

FINAL REPORT

OHV Designated Routes Working Group
Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area
Siuslaw National Forest

WORKING GROUP REVIEW DRAFT

SEPTEMBER 2010

Prepared by:
Ross Holloway, OHV Designated Routes Working Group Facilitator
Inciplan
336 Delaware Avenue
Bend, OR 97701
rholloway@inciplan.net



Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area - North Riding Area

Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction	7
Background	7
History of NRA and OHV Management.....	8
Context for OHV Designated Routes Process on the ODNRA.....	9
Overview of North, Middle and South Riding Areas on the ODNRA	9
North Riding Area.....	9
Middle Riding Area.....	11
South Riding Area.....	11
Purpose and Scope of OHV Designated Routes Working Group	13
OHV Designated Routes Working Group Process and Methods	15
Summaries of field trips, meetings and other Working Group activities	15
Methods for Developing Designated Route Proposals.....	18
Format for Organizing Proposal Narratives	21
Working Group Proposals	23
North Riding Area Proposal Narratives.....	23
Designated Route Proposals	23
“Re-Zoning” Proposals	38
Middle Riding Area Proposal Narratives.....	42
Designated Route Proposals	42
“Re-Zoning” Proposals	47
South Riding Area Proposal Narratives.....	48
Designated Route Proposals	48
“Re-Zoning” Proposals	57
Proposal Summaries	59
North Riding Area Summaries.....	59
Middle Riding Area Summaries.....	63
South Riding Area Summaries.....	64
Key Issues Discussed by Working Group.....	67

Summary of Public Comments Received 81
 Public Comment at Working Group meetings 81
 Letters and E-Mails Received 82
Existing Trail and Proposal Displays 85

Executive Summary

(to be completed with final draft of report)

Introduction

Background

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Siuslaw National Forest, manages the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area (ODNRA), comprised of approximately 28,900 acres of forest, water and open sand areas between Florence and North Bend on the Oregon coast. This area of diverse and constantly changing landscapes is host to a wide array of outdoor recreational uses. Many of those uses have been ongoing long before the establishment of the area as a National Recreation Area (NRA). One of the more popular uses of the area historically, and today, is Off Highway Vehicle riding. The ODNRA is the most popular and heavily used OHV area in Oregon, and one of the most popular in the country.

The report that follows presents a number of possibilities for the designation of additional “Designated Routes” within Management Area 10(C) of the ODNRA. These “proposals” were developed by the OHV Designated Routes Working Group, a group of fourteen individuals representing a diverse set of interests and stakeholders familiar with the ODNRA. The group participated in a series of four field trips and eight public meetings over a 13-month period. The report also summarizes the key information and issues discussed by the Working Group.



Dunes in North Riding Area of the ODNRA

History of NRA and OHV Management

Congress designated the ODNRA in March of 1972, specifying that it be managed to... *“provide for the public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of certain ocean shoreline and dunes, forested areas, fresh water lakes, and recreational facilities in the State of Oregon...and the conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment...”*

In 1979, the USFS adopted the first management plan for the recreation area, establishing standards and methods for managing Off-Highway Vehicle use and other uses of the area. Prior to the 1979 plan, 91% of the NRA was open to OHV use. The 1979 plan restricted OHV use to approximately 47% of the NRA. In 1994, the Forest Service adopted the current ODNRA Management Plan. The 1994 plan established separate management areas with differing resource emphases within the NRA. These management areas or “zones” (10A through 10L) restricted or allowed OHV use to varying degrees. The eleven management designations and associated acres are as follows:

- 10 (A) – Non-Motorized Undeveloped – 7,830 acres (27%)
- 10 (B) – Off-Road Vehicle Open – 5,930 acres (21%)
- 10 (C) – ORV on Designated Routes – 4,455 acres (15%)
- 10 (D) – Developed Corridors – 1,050 acres (4%)
- 10 (E) – Snowy Plover Habitat – 1,010 acres (3%)
- 10 (F) – Plant, Fish and Wildlife Habitat – 3,120 acres (11%)
- 10 (G) – Wetlands Emphasis – 2,540 acres (9%)
- 10 (H) – Wildlife and Fish Viewing – 315 acres (1%)
- 10 (J) – Recommended Wild and Scenic River – 1,090 acres (4%)
- 10 (K) – Research Natural Area – 1,190 acres (4%)
- 10 (L) – Noise Control Buffer – 370 acres (1%)

There are two management areas designed primarily to accommodate OHV use. Management Area 10(B) (MA 10(B)) is comprised of a number of large, open sand areas on the NRA, and is designated as open riding for OHVs. Management Area 10(C) (MA 10(C)) consists primarily of forested upland areas in the NRA, and restricts the operation of OHVs to “Designated Routes”. A number of these routes were identified and designated at the time the 1994 plan was approved. The plan also called for the identification of additional designated routes within 3 years of plan approval, and the obliteration or natural reversion of all other routes. Taken together, MA 10(B) and MA 10(C) comprise approximately 36% of the NRA.

Since 1994, the USFS has implemented many of the key action items identified in the plan. Key management actions taken have included prohibiting non-street legal OHVs in certain developed facilities, closing some specific areas to OHV use to provide non-motorized experiences, establishment of noise control buffers, the establishment of day-use only facilities and night riding curfews, and the establishment of designated OHV Dispersed Campsites and a permit system for their use.

Context for OHV Designated Routes Process on the ODNRA

The routes originally designated with 1994 plan approval have remained the only officially designated routes in MA 10(C). In addition, the lack of formal closure orders for most areas zoned as MA 10(C) has permitted the continued use of “undesigned” routes by OHVs, and the establishment of additional user-created routes in some areas. As a result, the majority of existing trails traveled by OHVs within MA 10(C) today are not designated routes.

The USFS’s “Travel Management Rule” (36 CFR 212, Subpart B, Designation of Roads, Trails, and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use), adopted in 2005, resulted in the establishment of a new process for specifying where OHV use could occur on USFS lands. Scheduled for implementation by 2010, this rule “reversed” the context for allowing or prohibiting OHV use on USFS lands. The rule requires each national forest or ranger district to designate those roads, trails, and areas open to motor vehicles. Once designation is complete, the rule prohibits motor vehicle use off the designated system or inconsistent with the designations. Designations are shown on a motor vehicle use map. Motor vehicle use maps for the Siuslaw National Forest, including the ODNRA were published in the Spring of 2010. It was within this changing context that the OHV Designated Routes Working Group was convened in October of 2009.

Overview of North, Middle and South Riding Areas on the ODNRA

In defining the process for the OHV Designated Routes Working Group, the NRA was divided into three logical geographic riding areas. The Working Group focused their attention on one riding area at a time.

North Riding Area

This riding area is located immediately south of Florence. It lies between the beach on the west and Highway 101 to the east, and between South Jetty Road on the north end, and the Siltcoos River on the south end. It is characterized by a large, relatively unbroken open sand area running from north to south in the center, with vegetated areas along the west and east sides. The western area, adjacent to the beach, is primarily foredune, with a combination of beach grass dominated area closer to the beach, transitioning to shrub and tree dominated vegetation further inland. The inland portion of this forested area is a deflation plain wetland, and has been expanding to the east over time. Vegetation on this west side of the riding area is generally very dense. Other than in beach grass dominated areas close to the beach, there are few OHV trails beyond the designated routes. The southern end of this western portion lies adjacent to Snowy plover habitat near the mouth of the Siltcoos River (Siltcoos Breach area). Some of this area has been designated as critical habitat for the Snowy plover by the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service (USFWS). The beach to the west of the riding area is under the jurisdiction of the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD), and is open to OHVs.

The forested area along the eastern portion of the north riding area is a combination of native forest stands, and plantation stands that resulted from dune stabilization efforts in the 1960s and 1970s.



“Undesignated” OHV trails in this area are numerous, particularly in proximity to the OHV Staging Areas located on the north and south ends of the riding area. Many of these plantation stands have also developed into high quality matsutake mushroom habitat, and support an active local mushroom picking industry. A number of privately owned properties lie along the eastern boundary of the area, just south of Florence. Many of these are residential properties. Cleawox Lake, popular for non-motorized recreation use, lies within and adjacent to these eastern portion of the riding area on the north end. Honeyman State Park also borders the riding area on the east side. A noise buffer of varying width, which is closed to OHV use, has been established along most of the eastern boundary of this area, south of Cleawox Lake. Other areas popular with non-motorized recreation users lie adjacent to the north (South Jetty area) and to the south (Siltcoos River/Lagoon Campground area).

Stream Outlet from Cleawox Lake

There are several existing designated routes (DR) and OHV staging areas in the north riding area, as follows:

- Coast Guard DR - running north-south immediately adjacent to the beach.
- Hunters DR - running north-south, parallel to the Coast Guard route but further inland.
- South Jetty DR – running east-west and then north-south, and connecting Goose Pasture and South Jetty Staging Areas with open sand areas to the south.
- Driftwood II DR – running north-south and connecting Driftwood II Campground with open sand areas to the north.
- Breach DR – running east-west and connecting the beach with open sand areas to the east (aka Siltcoos Breach).
- Incinerator Road DR – running north from Siltcoos Beach Road.
- Chapman’s DR – running east-west and connecting the beach with open sand areas to the east.

- Goose Pasture DR – running east-west and connecting the beach with open sand areas to the east.
- South Jetty Staging Area – located adjacent to South Jetty Road on north end of riding area.
- Goose Pasture Staging Area – located adjacent to South Jetty Road on north end of riding area.
- Driftwood II Campground – located north of Siltcoos Beach Road on south end of riding area.
- Siltcoos Beach Staging Area – located at west end of Siltcoos Beach Road on south end of riding area.

Middle Riding Area

This riding area is located immediately south of Reedsport and Winchester Bay. It lies to the west of Highway 101, adjacent to Umpqua Beach. The northern portion of the area is characterized by several long, narrow strips of open sand (parabola dunes), separated by densely forested ridges. The southern portion of this area is characterized by a large, relatively unbroken open sand area, which contains several small “tree islands”. The western side of the south portion is a foredune/deflation plain area, dominated by beach grass and shrub species. The beach to the west of the riding area is under the jurisdiction of the OPRD, and is closed to OHVs. The south boundary of this area lies adjacent to a designated Research Natural Area. Other than in the beach grass dominated area on the southwest side of the riding area, OHV trails are largely limited to the edges of the forested areas. This riding area is



Dunes and Forested Uplands in Middle Riding Area

notable for the height and steepness of its dunes, and OHV hill climbing is a popular activity here. Banshee Hill, a well known hill climb area, is located in the north end of the riding area. Umpqua Lighthouse State Park borders the riding area on the north side. There are currently no designated routes in this riding area. There are two OHV staging areas, Umpqua Beach #2 and Umpqua Beach #3, both located on the Umpqua Beach access road.

South Riding Area

This riding area is located north of North Bend. It is bordered by the beach on the west side, and by numerous private properties along the east side, with Highway 101 to the east of the private lands. It lies between Horsfall Beach Road on the south end, and Tenmile Creek on the north end. This is the largest and most diverse of the riding areas. The area contains numerous wetland areas, and several large lakes. Open sand areas are arranged in strips running north-south, with very limited access through the forested areas that separate them, due to wet areas and very dense vegetation. Vegetation in the western foredune/deflation plain area is dominated by beach grass near the beach, and dense shrub and wetland vegetation further inland. The forested strips further inland in the riding area are

primarily native forest vegetation located on short, steep ridges, with some open sand areas dominated by beach grass hummocks intermixed. There are also extensive areas of dense riparian and wetland vegetation intermixed due to the lakes and wetlands in the area. There are several large non-federal land “inholdings” within this area. Some are privately held and others are owned by Coos County. There is direct trail and/or open sand access onto NRA lands from many of these properties. Some of these property lines have been fenced by the landowners, and others have not. In some areas, OHV use moves from NRA land to private land and back, without regard to the property lines. There are easements in place for some designated OHV trails. The beach to the west of the riding area is under the jurisdiction of the OPRD, and is open to OHVs. Parcels of land zoned as Management Area 10(C) are smaller and more fragmented in the south riding area, due to the land ownership pattern and the presence of lakes and wetlands. Some parcels have extensive networks of “undesigned” OHV trails, primarily those in close proximity to staging areas and other access points. Others have few or no “undesigned” trails due to limited access and/or dense vegetation.



