are subject to separate project-level NEPA analysis.
5. For travel management, the federal action requiring NEPA analysis and decision is any change to the current NFTS (e.g., prohibiting cross-country travel, adding or removing facilities, or changing vehicle class or season of use). 'Designation' is an administrative act which does not require NEPA analysis and decision. Designation technically occurs with printing of the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM), and NEPA is not required to print a map.

Component Actions

All actions within Alternative 3, as modified, are intended to provide for recreational access, provide a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities, and protect Forest resources for the future. Some of these actions are discussed below.

The Addition of Motorized Trails. Available NFTS motorized trails will almost triple once designated and displayed on the MVUM. While some users have expressed frustration with the restriction on cross-country motorized travel, this decision is an important investment in providing quality motorized trails for public recreation and resource protection for ecosystems. Approximately 39 miles of these routes are subject to implementation of mitigations prior to inclusion on the MVUM. Alternative 3, as modified, maximized the addition of routes that fit within the scope of analysis while minimizing potential adverse resource effects.

The Pilot Ridge Jeep Trail. A total of 3.47 miles of companion trail is being added to the NFTS for motorcycle only use in this decision. In response to scoping comments, the unauthorized segments along Pilot Ridge were assessed and included as trail additions under Alternative 3. Resource concerns were mitigated following field review, and analysis during the summer of 2009.

Motorized Mixed Use. Motorized mixed-use (the combination of highway-legal vehicles and non-highway legal vehicles use on the same roadway) is allowed on all System roads maintained for high clearance vehicles (maintenance level 2). Within the planning area, almost 900 miles exist. Throughout this process, motorized mixed use was proposed for short (3 miles or less) segments of roads maintained for passenger cars (maintenance level 3 or higher) to provide linkages and loops between and within existing and proposed networks of motorized roads and trails. This decision authorizes mixed-use that will provide additional linkages and loop opportunities on both the Lower Trinity and Mad River Ranger Districts.

- On the Lower Trinity Ranger District two roads (6N12, 6N19) will provide these additional linkages and loops in the Hennessey area.

- On the Mad River Ranger District new mixed use will provide linkages and loops at the southern end of the Pilot Creek Trail network (2N12, 2N14); and near the Nelson Flat Area (1N15), just north of Buck Mountain (1N08), around Green Mountain (1S11), along Horse Ridge (3S12), and a short segment between North Kelsey Peak and the Bonanza Mine (27N12).

Risks to public safety will be reduced with information kiosks, signing the beginning and ending of mixed use segments, and by improving sight distance. Segments connecting Ziegler Point and Waterman Ridge on the Lower Trinity Ranger District and segments along Route 1 and a short segment at Van Horn Peak on the Mad River District are excluded from Alternative 3 because of high risks to public safety identified in the Mixed-Use Analyses.

Season of Use – Wet Weather. The season of use for motorized trails with wet weather restrictions is June 1 to October 31 on the Lower Trinity Ranger District; and May 1 to November 15 on the Mad River Ranger District. On the Mad River Ranger District, use is expanded a full six weeks over what was proposed under Alternative 2.

Inventoried Roadless Areas. Existing unauthorized routes are proposed for addition to the System as motorized trails in three Inventoried Roadless areas (IRAs): Pilot Creek, Mt. Lassics, and Soldier. Alternative 3 includes a companion trail for ATVs and motorcycles along Forest Route 1 in the Pilot Creek Motorized Trail Network; a “most difficult” motorized recreation opportunity for high clearance vehicles in Mt. Lassics, this is one of the few most difficult high clearance routes on the Forest and is treasured by users; and access to the northern extent of the Bradburn Trail in the Soldier IRA. Motorized Use is removed from the Bradburn Trail (7E04), also located in the Soldier IRA; non-motorized use will continue to be allowed. See the analysis in the FEIS, *Section 3.15 Inventoried Roadless Areas*.

