

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Intermountain
Region

February 2009

**Payette National Forest
Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts
Snow-free Season**

Travel Management Plan

Record of Decision



The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (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 USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Record of Decision

Snow-Free Travel Management on the Payette National Forest Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts USDA Forest Service

Located in Valley, Adams and Idaho Counties, Idaho

February 2009

Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service
Responsible Official: Suzanne C. Rainville, Forest Supervisor
Payette National Forest
800 West Lakeside Avenue
McCall, Idaho 83638
(208) 634-0700

Information Contact: Jane Cropp
Interdisciplinary Team Leader
(208) 634-0757

Or

Laura Pramuk
Public Affairs Officer
(208) 634-0784

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Background	3
Purpose and Need for Action	4
Decision.....	5
Rationale for the Decision.....	9
Forest Plan Consistency	16
Public Involvement and Alternatives Considered.....	16
Public Involvement	16
Response to Primary Comments Received in the FEIS that pertain to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.....	18
Other Alternatives Considered	22
Compliance with Environmental Laws and Regulations	23
Environmentally Preferred Alternative	27
Monitoring and Mitigation	28
Implementation.....	28
Administrative Appeal	29
Contacts.....	30
Appendix A – Errata Information - Errors identified in body of FEIS document specific to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts Snow-free season:.....	32
Appendix B – Summary of Public Comments and Agency Response	33
Appendix C – Council and New Meadows RD Designated Roads and Trails in the Selected Alternative.....	52
Appendix D – ROS maps for Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts – snow-free season	60

Record of Decision Map separate attachment

Introduction

The Payette National Forest (PNF) completed a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) to assess and designate a system of roads, trails, and areas open to motorized and non-motorized uses during both snow covered and snow-free periods. The environmental analysis was completed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the PNF Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) and other relevant federal and state laws and regulations and discloses effects of travel management designations for both summer and winter travel uses on the portion of the Payette National Forest outside of the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness (FC-RONRW).

Due to the complexity of the Forest-wide analysis, I decided to separate my decision by Ranger Districts for snow-free travel management. I issued the Record of Decision (ROD) for snow-free travel on the Weiser Ranger District in January 2008, and the ROD for snow-free travel on the McCall and Krassel Ranger Districts in October 2008. This is my third snow-free travel management decision document, and it pertains to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. The ROD map included in this packet displays my decision. The Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts' Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) will be issued during the implementation phase, and will designate motorized use on roads and trails by vehicle class and time of year (seasonal roads and trails). This decision will not be implemented until the MVUM is issued, which will be after the appeal period for this ROD. At that time I will issue all five districts' MVUMs for the snow-free seasons.

The analysis of alternatives and public comment received on the FEIS for the Payette National Forest Travel Management Plan serves as the basis for my decision for snow-free travel management on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. My decision incorporates by reference the analysis of effects and management direction disclosed in the FEIS, the errata to the FEIS located in Appendix A of this ROD, and the planning record in its entirety.

Background

Management of the PNF is guided by the Forest Plan as directed in the 1976 National Forest Management Act (NFMA). Regulations implementing the NFMA require the Regional Forester to revise forest plans and provide the basis for revision. The initial PNF Forest Plan completed in 1988 identified travel management planning as a significant issue and led to the release of a Forest Travel Map. This Forest Travel Map was revised in 1995 and has been updated on a yearly basis (until 2006) by the PNF *Backroads* map. These maps provided visitors with information on roads, trails, and areas open for various forms of travel on the Forest.

In 2003, the Payette National Forest revised the Forest Plan under regulations formulated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 CFR 219) in 1982. The purpose of the revision was to guide all natural resource management activities, address changed conditions and directions, and meet the objectives of federal laws, regulations, and policies.

The *Southwest Idaho Ecogroup Land and Resource Management Plan Final EIS* for the Forest Plan identified travel management, including winter access management as issues not analyzed in detail. The responsible official decided to not address travel management in the revision process “due to the broad array of localized issues with travel management that occurs at scales below a Forest Planning unit.” The decision was made to address travel management under a separate, more localized planning process (Forest Plan 2003: V.1: 2-6; USDA Forest Service, 2003a: ROD: 8). National direction for travel management, specifically off-road use of motor vehicles on federal lands, is provided by Executive Order (E.O.) 11644 (February 8, 1972) as amended by E.O. 11989 (May 24, 1977). Forest Service rules at Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, part 295 codify the requirements in E.O. 11644 and E.O. 11989. Regulations regarding travel management on National Forest System lands were recently modified (36 CFR 212, 251, 261 & 295). These regulations provide further direction for travel management specifically requiring the designation of roads, trails and areas open to motor vehicle use, and prohibiting the use of motor vehicles off the designated system.

These changes in travel management regulations coupled with increased motorized and non-motorized uses on the PNF necessitate the need for designation of a travel system that will strive to balance travel management needs between different forest uses while sustaining natural resource values.

Purpose and Need for Action

The Payette National Forest Supervisor identified the following as the **purpose** for a revised Travel Management Plan:

- Meet Forest Plan and national direction.
- Limit indiscriminate motorized cross-country travel.
- Designate a system of roads, trails, and over-snow use areas.
- Balance management considerations (such as maintenance costs and public safety) with recreation opportunities.
- Reduce impacts to Forest resources.
- Reduce conflicts between recreational uses.

The **need** for revision of the Travel Management Plan was identified in the 2003 PNF Forest Plan and ROD (Forest Plan 2003). The responsible official for the Forest Plan made the decision to address travel management under a separate, more localized planning process. The Forest Plan provided a framework for travel management planning. This framework requires that travel management emphasize maintenance and restoration of watershed conditions, species viability, terrestrial and aquatic habitats, and functioning ecosystems. The clear identification of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use will enhance management of National Forest System lands; sustain natural resource values through more effective management of motor vehicle use; enhance opportunities for motorized recreation experiences on National Forest System lands; address needs for access to National Forest System lands, and preserve areas of opportunity on each National Forest for non-motorized travel and experiences.

During the Forest Plan revision process, PNF specialists identified a variety of resource concerns related to travel management including conflicts between recreational uses, and impacts to wildlife, fish, and water quality from cross-country motorized travel, and use of unauthorized roads. These concerns were captured in the PNF Travel Plan FEIS as “Management Requirements” (FEIS page 2-5- through 2-56). Inconsistent travel management direction across the Forest was also causing problems with the enforcement of travel regulations. Much of the eastern portion of the PNF was closed to cross-country motorized travel, while large areas on the western portion of the PNF were open to cross-country motorized travel.

The **need** for revision of the PNF Travel Management Plan is also supported by a nationwide awareness within the Forest Service of the harmful effects of indiscriminate off-road travel. The proliferation of user-created routes is a major challenge on the PNF and examples of significant environmental damage, safety issues, and use conflicts are well established. This problem nation-wide led to the Forest Service Final Rule (Final Rule) in the Federal Register: 36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261, 295 “*Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use*” (Federal Register 2005: 70 FR 68264). This Final Rule requires designation of roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicle use. The Final Rule prohibits use of motor vehicles off the designated system, as well as use of motor vehicles on routes and in areas inconsistent with the designation.

Designations and prohibitions under the Final Rule do not apply to legally documented rights-of-way held by States, counties, or other local public road authorities. Only National Forest System (NFS) roads and trails may be designated for motor vehicle use under the Final Rule and in this Travel Plan for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.

Decision

For the remainder of this document, Alternative E – modified will be referred to as the Selected Alternative. Implementing the Travel Management Final Rule and designating a system of roads and trails will eliminate unregulated motorized cross country travel. Motorized travel on unauthorized routes will no longer be allowed. Cross country motorized travel will not be allowed. Forest users using motorized vehicles may travel up to 300 feet from the centerline of designated roads where topography allows, and no resource concerns have been identified on the ground and 100 feet from designated motorized trails, for the purpose of dispersed camping. Many of these road corridors have been identified on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. These areas are displayed on the enclosed ROD map as open to motorized access for dispersed camping with a “dot” symbol. Areas where motorized access to dispersed camping is not allowed except in designated areas will not show as “open” on the MVUM. Instead, these designated camping sites and their access will be signed on the ground with a camping symbol, and recreational users will be able to utilize these numerous areas for dispersed camping.

Dispersed camping areas with resource degradation will be evaluated and managed through administrative actions and larger scale analysis, and may be closed or relocated to allow for restoration (See Monitoring item E-8 in the FEIS).

As the Forest begins to implement travel planning, monitoring of dispersed campsites along designated roads and trails will occur to see if damage to resources, caused by either unexpected natural events, or by motorized vehicle access, occurs. Over time, the Forest could move toward more restrictions to dispersed camping along these open road corridors if resource damage occurs. Any changes to dispersed camping allowances would be apparent in the annual update of the MVUMs. On both Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, dispersed camping off all roads and trails, when accessed by foot, horse, or other non-motorized travel is not restricted or designated.

Traveling off of designated roads or trails for any other purpose, except those that I discuss below, may only be pursued with a written authorization. Game retrieval using motorized vehicles off of designated roads and motorized trails is prohibited. Fire wood permits, Special Use authorizations, and Mining Plans of Operation are some of the written authorizations that may incorporate explicit allowances for cross country motorized travel.

I have chosen to issue several combinations of district-wide decisions. To avoid confusion, I have developed and incorporated into my decision Tables 1 and 2 located in Appendix C. These tables display all open road and trail designations specific to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. My decision designates a system of motorized roads and trails that are generally similar to those managed under the 1995 Travel Plan as amended by the most current *Backroads* publication.

My decision is consistent with the 2003 Payette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan and the 2005 *Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use; Final Rule* (Federal Register 2005: 70 FR 68264). In addition my decision is based on a review of the Project Record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk. Motorized designation will be by vehicle class (i.e., roads open to all vehicles, trails open to all vehicles, trails open to off highway vehicles only, trails open to vehicles 50" or less in width, , trails open to motorcycles only) and time of year. The MVUM developed using this decision will display this information using the National Mapping standards for MVUMs.

My decision for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts encompasses 592,480 acres of National Forest System land located in three counties. After a thorough review of the Payette National Forest Travel Management Plan FEIS, consideration of Tribal, cooperator, agency and public comments, and resource specialist input, I have selected to implement Alternative E as described in the FEIS, for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts (which includes the analysis for MAs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9) with the following modifications:

Snow-free Travel Management Modifications:

New Meadows Ranger District:

-
- In MA 3, Proposal 3-42 shows road 51121 closed in Alternative E. While the road will remain closed to motorized travel in the Selected Alternative, it is open to non-motorized trail use and will be designated an open, non-motorized trail #358 to access the Lick Creek Lookout.

 - In MA 3, Road 50615 (3.5 miles) will be closed year round for Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (NIDGS) protection in accordance with Terms and Conditions from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to meet established recovery plan goals. Previously the road was closed seasonally; with my decision the road will be closed year-round to motorized use.

 - In MA 4 under Alternative E, Proposal 4-4, trail #191 to Paradise Flat at the 3.5 mile point (where trail #191 then becomes non-motorized) was designated two-wheel motorized with a seasonal motorized closure during hunting season. In the Selected Alternative, trail #191 to Paradise Flat will be designated as an ATV trail with a seasonal closure to all motorized use from September 1 – November 30. Beyond Paradise Flat, trail #191 will continue to remain non-motorized, as it is in the existing condition. This section of trail #191 was never proposed for motorized designation of any type.

Council Ranger District:

- In MA 2, Proposal 2-2, trail 234 was non-motorized in Alternative E. In the Selected Alternative it will be designated a two-wheel motorized trail (Same as the existing condition). Trail 252, Proposal 2-7, was non-motorized in Alternative E, but in the Selected Alternative is designated two-wheel motorized between trail junctions of trail 234 and trail 251. This will maintain a two-wheel motorized loop trail using trail #234 and trail #251. The remainder of trail #252 will be designated non-motorized.

- In MA 3, Proposals 3-49 thru 3-57, containing numerous user routes along the ridge between the Payette and Boise National Forests were designated as ATV trails in Alternative E in the FEIS. Because of cultural resource concerns these motorized routes will not be designated open. The routes will be open only to non-motorized use. No formal trail network will be designated along this ridge at this time.

- In MA 3, Proposal 3-7; currently this mapped two-wheel motorized trail #248 does not exist on the ground in many places. Prior to designation on the MVUM this trail will need heavy reconstruction. Once reconstruction is completed the new ATV route #248 will be designated open on the MVUMs.

- In MA 3, Proposals 3-9a and 3-9b have a new existing condition from a separate site-specific decision made since the release of the FEIS for travel planning. Trail #203 will be designated a non-motorized trail to the hot springs. The trail will end at this point. Trail #332 will be designated as a two-wheel motorized trail,

connecting to two-wheel motorized trail #203. Trail construction on the 332 trail is scheduled for completion in 2009, and will therefore appear on the MVUM.

- In MA 3, the FEIS map showed trail #213 in the Council Mountain area as two-wheel motorized. This was a mapping error. The trail is actually an ATV trail for its first 2.5 miles, where it then becomes a two-wheel motorized trail. This section of trail will be appropriately signed for the allowed use on the ground. The trail is designated correctly on the ROD map.

- In MA3, Proposals 3-12 and 3-13, will not be designated motorized opportunities (same as Alternative E in the FEIS). A new motorized route, just south of these proposals, was identified by a field review team on the ground that has the potential to provide the ATV motorized connection desired between the Anderson Creek Road and West Mountain Road. The analysis of this potential trail connection will be a top priority for the Council Ranger District to incorporate into their trail program of work for 2009-2010.

A more detailed explanation of these modifications follows in the "Rationale for my decision" section.

Compliance with ESA Consultation Modifications:

Consultation on effects to species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) resulted in *Project Design Features* provided by the Payette National Forest and *Terms and Conditions* issued in Biological Opinions from FWS and NMFS. Terms and Conditions are actions the Forest Service is required to perform to avoid jeopardy to listed species. These are summarized below for each listed species.

ESA-Listed Fish Species

- 1). Immediately (i.e., Forest Service fiscal year 2009) begin internal processes to identify, prioritize, and close those travel routes that have not been or will not be designated open for public use, including reducing the resource impacts of culverts, fords, and non-maintained road surfaces.

- 2). Immediately close fords along designated motorized routes found to be in close proximity to redds and take steps to permanently eliminate fords to protect the redd areas.

Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (NIDGS)

Project Design Features

- No off-road travel or travel to dispersed campsites will be allowed in occupied NIDGS habitat.

-
- NIDGS sites will be monitored for illegal off-road travel and, if necessary, these sites will be closed by barricades, fences, or by other means to reduce potential negative impacts to NIDGS habitat.
 - The Level 1 Team and NIDGS technical team will work together to identify opportunities to close and/or relocate NFS roads that occur in or adjacent to occupied NIDGS sites.
 - As necessary, information signs will be posted along roads that occur in or adjacent to occupied NIDGS sites to caution the public to drive slowly and avoid impacting NIDGS

Terms and Conditions from USFWS (Draft)

- 1) Work with the Level 1 team to identify and close roads in occupied NIDGSs habitat where illegal shooting, off-road travel, and introduction of noxious weeds may result in harm to NIDGS.
- 2) Post a warning sign (i.e., “wildlife area”) and advisory speed plaque of 15 mph on road segments which intersect occupied NIDGS habitat where the Level 1 team have determined that vehicle speeds could easily exceed this speed (specifically road 58009). Begin with main arterial roads and complete posting all roads in this category by November 2011.
- 3) The Forest shall gate, obliterate, or rip the first 0.25 miles of closed NFS roads 51454 and 50653. These roads are not designated open to travel on the MVUM, but prohibited use could occur because the roadbed is well established and the roads appear open on the ground.