Open Sand Area in South Riding Area

There are several existing designated routes and OHV staging areas in this riding area, as follows:

- Coast Guard DR - running north-south immediately adjacent to the beach.
- Bark DR - running north-south, from Horsfall Beach Road to Hauser Beach Road on the east side of the area.
- Bull Run DR – running east-west just north of Horsfall Beach Road on the west end.
- Hauser Beach DR – running east-west and connecting the Hauser Beach Road to the beach.
- 430 DR – running north-south from Hauser Beach Road to the Spinreel Campground and Staging Area.
- Saunders DR – running east-west, and connecting the Saunders Lake area to the beach.
- Old Bark Road Staging Area – located north of Horsfall Beach Road in the southeast corner of the riding area.
- Horsfall Beach Campground and Staging Area – located adjacent to the beach on the west end of Horsfall Beach Road, in the southwest corner of the riding area.
- Horsfall Campground – located north of Horsfall Beach Road in the southeast corner of the riding area.
- Hauser Staging Area – located on the east side of the riding area, on Hauser Depot Road just west of Highway 101.
- Spinreel Campground and Staging Area – located in the northeast corner of the riding area, near Tenmile Creek.

Purpose and Scope of OHV Designated Routes Working Group

The OHV Designated Routes Working Group was convened in October of 2009. The purpose of the group was to propose a system of designated routes within MA 10(C) of the ODNRA. They were to accomplish this by reviewing the existing conditions within the three riding areas and identifying a system of designated routes that would meet the intent of the direction in the 1994 ODNRA Management Plan, and balance the needs and objectives of the interests, recognizing that full satisfaction cannot be met for all interests.

MA 10(C) is one of several management areas identified in the 1994 plan. The plan specifies that this management area is to be managed to “protect vegetated habitats while providing controlled opportunities for Off Road Vehicle (ORV) touring and travel on designated routes.” The plan further states that the goal for this management area is “to minimize ORV impacts on vegetated areas while allowing controlled opportunities for riding and travel through the area on designated routes for access to the beach and other areas which are open for ORV use.”

Thus, while the Working Group did consider and discuss many issues applicable to the larger NRA and its management, the scope of the Group’s proposals is limited to potential designated routes in MA 10(C). The Group’s discussions and ideas on related NRA issues are summarized in the “Key Issues” section of this report.

The Working Group was comprised of fourteen individuals, who were selected by an independent, third party facilitator. The size of the Group, and the interests to be represented on the Group were specified by the USFS through a contract with the third party facilitator. However, once applications were solicited and reviewed, some additional interests were identified and included in the Group. The fourteen individuals were selected from a pool of thirty applicants. Appendix A lists the names of the Working Group members and interests they represented.

OHV Designated Routes Working Group Process and Methods

The Working Group conducted its work through a series of four field trips and eight meetings. In addition to the field trips and meetings, Group members provided review and feedback on various products and documents between meetings as the process moved forward. The Group was supported by two staff: Ross Holloway, Working Group Facilitator, and Sharon Stewart, Dispersed Recreation Coordinator for the Central Coast Ranger District, Siuslaw National Forest. Ross provided meeting scheduling and planning, meeting facilitation, and documentation. Sharon provided field trip planning and logistics, coordinated GIS and mapping support, and served as the USFS representative at all meetings and field trips.

All field trips and meetings of the Working Group were open to the public. Meeting notices were published in local media outlets seven to ten days prior to each meeting. Information on field trips and meetings was also posted to a specific web page developed by the Siuslaw National Forest, and distributed to individuals and organizations on a mailing list developed for the process. Meetings were held in locations from Florence to North Bend during the process in an effort to encourage participation by local residents and recreation users.

Summaries of field trips, meetings and other Working Group activities

October 3, 2009 – The initial meeting of the Working Group was held at the Florence Events Center in Florence, Oregon. In addition to Group members and staff, four members of the public were in attendance. Pam Gardner, District Ranger, Central Coast Ranger District, Siuslaw National Forest also



Working Group Members on Initial Field Tour

attended this initial meeting. The Group went through introductions of members and staff, and reviewed and discussed the purpose, ground rules and expectations for the process. They received a presentation on the history of the ODNRA, the current management plan, and the purpose and management goals for MA 10(C) from Pam Gardner. The Group took a short field trip to the north riding area of the NRA. The Group reviewed and discussed the future work plan and schedule of meetings and field trips that would be needed to complete their tasks.

Interim Work (between October 3 and November 6) – The Group received information on western snowy plover (provided by Liz Kelly), which had been requested at the October 3 meeting.

November 6, 2009 – The Group participated in a half-day field trip to the middle riding area. In addition to Group members and staff, five members of the public attended the field trip. Others in attendance included representatives of the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Coos County Sheriff's Office, and staff from Congressman Peter DeFazio's office. A USFS Geologist and Botanist, and USFS law enforcement staff also attended to share information on the dunes and NRA management. The group made seven stops on the field trip and viewed several different parcels of MA 10(C).

November 7, 2009 – The Group held its second meeting at the Winchester Bay Community Center in Winchester Bay, Oregon. In addition to Group members and staff, others in attendance included nine members of the public and a reporter from The Umpqua Post newspaper. Topics reviewed and discussed at this meeting included the history of OHV management and the designated routes issue on the NRA. The Group also developed and discussed a list of criteria that they could use to evaluate alternative designated route proposals. The Group developed an initial set of designated route proposals for the middle riding area.

Interim Work (between November 6 and January 22) – The Group received electronic files for the middle area riding displays used at the November 7 meeting. Group members reviewed and commented on the middle riding area proposals, and provided more detailed locations for some of the proposed routes. The Group received information on OHV use and economic impact surveys conducted by OSU. The Group also completed an on-line survey to "rank" the importance of the evaluation criteria developed at the November 7 meeting.

January 22, 2010 – The Group participated in a full-day field trip to the north riding area. In addition to Group members and staff, thirteen members of the public attended the field trip. Others in attendance included a USFS Botanist and Wildlife Biologist, and NRA recreation management staff. The Group visited two stops focused on matsutake mushroom habitat areas, and the impact of OHV trails and use on this resource. The Group viewed several "undesigned" OHV trails that receive heavy use and serve as key access routes. The Group viewed a large area of plantation forest, with extensive areas of non-



**Working Group Discusses Mushroom Habitat
in North Riding Area**

native species presence, and discussed the pros and cons of this area being "re-zoned" from MA 10(C) to MA 10(B) (Open riding). The Group visited the Driftwood II and Incinerator Road areas to view and discuss both currently designated routes and popular undesigned trails. January 23, 2010 – The Group held its third meeting at the meeting hall at Honeyman State Park, south of Florence. In addition to Group members and staff, others in attendance included nineteen members of the public. Topics reviewed and discussed at this meeting included review and discussion of the

evaluation criteria developed at the November meeting, review and refinement of the middle riding area designated route proposals, and development of initial designated route proposals for the north riding area.

Interim Work (between January 23 and April 16) – Group members reviewed and commented on the north riding area proposals, and provided more detailed locations for some of the proposed routes. The Group was provided with links to access the GIS displays for the middle, north and south riding areas. The Group completed on-line surveys, using the evaluation criteria developed, to provide feedback on the proposals developed for the middle and north riding areas. The Group received a summary of the feedback received from the on-line surveys.

April 16, 2010 - The Group participated in a full-day field trip to the south riding area. In addition to Group members and staff, twenty eight members of the public attended the field trip. Others in attendance included NRA recreation management staff, three local landowners, two representatives of Hauser Fire Department, and a Coos County Sheriff's Deputy. The Group traveled north on the Bark Designated Route and viewed and discussed several small parcels of Management Area 10(C) that lie between the route and open sand to the east. They discussed the pros and cons of these parcels being "re-zoned" from Management Area 10(C) to 10(B) (Open riding). The Group also visited an area overlooking private properties that are "inholdings" within the NRA and heard from landowners about their concerns with OHV use impacts on their properties. The Group visited the Beal Lake area and discussed concerns about the recent closure implemented there, and its impact on historical use and access to the lake shore. The Group discussed issues related to signing and fencing on the NRA, and the need for increasing the emphasis on educating users.



Field Tour of South Riding Area

April 17, 2010 – The Group held its fourth meeting at the North Bend Public Library in North Bend, Oregon. In addition to Group members and staff, others in attendance included twenty six members of the public, Siuslaw National Forest Supervisor Jerry Ingersoll, and a representative of Hauser Fire Department. Work at this meeting focused on reviewing, discussing and refining the proposals previously developed for the middle and north riding areas.

Interim Work (between April 17 and June 5) – Group members reviewed and commented on a proposal to revise and reduce the number of evaluation criteria developed in November, and reviewed and commented on a proposal to re-organize the proposals developed to date for the middle and north riding areas. The Group also provided feedback on the question of how best to schedule and receive public comment at their meetings. They continued to provide feedback for inclusion in proposal narratives for the middle and north riding areas.

June 5, 2010 – The Group held its fifth meeting at the North Bend Public Library in North Bend. In addition to Group members and staff, others in attendance included fifteen members of the public. Work at this meeting focused on development of initial proposals for the south riding area, and review and refinement of the middle and north riding area proposals.

Interim Work (between June 5 and June 26) – The Group received the south riding area proposal displays and proposal narratives for review and comment.

June 26, 2010 - The Group held its sixth meeting at the Florence Events Center in Florence. In addition to Group members and staff, others in attendance included twenty five members of the public, and Siuslaw National Forest Recreation Staff Officer Mike Harvey. Work at this meeting focused on a discussion of the 1994 ODNRA Management Plan and the process used to develop it, review and refinement of the south riding area proposals developed at the June 5 meeting, and review and discussion of a draft “Key Issues” document. The Group also discussed plans for two final meetings of the Group in the Fall of 2010 to complete their work and review a final report.

Interim Work (between June 26 and September 11) – The Group provided review and feedback on the proposal narratives for all three riding areas, and on the “Key Issues” document provided at the June 5 meeting. Group members also completed on-line surveys to assess their level of support for the various proposals developed to date.

September 11, 2010 – (to be completed following seventh meeting)

October 16, 2010 – (to be completed following eighth meeting)

Methods for Developing Designated Route Proposals

The process was constructed to focus on one riding area at a time, starting with the middle riding area, moving to the north riding area, and then to the south riding area. For each riding area, USFS GIS staff prepared GIS displays showing current designated routes and other existing OHV trails. The location of existing OHV trails was established through interpretation of 2005 aerial photos of the NRA. For some trail locations, corrections were made based on GPS information collected by USFS staff and by Working Group members. Each riding area was the subject of a field tour to look at specific MA 10(C) areas and key issues associated with OHV use. USFS resource specialists attended the field tours to share information on key issues and resources. Adjacent landowners were also present on some of the field tours to share issues and concerns from their perspective. The day following each field tour, a meeting of the Working Group was held in a nearby community to discuss that riding area and to develop initial proposals for designated routes.

The process of developing specific route proposals for each riding area began with a review of issues observed and discussed on the previous day’s field tour. The Group then reviewed historical aerial photos of the riding area to see how the landscape had changed over time. The Working Group was able

to review aerial photos from 1962 for each riding area, and compare those with the 2005 aerial photos. This enabled the Group to see where significant areas of new vegetation had developed over time, and how those changes had affected the amount and distribution of open sand and forested areas in each riding area. The Group also reviewed the existing trails display for each riding area. Group members contributed their personal knowledge of specific trails and the use they received.

At the second meeting of the Working Group, in November, 2009 in Winchester Bay, the Group discussed and developed a set of criteria they believed were important to evaluating and assessing specific route proposals. Criteria addressed a variety of social, economic and environmental issues.