Implementation and Maintenance Costs

Implementation cost is estimated at \$512,016. In addition, it is anticipated that these new NFTS motorized trails will result in additional annual trails maintenance costs of approximately \$65,000, and \$11,105 in monitoring costs. The development of partnerships and volunteers are expected to reduce that cost. By lowering the maintenance level of a 2 ½ mile road segment, Alternative 3 will slightly lower the annual road maintenance cost by approximately \$25,714. Allowing mixed-use is not expected to change annual maintenance cost, but has an estimated implementation cost of \$40,500. To meet potential short falls in funding the forest will seek additional funds and resources such as grants and partnerships for implementing the decision which includes implementing mitigations and maintaining NFTS roads and motorized trails. The forest will also work with volunteer organizations in the management of roads and motorized trails and implementation of the Selected Alternative to build additional stewardship opportunities for the public and reduce the cost of implementation and maintenance by

the Forest. See the Affordability Measurement Indicator Table, Table 3.18-3 in *Section 3.18 Transportation* of the FEIS.

Environmental Effects of Alternative 3

The effects of all actions included in Alternative 3 are included in the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects analyses documented for each resource in the FEIS.

Implementation of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule

The decision has been carefully designed to implement the provisions of Subpart B of the Travel Management regulations (36 CFR 212.51-57). Subpart B implements the Executive Orders that direct Federal agencies to ensure the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands. The Travel Management regulations implement those orders by requiring designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use and prohibiting motor vehicle use off the designated system. Alternative 3, as modified, fully implements this direction. Publication of a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) for each district will complete this route designation process by identifying which roads and trails are available for public recreation use on the Lower Trinity and Mad River Districts. The prohibition of motor vehicle use off the designated system will take effect once the MVUMs are published. For more information about compliance with the Travel Management regulations, see the Legal and Regulatory Compliance section located below.

Public Involvement

Public involvement has occurred throughout the development and analysis of this project. Key dates and the significant issues identified through scoping follow.

- 2007. Public involvement began. Public meetings were held to review, edit, and validate accuracy and completeness of unauthorized route inventories completed by Forest staff.
- April, May, June 2008. Public meetings provide additional opportunities to validate inventories, gather information opportunities, benefits, and concerns used in development of Proposed Action.
- December 19, 2008. Notice of Intent (NOI) published in the Federal Register 45 day scoping period begins. One hundred and seventy-five letters were mailed to federally recognized tribes; potentially affected business; federal, state, and local agencies; special interest groups; and other interested parties that described the proposed action and solicited involvement in the designation process.
- January 2009. Public meetings are held to inform the public of the proposed action, and how to provide comments, and to provide an opportunity to review

- maps and meet with Forest Staff. News releases and paid ads, Forest website, and radio interviews also inform public of project and alert public of opportunity to comment.
- February 2, 2009. The 45 day scoping period ends. The Forest identifies three significant issues from public comments.
 - April 2009. A brief description of the project was included in the Six Rivers NF Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA).
 - June 5, 2009. The Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published in the Federal Register. Copies or summary documents of the DEIS were mailed to over 225 individuals, organizations, tribes, and government agencies.
 - June 2009. Public meetings are held to inform the public of the Alternatives, how to read the associated maps, and how to provide comments. News releases and paid ads, and Forest website also inform public of project and alert public of opportunity to comment.
 - August 4, 2009. The 60 day comment period on DEIS ends, which includes 15 day extension in response to public comments. Two federal agencies, 14 organizations, and approximately 40 individuals responded during the comment period. Appendix J of the FEIS contains the summary of comments and Forest responses to comments.
 - February 19, 2010. A 30 day comment period on the FEIS was held. Comments received during this period were considered and used in reaching a decision on the project. Appendix B – Response to Comments addresses comments on the FEIS.

Implementation Strategy

This project started with a goal of engaging the public and key stakeholders in the management of their National Forest resources. These individuals and organizations will be important to engage and coordinate with the Forest through the implementation of this project well into the future. The decision will be implemented as follows:

- Produce two Motor Vehicle Use Maps (MVUM), one for the Lower Trinity District and one for the Mad River District, which integrate the Selected Alternative with the existing motorized system. MVUMs will be available to the public at no cost. The MVUM is the legal document which displays roads and motorized trails open for motor vehicle use by the public by allowed vehicle class and seasonal or other use restrictions.
- Supplement the MVUMs by signing roads and motorized trails that are open for motor vehicle use by the public with a road or trail number and in some circumstances type of vehicle use allowed.
- Develop and implement a sign plan for mixed-use roads.