Rationale for the Decision

During the travel planning efforts I have gained an increased understanding and appreciation for the complexities and controversy surrounding travel management on the PNF. For this decision regarding snow-free travel management on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, I have considered the site specific public comments and resource issues identified through the planning process and have strived to strike a balance between the various motorized and non-motorized uses, and the natural and cultural resource values across the PNF. I am sure that no single user or group will completely agree with my decision, but I do hope they can appreciate that their comments and concerns have been heard and considered in the context of all the comments and resource issues associated with travel management on the PNF. Appendix B includes a summary of public comments and agency responses specific to Council and New Meadows, and pertinent general comments answered in the previous two RODs for Weiser and McCall/Krassel Ranger Districts.

With the Selected Alternative, many Forest activities on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts will continue as they have in the past. Users will continue to be able to camp in both dispersed and developed recreation sites. Under different authorizations and permitting, users will be able to continue to collect firewood, harvest Christmas trees, conduct mining, continue grazing and timber operations, and conduct other authorized uses

on the forest. Work associated with these activities will continue as it does now, through contracts, operating plans, plans of operation, special use authorizations, and established authorization processes.

As stated in the Final Rule, motor vehicle use that is specifically authorized under a written authorization issued pursuant to Federal law or regulations is exempted from designations made under 36 CFR 212.51 and restrictions and prohibitions established by the Final Rule. Prohibitions, Section 261.13 of the Final Rule, state that while the written authorization is an exemption, use of motor vehicles contrary to the written authorization is prohibited.

While this decision does not address every issue or resource concern raised throughout the comment period process associated with travel management, it makes important steps towards meeting PNF Forest Plan requirements and implementing national direction for travel management. Specifically, this decision will eliminate unmanaged cross country motorized travel and provide a network of designated travel routes for motorized and non-motorized uses during snow-free seasons on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.

The biggest change to recreational use with this decision is to those who participated in motorized cross-country travel along the numerous unauthorized routes and areas across the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts that were contained within the 314,220 acres previously open to motorized cross-country travel. The majority of these unauthorized roads were not designated open to motorized use under this decision. The Selected Alternative was developed based on input received for both the DEIS and the FEIS and reflects the most inclusive integration of site-specific comments received from our diverse forest recreational users. The Selected Alternative provides for a diversity of motorized and non-motorized opportunities for the snow-free seasons in a manner that reduces the potential for conflict between uses and maintains and protects important natural and cultural resource values.

While making my decision I considered effects on the PNFs natural and cultural resources, public safety, provision of recreational opportunities, access needs, conflicts among uses on the Forest, the need for maintenance and administration of roads and trails designated by my decision, the criteria for designation of roads and trails as listed in 212.55(b) and (c) of the Final Rule; and the availability of resources for that maintenance and administration. As part of my decision to designate the system of roads and trails as identified in the Selected Alternative I am counting on the help offered by the many volunteers and cooperators in their comment letters to supplement Forest resources for maintenance of the designated travel system. I chose an alternative that proposed a designated system of roads and trails that I believe the Districts can maintain with the available funding allocations (including grants) and human resources (volunteers) to accomplish the work. I may need to consider closing portions of this system in the future if funding is reduced.

Given the quantity of information received and compiled as part of this process, it is likely that there may be minor errors or unforeseen consequences associated with some travel designations. Errors identified through the public and internal review of the FEIS have

been captured and documented in Appendix A of this decision, and will continue to be corrected with the annual updates of the MVUMs.

As we proceed with implementation of this decision, I assure you that through monitoring and continued public input we will work collaboratively with the public, Tribes, cooperators, and other agencies to address and work through potential issues in an open and constructive manner. This kind of collaborative and adaptive approach is imperative to build public support and to successfully implement travel management on the PNF now and into the future.

In addition it is important to realize that this decision reflects the best available information for this point in time. The Forest does not expect road and trail management objectives to remain static over time. The Final Rule recognizes that designations to travel routes are not permanent and that unforeseen environmental impacts, changes in public demand or monitoring may lead to Responsible Officials revising designations, 36 CFR 212.54 provides for revision of designations as needed to meet changing conditions. I recognize there may be a need for changes and will be open to addressing these needs as they arise. Necessary changes or alterations to travel management will continue across the Forest through site specific project analyses and continued public collaboration and feedback on travel management across the PNF. I am requesting the Council and New Meadows District Rangers continue to proactively engage with the public to provide new recreational road and trail opportunities on an ongoing basis.

Listed below is a more detailed rationale for my modifications to Alternative E, as specified under my decision:

On the *New Meadows Ranger District*, Trail #358 will remain open to non-motorized travel to provide access to Lick Creek Lookout. This trail lies on top of a road (Proposal 3-42), that will remain closed to motorized uses because of the existence of Idaho Ground Squirrel populations documented in the area.

Road 50615 will be closed year round for NIDGS protection in accordance with Terms and Conditions brought forward by FWS. The road had previously been open seasonally. This 3.5 mile road has alternate near-by roads that will remain open for firewood removal and motorized recreational access.

Trail #191 into Paradise Flats (3.5 miles) will be closed to motorized use seasonally from September 1 – November 30 annually. The remaining 3.1 miles of trail #191 will continue to remain non-motorized, yearlong, as it does in the existing condition. I had numerous discussions with district recreation staff, the District Ranger, the public and the cooperating agencies regarding this trail, and the continued documented prohibited ATV use that was occurring in the area, despite the district's efforts to control it with signs, physical barriers and enforcement patrols. This area is a prime big game hunting unit, and home to trophy big game. I received numerous letters from hunters requesting this area be closed to ATVs to protect the hunting experience. Seasonally closing the trail to motorized use at it's junction with trail #188 will provide a good location to monitor compliance. Because the

majority of prohibited ATV use has occurred during hunting season I am going to close the trail to motorized use only during hunting season camp set-up and the actual hunting season. I am hopeful that ATV use will be able to continue in the summer season, and that the seasonal motorized closure of the trail will protect the area from unauthorized ATV use. County Cooperator representatives from Adams, Washington, and Valley Counties, as well as Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation have agreed to help monitor and enforce the seasonal closure to motorized users. If the seasonal closure fails to address the motorized intrusions into Paradise Flat area, I may need to look at further reductions to motorized access into that area.

On the *Council Ranger District*, I reviewed the comments from two-wheel motorized users, and Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation asking me to maintain two-wheel motorized loop opportunities when possible. I will maintain the two-wheel motorized use on trail #234 (Proposal 2-2) by designating a portion of trail #252 (Proposal 2-7) two-wheel motorized between trail #234 and trail #251 (the section that does not have private land easement issues). The loop is completed with the previous designation done in the Weiser ROD on trail #251, which was also two-wheel motorized. This motorized loop will continue to provide two-wheel motorized users with access. These trail segments are in need of heavy trail maintenance and funding has been secured to complete much of this maintenance during the summer field season of 2009.

Current use in the area along the Council Ranger District boundary with the Boise National Forest, in the Mill Creek Summit to the Lookout Peak area has been open to motorized use in the past as it has been in an area open to motorized cross-country travel. I looked at designating an ATV trail system (Proposal 3-49 thru 3-57) along this ridge to accommodate ATV motorized use in this popular area. During the on-the-ground resource evaluation for cultural resources, many areas along the ridge were identified as having cultural significance. In my meetings with the tribes, and in my review of these findings, I have decided not to designate these routes as open to motorized use. Only non-motorized use will be allowed along this ridge by the recreation public. I do recognize that there is currently a lot of motorized use occurring in this area along user routes, and that eliminating this use will be difficult. As time and financial resources permit, the district will look at future options for other motorized routes in the area that would not be detrimental to cultural resources. Permittee needs for motorized use will be addressed through their own specific authorization process.

Proposal 3-7, trail #248 will be designated as an ATV trail with this decision but will not be open to use until reconstruction on the existing two-wheel motorized route has been completed. Many sections of this two-wheel trail are missing and need to be reconstructed on the ground. Once reconstruction is completed the new ATV trail #248 will be open and available for motorized use, and appear on the MVUM.

Proposal 3-9b has been modified to reflect a separate site specific decision for this area to accommodate a new trail that bypasses private land. Trail 332 went from a non-motorized trail to a two-wheel motorized trail, making trail 332 and 203 two-wheel motorized. A new section of two-wheel motorized trail is scheduled for construction during the 2009 field

season to avoid crossing private land. These new conditions are reflected in the ROD map and on the future Council Ranger District's MVUM.

A suitable ATV route could not be located to connect proposals 3-12, 3-13 and 3-11, but a field trip with Council Ranger District and Forest recreation specialists accompanied by cooperating agency participants found a suitable potential ATV trail connection in the area, that would provide the desired recreation connection across West Mountain for motorized users. This route was not analyzed in the FEIS for Travel Planning so will need separate site-specific analysis, and it will be identified as a top priority for the Council Ranger District 2009-2010 trails program.

Snow-free Travel Opportunities

I believe the Selected Alternative will improve our ability to meet the demands of current and future recreational use while providing for the protection of important natural and cultural resources across the Districts.

In the Selected Alternative, acres open to motorized cross-country travel go from 314,220 acres on Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, to zero acres open to motorized cross-country travel. I recognize this will be a loss of past motorized recreation opportunities to some users on the Forest used to traveling cross-country with their ATV or OHV on user created roads and trails that are now closed to motorized use. I believe the amount of open forest roads in the Selected Alternative will provide efficient access for forest users, and on-going forest management and administration activities across the Districts. The potential for resource damage caused by unrestricted motorized use, and the reality of our roads and trails budget did not allow me to designate large open areas for motorized cross-country travel. Funding of needed road maintenance will remain challenging and the Forest will continue to do strategic prioritization of future maintenance needs and expenditures with the help of partnerships and local interested groups. Future recreational road needs may be analyzed as brought forward to individual Districts by the public and/or as identified in project specific proposals.

I also received comments from publics that believe a greater reduction in forest roads is needed to reduce watershed and wildlife impacts. In making my decision, I considered these impacts and believe that the elimination of motorized cross-country travel, and reduction in motorized use on unauthorized roads will lead to a reduction in watershed and wildlife impacts ultimately benefiting these and other resources over the short and long term.

Tracking exact mileages for roads and trails is difficult because there are many changes in designations from two-wheel motorized to non-motorized, two-wheel motorized to ATV, and unauthorized routes to ATV trails. Because of this, mileages listed below are only approximations. Specifically, the Selected Alternative maintains 1107 miles of motorized open and seasonally open forest roads on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. This is a gain of three miles of open designated road on the Council RD and a loss of nine miles of road access on the New Meadows Ranger District (FEIS pp. S-22, 23; 2-57, 2-17

thru 2-32). These figures do not take into account the loss of past unauthorized routes in areas previously open to motorized cross-country travel.

The Selected Alternative increases the mileage of designated trails open to vehicles 50" or less in width (ATV) by six miles by designating 26.3 miles of trail open to vehicles 50" or less in width. The Selected Alternative also designates one-half mile of trail open to all vehicles (OHV trail). In addition, legally permitted ATVs and their licensed riders will have over 1107 miles of riding opportunities on the open and seasonally open road system. I encourage individual communities to work on mapping opportunities of this system of roads and trails available to ATV users to generate interest in the system. Listed below are the specifics on the new routes.

Previously closed roads or unauthorized routes that comprise the additional miles of designated open roads or ATV trail (Trails open to vehicles 50 inches or less), OHV trail (trails open to full size vehicles) under the Selected Alternative:

Proposal 2-11, closed road 50362 is designated open ATV trail #293 (0.7 mile)
Proposal 2-16, closed road 50986 is now open seasonal road 50986 (2.9 miles)
Proposal 3-11, unauthorized road 502189080 is now open ATV trail #240 (2.7 miles)
Proposal 3-18, unauthorized road 507142000 is now open road 507142000 (0.8 mile)
Proposal 3-19, unauthorized road 507104000 is now open road 507104000 (0.4 mile)
Proposal 3-48, unauthorized road 506441000 is now seasonal road 506441000 (0.5 mile)
Proposal 6-8, closed road 50405 is now open ATV trail #316 (1.3 miles)

Roads that would be closed under the Selected Alternative:

Proposal 3-24, Road 50793 seasonal road is closed (1.1 miles)
Proposal 3-25, Road 50790 seasonal road is closed (1.7 miles)
Proposal 3-28, Road 50794 open road is closed (1.8 miles)
Proposal 3-30b, Road 50556 seasonal road is closed (0.3 mile)
Proposal 3-41, Road 50787 seasonal road is closed (0.1 mile)
Road 50615 seasonal road is closed (3.5 miles) (Term and Condition from FWS)

Previously open road now closed to motorized use and designated as trail under the Selected Alternative:

Proposal 6-6, road 50268 open road is designated non-motorized open trail (1.0 mile)

The Selected Alternative designates approximately 194 miles of two-wheel motorized single track trail. While this is a reduction of 19 miles, the reduction is partially offset by ATV and OHV trails that are open to two-wheel motorized users (FEIS pp. S-21 to 23; 2-57, 3-54). Much of the reduction in two-wheel motorized trails is associated with rarely used, poorly designed trails likely to result in resource damage (FEIS pp. 3-54 to 3-57). Listed below are the specifics on changes to two-wheel motorized routes:

Two-wheel motorized routes that are now designated either non-motorized or ATV:

Proposal 2-7, (portion of) trail #252 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized trail from the junction with trail #234 northeast to where it ends at Road 50859 (4 miles)

Proposal 3-7, trail #248 two-wheel motorized to ATV trail (2.8 miles)
Proposal 4-1a, (portion of) trail #279 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized (1.6 miles)
Proposal 6-3, (portion of) trail #160 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized (4.4 miles)
Proposal 6-4, (portion of) trail #344 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized. The portion of the trail between Rainbow Lake and Black Lake is now non-motorized (0.8 miles)
Proposal 9-2, (portion of) trail #348 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized (2.8 miles)
Proposal 9-3, trail #503 two-wheel motorized to non-motorized (2.6 miles)

The Selected Alternative retains many challenging single-track trails for the more experienced riders seeking a highly technical two-wheel motorized experience, such as trails #245, #263 on Cuddy Mountain, and most motorized trails on the north side of Council Mountain, including trail #210 and trail #203.

There are 195 miles of non-motorized trails designated on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts in the Selected Alternative. This is a reduction of approximately 3 miles, due to trail closures. Although 17 miles of non-motorized trail is closed, approximately 15 miles of two-wheel motorized trail is now designated non-motorized, making up the difference.

Twenty miles of trail are closed under the Selected Alternative; 3.7 miles of two-wheel motorized trail, and 17 miles of non-motorized trail. Closing the trails mean they will not appear on any maps, and will no longer be maintained by the Forest Service. Non-motorized use along these old paths will continue to be an allowed use.