Evaluation criteria developed by the Group:

1. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would minimize impacts to native vegetation, or maintain blocks of native vegetation.*
2. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would provide for managed (controlled) OHV riding opportunities.*
3. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would connect open riding areas.*
4. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would affect the ability of users to use open riding areas (how levels of use are impacted, and thus economic benefits of use are impacted).*
5. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would affect the quality of the user experience.*
6. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would provide for emergency response vehicle access.*
7. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would avoid impacts to areas of quality matsutake mushroom habitat.*
8. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would avoid impacts to known cultural resources.*
9. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands.*
10. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would minimize impacts to sensitive or listed species, or to identified "critical habitat" for a species.*
11. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would be in close proximity to special wildlife habitats.*
12. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would be compatible with other uses of the area.*
13. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would affect trail maintenance requirements and the cost of maintenance.*
14. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would provide for the safety of users.*
15. *Extent to which the proposed designated route would have the potential for adverse impacts on neighboring landowners.*

Following development of the evaluation criteria, the Working Group developed initial designated route proposals for the middle riding area. Initially, Group members advanced two proposals that came to be characterized as the "bookend" proposals. The first of these was a proposal to designate all of the existing trails in the riding area, as shown on the GIS displays, as Designated Routes. The corollary proposal (the other "bookend") was to designate no additional trails as Designated Routes, beyond what was currently designated in the riding area. (Note: There are no currently designated routes in the middle riding area.) In addition to the "bookend" proposals, the Group developed several specific proposals for potential Designated Routes, focusing first on the east side of the riding area and then on

the west side. Proposals on the east side involved options for providing routes that crossed the five forested fingers in that portion of the riding area. Options on the west side focused on the foredune/deflation plain area in the southwest quadrant of the riding area. Also, based on their review of the historical photos and areas seen on the field tour, the Group developed proposals for “re-zoning” a MA 10(C) area in the southwest quadrant to MA 10(B), Open riding. Following the development of the initial proposals for the middle riding area, several Group members volunteered to do “ground truthing” work prior to the next meeting, to provide corrections to the existing trails displays, and to establish more specific locations for some of the Designated Routes proposed.

Similar processes were used to develop initial Designated Route and re-zoning proposals for the north and south riding areas. Both involved full-day field tours, followed by full-day meetings to review issues and historical photos, hear public comment, and develop initial proposals. Following the development of the middle riding area proposals in November, the interim period between subsequent meetings served as a review and comment period, whereby Working Group members provided additional information and their thoughts and concerns on various proposals. Initial north riding area proposals were developed at the January meeting, and initial south riding area proposal were developed at the June 5 meeting. Based on the feedback received and discussions at Working Group meetings, the following format was established for presenting information on each proposal:

Format for Organizing Proposal Narratives

<u>Riding Area:</u> (Middle,North or South)	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u> (Unique identifier for each proposal)
<u>Proposal Description:</u> (A short statement describing the proposal...what trails and where, or what area to be re-zoned)	
<u>Description of Area:</u> (A brief description of vegetation and other key features in proximity to the proposed route or re-zone)	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> (A listing of the benefits or “pros” of the proposal in the opinion of Working Group members. Note: No attempt was made to establish a consensus. Specific benefits could reflect the opinion of one, or several Group members.)	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> (A listing of the concerns or “cons” of the proposal in the opinion of Working Group members. Note: No attempt was made to establish a consensus. Specific issues or concerns could reflect the opinion of one, or several Group members.)	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> (Information generated through several on-line surveys where Working Group members were asked to indicated their level of support for individual proposals, and provide any comments they had.)	

Following development of the middle and north riding area proposals, Working Group members completed a series of on-line evaluation surveys, utilizing the fifteen evaluation criteria developed. As a result of these surveys and discussions at subsequent meetings, the Group decided that trying to evaluate each proposal against fifteen criteria was too cumbersome. For proper evaluation, several of the criteria required technical information or expertise either not readily available at the time, or outside the expertise of most Group members. Specifically, the Group determined that the criteria related to cultural resources, wetlands, critical habitat for species, presence of specific wildlife habitats, and trail maintenance requirements and costs should be dropped as evaluation criteria to be directly considered by the Working Group. It was agreed that if Group members had specific concerns or information relative to any of these elements, those would be documented in the proposal narratives. The Group also agreed that all of these elements are important and need to be considered by the USFS in any future analyses of Designated Route or re-zoning proposals.

Following development and discussion of Designated Route and re-zoning proposals for all three riding areas, Group members completed a series of on-line surveys to indicate their level of support for individual proposals. Members were asked to indicate whether they fully supported a proposal, supported the proposal with reservations, or did not support the proposal. A numerical value of 5 was assigned if a member indicated full support, 3 for support with reservations and 0 for no support.

Average ratings were calculated for each proposal and included in the proposal narratives and summaries in the following section of this report.

Working Group Proposals

North Riding Area Proposal Narratives

This riding area is located immediately south of Florence. It is bordered on the north by South Jetty Road and on the south by the Siltcoos River and Siltcoos Beach Road. There are currently 13.8 miles of designated OHV routes in this riding area. In addition, there is an estimated 94.1 miles of undesignated trails used by OHVs located within MA 10(C) areas.

Designated Route Proposals

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - All
Proposal Description: Designate routes on all existing identified trails in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area (currently designated and undesignated), and close all future user-created trails. This would result in approximately 108 miles of designated routes in this riding area.	
Description of Area: Applies to entire riding area.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would retain existing designated routes and designate all additional existing trails, making them available for continued use by riders. Maximizes the potential trail riding opportunities in MA 10(C) areas.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Designates many trails that may be in poor or unsafe locations. Designates many trails that do not serve as connectors between open riding areas. Perpetuates the “spider web” of trails that have developed in some MA 10(C) areas, impacting native vegetation and impacting high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat areas. Perpetuates a situation for emergency responders whereby it is often difficult to know what trail a victim is on, and provides access to more remote areas, which are difficult for emergency responders to reach. Perpetuates OHV noise and use impacts on non-OHV recreational users, neighboring rural residents, nearby cities, and sensitive wildlife and wetland areas.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.92. Overall, it ranked twelfth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Support is generally associated with maximizing trail riding opportunities and the diversity of trail riding experiences, and dispersing the heavy use associated with most of this riding area. Lack of support is generally associated with concerns about protecting other resource values in the area, including native vegetation, wetland areas, high quality mushroom habitat, and wildlife habitats. There is also concern about the large number of routes that would be associated with this proposal and potential impacts on other uses in the area.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - None
Proposal Description: Designate no additional routes in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area, beyond what is currently designated, and close all existing and future user-created trails. This would result in approximately 14 miles of designated routes in the riding area, and the closure and/or obliteration of approximately 94 miles of existing undesignated routes.	
Description of Area: Applies to entire riding area.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Maximizes protection to native vegetation, wetland areas, high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat, and wildlife habitat. Minimizes potential OHV use conflicts with other recreational users and with neighboring cities and rural residents.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Eliminates many historic trail riding opportunities in this riding area, since riding in MA 10(C) areas would be limited to currently designated routes. There are some existing trails that are located on historically used routes that should have been designated when the 1994 plan was adopted (north of Incinerator Road). Limiting routes to this degree would likely pose extreme management challenges. Existing use would be concentrated to a very small number of routes, increasing maintenance challenges and creating safety concerns.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received the lowest level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of .73. Overall, it ranked fifteenth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Lack of support was generally associated with an extreme limiting of trail riding opportunities, and the adverse effects of concentrating OHV trail use onto such a limited system of designated routes.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 1
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a “corridor” route on an existing trail, running north-south, on the west side of the plantation area in the northwest portion of the riding area. This route would be approximately 1.28 miles in length, and would intersect with the Hunters designated route approximately .75 miles south of the starting point, follow the Hunters route for a distance, and then leave the Hunters route and go east to the open sand area on the south end. The “corridor” concept is intended to allow riding within a specific distance of the route centerline, with the specific distance to be determined after evaluating conditions on the ground. (Formerly part of Proposal #3 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: The proposed “corridor” route is dominated by open sand with hummocks of beach grass, scotch broom and scattered trees. It is bordered on the east by dense pine stands with dense brush understory. It is bordered on the west by a combination of foredune vegetation (primarily beach grass), and deflation plain vegetation. This route is currently undesignated, but has long been a popular main access route through this area to connect open sand areas to the north and south. Historical aerial photos (1962) show that the area proposed as a corridor was open sand in the past.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides for continued use of well-established popular connector route that probably should have been designated in the 1994 plan. Allowing “corridor” use would help control beach grass which is present along most of the route, and reduces probability of developing a “washboard” trail requiring recurring maintenance.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a very high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.83. Overall, it ranked second out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Support is generally related to the fact that this is a long-standing, heavily used connector route, and one that agency staff believes should have been designated at the time the Dunes Plan was adopted in 1994.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 2
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a “corridor” route on an existing trail, running north-south, on the east side of the plantation area in the northwest portion of the riding area. This route would be approximately .32 miles in length, and consist of two short segments through areas where MA 10(C) to the west of Cleawox Lake connects to MA 10(C) farther west. Note: If the area to the west of this proposed route is re-zoned to MA 10(B) (Proposal NR-RZ-A), there would be no need for this designated route. (Formerly part of Proposal #3 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: The two short sections pass through areas dominated by beach grass hummocks, and connect the open sand areas that extend north to south between the MA 10(C) areas to the east and west. Historical aerial photos (1962) show that the forested area to the west was not present in the past, and this area was open sand.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides for continued use of well-established connector route that is only needed for short stretches between open sand areas. Allowing “corridor” use would help control beach grass which is present along most of the route. Allowing for continued use of this route would reduce congestion on the few connectors available between the open sand areas to the north and south.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received the highest level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 5.00. Overall, it ranked first out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Support is generally related to the fact that this is a long-standing, heavily used connector route, in an area dominated by European beach grass.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 3
Proposal Description: Designate an east-west connector route on existing trail, connecting the Hunters Designated Route to the beach, at a location approximately .75 miles north of the Chapman’s Designated Route. This route would be approximately .24 miles in length, and the east end of the route would intersect the Hunter DR at approximately the point where the route proposed in NA-DR-1 would join the Hunter route. (Formerly part of Proposal #3 for the north riding area)	
Description of Area: This area is dominated by deflation plain vegetation on the east end, and by foredune/beach grass vegetation on the west end, adjacent to the beach. The route would cross the Coast Guard Designated Route, which runs north-south through this area.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides an east-west connector to the beach at one of the closest points from the “inland” north-south routes.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.33. Overall, it ranked fourth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 4
<p>Proposal Description: Designate an east-west route on an existing trail on the north end of the northeast portion of the riding area, to connect open sand in the east side of this area with the South Jetty Designated Route. This route would be approximately .16 miles in length, and would intersect the South Jetty route approximately .1 mile east of the Goose Pasture Staging Area. From there, the route would travel east approximately .2 miles to reach the open sand. (Formerly part of Proposal #5 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: This area is plantation forest. The route would be located on an existing, heavily used trail.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides a logical second connector route (in addition to the South Jetty route) through this area of heavy use. Route would be located on an existing well established trail.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a very high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.83. Overall, it ranked second out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 5
Proposal Description: Designate a route on existing trail, on the south end of the northeast portion of the riding area, to the west of the existing South Jetty Designated Route. This route would be approximately .28 miles in length, and would connect open sand areas to the north and south. (Formerly part of Proposal #5 for the north riding area)	
Description of Area: Area is dominated by pine plantations established in the 1970's. The area around this proposed route appears as open sand on historical aerial photos (1962).	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides a second connector route (in addition to the South Jetty route) through this area of heavy use. Route would be located on an existing well established trail. Would improve emergency vehicle access to some heavily used dune areas.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Pine plantations in this area are considered high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat, and are popular picking areas. Concern about increasing "spider web" of trails impacting mushroom habitat.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.00. Overall, it ranked fifth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 6
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a route on existing trail in the southern end of the northeast portion of the riding area, connecting open sand on the west, to the shore of Cleawox Lake. (Formerly Proposal #6 for the north riding area) This route would be approximately .30 miles in length.</p> <p>Note: A possible variation on this proposal would be to designate a “loop” route to provide for a safer trail riding experience to and from the lake shore.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: Area is dominated by pine plantations established in the 1970’s.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides access to a popular shoreline spot on Cleawox Lake for both users as well as emergency responders.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Concerns about wetland or native vegetation resources immediately adjacent to the lake, which will require further evaluation. Concerns about degradation of dunal lakes by increasing access to shoreline areas. Concerns about the potential for noise impacts to residences and other resources on east side of lake, and to non-motorized uses of Cleawox Lake (kayakers and canoes). Concerns about increasing the potential for introduction of invasive species into this area.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.42. Overall, it ranked fourth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Support was generally related to providing access to a unique and attractive feature (Cleawox Lake). Lack of support was generally related to concerns about potential impacts to other resources near the lake, and also due to the fact that this is not a route that provides a connection between riding areas.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 7
Proposal Description: Designate a route running east-west, consisting of new trail construction, to connect to the beach on the north end of the southwest riding portion of the area, mid-way between Chapman Road and the Siltcoos Breach designated route. This route would be approximately .62 miles in length.	
Description of Area: This area is dominated by deflation plain wetland vegetation on the east end, and by foredune/beach grass vegetation on the west end, adjacent to the beach. The route would cross the Hunters and Coast Guard Designated Routes, both of which run north-south through this area.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides an east-west connector route to the beach, in an area where there is currently a 2 mile stretch with no east-west connector. Would likely improve emergency vehicle access to the beach.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Concerns about impacts to wetland areas and seasonal closures due to high water.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.17. Overall, it ranked seventh out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 8
Proposal Description: Designate a route on existing trail in the southwest portion of the riding area that extends the Incinerator Road designated route to the north to connect to the open sand area. This extension of the Incinerator Road route would be approximately .33 miles in length.	
Description of Area: This area is dominated by beach grass, with some open sand areas.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Extends Incinerator Road designated route all the way to the open sand as originally intended. Provides access from the sand camps along Incinerator Road to the open sand area to the north.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: There are significant marshy areas along side Incinerator Road. There are campgrounds close by, and this is a popular area for other uses (hikers, kayakers, birders and mushroom picking).	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.00. Overall, it ranked ninth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 9
Proposal Description: Designate a route on existing trail in the southwest portion of the riding area that branches off the Incinerator Road Designated Route approximately .4 miles north of Siltcoos Beach Road, and connects east to the open sand area known as Red Buggy. This route would be approximately .42 miles in length.	
Description of Area: The route would begin in an open sand/beach grass area on the west end, and then travel through dense, young pine plantations. The entire route would lie .25 to .5 miles from the Siltcoos River.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would maintain access to a trail in a popular riding area. Provides more direct and timely access to the Red Buggy open sand area for emergency vehicle access.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Concern about potential impacts to high quality mushroom habitat in the adjacent plantation stands. There are campgrounds close by, and this is a popular area for other uses (hikers, kayakers, birders).	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.17. Overall, it ranked seventh out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 10
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a route consisting of new trail construction in the southwest portion of the riding area that provides an east-west connector from the north end of the extended Incinerator Road route (Proposal NA-DR-8), west to the Driftwood 2 designated route. This route would be approximately .33 miles in length, and would intersect with the extended Incinerator Road route approximately .1 miles south of the open sand area on the north end. Note: This proposal requires implementation of proposal NA-DR-8, extending the Incinerator Road route to the north.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: This route would start in beach grass areas on the east end, and travel through dense, young pine plantations to reach the Driftwood 2 route.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides an additional trail riding experience in a popular area.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: While this route provides a connector west to the Driftwood 2 route, that route is easily accessed via open sand approximately .1 miles to the north, and does not provide a connection between open sand areas. Concerns about increased OHV trail use in an area that already has noise conflicts with adjacent non-motorized uses (Lagoon trail and campground). Concerns about increasing the potential for introduction of invasive species into this area. Concerns about mushroom habitat in vicinity of proposed trail.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.73. Overall, it ranked thirteenth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Lack of support was generally related to concerns about conflicts with other uses (hikers, campgrounds, mushroom pickers) in this portion of the riding area.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 11
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a route consisting of new trail construction in the southwest portion of the riding area to provide a connector from the Incinerator Road Designated Route west to the Red Buggy area. This would be a second route (in addition to the route proposed in NA-DR-9), located to the south of the DR-9 route. It could also be an alternative to the DR-9 route for providing access to the Red Buggy area. This route would be approximately .59 miles in length, and would intersect with the Incinerator Road route approximately .3 miles north of Siltcoos Beach Road.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: The route would begin in an open sand/beach grass area on the west end, and then travel through dense, young pine plantations. The entire route would lie .1 to .25 from the Siltcoos River.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides an additional trail riding experience in a popular area. Provides OHV access to a point close to the Siltcoos River. Provides an additional connector route to the Red Buggy area, reducing trail congestion and increasing safety for trail riders. Provides additional emergency vehicle access route, but of limited usefulness due to uneven terrain.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: This would be a duplicate connector route to Red Buggy if proposal DR-9 is implemented. Would increase the potential for noise impacts on non-motorized use areas to the east (Siltcoos River and campgrounds in the area). Route would be located in an area of high quality mushroom habitat, and could increase potential for “spider web” trails in this area. Concerns about increasing potential for erosion on and near banks of the Siltcoos River. Concerns about increasing the potential for introduction of invasive species into this area.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.17. Overall, it ranked eleventh out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members. Lack of support was generally related to concerns about conflicts with other uses (hikers, campgrounds, mushroom pickers) in this portion of the riding area, as well as concerns about the proximity of this route to the Siltcoos River.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 12
<p>Proposal Description: Establish an alternate route to accommodate seasonal closures of the Siltcoos Breach Designated Route to protect snowy plover fall/wintering critical habitat. This exact location of this route would be determined by on-the-ground analysis, and the results of discussion between USFS and USFWS. This route would consist of new trail construction of approximately .53 miles. (This proposal combines two previous proposals, NA-DR-12 and NA-DR-13).</p>	
<p>Description of Area: This area is dominated by deflation plain wetland vegetation on the east end, and by foredune/beach grass vegetation on the west end, adjacent to the beach. The existing route is subject to seasonal flooding. Snowy plover fall/wintering critical habitat has been designated on the beach end of the existing route.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides for a maintaining a critical east-west connector route to the beach, while providing an alternate route that avoids areas used as fall/wintering critical habitat by snowy plovers.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Presence of wetland areas and areas subject to seasonal flooding on the east end of the proposed route. Lack of any clear resolution of the discussions between USFS and USFWS on this issue.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.58. Overall, it ranked sixth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – DR - 14
<p>Proposal Description: Eliminate the existing Incinerator Road designated route, which currently provides a connector route from Siltcoos Beach Road to the open sand area that lies to the north. Maintain the route for access for emergency vehicles. This would result in the elimination of approximately .47 miles of existing designated route. Relocate existing sand camps in this area to other locations in the north riding area. (Formerly Proposal #13 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: The current route passes through beach grass areas and some small sections of pine plantation immediately adjacent to the route. The larger area adjacent is dominated by pine plantations. The current route lies .25 to .5 miles to the west of the Siltcoos River.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Eliminates OHV use and associated noise concerns from an area that lies in close proximity to areas popular with non-motorized users (Siltcoos River, Lagoon Trail, and campgrounds). Minimizes the potential impacts to high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat in this area.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Closes a key designated route in an area that is historically very popular with OHV users. Closes a route which provides access to several designated sand camps popular with OHV users (would require relocation of these sand camps to maintain current number of campsites). Eliminating OHV use of this route will increase the difficulty and cost of keeping the route open and accessible for emergency vehicle access. The annual cost of keeping the road open without OHV use is estimated to be \$500.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.73. Overall, it ranked thirteenth out of fifteen different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