- Develop and implement a sign plan for motorized trails.
- Implement mitigations as listed in Appendix A of this ROD, (also as listed in Appendix A and Table 3.18-0 of the FEIS,) prior to displaying respective routes on the MVUMs. Of the added trails, 39 of 65 miles require mitigations. All new mixed-use roads require mitigation; these mitigations are not expected to be in place before the initial printing of the MVUMs.
- Revise and reissue the MVUMs annually or as needed to accommodate future changes in the NFTS roads and motorized trails.
- Seek additional funds and resources such as grants and partnerships for implementing the decision which includes maintaining NFTS roads and motorized trails.
- Work with volunteer organizations in the management of roads and motorized trails and implementation of the Selected Alternative to build additional stewardship opportunities for the public. The activities of these groups could include, but are not limited to:
 - Developing a public volunteer strategy to identify opportunities for the public to help implement, maintain, and fund the designated system.
 - Creating a volunteer core capable of supporting ongoing resource protection efforts, public information dissemination, effectiveness and resource monitoring, and the maintenance of NFTS infrastructure including signs, kiosks, roads, trails, and restoration efforts.
 - Developing a public education strategy that incorporates successes from programs such as ‘Stay on the Trail’, ‘Tread Lightly’ and ‘Right Rider’, to educate forest visitors about the designated System, to assist the public with reading the MVUMs, and to educate forest visitors about best practices for minimizing impacts resulting from motorized travel activities.
 - Assisting with the implementation of actions included in this decision such as mitigations and signage.
- If new information or changed conditions relating to environmental impacts or the need for mitigation comes to the Forest’s attention, this information will be carefully reviewed to determine whether a correction, supplement, or revision of the decision for individual routes or issues is needed.
- Continue the examination of the adequacy of the designated system of routes and recommend modifications or adjustments to the system to be addressed in subsequent NEPA analyses.

Alternatives Considered in Detail but Not Selected

In addition to Alternative 3, three other action alternatives were considered in detail. The other alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, are summarized below. A more detailed comparison of these alternatives can be found in Chapter 2, Section 2.3 -

Alternatives Considered in Detail, through Section 2.5 - Summary Comparison of Alternatives by Environmental Effects of the FEIS.

Alternative 1 (No Action)

The No Action Alternative provides a baseline for comparing the other alternatives. Under the No Action Alternative, no changes would be made to the NFTS and there would be no prohibition of cross-country travel (see Table 2.4 in the FEIS). Current management plans would continue to guide project area management. The Travel Management Rule would not be implemented, and a Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) would not be published. Unauthorized routes would continue to have no status or authorization as NFTS facilities.

- Does not prohibit cross-country motor vehicle travel
- Adds no new NFTS roads or motorized trails
- Makes no changes to NFTS roads or motorized trails

Alternative 1 was not selected because it would not regulate unmanaged motorized use and therefore does not meet the stated purpose and need for the project.

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is the Proposed Action as described in the Notice of Intent (NOI) published on December 19, 2008 (Volume 73, Number 245) and in the DEIS, Notice of Availability published in the Federal Register on June 5, 2009 (Federal Register Volume 74, Number 107) with minor corrections identified through public involvement and additional field work following publication of the DEIS. Alternative 2 includes the following actions:

- Prohibit cross-country travel
- Add 58 miles of NFTS motorized trails
- Allow mixed-use on 23 miles of NFTS passenger car roads
- Lower maintenance level and allow mixed-use on 2 ½ miles NFTS road
- Change vehicle class on 4 miles of NFTS motorized trail
- Remove 6 miles of motorized use from NFTS trail
- Establishes season of use on 13 miles of NFTS motorized trails: June 1 to October 31