Trails closed are:

Proposal 2-5, trail #225, non-motorized trail to closed (5.5 miles)
Proposal 3-1, trail #212, two-wheel motorized to closed (2.6 miles)
Proposal 3-2, trail #214, non-motorized to closed (0.4 mile)
Proposal 3-3, trail #249, non-motorized to closed (2.1 miles)
Proposal 3-4, trail #330, non-motorized to closed (0.9 mile)
Proposal 3-5, trail #237, non-motorized to closed (4.0 miles)
Proposal 3-6, trail #247, non-motorized to closed (1.0)
Proposal 3-8, trail #244, non-motorized to closed (3.0 miles)
Proposal 9-5, trail #505 two-wheel motorized to closed (1.1 miles)

Several unauthorized routes, both roads and trails (all listed above), are added to the designated system with my decision because they provide good recreation opportunities and their addition to the system is both cost effective and unlikely to promote unacceptable resource damage. They will not appear on the MVUM until they meet design features, as listed in the FEIS, Project Design Features 2.3.2, pages 2-6 thru 2-7, and Appendix C of the FEIS. Roads and trails that fall into this category are those that are on former unauthorized roads or trails, and closed roads (FEIS page 2-6, Newly Designed Roads and Trails). Listed below are all the routes on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts that will need some type of review by the district recreation specials and the district or forest hydrologist and biologist prior to designation on the ground and on the MVUM. Some routes may be identified immediately as meeting Project Design features (PDFs) and can

appear on the first printing of the MVUM, others will need additional work to meet PDFs, and may not appear as designated open for use on a MVUM for several years. All routes needing some type of prior review are identified below:

Proposal 2-11, closed road 50362 to ATV trail #293.
Proposal 2-16, closed road 50986 to seasonal open road 50986.
Proposal 3-7, trail #248 two-wheel motorized to ATV trail #248.
Proposal 3-11, unauthorized road 502189080 to ATV trail #240.
Proposal 3-18, unauthorized road 507142000 to open road 507142000.
Proposal 3-19, unauthorized road 507104000 to open road 507104000.
Proposal 3-48, unauthorized road 506441000 to seasonal open road 506441000.
Proposal 6-8, closed road 50405 to ATV trail #316.

The *Backroads* Map

A revised Payette National Forest Travel Map was issued in 1995 and is now more commonly known as the "Forest Visitor Map". Since that time, travel management has been guided by the 1995 map as updated on a yearly basis (until 2006) by the PNF *Backroads* map. Combined, these maps provided visitors with information on roads, trails, and areas open for travel on the Forest (FEIS page 1-1). The *Backroads* Map was updated yearly to reflect PNF NEPA decisions on road and trail management, as well as any new Special Orders pertaining to roads, trails or area management. The *Backroads* Map also identified areas open and closed to motorized over-snow vehicle use. The *Backroads* Map was used as the starting point for the development of the existing condition of the motorized road and trail system at the beginning of this Travel Management planning process (FEIS page 2-1). Although used as a starting point, I recognize that it was not error free. The Forest recognizes that there was some misunderstanding regarding the purpose and the enforcement of the *Backroads* Map publication. Regardless, it was used to determine the initial existing condition when beginning the travel plan.

Forest Plan Consistency

My decision to implement the Selected Alternative is consistent with Forest Plan goals and objectives, and standards and guidelines as documented in each resource section in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and in the Rationale Section of this ROD. In addition, my decision incorporates management requirements from the Forest Plan that are designed for the protection of Forest resources and to ensure consistency with Forest Plan direction. These are discussed and summarized in the FEIS on pages 2-51 to 2-56. No Forest Plan amendments are needed to implement this project.

Public Involvement and Alternatives Considered

Public Involvement

Public involvement in this project officially began in October of 2004 when the proposed action was issued to 616 members of the public. A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register on October 4, 2004. Public comment was taken through January 7th, 2005. Many comments were received including: 130 comment forms, 165 emails, 34 faxes,

254 letters, and 964 postcards. All comments received were reviewed and categorized by issue. Major issues were incorporated into the design of two new alternatives. Documents detailing the review of public comments and how the agency incorporated the substantive comments into new alternative design are available in the Project Record.

Public meetings were held in McCall, Riggins, Council, New Meadows, and Weiser, Idaho in September and October of 2004. Informational meetings were held at the request of many stakeholders during the scoping phase of the project.

The project (including the Proposed Action, press releases, and additional information) was featured on the PNF website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/payette>. The Proposed Action maps, narratives, and summaries were available for review at the Weiser, Council, New Meadows, and McCall Ranger Districts of the Payette National Forest, the Hell's Canyon National Recreation Area in Riggins, and the Payette National Forest Supervisor's Office in McCall.

Scoping letters were sent to three Tribal Nations: Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley, and Nez Perce Tribe. Formal government-to-government consultation has occurred with the Nez Perce, Shoshone-Bannock, and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes including briefings to the tribal councils and their technical staff.

The DEIS was published in early February of 2006. The comment period on the DEIS officially began on February 17, 2006 when the Notice of Availability (NOA) was published in the Federal Register. The Forest initially established a 46-day comment period. The comment period was extended an additional 46 days at the request of members of the public.

Public meetings were held Boise, Weiser, Council, New Meadows, and McCall in February and March of 2006. The DEIS and accompanying maps were featured on the PNF website. Copies of the DEIS and the maps were available at all Forest offices.

Copies of the DEIS were also sent to the three Tribal Nations: the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley, and the Nez Perce Tribe. Formal government-to-government consultation on the project continued with the Nez Perce Tribe, Shoshone-Bannock and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes.

During the 92-day comment period on the DEIS, the Forest received approximately 450 comments including letters, emails, and faxes. All comments received were reviewed and categorized by issue. The Forest then developed a new action alternative, Alternative E, to respond to these comments and to address Ranger District specific needs and preferences.

The FEIS was published in April 2007 and a final 30-day comment period officially started on May 25, 2007 with publication of the NOA in the Federal Register. The comment period was extended from June 25 to July 10, 2007 based on public request. While there is no requirement to allow a comment period on a FEIS, I felt it was important to gain

feedback from the public on the newly developed Alternative E before making a final decision.

Since the end of the comment period the Forest has continued to engage with various publics including formal information sharing meetings with Travel Plan cooperators including members of the winter recreation forum, Adams, Idaho and Valley County Commissioners, Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation. Aside from these formal meetings travel plan team specialists have been responsive to numerous public requests for additional information or clarification on the Travel Plan. The comment periods generated over 2000 letters, e-mails, and faxes from a range of individuals, groups and other agencies. Along with Travel Plan team members, I reviewed and evaluated these comments, and my decision reflects responsiveness to many comments and concerns received on the FEIS. With the release of the RODs to date we have also had public information meetings in Weiser on February 27, 2008, in McCall on October 29, 2008 and in Yellow Pine on November 1, 2008.

Since spring 2004, numerous newspaper articles and press releases regarding the travel planning effort have been published in the local and regional papers, including *The Star News* (McCall), *Long Valley Advocate* (Cascade), *Adams County Record* (Council), *Weiser Signal American* (Weiser), and *Idaho Statesman* (Boise). Legal Notices of comment and availability were published in *The Star News*, *Idaho Statesman*, *Adams County Record*, *Idaho County Free Press*, and *Weiser Signal American*. In addition, the Forest has maintained a website (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r4/payette>) providing public access to current information, environmental documents, maps, and other items pertaining to travel management.

Response to Primary Comments Received in the FEIS that pertain to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts

The following sections document my consideration and responsiveness to the main issues and concerns brought forth during the FEIS comment period both general and specific to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. A summary of specific public comments and agency responses is provided in Appendix B of this document.

Firewood Gathering

Many individuals commented about the effects of the travel plan on firewood gathering opportunities and expressed concern with considering firewood gathering as a non-significant issue. I understand that firewood gathering is important to many of our forest users and I recognize the importance of firewood for providing a source of home heating fuel. The decision to categorize firewood gathering as a non-significant issue is not because I believe it is not significant to the public, but rather because the collection of firewood is already regulated through the firewood permitting process.

The Final Rule provides for off-road motor vehicle use that is specifically authorized pursuant to a written authorization issued under Federal Regulation (36 CFR 261.13). The firewood permit will specify the areas for fuel wood collection. I have directed the Council District Ranger to annually look at analyzing potential firewood cutting areas that may be

designated through the Firewood Permit Process. Over the past year roads and areas within the Council Ranger District have been analyzed and opened to firewood gathering under the firewood permit, and this work will continue in the future.

Unauthorized Roads

Many comments were received on the closure of unauthorized roads across the forest and how this would impact the public's ability to gather firewood, recreate and enjoy the Forest. An "unauthorized road or trail" is "A road or trail that is not a forest road or trail or a temporary road or trail and that is not included in a forest transportation atlas" (36 CFR 212.1). This includes, for example, user created trails or roads, and some temporary roads created for past forest management practices. The difficulty with unauthorized roads lies in the fact that the Forest does not have complete information on their level or type of use, condition, or location. Many felt the Forest should implement a complete inventory of these roads before making any travel management decisions. While this was considered, it was not feasible to complete such a task with our existing funding and personnel levels. Furthermore, such an inventory may never be complete, as new routes will continue to be created during the inventory process.

In the past, user-created routes were developed without agency authorization, environmental analysis, or public involvement. These routes do not have the same status as NFS roads and trails included in the Forest transportation system. The Final Rule recognizes this and indicates complete inventories are not necessary in order to complete the designation process. The Final Rule does allow for designating unauthorized roads as part of the transportation system through the public involvement process for travel planning. The Forest followed this direction and provided the opportunity for the public to bring forward unauthorized roads suitable for travel or recreational opportunities. This desire and intention was communicated from the beginning through public meetings, press releases, and continued throughout the planning process.

In response to the concern over loss of access associated with unauthorized roads, I asked team specialists to compile what was known about the unauthorized roads. An estimated 3,000+ miles of unauthorized roads exist across the entire PNF. Through past analysis and inventories (1996-2003) we have collected information on approximately one-third of those Forest-wide roads, 1,020 miles. At the time these roads were surveyed, approximately 31% were passable by a full-size vehicle, 34% passable by an ATV or motorcycle, and the remaining 35% by foot or horse traffic. Many of these inventories are 5-10 years old so the condition of many roads may have changed (e.g., grown in, washed out, opened up) or new user-created routes may have been pioneered since the inventories were completed.

Further assessment of the inventoried unauthorized roads reveals that approximately 300 miles (30% of the inventoried unauthorized roads) have been analyzed and proposed for decommissioning through past NEPA decisions that included public involvement, and approximately 240 miles (24% of inventoried roads) occur in areas that have been previously closed to motorized cross-country travel (the old A and B areas that are displayed on the 1995 PNF visitor map). The remaining 46% of inventoried roads are located in areas that were previously (prior to this decision) open to motorized cross-

country travel. As stated in my rationale for this decision, closing these areas will meet national direction and end unrestricted motorized cross-country travel.

In my decision for the Council and New Meadows Ranger District, I have added several miles of previously unauthorized roads and trails into the designated open motorized system because they provided favorable recreation opportunities and their addition to the system was both cost effective and unlikely to promote unacceptable resource damage. These routes are listed in the "Snow-free Travel Opportunities" section of the ROD. While some routes have been added to the designated open motorized system of roads and trails, I realize there will be a large reduction in cross-country motorized travel areas, which contained numerous unauthorized routes that used to be open to the recreating public. Continual site-specific project planning efforts on the Districts will allow the public future opportunities to look at additional unauthorized routes becoming designated routes. My desire is that during these small scale, site specific levels of planning, meaningful public input and dialogue on the unauthorized roads can occur.

Access to Private Lands

Several respondents who own land adjacent to or surrounded by NFS land expressed concern over changes in travel designations and their ability to access private lands. In instances where road or trail designations change on routes leading to private lands, landowners will still be allowed reasonable access to their properties through the regular special use permit issuance process. Landowners will need to apply for a special use authorization for use and maintenance of a road or trail. No decisions on access to private lands will be made with this Travel Plan decision (FEIS p. 1-12). This decision pertains to designations for general recreational uses.

Section 1323(a) of Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA) provides property owners within the boundaries of the NFS certain rights of access across NFS lands. While ANILCA provides certain rights to property owners, those rights are subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Forest Service may prescribe in a written authorization. This decision affects all roads on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, including those leading to private lands. Private roads needed only for the purpose of accessing private property will not show up on the MVUM (36 CFR 261.54). Private land owners will need to submit an application for a special use authorization issued under Federal Regulations (36 CFR 251.110 and 36 CFR 251.54) to access their property, if the road accessing their land is not shown as open to general public use on the map.

Access for Mining Activities

With my decision, motor vehicle access not covered by exceptions in the Travel Management Rule, inconsistent with designations shown on a MVUM and without written authorization is prohibited. Where the use of motor vehicles is reasonable and necessary to conduct mining operations pursuant to the Mining Laws (including exploration), exceptions to this prohibition will be applied to provide motor vehicle access as needed.

Undesignated roads and trails are not public roads or maintained for National Forest purposes under 36CFR228.4(a)(1)(i), and the use of motorized vehicles that is not in accordance with the designations causes substantially different surface disturbance than that caused by other users of the National Forest 36 CFR 228.45 (a)(1)(v). The remaining exemptions are also inapplicable.

The use of motor vehicles inconsistent with road, trail, or area designations shown on a MVUM might cause significant disturbance of surface resources. Under 36 CFR 228.4(a), persons proposing to use motor vehicles for mineral exploration or operations to be conducted under the Mining Laws in areas inconsistent with designations shown on a MVUM will be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to operate to the District Ranger having jurisdiction over the area in which operations will be conducted.

Upon receipt of a NOI, if the District Ranger determines the proposed motor vehicle use is reasonably incident to mining, exploration or operations under the Mining Laws and the motor vehicle use will not, or is not likely to, cause significant surface disturbance, the determination will be acknowledged as such in response to the proponent. This acknowledgement will serve in lieu of an authorization under the travel management rule for the case by case exceptions. If the District Ranger determines the activity will potentially result in significant disturbance of surface resources, they have the responsibility under 36 CFR 228.4(a)(4) to request the proponent submit a Plan of Operations.

I understand that reasonable access is a right under the Mining Laws. The prohibitions in 36 CFR 261.13 and the designations for motor vehicle use shown on the MVUM therefore do not preclude use of motorized vehicles where reasonable and necessary to conduct mineral exploration or operations pursuant to the Mining Laws. If the proposed motorized use is likely to cause significant disturbance of surface resources, the operator will be required to file a Plan of Operations with the District Ranger.

Economic Analysis

Some individuals and user groups disagreed with the comparisons to the Gallatin economic study, and stated the need for additional economic analysis. I reviewed and considered other economic studies and took into account public comments, and believe I had enough information to make a reasoned decision on the potential economic impacts of this travel management decision.

The FEIS clearly discloses the rationale for citing the Gallatin economic study. Given the scale and diversity of the total economy in the counties, the fact that a variety of recreational uses are maintained under all alternatives and that economic effects related to travel on NFS lands are more driven by national trends than by the supply of recreation areas, reliance on this study as an indicator of the economic relationship of travel management on the PNF was appropriate.

Under this decision, changes in use opportunities vary little from existing condition and do not represent an elimination or massive reduction of any one particular recreational use.

This decision maintains a variety of recreational uses and as such is not expected to have a measurable effect on local businesses reliant on recreational users and uses on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.

The addition of several new ATV routes and associated loop opportunities provides an opportunity for local counties and businesses to capitalize on this newly expanded form of recreational opportunity.

In summary, when compared with the force of national trends, regional and local demographics and larger economic factors influencing the economies of Adams, Valley and Idaho Counties, the relatively small changes in different recreational travel designations on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts are unlikely to have measurable economic impacts.

Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)

My decision to implement the Selected Alternative would not result in any changes to ROS classes/summer on the Council or New Meadows Ranger Districts (Table 1). See Appendix D for District ROS maps.

Table 1. Council and New Meadows Ranger District ROS Acreage

ROS	Alternative A – Current Condition	Alternative E - Modified
Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM)	138,800	138,800
Semi-Primitive Motorized (SPM)	44,000	44,000
Roaded Natural (RN)	97,660	97,660
Roaded Motorized (RM)	312,020	312,020
Total acres	592,480	592,480

Other Alternatives Considered

In addition to the Selected Alternative, I considered five other alternatives (FEIS page 2-2 thru 2-75) including four that were analyzed in detail. Those four are listed below. One alternative considered was dismissed from detailed consideration (FEIS page 2-2 (2.2)).

