

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Wallowa-Whitman National Forest proposes to amend the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan to set recreation use allocations in the Wild and Scenic Snake River corridor within the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (HCNRA).

This summary of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Wild and Scenic Snake River Recreation Management Plan highlights the following:

- Description of the planning area
- Purpose and need for this EIS
- Issues
- Description of the alternatives
- Comparison of the alternatives

PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The Wild and Scenic Snake River runs north from the Hells Canyon Dam to the Oregon-Washington border and forms the northern portion of the boundary between Oregon and Idaho. The Act establishing the Hells Canyon NRA designated 67.5 miles of the Snake River as wild and scenic, classified into the following segments:

WILD RIVER: The 31.5 miles from Hells Canyon Dam to Pittsburg Landing.

SCENIC RIVER: The 36.0 miles from Pittsburg Landing to the northern boundary of the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

STUDY RIVER: Four miles of river frontage added to Forest Service ownership and management with the acquisition of property at Cache Creek and included in this analysis.

The river corridor is approximately a quarter-mile on each side of the high-water mark. Hells

Canyon Wilderness is adjacent to the corridor along southern portions of the river in both Oregon and Idaho but does not include the wild and scenic corridor (reference Figure I-1).

PURPOSE AND NEED

The need for the proposed action is derived from Forest Service visitor use reports showing a 147% increase in visitor use during the primary season from 1979 to 1991; from the "Visitor Profile and Recreational Use Study" (Visitor Use Study) developed by the University of Idaho's College of Forestry, Wildlife, and Range Sciences; and from the "Recommended Limits of Acceptable Change Recreation Management Plan for the Snake River" developed through the LAC planning process.

The Visitor Use Study, completed in 1989, highlighted a concern that the increase in recreation use in the river corridor was negatively impacting visitors' recreation experiences. Based on this conclusion, Forest Service personnel concerned with protecting the outstandingly remarkable values (ORV's) of the river corridor and reducing visitor conflicts in Hells Canyon entered into a cooperative agreement with the University of Idaho to develop a limits of acceptable change planning process. The objective of the planning process was to recommend management actions that would protect resources and minimize conflicts.

Based on the recommendations presented in the LAC report, the proposed action would provide managers with specific strategies for implementation of the Forest Plan.

The following explanations of the need for action correspond to specific components of the proposed action:

- Provide for access to aviators on the Oregon side of the river for fishing and camping by proposing to open airstrips to private aircraft.

Summary

- Make use allocations to river users that are equitable and that manage continuing growth in visitor use.
- Initiate a closure on motorized personal watercraft to protect and enhance the diverse recreational users' experiences and provide protection for fisheries and wildlife resources.
- Refine management of the floatboat use levels in addition to protecting and enhancing the recreation resources and the associated recreation experience for the diverse groups of river users.
- Establish use season, party size, campsite stay limits, and recreation experiences.

ISSUES

An important step in the planning process is the identification of public issues and management concerns. This was accomplished through an extensive scoping process involving interested and affected individuals, representatives of special interest and user groups, and concerned State and Federal agencies. Contacts were made through publications, mailings, and public meetings.

These issues are the focus for formulating alternatives to the proposed action.

Each issue discussed in this chapter has one or more associated key indicators. Key indicators are select units of measure of how, or to what degree, each alternative responds to the issue. Key indicators are responsive to changes in effects and are measurable and predictable. They provide the decision maker with a basis for comparing the alternatives.

PROTECTION OF THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SALMON

Recreation use allocation should be consistent with the protection and enhancement of threatened and endangered salmon fisheries and habitat in the river corridor.

Many people questioned what effect varying recreation use levels in the river corridor could have on threatened and endangered salmon fisheries and habitat. Specifically, they were concerned about potential effects of exhaust emissions and fuel and oil discharge from motorized craft on salmon fisheries. The potential effect of motorized and non-motorized craft passing over salmon spawning areas was an additional concern.

Other comments expressed concerns over the potential effects on salmon fisheries and habitat from recreation activities such as swimming and fishing.