Alternative 2 meets the purpose and need by regulating unmanaged motorized use; providing a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities; and providing motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities. Alternative 2 was not selected however because it did not meet as many needs for diverse motorized recreation opportunities as other alternatives. Alternative 3 was selected because it provides additional motorized recreation diversity and opportunities, specifically by adding 6 more miles to the motorized trail System than Alternative 2 (including 5 miles of motorcycle only trails),

without adversely affecting Forest resources. Alternative 3 was identified from the public as desired routes and provided the only motorcycle “single track” opportunity in the action.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 responds to the issues of non-motorized recreation experience and adverse effects to forest resources resulting from the addition of motorized trails. Alternative 4 does not propose the addition of motorized trails. Alternative 4 responds to the need of prohibiting cross-country travel and includes seasonal closures on existing NFTS motorized trails where access occurs on existing NFTS roads that are subject to wet weather closures. This alternative also provides a baseline for comparing the impacts of other alternatives, particularly because it includes both a prohibition on cross-country travel and adds no additional routes to the NFTS. Alternative 4 includes the following actions:

- Prohibit cross-country travel
- Adds no new NFTS roads or motorized trails
- Establishes season of use on 13 miles of NFTS motorized trails consistent with NFTS access roads: May 1 to Nov 15

Alternative 4 meets the purpose and need by regulating unmanaged motorized use; providing a diversity of motorized recreation opportunities; and providing motorized access to dispersed recreation opportunities only along existing system roads and motorized trails. But in comparison, Alternative 3 adds an additional 65 miles to the motorized trail system providing additional diversity of motorized recreational opportunities and motorized access to dispersed recreation (e.g. dispersed campsites) without adversely affecting Forest resources.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

The NEPA implementing regulations (Section 1505.2) require that the alternative(s) that best promotes the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA, Section 101, be identified in the ROD as the “environmentally preferable alternative” or alternatives. This is ordinarily “the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment and best protects, preserves, and enhances historical, cultural, and natural resources” (FSH 1909.15, 05). For this project, Alternative 4 is the environmentally preferable alternative. See Section 2.5 in Chapter 2 of the FIES, and *Table 2.5-1 Summary Comparison of Alternatives by Resource Average Ranking*.

Legal and Regulatory Compliance

Land and Resource Management Plan Consistency

The decision is consistent with the management direction found in the Six Rivers Land and Resource Plan (Forest Plan); therefore, a Forest Plan amendment is not required. Chapter 3 of the FEIS provides information by resource affirming Forest Plan consistency.

Travel Management Regulations

The Travel Management regulations require that certain criteria be considered when designating routes for motor vehicle use (36 CFR 212.55(a) through (e)). These criteria have been considered at all stages of this process beginning with the development of the underlying Purpose and Need in *Section 1.3 Purpose and Need*, development of the alternatives, analysis of effects (as documented in the ‘*Analysis Framework: Statute, Regulation, Forest Plan, and Other Direction*’ and the ‘*Six Rivers Land and Resource Management Plan*’ sections of each analysis in Chapter 3 of the FEIS), and ultimately the selection of Alternative 3. Throughout the ROD and the FEIS, there are many specific examples of how the Travel Management Rule criteria were considered in making this decision. The following details have been included to underscore the importance given to these criteria in the decision:

- **Cultural resources.** The decision reduces effects to cultural resources by mitigating all identified and potential adverse effects to nine cultural sites associated with use of routes added to the transportation system (*Section 3.11.4.3 Alternative 3*). Further, this decision is in full compliance with the Programmatic Agreement with the State of California Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (2006).
- **Public safety.** The Selected Alternative authorizes the use of designated Maintenance Level 3 roads, also referred to as passenger car roads, by highway and non-highway legal vehicles. Highway and non-highway legal vehicles will continue to be allowed to use Maintenance Level 2 roads, also referred to as high clearance vehicle roads. Public safety has been a top priority when considering whether to allow mixed use on passenger car roads. Six route segments originally proposed for mixed use were eliminated from the selected alternative due to concerns for public safety, as the crash risk for these segments was found to be high for probability and severity (Table 3.18-0 and the Mixed Use Analysis available in the project file).
- **Access to public and private lands.** When identifying routes to add to the NFTS, the focus was on meeting the needs of the public by providing access to the most desired routes on the Forest that otherwise met project criteria. In addition, the decision will not impact access to private lands, as this project

does not designate roads or trails through private lands where the Forest Service does not have right-of-way nor will it change existing rights-of-way for adjacent private landowners.