Alternative A – No Action

This alternative is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and serves as a baseline for analyzing effects. The No Action Alternative represents “no immediate change” from current summer travel management. As the FEIS discloses, this alternative would have the greatest environmental impacts and would be inconsistent with national direction related to travel management, because it continues to allow for large areas to be open to indiscriminant motorized cross-country travel. In addition, the No Action Alternative would not address unmanaged recreation, one of the past four main threats

identified by the agency. Continuing current travel management would make achievement of many important Forest Plan standards related to watershed, fisheries and wildlife difficult to achieve.

Alternative B – Proposed Action

This alternative was proposed by the Forest Service to meet the purpose and need for a revised Travel Management Plan and to address important significant issues related to travel management. It responds to direction to limit cross-country motor vehicle use, protect Forest resources, minimize maintenance costs, and reduce conflicts between uses. Alternative B served as a starting point to address the stated purpose and need and was the catalyst for public input that led to the development of additional alternatives.

Alternative C – Additional Motorized Opportunities

Alternative C responds to issues raised by user groups to whom summer motorized access is important. This alternative would maintain opportunities for motorized uses in summer by retaining most of the current motorized trails, and adding ATV and OHV trails. This alternative would meet national direction to limit cross-country motor vehicle travel, but does less to minimize maintenance costs and protect Forest resources than Alternative B, D, or E.

Alternative D – Additional Non-motorized Opportunities

Alternative D responds to issues raised by non-motorized user groups relating to a need for more non-motorized opportunities. It also addresses associated concerns with noise and safety related to motorized and non-motorized uses in the same area. This alternative would create more opportunities for summer non-motorized uses. It also responds to direction to limit cross-country motor vehicle use, protect Forest resources, minimize maintenance costs, and reduce conflicts between uses.

Compliance with Environmental Laws and Regulations

Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended

The purpose of the Clean Air Act is to protect and enhance the quality of the nation's air resources. This is addressed under Issues Not Analyzed in Detail (FEIS Section 1.10.2 on page 1-17). The Travel Management Plan is not expected to have discernible effects on air quality and therefore I have determined that my decision is consistent with the Clean Air Act.

Clean Water Act of 1977, as amended

The objective of this Act is to restore and maintain the integrity of the nation's waters. This objective translates into two fundamental goals: (1) eliminate the discharge of pollutants into the nation's waters; and (2) achieve water quality levels that are fishable and swimmable. This act establishes a non-degradation policy for all federally proposed projects. The non-degradation goals would be accomplished through implementation and monitoring of Best Management Practices (BMPs) as described in Appendix C of the FEIS. The Clean Water Act is also addressed through Table 2-27 Management Requirements, Section 2.3.2 Project Design Features and in the Soil and Water (Section 3.4) effects

discussions in the FEIS. Based on my review of the FEIS including required project design features, BMPs and water related effects analysis, I have determined that my decision is compliant with the Clean Water Act.

Compliance with American Indian Treaty Provisions

The Forest Service is acting as a representative of the United States with regard to treaty rights reserved by the Nez Perce Tribe, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. The Forest Service is required to preserve the rights reserved by the Tribes, and the agency is not attempting to balance this proposal against the rights the Tribes have reserved unto themselves. The Forest understands and respects the trust responsibility to the Tribes to manage lands in a manner that protects and preserves Indian trust assets and treaty resources. This travel management decision will not conflict with American Indian treaty provisions or federal trust responsibilities, and will preserve the rights of the Tribes.

Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended

The purpose of this act is to provide for the conservation of endangered fish, wildlife, and plants, as well as their habitats. Biological Assessments and/or Evaluations were prepared to document possible effects of Selected Alternative for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts on endangered and threatened species. Consultation with the NMFS has been completed. The NMFS BO identifies terms and conditions. Recommended conservation measures are summarized in the earlier section of this decision entitled **“Snow-Free travel Management Modifications, Compliance with ESA Modifications”**. Consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is in progress. Through this process, the Forest Service has received a draft BO and informal agreement on the following determinations.

My Selected Alternative received a determination of *“May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect”* (LAA) for three fishes listed as “Threatened” that occur in the project area. These species are Snake River spring, summer and fall Chinook salmon (*Orcorhynchus tshawytscha*, 57 FR 14653), Snake River steelhead (*O. mykiss*, 62 FR 43937), and Columbia River bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*, 63 FR 31647). No designated critical habitat for bull trout occurs in the project area (69 FR 59996), however designated critical habitat for Chinook (58 FR 68543) and steelhead (70 FR 52629) occurs in the project area, for which the determination was also LAA.

The Canada lynx, northern Idaho ground squirrel, and gray wolf are the listed wildlife species that occur in the project area encompassed by the Council and New Meadows Ranger District’s travel plan action. In Idaho, populations of gray wolf south of Interstate 90 are currently considered experimental/non-essential (USDI FWS 1004), hence these populations are evaluated similar to a proposed species. Through the Biological Evaluation (BE), we made the determination the travel plan action *“May Affect, but would not jeopardize the continued existence of the gray wolf.”* Through the Biological Assessment (BA), we made a determination of *“May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect”* (NLAA) for the Canada lynx. The BA made a determination of *“May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect”* (LAA) for the northern Idaho ground squirrel.

The project botanist concluded that the action would have no effect on threatened, endangered, proposed or candidate plant species. No populations or habitat of any threatened, endangered, proposed or candidate plants are currently known to occur on the Council or New Meadows Ranger Districts.

At the time of signing this ROD, formal consultation has not been completed with the FWS, although a draft biological opinion (BO) has been received (January 8, 2009). The draft BO identifies terms and conditions and recommended conservation measures. In an email dated March 29th, 2007, FWS agreed with the determinations, noting they believed the Forest Service action would not reach a jeopardy threshold for listed species. This preliminary concurrence from FWS is repeated in the draft BO.

During the consultation process and through the draft BO, we have been apprised of the terms and conditions that will be levied by FWS as summarized in the section “Snow-Free Travel Plan modifications” of this document. Because we are so far along in the consultation process, which is well documented in meeting notes and emails among Level 1 Team members, I am confident that this decision is in compliance with Section 7(d) of ESA and will not make irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources that would foreclose development of additional reasonable and prudent alternative measures to protect ESA-listed species by the regulatory agencies.

Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974

This act provides for the control and management of non-indigenous weeds that injure or have the potential to injure the interests of agriculture and commerce, wildlife resources, or the public health. The FEIS addresses noxious weeds and provides for management requirements and project design features aimed at reducing levels of noxious weeds across the Forest consistent with this act (FEIS pp. 1-14, 2-7, 2-51).

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended and Executive Order 13186

The purpose of this act is to establish an international framework for the protection and conservation of migratory birds. Executive Order 13186 directs executive departments and agencies to take certain actions to further implement the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Federal agencies that undertake actions that may affect migratory birds must develop and implement a Memorandum of Understanding with the USFWS that would promote the conservation of migratory birds. Federal agencies must also “ensure that environmental analysis of federal actions required by NEPA ...evaluate the effects of actions and agency plans on migratory birds, with emphasis on species of concern.” Migratory Birds are addressed in the FEIS and an effects determination was made that migratory bird habitat would not be measurably impacted and no significant effects are anticipated from this action (FEIS pp. 3-189 to 190; 3-236 to 237).

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended

The NEPA establishes the format and content requirements of environmental analysis and documentation. The process of preparing this environmental analysis was undertaken to comply with NEPA and its implementing regulations. Information on the process of preparing this analysis can be found within this document and the Project Record. This

ROD and the Payette National Forest Travel Management Plan FEIS comply with NEPA and its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508).

National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA)

This act guides development and revision of National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans. The NFMA also has several specific provisions including maintenance of biodiversity. Project and activity decisions need to be consistent with a number of provisions of NFMA. The Payette Forest Plan was developed to implement NFMA. All action alternatives in this project's EIS were developed to meet the Payette Forest Plan and comply with NFMA (FEIS p. 1-20).

Environmental Justice (E.O.12898)

As required by Executive Order, all Federal actions will consider potentially disproportionate effects on minority or low-income communities. Potential impacts or changes to low-income or minority communities within the project area due to the proposed action must be considered. Where possible, measures should be taken to avoid negative impacts to these communities or mitigate adverse affects. This decision is not anticipated to disproportionately impact minority or low income communities who use the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts (FEIS p. 1-22).

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as Amended (NHPA)

This Act requires federal agencies to consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and American Indian Tribes when nonrenewable cultural resources, such as archaeological sites and historic structures, may be affected by a federal action. Section 106 of this Act requires federal agencies to review the effects project proposals may have on cultural resources in the project area. The Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer has been consulted concerning proposed activities in the project area. Four Section 106 reports were prepared and sent to the SHPO on new roads and/or trails that would be added to the designated open to motorized use system on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts. All the reports had a "no effect to historic properties" for all proposed new routes. Cultural Resource surveys completed by the Forest Archeologist along the proposed ATV trails along the Council Ranger District and Emmett Ranger District on the Boise National Forest boundary concluded that there were numerous historical properties and as a result of the determinations, the ATV trail route proposals were withdrawn from consideration as motorized routes. Since they were withdrawn, no determinations were prepared.

In a letter dated February 2008, SHPO suggested the Forest implement a monitoring plan to assess the 300 foot dispersed camping corridor for impacts to cultural resources. The Forest archeologist has already prepared a monitoring plan for the Weiser Ranger District, and continues to work on monitoring plans for McCall, Krassel, New Meadows and Council Ranger Districts. As new routes are proposed, new cultural resource surveys will be completed. These surveys are required in honoring the intent of the National Historic Preservation Act and as part of the project design features before any authorization use changes can occur on the ground. Additional information can be found in the FEIS (1-19, 1-20 and 1-22).

Roadless Area Conservation Final Rule

In October 2008, the U.S. Department of Agriculture adopted a state-specific, final rule establishing management direction for designed Roadless Areas in the State of Idaho (36 CFR Part 294). The final rule designates 250 Idaho Roadless Areas (IRAs) and established five management themes that provide prohibitions with exceptions or conditioned permissions governing road construction, timber cutting, and discretionary mineral development. Five Roadless IRAs exist in whole or part on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts and were analyzed as a part of the FEIS for this travel plan (FEIS pages 3-67 thru 3-75). These Roadless Areas include both motorized and non-motorized road and trail opportunities carried over from previously approved PNF travel management plans. No new motorized road or trail opportunities were designated in this decision within these Roadless Areas. Site specific information on existing roads and trails is contained within this decision.

Subpart 294.26, Other Activities in Idaho Roadless Areas, (a) *Motorized travel* states: “Nothing in this subpart shall be construed as affecting existing roads or trails in Idaho Roadless Areas. Decisions concerning the future management of existing roads or trails in Idaho Roadless Areas shall be made during the applicable travel management process.”

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Regulations implementing the NEPA require agencies to specify the alternative(s) considered to be environmentally preferable (40 CFR 1505.2(b)). Forest Service policy further defines this as the Alternative that best meets the goals of Section 101 of NEPA. In determining the environmentally preferred alternative, I referred to the goals of Section 101 and determined that Alternative D is the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. Alternative D is considered the environmentally preferred alternative since it will cause “the least damage to the biological and physical environment”. However, the Selected Alternative, over the long-term, will “attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment while minimizing risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences”. The Selected Alternative provides a mix of recreation opportunities and settings; while moving forest resource conditions towards the desired future conditions identified in the plan. The emphasis of the Selected Alternative is to maintain many of the existing recreation opportunities that exist today, while decreasing site-specific travel impacts to forest resources.

Alternative D would result in the greatest improvement to overall riparian conditions and salmonid fish habitat, but would not provide the desired motorized access for recreational users. Improvements to resource conditions are expected to occur under the Selected Alternative, but at a slower rate than Alternative D.

The goals of Section 101 of NEPA require consideration of, among other things, a “variety of individual choice” and “balance between populations and resource use.” Given those parameters, the Selected Alternative maintains forest resources while providing for a variety of recreational choices, both now and into the future.

Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts

The Selected Alternative likely will produce adverse effects on some components of the environment that cannot be avoided or mitigated. Actions that benefit one component can have at least temporary adverse effects on another. The Selected Alternative includes management requirements and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce adverse environmental effects. Monitoring and evaluation was incorporated to measure how effective the management requirements and mitigation measures are in reducing adverse environmental impacts.

Monitoring and Mitigation

My decision incorporated monitoring plans as described in the FEIS. Monitoring plans are listed in the FEIS – Appendix E, pages E-1 through E-10. Monitoring is also discussed in the FEIS on pages 2-8.

In addition, my decision incorporates mitigation measures and project design features aimed at avoiding or reducing environmental impacts associated with implementation of travel management designations.

These project design features are listed in the FEIS on pages 2-6 and 2-7 and will be implemented before new road or trails are designated for motorized use as described in the FEIS.

Implementation

Implementation includes the publishing of the official Council and New Meadows Ranger District MVUM. As stated at the beginning of my decision, the MVUMs for all five Ranger Districts, which officially implement my decision, will be issued after the appeal period of this last decision.

The final rule places a responsibility on users to get MVUMs from Forest Service offices or websites and to remain on routes and in areas designated for motor vehicle use. Travel routes will be “closed unless designated open” to motorized use as shown on the MVUM. These maps will be available at all District offices, and also on the Forest web page. They will be free of charge and meet Forest Service-wide MVUM standards. Although new travel restrictions were designed to be less complex and easier to define on the ground, any change will require a period of adjustment for Forest visitors. During the first field season after this decision, Forest staff will emphasize travel plan education with forest users. It is reasonable to assume there will be increased potential for violations during the initial stages of implementation. During the first field season, Forest staff will strive for travel plan education; however, Forest travelers will be cited if they are causing resource damage.

Enforcement of new travel restrictions will require additional emphasis by the PNF, with assistance from other public agencies and the public. Implementation of the Travel Plan will take several seasons of concentrated education efforts with the public via on-the-ground discussions, posting of travel information at high use trailheads and campgrounds,

articles in the local newspapers, dispersing of MVUMs, and continued signing of the designated system of roads and trails on the ground. Many of the trails lack adequate signing, and one of the keys to successful implementation and enforcement is a well signed system of roads and trails. Signing will indicate the allowed types of vehicle travel, although the MVUM is the enforcement tool for travel management, whether there are signs or not. The MVUM produced for each Ranger District will also display the vehicle class and time of year designation on the motorized trails and roads. A different map for winter motorized travel will be published under a separate decision at a later date.

Dispersed camping along open roads and motorized trails in the Forest will be closely monitored to identify the impacts of motor vehicle use. Those campsites that do not have an acceptable access route will be analyzed under appropriate NEPA in the future, and potentially closed and restored as appropriate based on resource concerns. The Districts will prioritize the removal of dispersed campsites and installation of physical barriers to eliminate crossing live streams and where motor vehicle use is resulting in damage to vegetation, wet meadows, riparian areas or other sensitive resource concerns.

Signs will be purchased and installed along roads where dispersed motorized camping is allowed only in designated areas. Additionally, Forest Service patrols will be used to enforce the new camping restrictions. This additional cost will need to be added to the annual recreation budget.

I want to emphasize implementation of my decision will require not only education of users but also enforcement of restrictions. The public has correctly pointed out in their comment letters, that not all of our closures have been effective and that our maps and regulatory signing is in need of improvement. The Forest will annually print new MVUMs if needed because of new project decisions. Districts will continue the process of signing, maintaining and installing gates to implement seasonal closures and begin to organize volunteers to embark on a program of public information. The Forest is committed to work with local motorized trail clubs, environmental groups, and other interested organizations to form volunteer patrols to assist with signing and public awareness campaigns regarding the new travel regulations.