“Re-Zoning” Proposals

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – RZ - A
<p>Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of approximately 93 acres in the NW portion of the riding area to MA 10(B), Open Riding. This area is a sparsely stocked area of plantation forest to the west of Cleawox Lake, and lies between two large open sand areas to the north and south. (Formerly Proposal #4 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: The area is dominated by beach grass and non-native brush species (Scotch broom), with scattered pines. There are a few small areas of denser pine plantations. Historical aerial photos (1962) show this entire area as open sand.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would provide for additional acres of open riding opportunity in an area that was open sand historically. Would provide an area where OHV users are allowed to create trails through existing vegetation (largely non-native species). Would provide for more “dispersal” of OHV use in this area, increasing the quality of user experience and the safety of users. Would eliminate the need for the routes proposed in NA-DR-2 on the west side of this area.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.36. Overall, it ranked first out of four different re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members. The general consensus is that since this area is dominated by non-native vegetation that has become established over the past four decades, it would more appropriately be managed as an open riding area.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – RZ - B
Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of approximately 21.5 acres on the south end of the northeast portion of the riding area to MA 10(B), Open Riding. This area is bordered on the east by the south end of the existing South Jetty Designated Route. It is bordered on the east by the route proposed in NA-DR-5.	
Description of Area: This area is dominated by pine plantations, and a network of trails that have evolved over time due to heavy use and the establishment of vegetation. The area is a key travel corridor for accessing the open sand area to the south and west. This entire area appears as open sand on historical aerial photos (1962).	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Re-zoning would allow for the continued use of the network of connector trails in this area, providing multiple options for accessing the open sand areas to the north and south. Multiple routes would provide for more “dispersed” trails use, increasing user safety, and provide quality trail riding opportunities for OHV users.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Re-zoning to open riding would allow for more user-created trails in this area, increasing potential impacts to the high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat in these pine plantations. Could lead to increased conflicts between OHV use and mushroom pickers in a popular and productive picking area. With a MA 10(B) zoning, it could send a message that creating trails within these types of forested areas is OK. An alternative approach of designating all existing trails in this area, and retaining the MA 10(C) designation might be a better option.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.50. Overall, it ranked fourth out of four different re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – RZ - C
<p>Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of 668 acres in the center west and southwest portions of the riding area to MA 10(B). This area would extend from Chapman Road on the north end, to a point north of the Siltcoos Breach designated route (to be determined through analysis). The southern boundary would be designed to provide a buffer of protection to Snowy plover fall/wintering habitat that lies to the south, in the vicinity of the Siltcoos Breach Designated Route. (Formerly Proposal #7 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: This area lies between the beach and open sand areas to the east. The western strip of this area, adjacent to the beach is the foredune area, dominated by beach grass with some Scotch broom and other brush species. The eastern half is a deflation plain area, dominated by native brush species, and wetland vegetation. The eastern third of this area is seasonal wetlands, with large areas of standing water in the winter and spring.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would add many additional connectors to the beach from open riding areas to the east in an area where there are currently no connector routes. Would further disperse use in a popular area and increase safety by providing a way to travel from north to south while avoiding the open sand area where high speeds are a problem. Continues access to approximately 8 miles of existing user-created trails which greatly enhances the experience for users who prefer to ride trails.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Potential impacts to native vegetation on the east side of this area are a concern, as are potential impacts to wetland areas. The proximity to Snowy plover fall/wintering habitat on the south end will be key to determining where the southern boundary of a re-zoned area would need to be located.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.30. Overall, it ranked second out of four different re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members. Support is generally associated with providing more trail riding opportunities and dispersing the heavy use associated with the southern portion of this riding area. Lack of support is generally associated with concerns about impacts to native vegetation and wetland areas in the deflation plain portion of the area.</p>	

Riding Area: North	Proposal Identifier: NA – RZ - D
<p>Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of approximately 250 acres located in the northwest, center west and southwest portions of the riding area to MA 10(B), Open Riding. This area would be a narrow strip adjacent to the beach, lying to the west of the existing Coast Guard Designated Route, between South Jetty Road and a point north of the Siltcoos Breach Designated Route (to be determined through analysis). The southern boundary would be designed to provide a buffer of protection to Snowy plover fall/wintering habitat that lies to the south, in the vicinity of the Siltcoos Breach Designated Route. (Formerly Proposal #9 for the north riding area)</p>	
<p>Description of Area: This entire area is a foredune area, dominated by beach grass vegetation. The adjacent beach is open to OHV use for the entire four-mile stretch.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would provide for unlimited, legal OHV access from the Coast Guard route to the beach.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Concerns about proximity to Snowy plover fall/wintering habitat on the south end of this area. Southern boundary would need to be designed to address this issue. As opposed to the proposal in NA-RZ-C, this would open up a much narrower area, concentrating OHV use and increasing safety concerns. Concern that opening the foredune area immediately south of South Jetty road impairs the scenic and natural values by presenting all of the non-OHV recreational users to the sight and increased sound of OHV use on the foredune, which is readily visible as they drive down South Jetty road to access the non-OHV portion of the South Jetty area to the north. The increased use of OHVs on the east side of the foredune will increase the noise being transmitted to nearby residents in Florence, Glenada, and non-OHV recreational users in the South Jetty area (fishing, crabbing, hiking, birding, surfing, dog-walking, and other nature viewing). These conflicts would be minimized by moving the north boundary of this proposal .5 miles south to the Goose Pasture designated route.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.80. Overall, it ranked third out of four different re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Middle Riding Area Proposal Narratives

This riding area is located immediately south of Winchester Bay, adjacent to Umpqua Beach. There are currently no designated OHV routes in this riding area. There are an estimated 13.7 miles of undesignated trails used by OHVs located within MA 10(C) areas.