- **Availability of resources for maintenance and administration of roads and trails that would arise if the uses under consideration are designated.** The additions to the motorized trail system will result in the additional annual maintenance cost of approximately \$65,000 in the trails budget, and \$11,105 in monitoring costs. Trail implementation cost is estimated at \$459,834. Implementation of Alternative 3 will slightly lower the annual road maintenance cost, by lowering the maintenance level of 2 ½ miles, reducing the annual road maintenance cost by \$25,714. The current annual road maintenance cost is \$4,865,903. The other road action, changing highway-legal only to mixed use, is not expected to change annual maintenance cost, but has an estimated implementation cost of \$40,500. To meet potential short falls in funding the forest will seek additional funds and resources such as grants and partnerships for implementing the decision which includes implementing mitigations and maintaining NFTS roads and motorized trails. The forest will also work with volunteer organizations in the management of roads and motorized trails and implementation of the Selected Alternative to build additional stewardship opportunities for the public and reduce the cost of implementation and maintenance by the forest. See the Affordability Measurement Indicator Table, Table 3.18-3 in the *Section 3.18 Transportation* of the FEIS.
- **Minimizing damage to soil, watershed, vegetation and other forest resources.** Routes added to the NFTS as part of the decision are expected to maintain and improve water quality and satisfy all federal and state water quality requirements. The decision minimizes impacts to both soil and water resources, including riparian and aquatic habitats, by only adding routes where adverse impacts could be either avoided or mitigated to acceptable levels. Mitigation measures to minimize impacts to soil, watershed, vegetation, and other forest resources are listed by route in Appendix A of this ROD and Appendix A of the FEIS in Tables A-1b, A-2, and A-4 of the FEIS. These measures include installation and maintenance of waterbars, hand pulling of weeds, drainage correction, route definition, and stream diversion correction. The full analysis displaying these effects can be found in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
 - With respect to **botanical resources**, the analysis contained within *Section 3.8.4 Environmental Consequences* of the FEIS determined that, with the exception of Tracy's sanicle, there were no direct or indirect effects to rare botanical species. A determination was made that implementing Alternative 3 may affect individuals, but is not likely to result in a trend toward Federal listing or loss of viability for Tracy's sanicle. Additionally it was determined

that due to a lack of presence implementing Alternative 3 will not affect *Erigeron maniopotamicus*, *Tracyina rostrata*, *Calycadenia micrantha*, *Cypripedium fasciculatum*, *Cypripedium montanum*, *Eucephalis vialis*, *Frasera umpquaensis*, *Iliamna latibracteata*, *Montia howellii*, or *Thermopsis robusta*. The decision allows for 0.99 miles of trail to traverse Lassics Botanical and Geologic Area. Signs will be posted on routes at area boundaries and at dispersed campsites within the Lassics Botanical and Geological Area to educate users about the area's unique ecological values to minimize potential effects. The analysis contained in section 3.10.4 *Environmental Consequences* found that a season closure on JM722 would not adequately mitigate the potential spread of Port Orford cedar root disease. Route JM722 was therefore eliminated from the selected alternative to protect botanical resources.