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

Administrative Appeal

My decision is subject to appeal pursuant to Forest Service regulations at 36 CFR 215. Appeals must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14. Any notice of appeal must be fully consistent with 36 CFR 215.14 and include at a minimum:

- A statement that the document is a Notice of Appeal filed pursuant to 36 CFR Part 215.
- The name, address, and telephone number of the appellant.
- Identification of the decision to which the objection is being made.

-
- Identification of the document in which the decision is contained, by title and subject, date of the decision, and name and title of the Deciding Officer.
 - Identification of the specific portion of the decision to which objection is made.
 - The reasons for appeal, including issues of fact, law, regulation, or policy and, if applicable, specifically how the decision violates law, regulation, or policy.
 - Identification of the specific changes(s) in the decision that the appellant seeks.

Only individuals or organization that submitted comments or otherwise expressed interest in the project during the comment periods may appeal. Appeals must be postmarked or received by the Appeal Deciding Officer within 45 days of the publication of the legal notice of decision in the *Idaho Statesman* newspaper. This date is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Timeframe information from other sources should not be relied upon. Incorporation of documents by reference in an appeal is not allowed.

Appeals must be sent to the Appeal Deciding Officer, Harv Forsgren, Regional Forester of the Intermountain Region. Appeals can be mailed, faxed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:

Regional Forester of the Intermountain Region
USDA-Forest Service
324 25th Street
Ogden, UT 84401
Fax: 801-625-5277
E-mail: appeals-intermtn-regional-office@fs.fed.us

E-mailed appeals must be submitted in rich text (rtf), Word (doc) or portable document format (pdf) and must include the project name in the subject line. Appeals that are hand delivered can be made to the address above during the regular business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Contacts

More information on the FEIS and the ROD for the Council and New Meadows Travel Management Plan for Snow-free travel can be obtained by contacting one of the following people:

Jane Cropp
Travel Plan Revision Team Leader
800 W. Lakeside Ave.
McCall, ID 83638
Telephone: (208) 634-0757
E-mail: jcropp@fs.fed.us

Or

Laura Pramuk
Public Affairs Officer
800 W. Lakeside Ave.
McCall, ID 83638
Telephone: (208) 634-0784

For the past four years, Payette National Forest personnel have worked with Tribal staff, cooperators, other agency personnel, and members of the public to complete the Draft and Final EIS for the Payette National Forest Travel Plan. With this Record of Decision for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, the public can see the result of this work. I look forward to moving on with implementation of the Travel Plan in cooperation and collaboration with all who use and enjoy the Payette National Forest.

Suzanne C. Rainville

SUZANNE C. RAINVILLE

Forest Supervisor

Payette National Forest

2/5/09

Date

Appendix A – Errata Information - Errors identified in body of FEIS document specific to the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts Snow-free season:

1. Trail 213 (MA 3) is an ATV trail from where it leaves road 50165 to the ridge top at approximately 2.5 miles, where it then becomes a two-wheel motorized trail. The ATV portion of this trail was not displayed correctly in the FEIS map. (Council RD).

Appendix B – Summary of Public Comments and Agency Response

This document summarizes comments and associated responses to specific snow-free season comments received on Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts, and relevant general comments. Comments specific to the McCall, Krassel and Weiser Ranger District Records of Decision are available in those specific decision documents.

Comments on Specific Proposals

Proposal ID 2-3

1. MA2 proposal 2-3, and the portions of trail 226 should be a motorized ATV trail either in whole or part. The lower portion of trail 226 is an ATV trail currently, it follows a number of old roads and a gentle ridge.

Agency Response: A portion of trail #226 is currently two-wheel motorized, it is not designated for ATV use. The area around Smith Mountain is a high alpine environment, characterized by steep rocky slopes and limited vegetation due to a short growing season. Several of the user created non-system ATV trails in the area are causing erosion and creating gully's that are difficult to rehabilitate. The Forest would not want to promote ATV use in this fragile high alpine environment.

Proposal 3-2

2. The Forest Service should seek funds to provide future motorized trail opportunities on Trails 214, 201-213, 249, 330, 237, 247, 248.

Agency Response: The Forest does and will continue to look for all types of funding opportunities on trails, both motorized and non-motorized, that are designated with this travel plan decision.

3. This proposal (trail#214) should be combined with trails #213 and #201 to provide an ATV loop trail. What is the rationale for designating as a two-wheel motorized instead of ATV?

Agency Response: Trail 213 is an ATV trail to a ridge top but then becomes a two-wheel motorized trail and was considered for full ATV development along the two-wheel portion of the trail, but dropped from the analysis due to the extensive site-specific work needed to turn this section of trail into a trail able to accommodate ATVs. Trail 201 is a two-wheel motorized trail, not an ATV trail. Most two-wheel motorized trails were not designed to accommodate ATVs and trail widening would be needed prior to any ATV designation. It would be physically difficult to reconstruct this trail and widen it for ATV use because of the steep and rocky terrain on both sides of the majority of this trail. It may be considered at a later date. Trail 214, a short connector trail was not designated as an alternate trail is open just to the south of this connector route.

Proposal 3-30, 3-37, 3-39

Why are these proposals being re-circulated if a NEPA decision already exists, is there a need for reassessment?

Agency Response: There had to be compelling reason to recommend a change to a road or trail that had a recent environmental analysis completed on its use. For the most part, recent decisions were not brought forward into full alternative development.

Proposal 3-12 and 3-13

4. *Opposed to proposed removal of proposals 3-12 and 3-13 as motorized ATV/UTV trails.*

Agency Response: These proposals are included as ATV in alternatives B and C, but were removed from Alternative E due to their location and impacts on bull trout spawning areas in the headwaters of the Little Weiser River. Proposal 3-11 is designated as an ATV trail in the Selected Alternative and will allow for a ride to a ridge top view. Another nearby trail is being reviewed in 2009 to provide a loop opportunity that would not impact bull trout spawning habitat.

Proposal 3-42

5. *Proposal 3-42 states road #51121 provides access to Lick Creek Lookout. This road does not provide access to the lookout, there is a trail that goes to the lookout. There are many other map errors.*

Agency Response: You are correct, Road 51121 is currently a closed road, that used to also be an ATV trail 358. The selected alternative designates this as an open non-motorized route only. Alternative C proposed reopening this old ATV trail, and that is why the proposal shows up in form 3-42.

Proposal ID 3-49, 3-50, 3-51, 3-53, 3-54, 3-55, 3-56, and 3-57

6. *The Forest Service should protect sensitive meadows and big game habitat instead of promoting a new proposed ATV trail from Mill Creek Summit to Greenfield and Willson Flats (proposal 3-56 and north) This plan would reduce opportunities and lessen the quality of experiences for hikers, mountain bikers, and horseback riders.*

Agency Response: The Selected Alternative designates these routes as non-motorized because of cultural resource concerns.

7. *South of Rock Lake, SE corner of section 36, T14N, R2E where Adams, Valley and Gem Counties meet is a two-track road. We propose it remain open to at least ATV use so we can continue to visit an area for personal reasons, and These proposals follow the ancient Shoshone Trail and cultural sites along this trail should be protected from the impacts of ATV's and motorized recreation, and this ridgeline trail opens the door for prohibited motor vehicle use on public lands and damage to natural resources.*

Agency Response: Formal authorization of these proposals as motorized ATV routes would be subject to application of project design features to protect and mitigate impacts to archaeological sites and natural resources in the area. The forest will continue to work with the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes on any activities associated with these trail proposals. The Forest Supervisor has decided to defer any designations on these proposals until additional site-specific analysis in conjunction with the Tribes and adjoining Boise NF can occur. These areas will maintain non-motorized designations.

Proposal ID 3-58

8. *This proposal is shown as an ATV trail in Alternative E, but can only be accessed from two-wheel or non-motorized trail segments. How do ATV's access this trail?*

Agency Response: This trail #352 goes to the overlook at Rush Peak and can be accessed from road 51155 – the Buck Park road.

Proposal 4-4

9. *The Forest Service should consider closing trails 162 (Teepee Springs), 344 (Hard Butte), 191 (Rankin Mill), and 153 (Patrick Butte) to motorized use due to impacts to wildlife in the Rapid River area.*

Agency Response: The FEIS did consider designating trails #344, #153, and #162 non-motorized in Alternatives B and D. Some of these trails follow ridgelines which are important landscape features used by wildlife as travel corridors. Motorized routes on ridgelines reduce the effectiveness of the ridgelines as travel ways. Motorized recreation can disturb elk by discouraging use of an area, by lowering reproductive success, and by causing loss and fragmentation of habitat. These trails do provide access to the Main Salmon River. Adams County's cooperating agency representative would like to see continued two-wheel motorized use on these trails, and ATV use to Jack's Creek. The Selected Alternative does maintain trail #191 as an ATV trail to Paradise Flats (at the 3.5 mile point), but there is now a seasonal closure to all motorized use from September 1 – November 30th for hunting season. Also, a portion of trail #344 was designated non-motorized from Rainbow Lake to Black Lake (0.8 miles). Trail #162 and Trail #153 remain two-wheel motorized.

10. *Prohibited ATV use on trail 191 impacts big game and fisheries in the Rapid River area. Enforcement of a motorized designation will continue to be a problem. Trail should be designated as non-motorized to enhance big game security and stop illegal motorized use and resource damage in the area. At a minimum, seasonal motorized closures should be extended to cover the archery and rifle hunting seasons.*

Agency Response: The Selected Alternative does designate trail #191 as non-motorized from September 1 – November 30 annually to best manage use on trail during hunting season.

Proposal 6-6, 6-7

11. *This trail should be hardened to Duck Lake so a nice alpine lake is made more accessible to a variety of users.*

Agency Response: Because of high construction costs, hardening the surface was not considered with this decision. ATVs have been accessing this lake and causing riparian vegetation damage. The access to the lake remains non-motorized in Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Goose Lake, Granite Lake, Upper Payette Lake and Hazard Lake, nearby alpine lakes, are just some of the nearby lakes that provide for this opportunity, all accessible by car. Rainbow Lake, an alpine lake, is accessible by ATV.

Comments on Trails or Roads not Included as Proposals

12. There are several roads in the 2004 PNF "Backroads" guide to motorized roads and trails that do not appear anywhere in the Travel Plan, where are they? They are Road #197 located south of No Business Lookout. Road #240 located south of No Business Lookout. Road #984 northeast of Bear. Road #026 on the east side of Mann Creek. Road #181 on Dry Beaver Creek west of Red Point. If these roads need to be closed, they should be listed in the Travel Management Plan.

Agency Response: At the beginning of this travel management process in 2002 the ID team researched recent decisions made within the previous 5 year period. The decisions made to close roads for whatever reason (mitigation, resource protection, elk security) were not revisited during the travel planning process, and were not analyzed for opening because they could potentially affect the outcome of the decisions already made. Roads #50026, 50181, #50984, #50197 and #50240 were closed under recent previous decisions.

13. Re-open trail #190 Copper Cr. To Trail #186 Paradise Creek to two-wheel machines for increased trail riding opportunities, and re-open trails 181, 327, 357 (Boulder Creek roads and end at Lockwood Point) to motorized use, and re-open trail 198 to motorized use, and re-open and designate the southern portion of trail 352 (MA 2 or 3?) to two-wheeled motorized access.

Agency Response: These trails remain designated for non-motorized use because we wanted to continue to provide a non-motorized opportunity to recreational users in this area that has historically been non-motorized. This decision strived to provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized opportunities across the Forest, and this area was identified as a long-standing non-motorized area. Recreationists using stock are the predominant users along these trails. In addition, it would be difficult to redesign these existing trails to accommodate two-wheel motorized use as they are located in steep terrain.

14. The Middle Fork Weiser River Watershed Analysis FEIS was not implemented as it related to the timber harvest, yet it appears that the roads that were posed for closure, following harvest, but not under the no-action alternative, are not shown as available to the public in the Travel Plan FEIS. Was that accounted for when determining roads open to the public in that area and other older analysis areas?

Agency Response: The Middle Fork Weiser River WA FEIS has not been withdrawn, therefore, it fell into the category listed in response #12 above. If at some future date the

decision is withdrawn, the district can re-look at opening these roads back up to recreational motorized travel. See response to #12 above.

15. The following trails in Management Area 9 should be closed to motorized use: 142, 504, 500.

Agency Response: No resource concerns were brought up from travel plan team members or the public that drove the change in designation of these trails from motorized to non-motorized in the scoping or DEIS process.

16. Trail 164 to Hard Creek Meadows should be closed to ATV's and open only to motorcycles. ATV's are causing damage to Hard Creek and creating new trails.

Agency Response: Trail 549 is an ATV trail that leads users into Bascom Canyon. Upon entering the canyon the motorized trail ends, and non-motorized trail #164 begins. ATVs have gone beyond the ATV trail in the past and there has been some damage to the meadows. The New Meadows Ranger District recreation crews installed signs in the past year marking the point at which the area becomes non-motorized. On the ground monitoring has shown that these signs have helped to curtail the prohibited ATV use in the non-motorized areas.

General Comments on FEIS

17. ATV loops and trails proposed by Adams County were ignored.

Agency Response: The majority of the ATV loops proposed by Adams County are available for ATV use in Alternative E. They are a part of the motorized designated road system, available for use by licensed and registered ATV and two-wheel motorized users, as provided for in Idaho State law. The remaining trails proposed for ATV designation by Adams County were either analyzed in Alternative C, or in some cases dropped due to resource concerns in the specific area, or the need for large scale on the ground construction – that would need future site specific project analysis. The County is encouraged by the Forest, to work with a private partner, to publish a map that would highlight these ATV opportunities and rides.

18. New Meadows RD; north of Lost Valley Reservoir at the end and south of Rd # 50146 (Butter Gulch area) the entire road system does not show up on the maps. These roads are open seasonal, Road #51442 runs parallel to the West Fork of the Weiser River Road below the mouth of Lost Creek This road could have been closed and another road opened with more benefit to the public, Fourth of July Rd #50135. The FIES maps show this road closed seasonal to the intersection with the West Fork of the Weiser River road. This road is open year round up the intersection in section 1; the bend of Boulder RD #50662 past the gate does not show on the map. This road is a seasonal closure.

Agency Response: Work on vegetation and other resource projects have continued to occur during the three year travel plan time period. Road use has been modified continuously through this process. The MVUM will show the most up to date information available at that time to display open to motorized use designated routes.

19. To close a trail to one user group, because of lack of use, seems like an oxymoron in terms of management. Does this mean only moderate use is acceptable? What happens if there is too much use, does that warrant a closure as well?

Agency Response: Not designating some trails for two-wheel motorized use was not determined solely by amount of use the trail received. It was based primarily on resource issues and trail design features. Lack of use was however used to describe the affects to certain user groups if they were to loose their opportunities on a trail; to describe the scope of the effect to the specific user group in numbers of users potentially affected.

20. Low volume use on non-motorized trails should go through an on-the-ground investigation to determine if they are suitable to convert to motorized trails.

Agency Response: Non-motorized trails providing a quiet, low volume of use provide a desired experience for many non-motorized users, and the Forest did not want to propose across-the board conversion of these types of trails to potential two-wheel motorized use. The Forest did propose some trail designations that differed from current condition, and in those cases did do an analysis to determine the affect of the change in designation (trail conversion from either non-motorized use to motorized use, or motorized use to non-motorized use). Low volume use on non-motorized trails was not used as an indicator to trigger a conversion to motorized use. Future on the ground investigations of individual trails are likely to occur as part of future specific trail projects.