Key Indicators:

- Potential for species to be inadvertently hooked by anglers.
- Potential for boat disturbance on migration/spawning behavior.
- Potential for boat disturbance to eggs/embryo in redds.
- Potential for species to be disturbed while in tributary stream.

EFFECTS OF RECREATION USE REGULATION ON SOCIO-ECONOMICS CONDITIONS

Regulation of recreation use could affect the socio-economic condition of current and future river users, recreation-related businesses, and related community and regional infrastructures.

Many comments focused on the potential socio-economic impacts on private recreationists who own motorized or non-motorized craft and how the proposed recreation use allocations may affect their ability to use their craft as they have in the past. In addition, many people felt the Forest Service should view recreation use allocations from a regional perspective. Specifically, the Wild and Scenic Snake River is one of the few remaining whitewater rivers in the region available for motorized use and should remain as such.

Other comments were related to the potential effects recreation use allocations may have on recreation-related businesses such as powerboat manufacturing, motorized and non-motorized commercial operators, and retail sporting goods. Additional concerns were expressed regarding the potential effects on related community and regional service industries such as restaurants, service stations, and lodging.

Key Indicators:

- Total commercial permittee revenue.
- Total associated expenditures by recreationists.
- Number and type of recreational users displaced by proposed regulations.
- River corridor management costs.

MANAGING FOR THE INTENDED RECREATION EXPERIENCE

The establishment of appropriate and equitable levels of boating and aircraft use should meet the intended recreation experience within the wild and scenic river.

This is a complex issue, and the comments represented a wide spectrum of opinion and concern regarding appropriate use levels within the river corridor. Many perspectives concerning this issue related to powerboat use levels within the wild section, equitable levels of allocation between powerboaters and floatboat users, equitable levels of allocation between commercial and private boaters, and whether motorized personal watercraft are appropriate within the scenic section.

An additional component of the issue concerned opening Sluice Creek and Cache Creek airstrips and the resulting effect on the intended recreation experience within the wild and scenic sections.

A majority of comments on recreation use focused on the compatibility of competing uses and the effects of noise from motorized watercraft and aircraft in relation to the intended recreation

experience for non-motorized users on the wild and scenic sections.

Comments regarding campsite stay limits addressed a fear that the proposed limits were constraining. Specifically, people felt limits would eliminate opportunities for river parties to enjoy long weekends or extended stays, particularly in the wild section during the primary season. Other people felt the limits in the secondary season would conflict with stays of hunting parties.

Many comments supported developing a campsite reservation system as a means of resolving conflicts over campsite competition and ensuring user accountability, with an expressed concern that the system be equitable between the various river users, including aviators, hikers, and horsepackers.

Key Indicators:

Using the ROS classes, evaluate each alternative's ability to protect and enhance the recreation ORV and DFC's, through the following settings:

- Degree of providing access.
- Degree of providing remoteness.
- Degree of social encounters.
- Degree of visitor management.
- Degree of facilities and site management.
- Degree of user fairness and equity.

MINIMIZE ONSHORE DEGRADATION

Party size restrictions, solid human waste carryout, and campsite stay limits should minimize onshore impacts from recreational users.

Comments on party size were concerned with the impact parties may have on the physical resources. Additionally, some comments were concerns about the ability to hold special events on the river that would result in parties exceeding 30 people.

Summary

Comments on the proposal for phasing out pit toilets and initiating a human solid waste carry-out system were varied. Many expressed support for such a system, providing the system would be environmentally and aesthetically sound. Others expressed concern that a timeline for installation of a solid human waste carry-out system be developed. Other comments suggested the system was unnecessary, an inconvenience to all parties and there were alternative methods to a carryout system.

Key Indicators:

- Risk of visitor impacts from onshore recreation use on:
 - Proposed, endangered, threatened, and sensitive plant species and habitat
 - Cultural resources

OTHER ISSUES

Some additional issues, concerns, and opportunities for river management were identified during scoping and have been addressed by establishing management elements, mitigation measures, and monitoring.

ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action was developed from recommendations resulting from the LAC planning process. A Forest Service interdisciplinary team (ID team) of resource specialists used opinions, comments, and suggestions gathered at internal and public scoping meetings to help define key issues identified in the proposed action. Alternative themes were developed by the ID team to respond to the issues generated by analyzing the proposed action. Alternatives were also submitted by special interest groups for consideration in the alternative development process. The alternatives carried forward for detailed study are designed to resolve the significant issues surrounding the proposed action.

ALTERNATIVE A - NO ACTION

This is the "No Action" alternative as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. This alternative would not implement the proposed actions and provides a baseline in which to evaluate the action alternatives. Current Forest Plan management direction would remain in effect until the Forest Plan is revised.

Implementation of this alternative would not contribute toward meeting the purpose and need for action or the desired future condition. Projected use levels for the wild and scenic sections would not lead the river corridor toward the DFC's established for the identified ORV's, short- or long-term. The effects of Alternative A are used as a frame of reference to compare the effects of implementing the action alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE B - PROPOSED ACTION

This alternative was used in the scoping process to identify issues and generate a variety of concepts for designing alternatives to the proposed action. The recommendations from the LAC planning process, developed by the Forest Service as the proposed action, are the components of the alternative.

Implementation of this alternative would rapidly move the wild section to the DFC's by providing a blend of motorized and non-motorized white-water boating opportunities during the primary season. Unlimited motorized access in the scenic section would not lead that section toward the DFC for an appropriate and equitable level of motorized and non-motorized access in support of the protection and enhancement of the outstandingly remarkable values.

ALTERNATIVE C

This alternative is designed to specifically address the significant issues of the protection of threatened and endangered salmon, managing for the intended recreation experience, and minimizing onshore degradation by emphasizing a balanced allocation of motorized and non-motorized use levels within the entire corridor. Moderate use levels for both private and commercial users would be allocated from an

average of the 1985 through 1989 use levels, for both the wild and scenic sections.

The entire river corridor would be managed for a semi-primitive motorized setting, requiring launch reservations for all river users in the entire river corridor and campsite reservations in the wild section.

Implementation of this alternative would rapidly move the entire river corridor to the DFC's by providing an appropriate and equitable blend of motorized and non-motorized whitewater boating opportunities within the entire river corridor, during the primary season. Additionally, the moderate and balanced use levels would quickly lead toward meeting the DFC's for the protection and enhancement of the identified ORV's within the entire river corridor.

ALTERNATIVE D

This alternative is designed to specifically address the significant issues of the protection of threatened and endangered salmon, managing for the intended recreation experience, and minimizing onshore degradation by emphasizing, during the primary season, the opportunity for a non-motorized recreation experience within Hells Canyon Dam to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch portion of the wild section. During the secondary season, a motorized recreation experience would be provided. Within the wild section, from Kirkwood Historic Ranch to Pittsburg Landing, a blend of motorized and non-motorized use would be provided during the primary season. Motorized use would be emphasized within the scenic section.

The non-motorized portion of the wild section would be managed to provide a semi-primitive non-motorized recreation setting during the primary season, requiring launch and campsite reservations for floatboaters. The remainder of the wild section and the entire scenic section would be managed to provide a semi-primitive motorized recreation setting.

While providing a seasonal approach to an appropriate and equitable blend of motorized and non-motorized whitewater boating opportunities, implementation of this alternative would not move the section between Hells Canyon Dam and Kirkwood Historic Ranch quickly or equita-

bly toward the DFC's. The alternative would lead the wild section from Kirkwood Historic Ranch to Pittsburg Landing rapidly toward the established DFC's by providing a blend of motorized and non-motorized use levels and equitable access to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch. Although the scenic section would emphasize motorized use, the prohibited launching of floatcraft in the scenic section would not move this section toward the established DFC's.

ALTERNATIVE E

This alternative is designed to specifically address the significant issues of the protection of threatened and endangered salmon, effects of recreation use regulation on socio-economic conditions, managing for the intended recreation experience, and minimizing onshore degradation. These issues would be resolved by emphasizing, during the primary season, the opportunity for alternating weeks of exclusive motorized and exclusive non-motorized recreation use in the wild section from Hells Canyon Dam to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch. During the secondary season, a blend of motorized and non-motorized recreation experiences would be provided. Within the wild section, from Kirkwood Historic Ranch to Pittsburg Landing, a blend of motorized and non-motorized use would be provided during the primary season. Regulated motorized use would be emphasized within the scenic section.