- **Minimizing harassment of wildlife and significant disruption of wildlife habitat.** Routes with known or potential conflicts with wildlife species or their habitat were assessed for effects. Mitigation measures listed by route in Appendix A will have no effect on wildlife habitat because the work would occur on the travel way, which is already a disturbed site. With respect to disturbance of individuals, for all Threatened and Endangered species it was determined that the Selected Alternative “*may affect but not likely to adversely affect individuals*”. For all Forest Service Sensitive species, it was determined that the Selected Alternative will not lead towards trends for federal listing or cause a loss of viability to the population or species.
- **Consistency with the 2001 ROD for Survey and Manage Species.** The Forest assessed the potential for significant negative impacts to the habitat of current Survey and Manage species (including plant, lichen, fungi, terrestrial mollusk, aquatic mollusk and vertebrates) of Alternative 3 of the Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management Project. The analysis included a table of all Survey and Manage species that are thought to occur or have the potential to occur on Six Rivers National Forest. This analysis explains which Survey and Manage species were initially considered and the rationale for either including or excluding them from further consideration (Botany and Wildlife sections of EIS). No aquatic Survey and Manage mollusks or their habitat are identified on Six Rivers National Forest.

The actions were evaluated to determine if their use would have a significant negative impact on Category A and C Survey and Manage species habitat, life cycle, microclimate, or life support requirements for those species whose range coincides with the project area. The assessment indicated that actions proposed under the Lower Trinity and Mad River Travel Management project are not habitat-disturbing and surveys are not required for Category A and C

Survey and Manage species prior to project implementation. The project is consistent with the 2001 ROD as amended.

- **Minimizing conflicts between motor vehicles and existing or proposed recreational uses of NFS lands.** The Selected Alternative was developed in an interdisciplinary setting, with the objective of avoiding potential conflict between motor vehicle use and non-motorized recreational use. This decision will minimize the potential for conflicts, in part by increasing the general forest area more than 1/4 mile from the influence of roads or motorized trails, and by ensuring the compatibility of route additions with recreation management direction provided by the Forest Plan.
- **Minimizing conflicts among different classes of motor vehicle uses of NFS lands or neighboring federal lands.** The vehicle class and use of routes on adjacent lands have been considered to ensure compatible designations for the adjoining route segments on National Forest System lands. As described previously, mixed use proposals have been designed to maintain safety for the public and minimize conflicts between different vehicle classes on passenger car roads (Table 3.18-0). This decision also includes the addition of 5 miles of motorcycle only routes, which will minimize conflicts between single and double track motor vehicle users.
- **Compatibility of motor vehicle use with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account sound, emissions, etc.** All of the added routes are within rural or forested areas; there are no routes within populated areas. See *Section 3.14.5 Summary of Effects Analysis Across All Alternatives* of the FEIS for further discussion.
- **Speed, volume, composition, and distribution of traffic on roads.** Based on the analysis disclosed in the EIS, the limitations dictated by the terrain, sight distance, and condition of the route surface make the routes suitable for addition to the NFTS as motorized trails. The number of trails available for use in the Selected Alternative is expected to result in a low traffic density on most of the NFTS, although there may be some congestion near staging areas during hunting season. Prior to allowing mixed use on passenger car roads, signing that warns drivers of the mixed use and other identified mitigations must be in place, see Table 3.18-0 of the FEIS.
- **Compatibility of vehicle class with road geometry and road surfacing.** This decision includes the change in Maintenance Levels (ML) on 2.49 miles of road from ML 3 to ML 2, mixed use will be designated on 16.1 miles of existing ML 3 roads, and mixed use will not be approved on 6.87 miles originally proposed. The analysis of each ML 3 road proposed for motorized mixed use considered the compatibility of each vehicle class with the road geometry and surfacing based on an assessment of the type and size of vehicle

in conjunction with the driver's level of skill, as documented in the Mixed Use Analysis Reports, which are part of the project record.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

All management practices and activities of the Selected Alternative are consistent with the management direction of the Forest Plan.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

NEPA requires that Federal agencies complete detailed statements on proposed actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The Act's requirement to prepare an EIS is designed to provide decision makers with a detailed accounting of the likely environmental effects of a proposed action prior to adoption and to inform the public of, and allow them to comment on, such effects. The EIS does a comprehensive job of analyzing the alternatives and displaying the environmental effects. The procedural requirements of the NEPA have been followed. This FEIS has been prepared in accordance with the following regulations:

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966

This project was designed to meet this act by following the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, California State Historic Preservation Officer, and Advisory council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Designating Motor Vehicle Routes and Managing Motorized Recreation on the National Forest in California (2005). Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966 (36 CFR 800) requires federal agencies to consider the potential effects of a Preferred Alternative on historic, architectural, or archaeological resources that are eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and to afford the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment. Section 110 of the Act requires federal agencies to identify, evaluate, inventory, and protect National Register of Historic Places resources on properties they control. Potential impacts to archaeological and historic resources have been evaluated in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800).