21. I request the Forest Service do a scientific study to convert all two-wheel motorized trails to ATV trails.

Agency Response: This large-scale conversion of two-wheel motorized trails to ATV use was not a part of the project purpose and need and is outside the scope of this project. Conversion of all two-wheel trails to ATV trails would not maintain two-wheel motorized opportunities including a single track trail experience identified as an important opportunity to two-wheel motorized user groups. Two-wheel motorized trails offer a unique experience to those riders. To convert single track trails designed for two-wheel motorized to larger, wider ATV width would take a large-scale on the ground site specific study, and also, large amounts of trail reconstruction. Major site-specific analyses of over 500 miles of trails would be required for the whole scale conversion to ATV trails. Several individual two-wheel motorized trails were analyzed for conversion to ATV trails, and are shown as ATV trails in Alternative E.

Federal Road and Trail Act (FRTA)

22. There are 360 miles of roads that have recently been transferred to Valley County by FRTA easements. Indicate those roads on the Travel Plan maps, and the FEIS fails to

address roads within the forest that are not under USFS jurisdiction including historic rights of way and rights of ways with a FRTA easement.

Agency Response: The MVUM will adhere to agency-wide mapping standards which include designating only roads and trails that will be open to motorized travel on National Forest System lands. Roads under non-Federal jurisdiction have no assigned designated use. The Motor Vehicle Use map cannot designate roads or trails that are not within our Forest Service jurisdiction. These roads and trails will be marked in gray on the map to show connections, but will not be designated with type of use allowed, nor who owns or has jurisdiction of those roads.

All Terrain Vehicles (ATV's)

23. There has been no greater degeneration of public lands in the last 15 years than the out of control growth of motorized recreation abuse, especially ATVs. This document does not seriously address this problem on a per trail basis, instead it only insures that the destruction continues and becomes more widespread.

Agency Response: With the selection of the Selected Alternative the Forest will implement the elimination of motorized cross-country travel Forest-wide, which will improve the condition of those areas currently open to motorized cross-country travel. The elimination of motorized cross-country travel by ATV's and other motorized vehicles is a major improvement over the current condition (Alternative A). The Forest team did look at the existing trail network, and put forward in different alternatives, changes to current motorized trail designations where resource problems were severe and irreparable with future maintenance, or where opportunities existed to reduce use conflicts.

24. In my time in the wilderness I have met very few responsible ATV travelers. This holds less true for the bikers. There are no regulations, no fines, no teaching of respect for the lands. This is very troublesome.

Agency Response: The Payette National Forest backcountry offers both motorized and non-motorized trails to give the public a choice on their recreation trail experience. The true "Wilderness" trails are restricted to non-motorized and non-mechanized travel. The national "Tread Lightly" campaign has been successful nation-wide in getting the message out to motorized users to pursue proper trail etiquette, with the least impacts to the land. The Forest will continue to work with the motorized community and the non-motorized community to teach respect for the land through education via signing and on-the-ground ranger patrols.

25. ATV's are loud, noisy, and pollute the environment - - to say nothing of frightening the wildlife. They also can negatively impact habitat for fish and wildlife. Please leave the roads designated as non-motorized as they are so that those of us who want to enjoy nature - naturally (i.e., hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, even mountain bikes) - - can do so.

Agency Response: The Forest has tried to provide recreational opportunities for multiple uses, both motorized and non-motorized.

26. This plan would reduce opportunities and lessen the quality of experiences for hikers, mountain bikers, and horseback riders since ATVs are extremely loud and their use would affect habitat for fish and wildlife.

Agency Response: This plan actually increases opportunities for non-motorized users by eliminating previous (authorized in the old – C, D and E areas as identified in the 1995 PNF visitor map) motorized cross-country travel off trail areas, and restricts users of motorized vehicles to remain on the designated motorized route system.

27. To deny use of a closed or unauthorized road for an ATV route until the road is narrowed and reclaimed, and meets design features, seems to be an unreasonable overkill, because funding to accomplish it may be delayed for a long time.

Agency Response: Many existing system roads and trails were able to be designated “as is”, but new roads or trails (which include any unauthorized routes or previously closed roads) need to meet design standards prior to designations. These design features were put in place to assure the Forest would not be condoning use on trails with unacceptable resource impacts. Since the Forest did not design many of these routes to address resource issues, safety issues, or hazard to stock because of trail clearance, they will not be formally designated as open to motorized use until design features can be met. With the help of the many volunteers and partners that offered their trails maintenance services and trail construction funding, the District should be able to designate many of the routes in the near future. If partnerships and volunteer support are not there, it will take longer using only allocated funds.

28. You have not adequately defined OHVs. There is a new class of OHV that is larger than an ATV and seats two passengers.

Agency Response: The MVUM will not display trails by “OHV”, “UTV” or “ATV”, but restricts designations to:

1. Roads Open to Highway Legal Vehicles Only
2. Roads Open to All Vehicles
3. Trails Open to Vehicles 50” of Less in Width (This is where ATV trails fit in)
4. Trails Open to All Vehicles (This is where OHV and UTVs fit in)
5. Trails open to motorcycles only.

Non-motorized trails will not appear on the MVUM, but are displayed on the ROD map included with this decision. Designation on the MVUM will be made by class of vehicle and, where appropriate, by time of year (Seasonal roads and trails).

29. The current travel plan addresses ATV's but it is unclear whether utility vehicles are included in this designation.

Agency Response: Utility vehicles (UTV) are not allowed on the ATV trail system because of their width (Trails designated for vehicles 50 inches or less), because the trails were not designed to accommodate their wider frames, but UTVs may use the OHV trails (7.4 miles included for designation in Alternative E) and as State of Idaho law allows, they can use the public road system. The MVUM will display the roads and/or trails the UTVs can use.

Cross-country motorized travel

30. *As the FEIS is currently written, the public is not being informed about the loss of access associated with closing all non-system roads.*

Agency Response: The FEIS mentions in several key places within the document that unauthorized roads not identified to remain open with one of the alternatives would be closed. See pages S-10 (roads definition), page 1-4 Proposed Action, and most definitively on page 1-11, Access Opportunities where it states: "Allowance of indiscriminant access to unauthorized (also known as user-created, unclassified, or non-system) roads, trails, and/or areas would not meet the purpose and need for the project or Forest Plan and national direction. In many cases, these routes were developed without agency authorization, environmental analysis, or public involvement, hence they do not have the same status as NFS roads and trails included in the PNF Travel Management Plan. Through the public involvement process, the Forest Service was made aware of specific unauthorized routes that members of the public proposed be added to the Travel Plan system. All of these proposals were reviewed and several of the routes were placed into Alternative C, and the selected Alternative E - modified."

Cumulative Effects

31. *You must address the cumulative effects of the damages the counties have suffered from the Federal Governments failure under the 25% Act of 1908 and PILT.*

Agency Response: This request is outside the scope of this project analysis.

32. *The effects of previous road and trail closures must be incorporated into the analysis and a connection between the facts on the ground and in the travel plan should be clearly visible.*

Agency Response: The project incorporated the existing system of roads and trails into Alternative A analysis, and served as the baseline. See response to #12 above regarding how past decisions on road closures were brought into the existing condition development. The cumulative effects section (page 3-63 through 3-66) for recreation discussed certain past and foreseeable future actions that could affect the recreation resource.

33. *The Payette must consider cumulative effects associated with the travel management plan.*

Agency Response: The FEIS includes consideration and disclosure of cumulative effects as required by federal laws and regulations. Cumulative impact is defined by CEQ regulation as the impact on the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the action, when added to other past, present and reasonable foreseeable future actions (40 CFR 1508.7). Additional guidance on analyzing cumulative effects was provided by CEQ in a memorandum. “Based on scoping, agencies have the discretion to determine whether, and to what extent, information about the specific nature, design, or present effects of a past action is useful for the agency’s analysis of the effects of a proposal for agency action and its reasonable alternatives. Agencies are not required to list or analyze the effects of individual past actions unless such information is necessary to describe the cumulative effects of all past actions combined” (CEQ Memorandum, June 24, 2005). Unmanaged recreation, specifically motorized or OHV use, is identified as one of the main threats to public lands and is a primary issue analyzed throughout the Payette National Forest Travel Management Plan.

Designation of Roads

34. The designation of roads as closed unless identified as open should be reversed where a road is considered open unless marked as closed on the ground.

Agency Response: The new national policy for managing OHV use on National Forest System lands established the same signing and mapping policy for all Forests across the nation, in an effort to provide consistency and reduce confusion. Once all Forests have completed their travel planning process, mapping for roads and trails will follow the national policy to display only open motorized routes. The Forest does not have the ability to change this designation process, it is outside the scope of our decision making ability.

Dispersed Camping and Game Retrieval

35. The same limits to off road travel should apply for game retrieval as for dispersed camping. The PNF Travel Plan should be consistent with the National Directive. The Forest Service should allow hunters motorized access to retrieve game as outlined in the National Travel Planning directive. Special accommodations may need to be made for handicapped hunters, and comments were made during scoping to include game retrieval areas during hunting season after 2 p.m. in IDFG units 22 and 23. Those requests were not placed into an alternative.

Agency Response: The National Directive states that game retrieval will be decided at the local level, not by National Direction. The Selected Alternative prohibits game retrieval using motorized vehicles off designated routes. Idaho State Fish and Game Department has stated they do not support motorized access for game retrieval. Reasonable restrictions on motor vehicle use, applied consistently to everyone, are not discriminatory.

36. Having narrowed the allowed use in designated motorized corridors along designated motorized routes to only allow dispersed camping appears to be an arbitrary and capricious and pre-decisional decision.

Agency Response: Under 36CFR (212.51 (b)) *Motor vehicle use for dispersed camping or big game retrieval*. States: “In designating routes, the responsible official may include in the designation the limited use of motor vehicles within a specified distance of certain designated routes, and if appropriate within specified time periods, solely for the purposes of dispersed camping or retrieval of a downed big game animal by an individual who has legally taken that animal”. In my Selected Alternative I allow limited use of motor vehicles within 300 feet of designated roads and 100 feet of designated motorized trails. This carries over the prior/past Payette National Forest Travel Plan which allowed for motorized off-road travel within 300 feet of a designated road or 100 feet of a designated trail to access undeveloped campsites. Based on information contained in by FEIS regarding potential damage to resources, and to try and be consistent with other Forest’s in Region 4, I am prohibiting retrieval of a downed big game animal using a motorized vehicle.

37. *Developed campgrounds often discourage horses in campgrounds due to conflicts with other campers. Therefore a horse camper will look for a dispersed camp site to comply and avoid a conflict.*

Agency Response: Several of the Payette’s campgrounds allow for horses, including Kennally, Secesh Horse Camp, Chinook, Hard Creek Dispersed campground, Cabin Flats dispersed campground, Hitt Mountain dispersed campground, Ponderosa Horse Camp, and Poverty Flats CG (horse hitching rails). Also, there are numerous dispersed camping areas within the 300 foot corridor which allow for overnight camping (including camping with livestock) throughout the majority of the Forest.

Economics, Visitor Use, and Enforcement

38. *The economics evaluation is flawed. Reliance on the Gallatin study is not a good match for conditions on the Payette and an economic study should be completed.*

Agency Response: See the ROD, “Economic Analysis” page 19, which responds to this comment. Under this decision, changes in use opportunities vary little from existing condition and do not represent an elimination or massive reduction of any one particular use. This decision maintains a variety of uses and as such is not expected to have a measurable effect on local businesses reliant on recreational users and uses on the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.

The addition of several new ATV routes and associated loop opportunities provides an opportunity for local counties and businesses to capitalize on this newly expanded form of recreational opportunity. In summary, when compared with the force of national trends, regional and local demographics and larger economic factors influencing the economies of Adams and Valley and Idaho Counties, the relatively small changes in different recreational travel designations in the snow-free seasons on the districts are unlikely to have measurable economic impacts.

39. *The Forest Service did not analyze the economic contribution that active non-motorized has on the economy of the area.*

Agency Response: The Forest has provided for both motorized and non-motorized use opportunities throughout the Forest in both summer and winter months. The purpose of this travel plan was to designate a system of roads and trails open to use. Economic impacts of travel management including non-motorized uses are discussed in the FEIS on pages 1-15 to 1-16.

40. *To base a decision on educating the public through public meetings and brochures, knowing that industry wide standards prove that this means of marketing is not effective is irresponsible.*

Agency Response: The Forest plans to use many methods to inform the public on the new travel regulations including maps, internet information, newspaper articles, and signs, along with on-the-ground Forest Service Law Enforcement. It will take several years of intense work to familiarize the public with the new travel regulations for both winter and summer. See the “implementation” direction in the ROD.

41. *No real proactive mechanism for volunteer support has been identified to mitigate issues and proposed problems.*

Agency Response: Volunteers were identified in the FEIS as one means of implementing some of the work identified in this travel plan. During the travel planning process numerous individuals and groups have come forward to volunteer for trail maintenance projects. The Forest realizes that use of volunteers will take a great deal of coordination and work. As stated in the “Cost to Program Management” sections for each alternative, the Forest does not propose volunteers as a solution to the lack of trail maintenance. The implementation portion of the ROD states some techniques the Forest will use, including volunteer support, to accomplish future trail maintenance goals.

42. *There have been no visitor studies conducted in the preparation of this Travel Plan. The Forest Service must conduct visitor studies before implementing the Travel Plan.*

Agency Response: There is no requirement in the Travel Management Final Rule that Visitor Use studies be completed or conducted prior to designating a system of motorize roads, trails and areas. Even so, information gathered in the 2002 National Visitor Use Monitoring surveys was used and cited in the document. This survey documented user satisfaction, economic data, and visitor use figures on the Payette National Forest.

43. *Handicap accessible areas need to be identified on maps.*

Agency Response: The map protocol developed nationally for Motor Vehicle Use Maps (MVUM) does not indicate areas for the disabled. This is outside the scope of this project.

Many existing brochures available at all of the districts on the Payette National Forest display handicap accessible features at our developed campgrounds.

Firewood Gathering

44. The reduction in open roads will impact local lower income resident's ability to gather firewood and place added impacts on remaining open roads

Agency Response: The Payette agrees that access for firewood cutting is an important issue. However, this issue is outside the scope of route designation for travel management planning because it is handled by the Forest in a separate permitting process as disclosed in the DEIS and FEIS (see Chapter 1 Section 1.10.2 Non-Significant Issues for a discussion of access for firewood cutting). Please refer to the ROD section "Response to Primary Comments – Firewood Gathering" for a complete description of my decision.

Maps

45. There has not been consistency in the maps between scoping, the DEIS and the FEIS

Agency Response: Through each step of the Travel Planning process, scoping, DEIS and FEIS the Forest made a concerted effort to improve the map packages using comments received from the public at each juncture. Every effort was made to provide quality, understandable maps so the public could identify individual site specific proposals. The maps provided in the documents, on the internet web page, on CD upon request, and at each individual office in hard copy format, were of sufficient quality to distinguish and understand each proposal as described in the document. Maps included with the final ROD follow closely the national template for the upcoming Motor Vehicle Use Map that will follow in the implementation stage. The only exception is that the ROD map also includes the non-motorized trail system, where the MVUM will not.

46. There are still some errors on the Alternative A, existing condition maps, missing roads, trails in the wrong location.

Agency Response: The GIS team worked with the best available information when assembling the maps for this project. Since this project has been going on for over four years, many conditions change, and it has been difficult to track and map all changes. Several errors or omissions have been identified through the public review and an errata sheet has been compiled including identified corrections to maps. The MVUM to be published after the ROD is signed will show the best information available at that time as far as motorized roads and trails that will be open for motorized use. The maps will be updated on a regular basis, and every attempt will be made to capture information during those updates.

Mixed Use Traffic Study

47. The USFS must complete a mixed use traffic study.

Agency Response: The Forest is required to do a mixed use study for our road system only when a road is designated for dual use as a trail by other types of motorized vehicles, such as UTVs, ATVs, two-wheel motorized cycles. The Forest chose not to dual designate any roads as trails within our jurisdiction, and instead is deferring to Idaho State Law which allows for licensed drivers, with up to date registrations for their vehicles, to travel on graveled Forest System roads.