Hells Canyon Dam to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch section of the wild river would be managed to provide both a semi-primitive non-motorized and semi-primitive motorized recreation settings during their respective week of exclusive use through the primary season. The remainder of the wild section and the entire scenic section would be managed to provide a semi-primitive motorized recreation setting.

Implementation of this alternative would rapidly move the wild section, from Hells Canyon Dam to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch, toward the DFC's by providing an exclusive weekly approach to an appropriate and equitable blend of motorized and non-motorized whitewater boating opportunities. The alternative would lead

Summary

the wild section, from Kirkwood Historic Ranch to Pittsburg Landing, rapidly toward the established DFC's by providing a blend of motorized and non-motorized use levels and equitable access to the Kirkwood Historic Ranch. The regulated motorized and non-motorized use within the scenic section would rapidly move this portion of the river toward its DFC's by emphasizing the protection and enhancement of the ORV's.

ALTERNATIVE F

This alternative is designed to specifically address the significant issues of the protection of threatened and endangered salmon and minimizing onshore degradation. These issues would be resolved by emphasizing an exclusive non-motorized recreation experience in the entire wild section, year-round. A motorized recreation experience would be emphasized within the scenic section, year-round.

The wild section would be managed to provide a primitive recreation setting, while requiring launch reservations. The scenic section would be managed to provide a semi-primitive motorized recreation setting.

While providing a primitive non-motorized recreation setting in the wild section, implementation of this alternative would not move the wild section toward its DFC's established for providing appropriate and equitable level of access or to Kirkwood Historic Ranch. Although the scenic section would emphasize motorized use, the prohibited launching of floatcraft in the Scenic section would not move this section toward the established DFC's for this section of river.

ALTERNATIVE G - PREFERRED

This alternative is specifically designed to address the significant issues and the diverse public comments received on the DEIS. These issues and public comments are resolved or partially resolved by emphasizing, during July and August of the primary season, a balanced allocation of motorized and non-motorized use

levels within the wild section four days of the week, in addition to providing an opportunity for a three-day non-motorized experience within a portion of the wild section. The emphasis for the remainder of the primary season (May, June, and September) would be for a balanced allocation of motorized and non-motorized use levels.

The three-day non-motorized period is designed to occur during the historically lowest use periods for motorized users (Monday through Wednesday) between Wild Sheep Rapids and Kirkwood Historic Ranch (approximately 21 miles or 66% of the wild section) to provide non-motorized users with extended periods of remoteness by limiting encounters with other river users. The non-motorized period would be implemented for eight weeks during the primary season for a total of approximately 24 days annually (approximately 22% of the primary season). Annual monitoring of users' perceptions and recreation experiences would be conducted to determine the long-term durability and feasibility of the non-motorized period.

During the secondary season, use levels within the entire wild section would not be regulated for either motorized or non-motorized users. When monitoring indicates the daily averages in the secondary season exceed those established for the primary season for two consecutive years, the control period for the primary season would be expanded.

Management within the scenic section during the primary season would focus on providing a semi-primitive motorized experience. Daily use levels would reflect historical use patterns that provide maximum opportunities on weekends for motorized users, while providing a more shared-use level for those non-motorized trips that either continue into or initiate in the scenic section.

During the secondary season, use levels would not be regulated within the entire scenic section for either motorized or non-motorized users.

Following are tables which summarize the management requirements for each alternative.