Designated Route Proposals

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – DR - All
Proposal Description: Designate routes on all existing identified trails in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area, and close all future user-created trails. This would result in approximately 21 miles of designated routes in the riding area.	
Description of Area: Applies to entire riding area. East side MA 10(C) area consists of older native forest stands. West side MA 10(C) consists of foredune/deflation plain, with foredune dominated by European beach grass and scotch broom, and deflation plain a mixture of native and non-native vegetation.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would designate all existing trails, making them available for continued use by riders. Maximizes the trail riding opportunities for OHV users.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Designates many trails that may be in poor or unsafe locations, and that are difficult to maintain properly. Increases the potential for additional “user created” trails to develop adjacent to existing trails. Allows retention of user trails that provide direct access by OHVs to beaches closed to their use. Increases potential for non-native species to spread into native forest on east side of area. Impacts to wetland areas are likely in the MA 10(C) area on the west side.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.75. Overall, it ranked fourth out of five different route proposals evaluated by group members. Some support among OHV users on the Group, but very little from other Group members.	

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – DR - None
Proposal Description: Designate no routes in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area, and close all existing and future user-created trails. (This could also be considered a proposal to “re-zone” MA 10(C) areas to 10A, non-motorized). This would result in closure and/or obliteration of approximately 21 miles of existing undesigned routes.	
Description of Area: Applies to entire riding area. East side MA 10(C) area consists of older native forest stands. West side MA 10(C) consists of foredune/deflation plain, with foredune dominated by European beach grass and scotch broom, and deflation plain a mixture of native and non-native vegetation.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides maximum protection to native vegetation, wetland areas, and wildlife habitat. Reduces spread of invasive species into new areas. Reduces access by OHVs to closed beaches.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Eliminates all historic trail riding opportunities in this riding area, since there are no currently designated routes.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a very low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of .67. Overall, it ranked fifth out of five different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – DR - 1
<p>Proposal Description: Designate one OHV route to cross each of the five forested fingers on the east side of the riding area, connecting the parabola dunes that lie between these “fingers”, so that one continuous route would exist from north to south through the forested areas. The route would rely on two existing trail segments approximately .45 miles in length, and three sections involving new trail location and construction totaling approximately 1.6 miles. All other existing identified trails on the east side of the riding area would be closed and/or obliterated.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: Applies to east side of the riding area. The five forested “fingers” are native forest stands dominated by Lodgepole pine and Sitka spruce, with an understory of native shrubs.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Includes the existing “Banshee Hill” trail, providing for continued use of that area. Provides an engineered trail riding experience through the forest stands, connecting the parabola dune sections. Improves emergency access to this portion of the riding area.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Route could open up portions of these stands to the effects of strong winds. Routes could increase the potential for non-native species to “invade” these native forest stands. Concerns about reducing native vegetation and increasing fragmentation of native plant communities and wildlife habitat.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.42. Overall, it ranked third out of five different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – DR - 2
<p>Proposal Description: Designate one OHV route to cross three of the five forested fingers on the east side of the riding area. Running from north to south, the route would cross the first forested finger (Banshee Hill), and the fourth and fifth forested fingers (furthest south). The entire route would rely on using approximately .34 miles of existing trails, with no new trail construction. All other existing identified trails on the east side of the riding area would be closed and/or obliterated.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: Applies to east side of the riding area. The three forested “fingers” are native forest stands dominated by Lodgepole pine and Sitka spruce, with an understory of native shrubs.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Includes the existing “Banshee Hill” trail, providing for continued use of that area.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: None noted.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.33. Overall, it ranked first out of five different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – DR - 3
<p>Proposal Description: Designate a north-south route adjacent to the beach on the west side of the riding area. Locate this route behind the first foredune (100-200 feet back from beach) to provide a noise and visual buffer. Provide pedestrian access areas along the route, where OHVs can be parked and riders can access the beach by foot. (Formerly part of Proposal #8 for the middle riding area). Close all other existing identified trails in this area.</p>	
<p>Description of Area: Applies to west side of the riding area.</p>	
<p>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides for OHV users to reach beach access points (for pedestrian use) along this stretch of beach, while providing a noise and visual buffer.</p>	
<p>Key Issues or Concerns Noted: This proposal should be considered in concert with the re-zoning described in Proposal “MA–RZ-A”.</p>	
<p>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.00. Overall, it ranked second out of five different route proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

“Re-Zoning” Proposals

Riding Area: Middle	Proposal Identifier: MA – RZ - A
Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of approximately 142 acres on the west side of the riding area to MA 10(B). This area is adjacent to the beach, immediately south of the Umpqua Beach #3 Parking/Staging Area. The western boundary of the area would be behind the foredune.	
Description of Area: Applies to west side of the riding area. This area consists of foredune/deflation plain, with foredune dominated by European beach grass and scotch broom, and deflation plain a mixture of native and non-native vegetation.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Provides for continued, relatively unrestricted riding opportunities in this area. Riding may help to control the European beach grass and scotch broom, which dominate the vegetation on much of the area. This additional riding area would lessen congestion and enhance safety by providing a “low speed” riding area.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Accommodating a high level of OHV use in this area will increase the management challenges associated with OHVs accessing the closed beach area. Some concern about the presence of wetland areas and native vegetation along the east side of this area, and potential impacts to those resources.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.73.	

South Riding Area Proposal Narratives

This riding area is located immediately north of North Bend. It is bordered on the north by Tenmile Creek and on the south by Horsfall Beach Road. There are currently 19.7 miles of mapped designated OHV routes in this riding area, with approximately 2.45 within MA 10(C) areas. In addition, there is an estimated 26.5 miles of undesignated trails used by OHVs located within MA 10(C) areas.

Designated Route Proposals

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - All
Proposal Description: Designate routes on all existing identified trails in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area, and close all future user-created trails. This would result in approximately 46.2 miles of designated routes in the riding area, with approximately 29 miles located within MA 10(C) areas.	
Description of Area: Applies to entire riding area.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Would designate all existing trails, making them available for continued use by riders. Maximizes the trail riding opportunities for OHV users.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Designates many trails that may be in poor or unsafe locations, and that are difficult to maintain properly. Increases the potential for additional “user created” trails to develop adjacent to existing trails. Designates many trails that do not serve as connectors between open riding areas, and also a number of trails in isolated “islands” of FS ownership, surrounded by private property. Perpetuates the “spider web” of trails that have developed in some MA 10(C) areas, impacting native vegetation and potentially impacting high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat areas. Perpetuates OHV noise and use impacts on non-OHV recreational users, neighboring rural residents, and sensitive wildlife and wetland areas.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.92. Overall, it ranked eighth out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u> SA – DR - None
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Designate no additional routes in the MA 10(C) portion of the riding area, and close all existing and future user-created trails.	
<u>Description of Area:</u> Applies to entire riding area.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> Maximizes protection to native vegetation, wetland areas, high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat, and wildlife habitat. Minimizes potential OHV noise and use impacts on other recreational users and neighboring rural residents.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u>	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> This proposal received a very low level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 1.08. Overall, it ranked ninth out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - 2
Proposal Description: Designate an existing trail that traverses behind the “tree island” on the eastern boundary of the riding area, north of the wildlife closure area. This route would be approximately .11 miles in length, and would connect open sand areas to the north and south.	
Description of Area: The tree island is an isolated stand of timber on the east side of the riding area. The stand extends onto the adjacent private land to the east. The north, west and south sides of the stand are bordered by open sand, which is designated as open riding area (MA 10(B)).	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: This route would provide for continued use of a popular trail that connects the open sand areas to the north and south, and also connects to trails on the private land to the east.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Some members are concerned about possible impacts to the larger trees present in this stand, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if this trail is designated.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.42. Overall, it ranked sixth out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u> SA – DR - 3
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Designate an existing north-south trail south of the Hauser Beach access road, which traverses a 10(C) parcel, connecting open riding areas to the north and south. This route would be approximately .19 miles in length, and would be an additional, alternate route to connect between open riding areas for which access is currently available.	
<u>Description of Area:</u> The propose route is a well-established trail located at the bottom of the slope between two forested areas. The forest stands in this area are dense, natural stands, and the probability of additional routes developing off of this trail is very low, due to the dense vegetation and steep slopes.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> This route would provide for continued use of a popular trail that connects the open sand areas to the north and south. This is a popular family riding area. Due to heavy use and safety concerns in this area, having more than one connector between these popular open riding areas is desirable. This route is also a good candidate for designating a wider corridor route.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> None noted.	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> This proposal received a very high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.50. Overall, it ranked first out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - 4
Proposal Description: Designate two existing north-south trails located south of the intersection of the 430 Designated Route and the Hauser Beach Road Designated Route. This route would be approximately .73 miles in length, and both trails would connect open riding areas to the north and south, for which connecting access is already available.	
Description of Area: The proposed routes are both well-established trails in confined locations. The forest stands in this area are dense, natural stands, with scattered larger trees. The probability of additional routes developing off of these trails is very low, due to the dense vegetation and steep slopes.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: These routes would provide for continued use of popular trails that connect open sand areas to the north and south. Both routes provide better riding experiences than the “washboarded” primary route (Hauser Beach Road Designated Route) that currently connects the open riding areas. These additional routes would also disperse trail traffic in this heavy use area onto multiple designated routes, increasing user safety.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Some members are concerned about possible impacts to the larger trees present in the adjacent stands, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if these trails are designated.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.67. Overall, it ranked fifth out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u> SA – DR - 5
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Designate an existing north-south trail located north of the intersection of the 430 Designated Route and the Hauser Beach Road Designated Route. This route would be approximately .21 miles in length, and would connect open riding areas to the north and south, for which connecting access is already available.	
<u>Description of Area:</u> The proposed route is a well-established trail in a confined location. The forest stands in this area are dense, natural stands, with scattered larger trees. The probability of additional routes developing off of this trail is very low, due to the dense vegetation and steep slopes.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> This route would provide for continued use of a popular trail that connects open sand areas to the north and south. This route provides a better riding experience than the “washboarded” primary route (Hauser Beach Road Designated Route) that currently connects the open riding areas. This additional route would also disperse trail traffic in this heavy use area, increasing user safety.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> Some members are concerned about possible impacts to larger trees that may be present in the adjacent stands, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if these trails are designated.	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.33. Overall, it ranked second out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - 6
Proposal Description: Designate existing trails located in an “isolated” MA 10(C) parcel bordered on two sides by the Goergen property, southeast of the Old Bark Staging area. These routes would be approximately .16 miles in length.	
Description of Area: The existing trails are in an isolated parcel of older, larger timber (up to 36” trees) bordered on two sides by private property. These trails pass from Goergen property onto FS land, and connect to open riding area in the NRA.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Designation would provide for continued use of these trails for user access to and from the Goergen property. The landowner supports the designation to provide for this continued use.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Some group members are concerned about the number of trails to be designated and the potential for trails to increase instability of the larger trees over time. They are concerned about possible impacts to the larger trees present in this stand, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if these trails are designated.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.33. Overall, it ranked second out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - 7
Proposal Description: Designate an existing trail to provide an east-west connection between the 430 Designated Route and open sand to the west, located northwest of Beal Lake. This route would be approximately .07 miles in length.	
Description of Area: This trail would pass through a narrow strip of native forest vegetation and connect to open riding area to the west.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: Designates a key east-west connector that is heavily used to get from the 430 Designated Route into the open riding area.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: Some members are concerned about possible impacts to larger trees that may be present in the adjacent stands, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if these trails are designated.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate to high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 3.92. Overall, it ranked fourth out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – DR - 9
Proposal Description: Designate an existing trail that traverses a parcel of MA 10(C) that lies immediately north of the Coos County parcel that is just north of Beal Lake. This route would be approximately .26 miles in length, and would connect open riding areas to the east and west, for which connecting access is already available.	
Description of Area: The forest stands in this area are dense, natural stands, with scattered larger trees. The probability of additional routes developing off of this trail is very low, due to the dense vegetation.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: None noted other than provision of a trail riding experience.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: This area is known to have seasonal high water levels, and the presence of wetland areas may be a problem for designating this route. This area needs to be closely evaluated for wetland areas and possible habitat values. Some members are concerned about possible impacts to larger trees that may be present in the adjacent stands, and would like to see a commitment to evaluating such impacts if these trails are designated.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.92. Overall, it ranked seventh out of nine different route proposals evaluated by group members.	