Motorized Road and Trail Access

48. Evaluate the impact of fewer access routes to the higher level of use on the remaining routes.

Agency Response: The impact of fewer access routes to the higher level of use on the remaining routes was analyzed in Chapter 3, pages 3-23 through 3-62. Monitoring will continue after the signing of the ROD to assess any change in level of use, and associated need for alterations to the travel plan.

49. The FEIS does not offer adequate justification as to why the Forest Service feels it needs to offer expert riding trails on the PNF.

Agency Response: The Payette National Forest is known for the diversity of motorized and non-motorized trail opportunities provided to the public. When feasible, the Forest tries to offer a diversity of trail experiences from expert to beginner terrain, similar to what a ski area does by providing skiers a range of skiing experience from expert black diamond slopes to easy, green circle slopes. This range of opportunities offers individuals a chance to experience the particular recreation opportunity they are searching for on the Forest.

50. The analysis fails to include or discuss the "best available science" on recreation and its impacts. The analysis of vehicle use should be compared and contrasted to baseline data.

Agency Response: The Forest incorporated the best available science related to recreation and its impacts in the discussion of the affected environment and potential environmental consequences on recreation for all five alternatives on pages 3-1 through 3-66. Summary tables on FEIS pages S-22 to S-26 and pages 2-57 to 2-59 provide a comparison of different types of vehicle use between the current condition (i.e. the baseline) and the various alternatives.

51. There is no alternative that considers looking at increasing the number of road and trail miles open to the public although public use is increasing both in the summer and winter.

Agency Response: There are alternatives that increase various road and trail miles for different uses. For example, ATV trail and OHV miles increase on the Forest in Alternatives B, C, and E. Additionally, non-motorized trail miles increase in Alternatives B, D and E. The decision maker is charged with designating a system of roads and trails

that can be managed using existing resources and proposing large increases in any use would be irresponsible if the trails cannot be maintained or use effectively enforced.

52. *No additional motorized vehicle access or roads should be permitted within the Payette National Forest.*

Agency Response: Overall the travel plan strives to balance different uses while protecting natural and cultural resource values. In addressing the demand for all uses on the Payette, providing opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized recreation is necessary and the travel plan does include additional opportunities for both uses in Alternative E.

53. *Existing access roads should be left alone to facilitate dispersed recreation. Leave more miles open than you close.*

Agency Response: Continued allowance of indiscriminant access to unauthorized roads, trails, and/or areas would not meet the purpose and need for the project or Forest Plan and national direction (Federal Register 2005: 70FR68264) for travel management.

Public Impacts/Local versus National

54. *The proposed travel plan has stronger effects on the local public than public from outside the area.*

Agency Response: The forest understands that the impacts on the public will be different. The agency must consider input from and effects on all the public when making decisions.

Public Involvement

55. *The travel plan lacks collaboration with users*

Agency Response: The ID team has worked over a four year period engaging the public through public meetings, newspaper articles, letters and formal comment periods. The Forest also involved cooperating agencies including Idaho Department of Parks & Recreation, Idaho State Fish & Game, and county commissioners or their appointed representatives from Valley, Washington, and Adams Counties. Idaho County declined to take part in the cooperating agency status for the project, but remained engaged through the comment periods. The Forest ID team also worked with the Winter Recreation Forum, which contains members from both the back country ski and snowmobile community. The ID team developed the original DEIS alternatives and Alternative E in the FEIS based on communication and collaboration with the public, and other state and federal agencies. Public involvement and collaboration has been on-going throughout the past several years of travel management planning.

R.S. 2477

56. *The trend in granting Valley County control of roads on the PNF is a concern. Unless an R.S. 2477 assertion has been validated, these roads and trails still fall under the jurisdiction of the PNF.*

Agency Response: On roads where Counties have been given a Forest Roads and Trails Act (FRTA) Easement, jurisdiction for maintenance and operations of the roads fall to the County, and the road will not be designated for type of motorized use by the PNF. These roads will show up on the MVUM as “other” roads, outside our jurisdiction.

57. *The FEIS fails to disclose a historic road analysis and ignores information and authority of cooperating agencies on road jurisdictions and R.S. 2477 designations.*

Agency Response: If or when any future RS 2477 assertions are validated in court as legal Rights-of-ways (ROWs), the Forest will update the Council and New Meadows Ranger District MVUM to reflect these assertions.

Unauthorized Roads

58. *Unauthorized roads are being closed without specific analysis of the need for closure, the Payette National Forest should complete an on the ground inventory of all routes in the open areas prior to closing them.*

Agency Response: During the scoping period for travel management the Forest asked the public to help the Agency identify unauthorized routes receiving enough use to make their addition to the National Forest travel system worth evaluation. Both roads and trails were brought forward into analysis.

The Travel Management Final Rule implements Executive Order 11644 “Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands” as amended by E.O. 11989. These Executive orders direct Federal agencies to ensure that 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 growing popularity and capabilities of OHVs demand new regulations. The magnitude and intensity of motor vehicle use has increased to the point the unrestricted cross-country travel cannot continue, because soil erosion, water quality, and wildlife habitat are affected.

User created routes were developed without agency authorization, environmental analysis, or public involvement and do not have the same status as NFS roads and trails included in the forest transportation system. Some user routes are well-sited and provide excellent opportunities, while others are poorly located and cause unacceptable environmental impacts. The Department disagrees that a complete inventory of user-created routes is required in order to complete the designation process. Such an inventory may never be fully complete as new routes will continue to be created during the inventory process. A complete inventory would be very time consuming and expensive, delaying completion of route designation. The PNF was committed to working with the public to accept and

analyze specific user routes brought forward during scoping and the DEIS for designation into the system. Several of these routes made it into the Selected Alternative for the Council and New Meadows Ranger Districts.

Wildlife Habitat Connectivity – Summer

59. The Forest Service should consider that there is no documentation or data to support closure of any motorized routes in the project area to improve wildlife connectivity.

Agency Response: Wildlife connectivity is discussed in Chapter 3. Forest management requirements for wildlife are listed in Table 2-27. Connectivity is improved when habitat is not fragmented by roads and trails. Fragmentation can lead to isolation of populations, reduced population size, and an increased risk of extinction (page 3-195). Forest Plan direction (TEOB14) states “identify and prioritize opportunities for restoration of habitat linkage zones to promote genetic integrity and species distribution” (Forest Plan, page III-9) and “provide well-distributed habitat and connective corridors important to sustaining wildlife species” (WIGO06) (Forest Plan, page III-5).

Wildlife Monitoring

60. The Forest Service should consider collecting sufficient data about existing conditions in relation to wildlife, then, if a motorized closure is enacted, the Forest Service should collect data demonstrating effects of the closure, including significant measurable improvements.

Agency Response: The Forest is committed to implementation and effectiveness monitoring for wildlife. Project design features in Chapter 2 are designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the route and area designation made with the travel management plan decision. Monitoring and evaluation plans for wildlife are located in Appendix E.

Scientific evidence

61. The Forest Service should consider that this EIS seriously lacks proper scientific foundation and evidence necessary to make critical sound wildlife management decisions, and,

The Forest Service should consider that supportive data for this EIS, on which wildlife management decisions were made, is lacking. Research studies conducted in other areas of the country are quoted. There is very little PNF collected data quoted, and,

The Forest Service should consider that wildlife statements have been made regarding Alternative E without a scientific basis.

Agency Response: The literature on the effects of motorized travel on wildlife is extensive as documented in the EIS and project files. The Travel Plan analysis has been conducted over a period of 4 years. During this time, additional scientific literature has become available. The wildlife biologists on the IDT attempted to ensure they used the latest and best scientific information. This information was determined to be sufficient to

support travel management decisions. Travel plans are designed to be dynamic. If new information becomes available that would support site-specific changes, this information would be considered in future analyses.

62. The Forest Service should consider that the PNF has failed to adequately recognize that wildlife are affected far more by nature than by motorized visitors, and has failed to evaluate impacts with a relative sense of magnitude.

Agency Response: Forest Service management requirements arise from Forest Plan direction designed for protection of Forest resources (Forest Plan 2003). The Forest can attempt to manage “nature”, but the scope of this analysis was to address the effects of human travel, primarily motorized travel. Hence the evaluation of impacts was appropriate for the project purpose and need.

Summer Recreation Effects to Wildlife

63. The Forest Service should consider leaving roads designated as non-motorized because ATVs and motorcycles affect wildlife habitat.

Agency Response: The effects to wildlife habitat from ATVs and motorcycles are discussed in Chapter 3. Closure of additional roads and trails was analyzed as part of Alternative D in the DEIS and FEIS. Alternative D provides the greatest protection to wildlife from the effects of ATVs and motorcycles.

64. The Forest Service should consider that disturbance to wildlife and wildlife corridors by OHV use has been overstated. Wildlife populations have increased at the same time that OHV use is increasing.

Agency Response: Some wildlife populations may have increased at the same time as OHV use has increased, but populations of many other species (such as federally listed and sensitive species) have declined. Many studies have documented the effects of OHV use on wildlife (FEIS, chapter 3, pages 3-194 through 3-244.) Forest Plan direction requires that we design management actions to avoid or minimize adverse effects to wildlife including the effects of disturbance to listed species and their habitats (FEIS, Chapter 2, Table 2-27; Forest Plan, page III-10) and to other species (Forest Plan, pages III-26 through III-28.)

65. The Forest Service should consider that hikers disturb elk more than motor vehicles and that “disturbance of wildlife” should not be used as a reason to justify motorized recreation and access closures.

Agency Response: Although elk may be disturbed by both motorized and non-motorized recreationists, the impacts of motorized use extend over a larger area due to the greater noise and numbers of people associated with motorized travel (FEIS, Wildlife Analysis, chapter 3; project file). Rocky Mountain elk are a species of special concern on the Payette National Forest and are managed to achieve particular population goals. Long-term productivity of elk is partly based on the quality of summer and transitional ranges.

Management of summer range includes consideration of disturbances that might discourage elk use of an area. As documented in the wildlife analysis, motorized use affects elk and other wildlife species by decreasing habitat effectiveness through disturbance, displacement, habitat loss, and human-caused mortality.

Roads and motorized recreation can disturb elk by discouraging use of an area, by lowering reproductive success, and by causing loss and fragmentation of habitat (page 3-191), Wisdom et. al. (2004) indicates that off-road recreation, including motorized and non-motorized, increases movement rates and flight responses for elk. Effects are more pronounced in response to OHV and mountain bike riding verses horseback and hiking activities.

66. The Forest Service should consider that there are no compelling reasons to justify road closures as a sought-after or necessary wildlife management criterion. Reasonable alternatives to the same outcomes sought by road closures include permit hunting and seasonal travel restrictions.

Agency Response: These concerns are addressed in the wildlife analysis (FEIS, chapter 3). An important aspect of elk management is limiting elk vulnerability during hunting season. This susceptibility is a function of access to elk and the quality of cover for elk. Roads provide access for hunters and poachers, leading to increased elk mortality. On the PNF, seasonal and year-round travel restrictions have been implemented in locations where elk lack secure habitat due to road densities and/or lack of cover. Requirements for special permits to minimize the effects of hunting are outside the control of the Forest Service and administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

Appendix C – Council and New Meadows RD Designated Roads and Trails in the Selected Alternative

Table C-1: Designated Trail Status on Council RD

TRL_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles	TRL_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles
133	non-motorized	0.8	320	non-motorized	2.8
178	non-motorized	0.1	322	non-motorized	0.4
198	non-motorized	1.6	331	non-motorized	2.7
198	motorized	7.8	331	motorized	2.4
201	motorized	2.4	332	motorized	2.2
203	motorized	4.0	358	non-motorized	0.4
203	non-motorized	1.8	514	non-motorized	2.2
205	motorized	1.7	515	non-motorized	5.5
209	motorized-atv	2.4	516	non-motorized	0.5
210	motorized	4.2	517	motorized	3.5
213	motorized-atv	2.8	518	non-motorized	0.6
213	motorized	2.7	518	motorized	4.4
215	non-motorized	2.2			
216	non-motorized	0.4			
217	non-motorized	4.0			
218	non-motorized	0.2			
219	non-motorized	8.5			
220	motorized	2.3			
221	non-motorized	3.7			
221	motorized	2.1			
222	non-motorized	5.3			
223	non-motorized	3.6			
226	non-motorized	4.0			
226	motorized	1.4			
227	motorized	5.0			
228	motorized	4.4			
229	non-motorized	4.1			
229	motorized	2.1			
230	motorized	1.5			
231	motorized	7.0			
234	motorized	2.1			
235	motorized	3.7			
236	motorized-atv	2.3			
240	motorized-atv	2.7			
241	non-motorized	2.5			
246	non-motorized	0.2			
248	motorized-atv	2.7			
252	non-motorized	3.2			
252	motorized	0.8			
289	motorized-full	0.4			
293	motorized-atv	0.7			
318	non-motorized	1.0			

Table C-2: Designated Trail Status on New Meadows RD

TRL_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles	TRL_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles
115	motorized	8.9	316	motorized-atv	1.4
116	motorized	6.1	317	non-motorized	1.8
149	motorized	8.1	319	non-motorized	0.9
151	non-motorized	1.8	323	non-motorized	2.0
152	non-motorized	4.6	324	non-motorized	0.9
153	motorized	12.6	327	non-motorized	3.5
155	non-motorized	5.8	328	motorized	2.5
155	motorized	0.3	329	non-motorized	3.9
156	non-motorized	2.4	344	non-motorized	3.4
157	motorized	3.9	344	motorized-atv	0.8
158	non-motorized	0.3	344	motorized	3.0
159	non-motorized	1.2	345	non-motorized	0.3
160	non-motorized	3.9	346	non-motorized	1.1
160	motorized	3.9	347	motorized-atv	2.1
161	non-motorized	0.2	347	motorized	3.7
162	motorized	4.6	348	non-motorized	7.3
163	motorized-atv	3.3	350	non-motorized	0.6
163	motorized	4.5	353	non-motorized	5.4
164	non-motorized	2.9	354	non-motorized	1.2
165	non-motorized	7.1	358	non-motorized	2.2
168	non-motorized	0.4	361	non-motorized	0.6
169	motorized	4.2	362	motorized	1.5
171	non-motorized	0.9	366	non-motorized	0.3
172	non-motorized	4.9	367	non-motorized	1.4
177	non-motorized	13.1	367a	non-motorized	0.1
177	motorized	0.6	368	non-motorized	1.8
178	non-motorized	4.3	369	non-motorized	0.6
178	motorized	10.2	370	non-motorized	0.1
179	non-motorized	3.5	371	motorized	0.5
180	non-motorized	0.9	372	motorized	0.7
181	non-motorized	7.8	373	motorized	3.6
183	motorized	3.9	374	motorized	1.7
184	motorized	5.0	500	motorized	6.5
185	non-motorized	4.1	501	motorized	1.2
186	non-motorized	4.0	502	non-motorized	0.2
187	motorized	5.9	503	non-motorized	3.9
188	non-motorized	0.7	504	motorized	4.1
188	motorized	4.4	505	motorized	3.4
190	non-motorized	4.9	506	motorized	1.2
191	non-motorized	3.1	507	non-motorized	0.3
191	motorized-atv	3.5	508	non-motorized	2.5
197	non-motorized	2.4	509	non-motorized	0.3
219	non-motorized	0.1	511	motorized	2.8
229	motorized	0.1	519	motorized	0.5
279	non-motorized	1.6	549	motorized-atv	1.7
279	motorized	2.2			