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act, as amended, regulates the dredging and filling of freshwater and coastal wetlands. Section 404 (33 USC 1344) of the Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters (including wetlands) of the United States without first obtaining a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Wetlands are regulated in accordance with federal Non-Tidal Wetlands Regulations (Sections 401 and 404). No dredging or filling is part of this proposed action and no permits are required.

Given the design features and best management practices (Appendix B) built into the project, and the findings of minimal effects to the beneficial uses of water as disclosed in the FEIS, this project is consistent with the North Coast Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan and therefore is consistent with the Clean Water Act (see the FEIS, *Section 3.5.4 Environmental Consequences*).

Clean Air Act of 1970

The Clean Air Act of 1970 and its amendments provide for the protection and enhancement of the nation's air resources. No exceeding of federal and state ambient air quality standards is expected to result from the proposed action. This project is consistent with the Clean Air Act (see the FEIS, *Section 3.12.4 Environmental Consequences*).

Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531 et seq.) requires that any action authorized by a federal agency not be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species. Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, requires the responsible federal agency to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concerning endangered and threatened species under their jurisdiction. There are no threatened or endangered plant species within the project area.

Six Rivers NF concurs with the Programmatic Design Criteria. All action alternatives will be in compliance with the Programmatic and all routes will adhere to the Motorized Travel Management Project Design Criteria's for 'No effect' or 'May Affect not likely to Adversely Affect' determination for the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet (October 2006). Determination for the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet Critical Habitat was not included in the Programmatic Design Criteria. No informal or formal consultation was initiated however opinions regarding Critical Habitat on the project were discussed with USFWS in October, 2009. Since the project prohibits cross-country travel and adds specific unauthorized or unclassified routes and areas to the NFTS for recreational wheeled motorized vehicle use and no new ground disturbance would occur as the routes already exist. The only new ground disturbance would be the installation of water bars and work would occur on the travel way, which is already a disturbed site. Because the project will not remove or modify primary constituent elements, the result will have "no effect" on northern spotted owl or marbled murrelet Critical Habitat. The assessment and disclosure of effects are fully documented in the FEIS in *Section 3.7 Terrestrial Wildlife* and the Wildlife Biological Assessment/Biological Evaluation (February 11, 2010).

A Fisheries Biological Assessment was prepared and submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service on October 23, 2009. A Letter of Concurrence was received from

NFMS on January 8, 2010 that concurred with the determinations that the selected alternative may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect Southern Oregon/Northern California Coasts coho salmon and Northern California steelhead or their critical habitats. There will be no effect on California Coastal Chinook salmon or its critical habitat (Biological Assessment/Evaluation, Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Forest Service Sensitive Aquatic Species, Lower Trinity/Mad River Ranger Districts Travel Management, Final – October 21, 2009).

Thorough analyses of federally listed species and consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service have been completed fulfilling Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act consultation requirements (19 U.S.C. 1536 (c)). Therefore, this decision is consistent with the Endangered Species Act.

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)

In addition to the ESA, the 1996 Amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) requires the identification of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for federally managed fishery species. Essential fish habitat means those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. The species that the MSA covers include coho and Chinook salmon. Consultation with NMFS on effects to EFH was accomplished under the biological assessment prepared for ESA listed salmon species. NMFS determined that the project may adversely affect EFH for Chinook and coho salmon however, anticipated effects would be so minimal that no EFH conservation recommendations would be necessary.