“Re-Zoning” Proposals

<p><u>Riding Area:</u> South</p>	<p><u>Proposal Identifier:</u> SA – RZ - A</p>
<p><u>Proposal Description:</u> Re-zone an area of approximately 57 acres, in several parcels from MA 10(C) to MA 10(B) (Open riding). These parcels are in the vicinity of Old Bark Staging, and east of the Bark Designated Route as it goes north from the Horsfall Lake area.</p>	
<p><u>Description of Area:</u> These parcels are dominated by beach grass hummocks, and lie adjacent to open sand area on the east side of the riding area. These areas have many existing trails between the hummocks, and are popular family riding areas.</p>	
<p><u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> This zone change would establish consistency with many existing areas that are zoned as open riding. The additional riding allowed would help limit the non-native beach grass that dominates the vegetation in these parcels. This zone change would also provide a more logical set of zones adjacent to the Bark Designated Route, providing a simpler and clearer situation for users. Areas to the west of the route would be closed to OHV use, and areas to the east would be open riding.</p>	
<p><u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> None noted.</p>	
<p><u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> This proposal received a very high level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 4.67. Overall, it ranked first out of two re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members.</p>	

Riding Area: South	Proposal Identifier: SA – RZ - B
Proposal Description: Re-zone an area of approximately 20 acres located north of Beal Lake and east of the 430 Designated Route, from MA 10(C) to MA 10(B) (Open riding). (An additional adjacent area to the south of this parcel, located within MA 10F, is discussed in the Key Issues section of this report)	
Description of Area: This area is dominated by beach grass hummocks, and some areas of continuous beach grass.	
Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change: This zone change would establish consistency with many existing areas that are zoned as open riding. The additional riding allowed may help limit the non-native beach grass that dominates the vegetation in this area.	
Key Issues or Concerns Noted: . May increase unwanted OHV use and habitat damage in sensitive wildlife area, MA 10F adjacent to Beal Lake. The Beal Lake area was zoned MA 10F to manage for fisheries, wildlife, and special plant species, including the Red Fescue globally significant plant community. This is one of the few lakes in this area where USFS has ownership completely around the lake.	
Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal: This proposal received a moderate level of support from Working Group members. In a range from 5 (full support) to 0 (no support), it received an average rating of 2.58. Overall, it ranked second out of two re-zoning proposals evaluated by group members.	

Proposal Summaries

North Riding Area Summaries

Coding Key:

NA = North Riding Area DR = Designated Route RZ – Re-Zoning

Working Group Support: 5 = Unanimous support, 0 = No support

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
NA – DR – All	Designate routes on all existing identified trails (including currently designated), and close all future user-created trails.	94.1 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. All other DR Proposals.	1.92
NA – DR – None	Designate no routes, beyond what is currently designated, and close all existing and future user-created trails.	0 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. All other DR Proposals	.73
NA – DR – 1	Designate a “corridor” route running north-south, on the west side of the plantation area in the northwest portion of the riding area.	1.28 miles	Existing Trail	No	4.83
NA – DR – 2	Designate a “corridor” route running north-south, on the east side of the plantation area in the northwest portion of the riding area.	.32 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-RZ-A	5.00
NA – DR – 3	Designate an east-west connector route to the beach that connects to the route proposed in NA-DR-1.	.24 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-DR-1	4.33
NA – DR – 4	Designate an east-west route on the north end of the northeast portion of the riding area, to connect open sand in the east side of this area with the South Jetty Designated Route.	.16 miles	Existing Trail	No.	4.83

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
NA – DR – 5	Designate a route on the south end of the northeast portion of the riding area, to the west of the existing designated route.	.28 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-RZ-B	4.00
NA – DR – 6	Designate a route in the southern end of the northeast portion of the riding area, connecting open sand on the west, to the shore of Cleawox Lake.	.30 miles	Existing Trail	No.	2.42
NA – DR - 7	Designate a route east-west to connect to the beach on the north end of the southwest riding portion of the area.	.62 miles	New Construction	Yes. MA-RZ-D	3.17
NA – DR – 8	Designate a route in the southwest portion of the riding area that expands the Incinerator Road designated route to the north.	.33 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-DR-14	3.00
NA – DR – 9	Designate a route in the southwest portion of the riding area that branches off the Incinerator Road route and connects east to the open sand area known as Red Buggy.	.42 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-DR-14	3.17
NA – DR – 10	Designate a route in the southwest portion of the riding area that provides an east-west connector from the north end of the Incinerator Road route, west to the Driftwood 2 designated route.	.33 miles	New Construction	Yes. MA-DR-14	1.73

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
NA – DR – 11	Designate a route in the southwest portion of the riding area to provide a connector from Incinerator Road west to the Red Buggy area, located to the south of the connector proposed in NA-DR-9.	.59 miles	New Construction	Yes. MA-DR-14	2.17
NA – DR – 12	Designate a route in the southwest portion of the riding area to replace the Siltcoos Breach designated route, located farther north to avoid Snowy plover fall/wintering habitat. (Combined with what was NA-DR-13)	.53 miles	New Construction	No.	3.58
NA – DR – 14	Eliminate the existing Incinerator Road designated route.	N/A	Trail Closure	Yes. MA-DR-8, 9, 10 & 11	1.73

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate acres of re-zoning	Current and Historic Vegetation	Level of WG Support
NA – RZ - A	Re-zone the NE portion of the plantation forest area in the northwest portion of the riding area (pine plantation southwest of Cleawox Creek) to MA 10(B).	93 acres	Current: ~ 40 year old, sparsely stocked shore pine plantation, with non-native shrubs and grasses. Historic (1962 photo): Open sand area.	4.36
NA – RZ - B	Re-zone an area on the south end of the northeast portion of the riding area, between an existing designated route, and the route proposed in NA –RZ – 5 to MA 10(B).	21.5 acres	Current: ~ 40 year old shore pine plantation. Historic (1962 photo): Open sand area.	2.50
NA – RZ - C	Re-zone an area in the center west portion of the riding area, from Chapman Road to a point north of the Siltcoos Breach designated route (to be determined through analysis) to MA 10(B).	668 acres	Current: West half – European beach grass and Scotch broom. East half – Native shrub and wetland vegetation. Historic (1962 photo): West half – Beach grass dominated w/some wetland. East half – Open sand.	3.30
NA – RZ - D	Re-zone an area in the northwest and center west portions of the riding area, lying west of the Coast Guard designated route, between South Jetty Road and a point north of the Siltcoos Breach designated route (to be determined through analysis) to MA 10(B).	185 acres	Current: European beach grass and Scotch broom. Historic (1962 photo): Beach grass and open sand.	2.80

Middle Riding Area Summaries

Coding Key:

MA = North Riding Area DR = Designated Route RZ – Re-Zoning

Working Group Support: 5 = Unanimous support, 0 = No support

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
MA – DR – All	Designate routes on all existing identified trails, and close all future user-created trails.	13.7 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. All other DR Proposals.	1.75
MA – DR – None	Designate no routes, and close all existing and future user-created trails.	0 miles	N/A	Yes. All other DR Proposals	.67
MA – DR – 1	Designate one OHV route to cross each of the five forested fingers on the east side of the riding area.	2.05 miles	.45 miles of Existing Trail and 1.6 miles of New Construction	Yes. Alternative to MA-DR-2	2.42
MA – DR – 2	Designate one OHV route to cross three of the five forested fingers on the east side of the riding area.	.34 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. Alternative to MA-DR-1	4.33
MA – DR – 3	Designate a north-south route adjacent to the beach on the west side of the riding area.	1.44 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. MA-RZ-A	3.00

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate acres of re-zoning	Current and Historic Vegetation	Level of WG Support
MA – RZ - A	Re-zone an area on the west side of the riding area to MA 10(B).	142 acres	Current: West two thirds – European beach grass and Scotch broom. East third – Native wetland vegetation. Historic (1962 photo): Similar, but with more open sand and narrower strip of vegetated area.	3.73

South Riding Area Summaries

Coding Key:

SA = North Riding Area DR = Designated Route RZ – Re-Zoning

Working Group Support: 5 = Unanimous support, 0 = No support

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
SA – DR – All	Designate routes on all existing identified trails within MA 10(C) areas (including currently designated), and close all future user-created trails.	26.5 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. All other DR Proposals.	1.92
SA – DR – None	Designate no routes, beyond what is currently designated, and close all existing and future user-created trails.	0 miles	Existing Trail	Yes. All other DR Proposals	1.08
SA – DR – 2	Designate an existing trail that traverses behind the “tree island” on the eastern boundary of the riding area.	.11 miles	Existing Trail	No.	3.42
SA – DR – 3	Designate a north-south route south of the Hauser Beach access road.	.19 miles	Existing Trail	No.	4.50
SA – DR – 4	Designate two north-south routes located south of the intersection of the 430 Designated Route and the Hauser Beach Road Designated Route.	.73 miles	Existing Trail	No.	3.67
SA – DR – 5	Designate a north-south route located north of the intersection of the 430 Designated Route and the Hauser Beach Road Designated Route.	.21 miles	Existing Trail	No.	4.33
SA – DR – 6	Designate a route located in an “isolated” MA 10(C) parcel bordered on two sides by the Goergen property.	.16 miles	Existing Trail	No.	4.33

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate new DR miles	Existing Trail or New Construction?	Linked to other proposals?	Level of WG Support
SA – DR - 7	Designate a route to provide an east-west connection between the 430 Designated Route and open sand to the west.	.07 miles	Existing Trail	No.	3.92
SA – DR – 9	Designate a route that traverses a parcel of MA 10(C) that lies immediately north of the Coos County parcel that is just north of Beal Lake.	.26 miles	Existing Trail	No.	2.92

Route/Re-Zone Identifier	Description	Approximate acres of re-zoning	Current and Historic Vegetation	Level of WG Support
SA – RZ - A	Re-zone several MA 10(C) parcels in the vicinity of Old Bark Staging, and east of the Bark Designated Route to MA 10(B).	57 acres	Current: European beach grass hummocks. Historic (1962 photo): Primarily open sand areas.	4.67
SA – RZ - B	Re-zone an area north of Beal Lake and east of the 430 Designated Route to MA 10(B)	20 acres	Current: European beach grass hummocks. Historic (1962 photo): Primarily open sand area.	2.58

Key Issues Discussed by Working Group

During the process of discussing and evaluating ideas for designated routes in Management Area 10(C) of the ODNRA, the Working Group identified a number of key issues. Some of these issues related directly to the process of identifying and designating routes in MA 10(C), and others are more general in nature and are issues of concern that apply more broadly to management of the ODNRA, and the variety of uses and users there.