C-3: Designated Road Status on Council RD

RD_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles	RD_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles
50001	OPEN	0.2	50314	SEASONAL	1.2
50003	SEASONAL	1.9	50317	OPEN	0.2
50004	OPEN	2.9	50326	OPEN	7.2
50022	SEASONAL	1.6	50348	OPEN	0.2
50038	OPEN	13.5	50351	OPEN	1.2
50038	SEASONAL	3.8	50358	OPEN	0.4
50039	OPEN	7.2	50429	OPEN	3.8
50041	OPEN	2.5	50436	SEASONAL	0.6
50048	OPEN	0.9	50438	OPEN	0.9
50049	OPEN	0.8	50447	OPEN	3.0
50055	OPEN	13.4	50448	OPEN	0.5
50059	OPEN	2.9	50474	OPEN	0.1
50060	OPEN	7.2	50477	OPEN	0.5
50061	OPEN	7.9	50482	SEASONAL	0.5
50071	OPEN	4.2	50486	OPEN	3.1
50072	OPEN	0.1	50487	OPEN	3.5
50073	OPEN	5.4	50493	SEASONAL	1.0
50077	OPEN	1.3	50497	OPEN	0.2
50081	OPEN	0.0	50498	SEASONAL	0.1
50096	OPEN	0.6	50507	OPEN	3.9
50108	OPEN	1.4	50509	OPEN	2.4
50109	OPEN	0.5	50510	OPEN	1.2
50110	OPEN	3.0	50511	OPEN	1.4
50111	OPEN	1.6	50516	SEASONAL	3.1
50112	OPEN	7.1	50519	SEASONAL	0.8
50113	OPEN	0.6	50521	SEASONAL	5.5
50116	SEASONAL	0.4	50524	SEASONAL	3.1
50119	OPEN	2.1	50541	SEASONAL	2.3
50121	OPEN	10.9	50542	SEASONAL	1.2
50122	OPEN	2.3	50544	OPEN	0.1
50123	OPEN	5.8	50544	SEASONAL	1.5
50125	OPEN	9.5	50567	OPEN	1.0
50129	OPEN	0.9	50570	OPEN	0.2
50129	SEASONAL	0.6	50571	OPEN	0.6
50130	OPEN	0.7	50571	SEASONAL	1.8
50130	SEASONAL	4.7	50581	OPEN	2.9
50133	SEASONAL	3.0	50587	OPEN	3.0
50135	SEASONAL	0.0	50591	OPEN	4.9
50141	OPEN	1.9	50593	OPEN	1.1
50141	SEASONAL	8.3	50605	OPEN	0.2
50143	OPEN	8.1	50606	SEASONAL	1.1
50144	OPEN	1.2	50607	SEASONAL	0.8
50145	OPEN	9.3	50608	SEASONAL	1.0
50149	OPEN	2.3	50623	SEASONAL	3.9
50150	SEASONAL	2.3	50626	OPEN	2.3
50314	OPEN	0.2	50630	SEASONAL	4.2

50636	OPEN	0.2	50855	OPEN	0.3
50636	SEASONAL	3.0	50858	OPEN	0.9
50637	OPEN	1.3	50859	OPEN	0.9
50638	OPEN	2.6	50860	OPEN	0.9
50639	SEASONAL	2.2	50862	OPEN	0.4
50640	OPEN	0.4	50863	OPEN	1.0
50640	SEASONAL	3.7	50870	OPEN	0.4
50644	OPEN	0.1	50878	SEASONAL	1.5
50644	SEASONAL	0.6	50880	OPEN	0.5
506441000	SEASONAL	0.5	50883	OPEN	0.5
50646	SEASONAL	0.4	50890	OPEN	1.5
50652	OPEN	2.2	50891	OPEN	0.7
50654	OPEN	0.3	50895	SEASONAL	1.0
50654	SEASONAL	5.6	50905	OPEN	0.4
50660	OPEN	0.4	50906	OPEN	0.7
50665	SEASONAL	1.4	50915	SEASONAL	0.6
50678	OPEN	0.6	50917	OPEN	0.1
50678	SEASONAL	2.2	50938	SEASONAL	1.1
50692	OPEN	4.4	50966	SEASONAL	2.3
50701	OPEN	1.9	50967	SEASONAL	1.3
50702	OPEN	0.4	50968	SEASONAL	4.5
50704	OPEN	0.3	50969	SEASONAL	0.4
50706	OPEN	0.5	50970	SEASONAL	2.0
50717	OPEN	1.1	50971	SEASONAL	0.4
50718	OPEN	4.4	50972	SEASONAL	2.8
50737	SEASONAL	3.0	50986	SEASONAL	2.9
50743	OPEN	0.4	51018	OPEN	0.2
50752	OPEN	2.8	51020	OPEN	0.9
50754	OPEN	0.4	51023	OPEN	0.5
50758	SEASONAL	5.3	51024	OPEN	0.7
50759	OPEN	7.0	51027	OPEN	1.6
50761	OPEN	0.7	51032	OPEN	1.1
50765	SEASONAL	2.1	51054	OPEN	0.1
50766	SEASONAL	1.4	51142	OPEN	0.1
50770	OPEN	0.2	51143	OPEN	0.1
50770	SEASONAL	2.4	51144	OPEN	0.8
50772	SEASONAL	2.8	51158	OPEN	0.8
50773	SEASONAL	1.2	51161	OPEN	0.4
50774	SEASONAL	0.2	51194	OPEN	0.6
50800	SEASONAL	2.5	51238	SEASONAL	2.0
50802	SEASONAL	1.4	51242	OPEN	0.9
50806	SEASONAL	1.2	51302	OPEN	0.6
50807	SEASONAL	0.4	51304	OPEN	0.2
50821	SEASONAL	0.6	51306	OPEN	0.6
50822	OPEN	1.3	51310	SEASONAL	1.9
50826	SEASONAL	3.0	51312	OPEN	0.0
50835	OPEN	8.0	51312	SEASONAL	1.4
50850	OPEN	1.2	51314	OPEN	0.8

51315	OPEN	0.3	51845	OPEN	0.4
51321	OPEN	0.2	51849	OPEN	0.2
51362	SEASONAL	0.3	51853	SEASONAL	1.0
51382	OPEN	1.6	51899	OPEN	0.8
51383	OPEN	0.2	51900	OPEN	0.5
51384	OPEN	1.3	58008	OPEN	0.1
51385	OPEN	0.6	58009	OPEN	0.1
51494	SEASONAL	1.2	58010	OPEN	0.0
51495	OPEN	1.6	58012	OPEN	0.0
51533	OPEN	0.1			
51539	OPEN	1.2			627.3
51540	OPEN	0.3			
51544	SEASONAL	0.5			
51551	OPEN	0.4			
51553	OPEN	0.4			
51569	OPEN	0.2			
51573	OPEN	1.5			
51582	OPEN	0.7			
51589	OPEN	0.6			
51602	OPEN	0.6			
51605	OPEN	0.5			
51606	OPEN	0.5			
51608	OPEN	0.3			
51610	OPEN	1.2			
51637	OPEN	0.2			
51648	OPEN	1.3			
51699	OPEN	0.2			
51754	SEASONAL	1.2			
51759	SEASONAL	1.0			
51762	OPEN	2.3			
51763	OPEN	15.9			
51767	OPEN	0.0			
51768	OPEN	0.0			
51781	OPEN	0.1			
51784	SEASONAL	0.8			
51785	OPEN	0.8			
51786	OPEN	0.0			
51789	SEASONAL	0.7			
51790	OPEN	0.2			
51792	SEASONAL	0.4			
51793	OPEN	0.1			
51794	OPEN	0.2			
51796	OPEN	0.6			
51812	SEASONAL	0.1			
51814	OPEN	2.1			
51820	OPEN	0.3			
51825	SEASONAL	0.5			
51831	OPEN	0.8			

C-4: Designated Road Status on New Meadows RD

RD_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles	RD_ID	Selected Alternative	Miles
50006	OPEN	0.1	50187	SEASONAL	0.4
50006A	OPEN	0.0	50224	OPEN	0.1
50021	OPEN	0.4	50257	OPEN	21.2
50051	OPEN	0.4	50257P	OPEN	0.3
50063	SEASONAL	2.0	50259	OPEN	0.2
50074	OPEN	16.5	50259A	OPEN	0.1
50079	OPEN	4.7	50262	OPEN	0.3
50083	OPEN	1.3	50263	OPEN	0.4
50083	SEASONAL	9.0	50267	OPEN	0.1
50089	OPEN	9.5	50273	OPEN	9.6
50090	SEASONAL	5.7	50274	OPEN	0.2
50091	SEASONAL	0.6	50274	SEASONAL	0.1
50094	OPEN	0.4	50275	OPEN	0.4
50097	OPEN	0.1	50275	SEASONAL	4.3
50098	OPEN	7.0	50278	OPEN	0.2
50100	OPEN	7.4	50278A	OPEN	0.2
50101	OPEN	4.6	50278B	OPEN	0.1
50101	SEASONAL	4.5	50279	SEASONAL	1.6
50102	OPEN	4.7	50284	OPEN	0.2
50112	OPEN	4.8	50287	OPEN	6.3
50114	OPEN	0.1	50294	OPEN	10.5
50115	SEASONAL	3.8	50299	OPEN	3.4
50118	OPEN	0.3	50303	OPEN	5.1
50120	SEASONAL	1.5	50304	OPEN	5.2
50123	OPEN	7.3	50305	OPEN	2.0
50126	SEASONAL	3.2	50307	OPEN	3.1
50127	OPEN	7.9	503072500	OPEN	0.2
50128	OPEN	8.5	503077100	OPEN	0.1
50132	SEASONAL	5.5	503077600	OPEN	0.1
50134	SEASONAL	1.8	503079100	OPEN	0.0
50135	SEASONAL	7.0	50308	OPEN	13.3
50136	SEASONAL	5.0	50308	SEASONAL	3.5
50138	SEASONAL	1.8	50310	SEASONAL	1.5
50139	OPEN	11.1	50312	OPEN	0.6
50146	OPEN	0.3	50319	OPEN	1.0
50146	SEASONAL	0.6	50339	OPEN	3.5
50152	OPEN	7.4	50342	SEASONAL	1.3
50153	SEASONAL	2.4	50365	SEASONAL	0.5
50154	OPEN	10.5	50374	SEASONAL	0.3
50155	SEASONAL	4.4	50380	SEASONAL	0.9
50156	OPEN	0.3	50381	OPEN	0.3
50157	OPEN	0.3	50386	OPEN	0.4
50158	SEASONAL	7.2	50407	SEASONAL	0.4
50160	OPEN	0.9	50413	SEASONAL	2.0
50162	SEASONAL	1.0	50450	OPEN	0.5
50178	OPEN	0.0	50453	OPEN	7.2

50458	OPEN	0.3	50954	OPEN	0.2
50458	SEASONAL	0.3	50955	SEASONAL	2.7
50462	SEASONAL	0.4	50956	SEASONAL	0.5
50478	SEASONAL	2.4	50957	OPEN	0.3
50508	OPEN	0.2	50959	OPEN	0.3
50520	OPEN	5.0	50960	OPEN	0.3
50520	SEASONAL	2.2	50961	OPEN	0.3
50526	SEASONAL	1.1	50974	SEASONAL	1.4
50527	SEASONAL	1.1	50975	SEASONAL	0.9
50557	SEASONAL	3.5	50976	SEASONAL	2.2
50558	SEASONAL	0.5	50977	SEASONAL	2.1
50559	OPEN	3.7	50979	SEASONAL	1.6
50561	SEASONAL	0.4	50980	SEASONAL	1.0
50563	SEASONAL	4.7	50981	SEASONAL	0.8
50564	SEASONAL	3.2	50987	SEASONAL	2.7
50565	OPEN	2.5	50990	SEASONAL	0.3
50576	SEASONAL	1.5	50991	SEASONAL	1.9
50577	SEASONAL	0.2	51050	SEASONAL	1.3
50578	SEASONAL	1.1	51056	SEASONAL	3.9
50579	SEASONAL	0.9	51057	SEASONAL	3.7
50585	OPEN	1.8	51061	OPEN	0.1
50590	SEASONAL	1.1	51080	OPEN	1.5
50596	SEASONAL	0.3	51081	SEASONAL	0.9
50662	OPEN	0.4	51082	SEASONAL	0.6
50710	OPEN	3.2	51083	OPEN	0.4
507104000	OPEN	0.4	51083	SEASONAL	1.0
50712	OPEN	0.3	51087	OPEN	2.2
50714	OPEN	0.3	51111	SEASONAL	0.9
507142000	OPEN	0.8	51125	SEASONAL	1.1
50723	OPEN	0.0	51126	SEASONAL	2.3
50723	SEASONAL	3.1	51130	SEASONAL	0.8
50726	SEASONAL	0.4	51175	SEASONAL	3.3
50767	SEASONAL	0.5	51176	SEASONAL	0.7
50780	OPEN	1.9	51177	SEASONAL	1.8
50789	OPEN	0.4	51179	SEASONAL	2.0
50795	SEASONAL	2.2	51182	SEASONAL	1.3
50796	OPEN	0.2	51198	OPEN	0.4
50809	SEASONAL	3.6	51206	OPEN	2.7
50825	OPEN	0.1	51210	SEASONAL	3.4
50825	SEASONAL	0.8	51214	SEASONAL	2.4
50932	SEASONAL	0.9	51232	SEASONAL	1.6
50933	SEASONAL	2.5	51233	SEASONAL	0.6
50943	OPEN	0.1	51235	SEASONAL	1.6
50943	SEASONAL	2.9	51243	SEASONAL	0.8
50944	SEASONAL	4.0	51248	SEASONAL	1.8
50946	SEASONAL	1.2	51251	SEASONAL	0.7
50950	SEASONAL	2.9	51254	OPEN	1.3
50953	SEASONAL	1.4	51262	SEASONAL	0.4

51281	OPEN	0.9	51927	OPEN	0.1
51287	OPEN	0.4	51928	OPEN	0.1
51312	OPEN	0.1	58007	OPEN	0.0
51317	OPEN	0.7	58013	OPEN	0.0
51317	SEASONAL	2.9			
51318	SEASONAL	2.0			
51319	SEASONAL	0.9			
51320	SEASONAL	1.1			
51322	SEASONAL	1.7			
51323	SEASONAL	0.9			
51324	SEASONAL	1.4			
51396	OPEN	1.4			
51402	SEASONAL	0.6			
51421	SEASONAL	0.9			
51422	SEASONAL	1.4			
51428	OPEN	0.4			
51429	SEASONAL	0.6			
51430	SEASONAL	0.7			
51432	SEASONAL	0.4			
51444	SEASONAL	1.2			
51445	SEASONAL	1.0			
51448	SEASONAL	1.2			
51473	OPEN	1.1			
51474	SEASONAL	0.9			
51475	SEASONAL	1.9			
51476	SEASONAL	1.4			
51478	SEASONAL	1.2			
51508	OPEN	0.2			
51509	OPEN	0.2			
51511	OPEN	0.7			
51536	OPEN	0.2			
51591	SEASONAL	0.8			
51592	SEASONAL	0.2			
51593	SEASONAL	0.5			
51594	SEASONAL	0.2			
51616	SEASONAL	0.3			
51618	SEASONAL	0.6			
51704	OPEN	1.5			
51732	SEASONAL	1.2			
51891	SEASONAL	0.8			
51902	OPEN	0.2			
51910	OPEN	1.6			
51912	OPEN	0.7			
51913	OPEN	0.8			
51916	OPEN	0.1			
51919	OPEN	0.9			
51921	OPEN	0.1			
51922	OPEN	0.2			

Payette National Forest
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
Council & New Meadows Ranger Districts