Executive Order 13112 Invasive Species 64 FR 6183 (February 8, 1999)

Consistent with this Order, this project has incorporated feasible and prudent mitigation measures in the Selected Alternative to minimize risk of harm caused by invasive species. As documented in the noxious weed risk assessment in *Section 3.9 Noxious Weeds*, of the FEIS, all high risk routes that have known high priority weeds along travel ways and turnouts will be treated before the respective route can be included on the MVUM. Required weed treatment mitigations vary by species and are listed in Table 3.9.6 of the FEIS.

Special Area Designations

The Selected Alternative complies with laws, regulations, and policies that pertain to the following special areas. In addition, by eliminating cross-country travel, this decision enhances the values that make these special areas unique.

- **Research Natural Areas.** No routes within RNAs are added to the NFTS.
- **Special Interest Areas.** Routes added within the Horse Mountain Botanical SIA and the Lassics Botanical and Geological SIA are consistent with Forest

Plan direction. Adverse impacts to the unique ecological values are not anticipated. Providing access to these areas, in conjunction with signage, supports the SIA management strategy to promote public use, education, interpretation, and enjoyment of the special interest values of the area when such activities do not harm the values for which the area was designated (IV-50 Six Rivers NF LRMP).

- **Inventoried Roadless Areas.** As documented in *Section 3.15.4 Environmental Consequences* of the FEIS, the Selected Alternative would result in minor beneficial effects to the overall character of IRAs on the Forest.
- **Wilderness Areas.** No routes are added to the NFTS for public use within Wilderness areas. The preservation of Wilderness values was considered in this decision. The Selected Alternative will prevent future unauthorized use of motorized vehicles within the North Fork Wilderness area by prohibiting cross country travel and using route definition methods to assure that motor vehicles stay on designated routes.
- **Wild and Scenic Rivers.** No routes within Wild and Scenic River designations are added to the NFTS.

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 215. In accordance with the April 24, 2006 order issued by the U. S. District Court for the Missoula Division of the District of Montana in Case No. CV 03-119-M-DWM, only those individuals and organizations who provided comments during the comment period are eligible to appeal [36 CFR 215.11(a), 1993 version]. Appeals must be filed within 45 days from the publication date of the legal notice in the Times Standard. Notices of appeal must meet the specific content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14. An appeal, including attachments, must be filed (regular mail, fax, e-mail, hand-delivery, express delivery, or messenger service) with the appropriate Appeal Deciding Officer [36 CFR 215.8] within 45 days following the publication date of the legal notice. The publication date of the legal notice is the exclusive means for calculating the time period to file an appeal [36 CFR 215.15 (a)]. Those wishing to appeal should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

Appeals must be submitted to Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service, 1323 Club Drive, Vallejo, CA 94592, (707) 562-8737. Appeals may be submitted by FAX [(707) 562-9091] or by hand-delivery to the Regional Office, at the address shown above, during normal business hours (Monday-Friday 8:00am to 4:00pm). Electronic appeals, in acceptable [plain text (.txt), rich text (.rtf) or Word (.doc)] formats, may be submitted to **appeals-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us** with Subject: Lower Trinity and Mad River Motorized Travel Management.

For electronically mailed appeals, the sender should normally receive an automated electronic acknowledgment from the agency as confirmation of receipt. If the sender does not receive an automated acknowledgment of the receipt of the appeal, it is the sender's responsibility to ensure timely receipt by other means [36 CFR 215.6(a)(4)(iii)].

Implementation Date

If no appeals are filed within the 45-day appeal period, implementation of the decision may occur on, but not before, five business days from the close of the appeal filing period. When appeals are filed, implementation may occur on, but not before, the 15th business day following the date of the last appeal disposition.

Contact Person

The FEIS and supporting documents are available for public review at the Six Rivers National Forest, Supervisor's Office, 1330 Bayshore Way, CA 95501, (707) 442-1721. For further information on this decision, contact Linda West, Environmental Coordinator, by calling (707) 441-3561.

Signature and Date

Tyrone Kelley

April 22, 2010

TYRONE KELLEY
Forest Supervisor
Six Rivers National Forest

Date