1. Vegetation on the NRA:

a. Native versus Non-Native vegetation

Issue Statement: Non-native plant species are becoming increasingly abundant and widespread in the NRA. In particular, European beach grass has invaded many open sand areas over the past four decades, and appears to be causing significant reductions in the “true” open sand areas popular with OHV users. Well established European beach grass in the foredune areas of the NRA has led to stabilization of this area, as well as the adjacent deflation plain wetlands. As a result, the deflation plain wetland areas have been “migrating” inland over time, further reducing the amount of open sand areas present historically.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: Existing vegetation in MA 10(C) is a combination of native plant associations, non-native associations dominated by European beach grass and scotch broom, and a mixture of native and non-native species. The foredune areas have become dominated by European beach grass, to the exclusion of many native species. The deflation plain wetlands are dominated by native species, with some non-native beach grass and scotch broom, and are typically extremely dense vegetation. Trail maintenance in this vegetation type is difficult due to the speed with which vegetation encroaches. This is an advantage where the goal is to close a trail, and a disadvantage if the goal is to keep a trail open. On the eastern edge of the deflation plain, the area of seasonally wet ground continues to migrate eastward, reducing the open sand areas that are typically found inland. Thus, in many areas there is a strip of land that is designated MA 10(B), Open Riding, but is covered with dense wetland vegetation. A number of designated sand camps are also in such areas. Further inland, European beach grass and scotch broom are incrementally invading many open sand areas. Historic aerial photos of the NRA (1962 and later) graphically show this encroachment and the reduction in areas of open sand.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: It is important for the USFS to examine the issue of the establishment of increasing amounts of non-native vegetation on the ODNRA. It appears that there are areas where eliminating non-native vegetation such as European beach grass and restoring historically open sand areas would be a reasonable management objective. This is particularly critical in foredune areas, where European beach grass has stabilized an otherwise dynamic system, and caused changes to extensive areas of the dunes system. In areas where minimal user conflicts exist, it would be useful to test the concept of establishing OHV open riding areas with the primary objective of evaluating the extent to which OHV use can control the spread of European beach grass. Such “test” areas should be well designed and carefully monitored.

b. Natural versus human-created vegetative conditions

Issue Statement: Significant portions of MA 10(C) are vegetated with Lodgepole pine (shore pine) plantations, established in the 1970’s. These plantations were established with the intent of suppressing European beach grass, which had been introduced to stabilize open sand areas. For the most part, these pine plantations areas are comprised of a different plant association than found in natural shore pine stands. In addition to some native shrub species, Scotch broom is present in many of these stands, as is European beach grass along open edges. Some of these stands have developed into high-quality Matsutake mushroom habitat, and a commercial mushroom harvesting industry has become a well-established use on the NRA.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: User-created OHV trails can impact mushroom habitat by disturbing the duff layer on the forest floor.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: Evaluate the potential of stabilizing eroding areas adjacent to Highway 101 and other problem areas by establishing plantings of shore pine along with the native shrub species commonly found in association. The long term objective would be both erosion control and the establishment of a native forest capable of supporting local wildlife and Matsutake mushrooms.

c. Dynamic landscape conditions on the NRA versus “Static” planning decisions

Issue Statement: The physical landscape on the NRA is uniquely dynamic. The forces of wind and water can dramatically alter vegetative conditions and landforms seasonally on large parts of the area. The relatively “static” system of “zoning” and mapping use areas on the NRA (often times based on existing vegetation) creates situations where “mapped” conditions bear no resemblance to actual conditions on the ground.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: The 1994 ODNRA management plan relied on a “zoning” or land allocation approach to managing the NRA landscape over time. Eleven management areas or zones (10A through 10L) were specified and boundaries established on maps and in GIS layers. In some cases, information used to map out the zones was limited, and the resulting boundaries were based largely on broad-scale aerial photo

interpretation. In addition, over time, significant vegetative changes have occurred due to the reasons cited in sub-sections a) and b) above, and to the factors described in the issue statement.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: The dynamic landscape on the ODNRA calls for a shorter planning cycle than what is normally provided for in National Forest plans. The FS has not been able to achieve its intent of updating the 1994 plan after ten years, so it is not clear how successful they would be with an even shorter cycle. Due to the changing landscape and the effects on the user community, plan implementation would benefit from a standing advisory committee to help address the management challenges presented.

2. Noise associated with OHV use

Issue Statement: Noise from OHVs is of concern to many non-OHV users of the NRA, and to some adjacent landowners and residents. Although noise limits are specified in Oregon law (99 decibels) and in NRA regulations (93 decibels), monitoring indicates that many vehicles do not meet the current limit.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: The 2009 Sound Monitoring Tests on the ODNRA indicated that only 64% of OHVs met the current 93dB limit, with 24% above 100dB. 2010 monitoring showed even lower compliance levels, with 50% of OHVs exceeding the 93 decibel level. This situation is further complicated by the fact that Oregon State Law specifies a different noise standard (< 99 decibels), than the ODNRA standard (93 decibels). Despite efforts to “zone” uses in the 1994 ODNRA management plan, in an effort to separate them and reduce conflicts, there are still many areas where popular OHV areas are adjacent to popular non-motorized use areas. The Working Group heard opinions from law enforcement, emergency responders, OHV tour operators, and OHV users regarding the percentage of OHV riders who would not respond to educational outreach to change their behavior (10-20% of users). This number of users could significantly undermine the positive effects of compliance efforts based on education efforts alone.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: The USFS, OHV User Groups, Oregon State Parks, County law enforcement, and other appropriate parties need to concentrate on reaching compliance with the 1994 ODNRA Management Plan objective of 95% compliance with the current 93dB noise emission limit. Reaching this objective would significantly reduce conflicts between OHV users and non-motorized recreation, neighboring communities, and rural landowners. Noise control should be a high priority management issue on the NRA. In addition to an aggressive user education programs, increased monitoring and more aggressive enforcement must be important elements of noise reduction activities. Where possible, relocate OHV use behind ridgelines in areas adjacent to conflicting uses including non-motorized recreationists, neighboring communities, and rural landowners. There is a need to evaluate the NRA to determine if there are areas that should be managed for nature viewing experiences

that include a high level of natural quiet. This is a highly valued recreation value by many nature viewers. If it is decided that this will not be done on the NRA, then visitors should be clearly informed to prevent unrealistic expectations and disappointment.

3. Staffing and Funding –

a. Adequacy of staffing for management and law enforcement

Issue Statement: The ODNRA is currently experiencing heavy use, use levels are constantly increasing, and the NRA has an unusually dynamic landscape. Current staff is unable to address the many pressing management needs, or spend the time necessary to conduct adequate levels of use monitoring, user contact and education to mitigate impacts and minimize conflicts between uses.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: There is a need to implement more effective compliance programs and carry out local research to answer management questions. There is a need to use adaptive management to update management plans more frequently to respond to changing use patterns, rapid vegetation change, and user conflicts. Staffing levels on the NRA have changed over time as the FS has implemented changes in organization at the Forest and District level. For the most part, these changes have resulted in a net loss of dedicated staff on the NRA, while use levels and management needs have increased dramatically.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: There is a need for a higher level of staffing than currently provided.

b. Adequacy of funding mechanisms

Issue Statement: FS ability to fund priority projects and work on the NRA appears to be constrained by a variety of factors. As a result, many identified action items in the 1994 management plan have yet to be implemented. Consistent and effective management and enforcement programs have been difficult to establish and maintain in part due to the funding system.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: Current funding for management and project activities on the NRA comes from a combination of sources, as described by FS staff during Working Group discussions.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: There is a need for the FS to explore the potential for increasing user fees to support more intensive management of the high level of OHV use on the ODNRA. Fees collected from OHV users on the ODNRA should be dedicated to managing OHV activities on the NRA. A more effective noise monitoring and enforcement program could be put in place if dedicated funding were available. Two

possible ideas for additional funding for this purpose are, 1) the establishment of an extra permit fee for OHV users until noise compliance levels reach an acceptable level, or 2) extra ATV fund requests to pay for more noise monitoring and enforcement.

4. Adjacent Landowners and “Inholdings”

Issue Statement: The NRA is bordered by a variety of public and private landowners, whose management objectives are largely unknown. There are also private and public land “inholdings”, areas of other ownership completely surrounded by NRA lands. In some cases, it appears that the establishment of management zones in 1994 created conflicts with adjacent an inholding lands.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: This issue is particularly evident in the south riding area, where there are several large blocks of private and other public land embedded within the NRA. In a least two cases, private landowners are experiencing significant impacts from the use occurring on adjacent FS land. A major designated route (Old Bark Road route) currently passes through private and Coos County land in several locations as it travel northward from Old Bark Road Staging Area. There are no easements or right-of-ways in place for several of the parcels crossed. In at least one location (Day property) the route location is critical to maintaining necessary emergency vehicle access.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: It is critically important that the FS pursue land exchanges, easements, agreements, and other appropriate mechanisms to secure critical access across private and county parcels in the south riding area. The most critical access situations should be identified and pursued first. Explore agreements with neighboring landowners to fence certain areas to reduce impacts on private lands, possibly in exchange for access.

5. Signs and Fencing

Issue Statement: Adequate signage and the use of fences to control access on portions of the NRA are difficult management issue due to the size of the area, the large number of access points, and the dynamic nature of the landscape described in Issue #1. This complicates user education and enforcement efforts on the NRA.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: Although not required by the current USFS rules, there are locations on the ODNRA where signs and fences are necessary to assure compliance with designated OHV use rules. Due to the presence of many recently established user created trails and the presence of out-of-area OHV recreationists, many users may not completely understand what trails are open and what trails are not open. This is likely to be an increasingly challenging issue as the current network of trails is “scaled back” to a system of designated routes. With the implementation of the agency’s “Travel Management” rule, the

intent is to rely less on signage, and more on published maps, to inform users on what areas and routes are open to OHVs. This shift away from signage is of concern to the Working Group members who see this as making it more difficult to clearly communicate with users.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: The FS should continue to use signage as a primary tool for informing users of areas and routes that are open, or closed to OHV use. The FS should also increase the visibility of existing fences by adding some type of reflectors to fence posts. The FS should also explore the use of GPS markers to identify the location of key features and designated routes.

6. Existing Sand Camp Locations

Issue Statement: The location of some existing designated sand camps appears to conflict with other uses, adjacent land ownerships, and with other resource values. To some extent, this is the result of landscape changes over time, i.e. migration of deflation plain wetland into open sand areas.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: The establishment of designated sand camps on the NRA has help resolve many issues that existed with “dispersed” camping in the OHV use areas of the NRA. The sand camps are very popular with users, and present a better management situation for FS staff than unregulated dispersed camping in these areas. There are a number of sand camp locations that appear to raise issues of conflicts with other uses, conflicts with adjacent landowners and/or impacts on other resources values (i.e. wetlands). Some of these sand camps are located in areas where the migration inland of the deflation plain wetlands behind the foredune has caused the water table to be exposed for more of the year, resulting in wetland areas developing. Some of these sand camps are adjacent to existing designated routes. In other areas, sand camps were located in areas where sanitation concerns may impact other resource values (i.e. Incinerator Road area in north riding area). In the south riding area, sand camps were located in close proximity to private inholdings (Day and Lyon properties), and are contributing to landowner concerns over sanitation issues and trespass onto their property. This issue is related to the issue of the dynamic landscape in the dunes, in that facility siting decisions that seem appropriate at one point in time, can seem inappropriate a few years later due to changing landscape conditions.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: Relocate sand camps adjacent to private lands to prevent conflicts and damage. Relocate sand camps adjacent to high quality Matsutake mushroom habitat to eliminate physical damage and remove the threat of human waste contamination of this food product. Relocate sand camps that are immediately adjacent to or within wetland areas to prevent conflicts and damage. Establish criteria for locating sand camps that considers these issues, and other issues in making sand camp siting decisions on the NRA. Periodically review the location and conditions in and adjacent to sand camps, and plan to relocate a certain number of sites on a regular basis.

7. ODNRA “Recreation Capacity”

Issue Statement: Use levels on the NRA have been steadily increasing since the current management plan was adopted in 1994. There does not appear to be an established “capacity” or “level of acceptable change” against which proposed developments or restrictions can be evaluated.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: As defined in the 1994 management plan, “recreation capacity” refers to “the number of people that can take advantage of the supply of a recreation opportunity during an established time period without substantially diminishing the quality of the recreation experience or biophysical resources”. The accepted method for establishing recreation experience opportunities for FS lands is through the use of the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). ROS delineates lands into six classes on a continuum from primitive to urban. Each class is defined in terms of the degree to which it satisfies certain recreation experience needs, based on the extent to which the natural environment has been modified, the type of facilities provided, the degree of outdoor skills needed to enjoy the area, and the relative density of recreation use. Both Management Area 10(C) and Management Area 10(B), the two primary OHV use zones on the NRA, were classified as “Semiprimitive Motorized” areas in the 1994 plan. This is described as an “area characterized by a predominantly natural or natural-appearing environment of moderate to large size. Concentration of users is low, but there is often evidence of other users.” The plan provided an initial estimate of appropriate average visitor density in these areas of between 1 and 2 people per acre (computed only on open sand acres where most use occurs). It is not clear whether or not there has been any monitoring or analysis since the plan was adopted to assess the actual average use density in these areas. There are concerns among users and working group members, that actual densities of use are much higher, raising questions about user safety. There are also concerns that with OHV use continuing to rise in popularity and use levels continuing to increase on the NRA, there is no measurable standard in place against which decisions can be made to restrict or re-direct use if levels become excessive. User experiences and types of use appear to differ dramatically between MA 10 (C) and 10(B), even though they are assigned to the same ROS class. The desire for both open riding areas and more controlled Designated Routes (more family friendly) within the OHV community needs to be recognized and the desires of these two groups evaluated separately. It would seem that thresholds of acceptable use would be quite different between these two zones.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: There is a need for an updated look at ODNRA “Recreation Capacity” or “Maximum Visitor Numbers” for OHV and non-OHV uses in order to provide high quality experiences and minimize impacts to other users and natural resources. These estimates would be more useful if expressed in “total simultaneous users” in a particular area rather than the user per acre measure used in the 1994 Management Plan. As with many of the standards and policies related to planning and management of FS lands, the ODNRA

represents a unique and different landscape. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum may not be as usefully applied on this landscape as it is on more traditional forested landscapes. Future analysis on this issue should consider whether there are more appropriate systems for assigning and monitoring threshold use levels.

8. User Surveys and Feedback Systems/User Involvement in Management Decisions

Issue Statement: No formal mechanism exists for consistent collection of information on use levels and user experiences on the NRA, or to involve users in the ongoing management of the NRA and the implementation of the management plan.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: Information on use levels and user experiences comes from periodic work by academic institutions and the State of Oregon, but not through a consistent system of monitoring and/or surveying focused on NRA-specific management needs. Management “decisions” identified in the 1994 management plan have been implemented incrementally over the past 16 years, and without any formal process of consulting or communicating with affected users. This has resulted in dissatisfaction and discontent among some users over specific management actions (i.e. implementation of wildlife closure area around Beal Lake.) The process of designating routes in Management Area 10(C) is another example. In the intervening 16 years since the 1994 plan was approved, large numbers of user-created trails have come into existence. Formal closure orders to prohibit riding off of designated routes in MA 10(C) were only implemented in limited areas. “Undesignated” trail use in most MA 10(C) areas was permitted to continue without any enforcement action. As a result, the need for ongoing communication with users and user groups is critical to implementing the system of designated routes envisioned by the 1994 plan.

As discussed under the “Recreation Capacity” issue, there is little actual information on use densities that can be evaluated against the initial estimates of use described in the 1994 plan. It is clear from broader user surveys done by OSU in 2005 and 2009 that OHV use levels in general in Oregon, and more specifically in the south coast region where the ODNRA is located, have increased dramatically, and have increased faster than estimates used when the management plan was created.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue: Consider conducting a standardized, periodic survey of recreational uses and use levels on the NRA, similar to what has been conducted by OSU in the past. To the extent that such a survey can be customized to address specific monitoring and information needs important to NRA management decisions, that would be desirable. Such a periodic survey would also be more valuable if it included information from local businesses, and also from other recreation providers in the area (State, County, private, etc.) Past surveys by OSU have included information on user expectations and experiences, and that should be continued in future surveys. Comprehensive ODNRA user surveys could include surveys of neighboring communities and nearby rural landowners. Information could

potentially be used to identify highest priority OHV and non-OHV recreational user desires and highest priority desires of each identifiable neighborhood and rural landowner area. It may also be possible to develop estimates of projected future use for each user, community, and landowner category. Information from a standardized, comprehensive survey effort should be completed in time to be incorporated into the next management plan update.

Consider developing and implementing a quick, simple method of receiving reports and feedback from users on their ODNRA experience. This could include feedback on things like negative impacts to habitats, suggestions for improved management, conflict with other users, and location of fragile or economically important areas (such as maturing pine areas with Matsutake habitat). This could be accomplished through a simple survey form attached to user permits in the area, or through periodic on-site surveys conducted by staff or volunteers.

Consider the establishment of an ongoing forum to engage users and keep them informed on key plans and project activities associated with implementation of the management plan.

9. User Safety

Issue Statement:

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process:

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue:

10. Economic Impacts from ODNRA Use

Issue Statement: Economic benefits to local and regional economies associated with the ODNRA are significant. There are concerns about how management actions like implementing a system of designated routes in Management Area 10(C) will affect use levels and economic benefits. There are also concerns about how increasing OHV use may impact non-motorized uses of the area, which also contribute to local economies.

Discussion/Relationship to Designated Routes Process: As discussed in the “Recreation Capacity” issue narrative, OHV use levels in the south coast region, and on the ODNRA have increased steadily over the years. There have been a number of studies and analyses of the contributions to local economies that this use represents.

Solutions/Potential Actions to Address Issue:

11. Designated Route and Re-Zoning Proposals in other Management Areas (not 10(C))

Issue Statement: In the course of field trip and meeting discussions, the Working Group identified and discussed a number of potential designated route and re-zoning ideas for areas that are not

within Management Area 10(C). However, most of these were either immediately adjacent to MA 10(C), or were considered integral to addressing issues associated with MA 10(C). Since they are outside the scope of the Working Group’s mandate, they have been included here for future consideration by agency managers.

Additional ideas for designated OHV routes

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u>
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Identify and designate one OHV route to connect the Bull Run Staging area to the Old Bark Staging area.	
<u>Description of Area:</u> The area between the two staging areas is dominated by wetland and open water areas, with dense vegetation. Water levels typically rise seasonally, and routes that are dry in the summer months are submerged from late fall to late spring. The majority of this area is currently in Management Area 10(G), Wetlands Emphasis.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> This route would provide clear and direct access between these two popular use areas. Current access between the areas requires traveling north on the west side of the riding area, to the Hauser Beach Access road area, and then back south on the east side of the riding area.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> There is currently no clear location for such a route. Extensive wetland areas between the two Staging areas have thwarted previous attempts to establish this route. There are concerns about being able to establish a route location, and obtain the necessary approvals and permits to construct the route.	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u> During Working Group discussions, OHV users expressed strong support for the establishment of this route. While many group members see the value of a connector route between the two areas, some have concerns as to whether or not it will be possible to locate a route due to the prevalence of wetlands and lakes.	

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u>
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Designate an existing trail to provide access to the north shore of Beal Lake at a point where there has been historical access. (Note: This proposal is within Management Area 10(F), (Plants, Fish and Wildlife).	
<u>Description of Area:</u> This area is dominated by beach grass hummocks intermixed with open sand areas.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> The designation of this route would restore OHV access to a popular access point on the north end of Beal Lake. This access was eliminated in 2009 with the implementation of a management zone to protect wildlife values in the Beal Lake area.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> Some group members are concerned about the wildlife values present, and	

the potential impacts to those resources.
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u>

<u>Riding Area:</u> Middle/South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u>
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Designate a route or corridor to provide OHV access between the south riding area and the middle riding area (between Ten Mile Creek and Umpqua Dunes.	
<u>Description of Area:</u> This area is currently designated in several “zones” that do not allow motorized use.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u> The designation of this route would restore provide for OHV access between two popular riding areas, and would provide additional trail riding opportunity to users.	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u> This would allow OHV use in an area that has been designated as non-motorized since the 1994 plan was adopted and implemented.	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u>	

Additional ideas for changes to management area designations:

<u>Riding Area:</u> South	<u>Proposal Identifier:</u>
<u>Proposal Description:</u> Re-zone an area of approximately 15 acres located north of Beal Lake and east of the 430 Designated Route, from MA 10(F) to MA 10(B), Open Riding. (An additional adjacent area to the north within Management Area 10(C) is discussed in the Proposals section of this report)	
<u>Description of Area:</u> This area is dominated by beach grass hummocks, and some areas of continuous beach grass. This area is currently in Management Area 10(F), Plant, Fish and Wildlife Habitat.	
<u>Key Benefits of Route Designation or Zone Change:</u>	
<u>Key Issues or Concerns Noted:</u>	
<u>Summary of Working Group Evaluations/Support for Proposal:</u>	

Appendix A – Working Group Members and Affiliations

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
John Carnahan	Emergency Responders – Siuslaw Valley Fire and Rescue
Arrow Coyote	Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
Adele Dawson	General Public - Birders
Doug Duchscher	OHV Outfitters/Guides
John Getz	Mushroom Pickers
Marty Giles	Non-OHV Outfitters/Guides
Greg Hoover	Organized OHV Groups
Liz Kelly	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jody Phillips	OHV Users
Ron Price	OPRD - State ATV Program
Larry Robison	Coos County Parks Department
Scott Ryland	Organized OHV Groups
Barbara Taylor	Conservation Groups (Cape Arago Audubon Society)
Mark Tilton	Local Community Leader

Summary of Public Comments Received

Public comment during the process occurred through three primary mechanisms. First, each meeting of the Working Group included a specific time block for public comment. During this time block, individuals were invited to provide their input in the order in which they had signed-in as they arrived during the day. Second, numerous e-mails were received from interested public throughout the process. Third, a number of letters and copies of e-mails were submitted at the public meetings, either in lieu of, or in addition to oral comments.

What follows is a summary of the comments received during the process and the general sentiments expressed through those comments. More detailed summaries of comments received during the public comment periods at Working Group meetings can be found in the individual meeting notes for those meetings. Meeting notes are available through the Siuslaw National Forest web site at the following location... <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/siuslaw/projects/rec-plans-projects/dunes-routes/index.shtml>

Copies of all written and e-mail input received are filed at the Siuslaw National Forest Supervisor's office in Corvallis. Information on these materials is available from Frank Davis, Siuslaw National Forest Planner.

Public Comment at Working Group meetings

Saturday, October 3, Florence – Two individuals provided comments at the meeting. Both expressed their concern about the potential for further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued access to the NRA for OHV users.

Saturday, November 7, Winchester Bay – Five individuals provided comments at the meeting. One person expressed concerns about OHV trail impacts on Matsutake mushroom habitat areas, and emphasized the need to protect those areas. Four individuals expressed their concerns about further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued OHV access. They also emphasized the economic benefits of OHV use to local communities.

Saturday, January 23, Honeyman State Park – Nine individuals provided comments at the meeting. All expressed their concerns about further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued OHV access. They emphasized the economic benefit of OHV use to local communities. They also commented on concerns about overcrowding and safety issues as OHV use increases and available areas decrease.

Saturday, April 17, North Bend – Fourteen individuals provided comments at the meeting. All expressed their concerns about further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued OHV access. They emphasized the economic benefits of OHV use to local communities. Several also shared their concerns about the recent OHV closure implemented in the area around Beal Lake in the south

riding area. One piece of written input was submitted by a local landowner, in addition to the oral comments received.

Saturday, June 5, North Bend – Eleven individuals provided comments at the meeting. Nine individuals expressed their concerns about further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued OHV access. They emphasized the economic benefits of OHV use to local communities. They also shared concerns about the extent to which areas of the NRA that were once open sand, are becoming covered with vegetation, primarily European beach grass. One individual expressed concerns about the impact of OHV noise on local residents in the Hauser area. One individual shared information on noise monitoring and enforcement efforts. Fourteen pieces of written input were submitted (copies of e-mails), all in support of continued OHV use and riding opportunities on the NRA.

Saturday, June 26, Florence - Fifteen individuals provided comments at the meeting. Four individuals expressed their concerns about noise impacts on local residents from OHV use on the NRA, and expressed their support for stronger enforcement of existing rules. Two individuals expressed concerns about the lack of camping facilities in the area, and the potential loss of tourist income to local communities. Nine individuals expressed their concerns about further restrictions on OHV use on the NRA, and their support for continued OHV access.

Saturday, September 11, North Bend – (to be completed)

Saturday, October 16, Florence – (to be completed)

Letters and E-Mails Received

Through September 6, 2010, 46 e-mails were received providing specific comments about OHV use and related issues on the NRA. A number of additional e-mails were received requesting information on upcoming meetings and/or the Working Group process, but providing no specific input or comments. Of the 46 e-mails received, 29 came from individual OHV users that were forwarded through an organization called Save The Riders Dunes (STRD). Input from STRD “members” generally emphasized their experiences riding on the NRA and the importance of this activity to families. They expressed concerns about further restricting the area available to OHV use, and related impacts on rider safety (due to overcrowding) and impacts on local economies (due to reduced use). STRD “members” support continued access to the NRA for OHV use, and oppose any further restrictions on the area available to OHV users. (Note: Printed copies of most of the STRD e-mails were also submitted at the June 5 and June 26 Working Group meetings). Several additional e-mails were received from OHV users of the NRA, expressing their support for continued access and OHV riding opportunities, and their opposition to further restrictions on OHV use in the NRA. 12 e-mails were received from adjacent landowners and residents of the Florence area, expressing their concerns about noise impacts from OHV use on the NRA, and also concerns about trespass and damage to private properties. Several e-mails were received from individuals concerned about opening up areas of the NRA currently closed to OHV use, and allowing OHV use in those areas. They expressed concerns about the potential impacts to non-OHV users in these areas.

Two additional pieces of written input were submitted at Working Group meetings. One came from an adjacent landowner, and expressed support for the designation of OHV user trails in the NRA, including trails that connect to their property. Another letter came from a local resident of the Florence area, and expressed concerns about federal lands being sold into private ownership, and not being available to the people of the United States.

Existing Trail and Proposal Displays

(to be added to final report)