Summary of Alternative Management Requirements

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	Alternative G
PRIVATE POWER- BOAT USE							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P&S-Unlimited use	P-max 635 permits/season 16 launches/day F/Sa and 8 launches/days Su-Th S-Unlimited use	P-4 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-No motorized use S-Unlimited use	P-Exclusive motorized use Th-W on alternating weeks. Daily max of 24 launches at any one time. S-Unlimited use	P&S-No motorized use.	P-6 launches/day except no motorized use M-W Wild Sheep to Kirkwood in July and August S-Unlimited use
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P&S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Unlimited until use reaches an avg of 6 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Same except for alt off week, daily max of 8 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P&S-No motorized use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use
Scenic	P&S-Unlimited use	P&S-Unlimited use	P-5 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Unlimited until use reaches an avg of 13 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-10 launches/day M-Th. 20 launches/day F-Su. S-Unlimited use	P-Unlimited until use reaches an avg of 13 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-10 launches/day M-Th. 20 launches/day F-Su plus 5 day-use only. S-Unlimited use
PERSONAL MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded
Scenic	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded	R-1 daily permit of up to 4 craft. U-Unlimited use	R-1 daily permit of up to 4 craft between northern boundary and Salm-on River. U-Unlimited use between northern boundary and Salm-on River.	R&U - Excluded	R&U - Excluded

P = Primary
S = Secondary

Summary of Alternative Management Requirements

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	Alternative G
COMMERCIAL POWERBOAT USE							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P&S-Unlimited use	P-max 1368 launches/season avg 12 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Daily max 4 launches S-Unlimited use	P-No motorized use S-Unlimited use	P-Exclusive motorized use Th-W on alternating weeks. Daily max of 12 launches (max of 6 for overnight trips) S-Unlimited use	P&S-No motorized use.	P-7 launches/day except no motorized use M-W Wild Sheep to Kirkwood in July and August S-Unlimited use
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P&S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Daily max 6 launches S-Unlimited use	Same except for alt off week allow daily max 4 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P&S-No motorized use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use
Scenic	P&S-Unlimited use	P&S-Unlimited use	P-Daily max 5 launches S-Unlimited use	P-Unlimited until use averages 8 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Included in wild allocation for alt on week. Alt. off week allow 8 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Unlimited until use averages 9 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-6 launches/day No overnight except at Copper Creek S-Unlimited use
PRIVATE FLOAT-CRAFT USE							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P-3 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-348 launches/season with max 3 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-3 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-3 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Exclusive non-motorized use Th-W on alternating weeks. Max 4 launches/day S-Unlimited use	P-Max 100 users/day, comm and pvt S-Unlimited use	P-3 launches/day S-Unlimited use
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use
Scenic	P&S-Unlimited use	P&S-Unlimited use	P-Average 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, from Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use	P-No launches at Pittsburg or Dug Bar S-Unlimited use	P-Average 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, from Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use	P-No launches at Pittsburg or Dug Bar S-Unlimited use	P-Average 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, from Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use

P = Primary
S = Secondary

Summary of Alternative Management Requirements

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	Alternative G
COMMERCIAL FLOATCRAFT USE							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P-2 launches/day, 1 one-day trip M-F S-Unlimited use	P-232 launches/season with max 2 launches/day; 2 one-day trips included in seasonal launch max) S-Unlimited use	P-2 launches/day one-day trips would be included in multi-day allocations S-Unlimited use	P-2 launches/day and no one-day permits S-Unlimited use	P-Exclusive non-motorized use Th-W on alternating weeks with limit of 3 launches/day S-Unlimited one-day trips w/jetbacks	P-Max 100 users/day, comm and pvt S-Unlimited use	P-2 launches/day one-day trips would be included in multi-day allocations S-Unlimited use
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use	P-Included in above allocation S-Unlimited use
Scenic	P&S-Unlimited use	P&S-Unlimited use	P-Allow average of 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use	P-No launches from Pittsburg or Dug Bar S-Unlimited use	P-Allow average of 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use	P-No launches from Pittsburg or Dug Bar S-Unlimited use	P-Allow average of 1 launch/day, comm or pvt, Pittsburg or Dug Bar. When average reaches 1 launch/day, implement daily limit S-Unlimited use
LAUNCH RESERVATIONS							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P-Required for floatcraft only S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft only S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P-Required for floatcraft only S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft only S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required
Scenic	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P-Not required exc F-Su for powerboats S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P-Required for all river users S-Not required

P = Primary
S = Secondary

Summary of Alternative Management Requirements

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	Alternative G
NAVIGATION MARKERS							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	In	Out	In	Out	Out	Out	Out
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In
Scenic	In	In	In	In	In	In	In
PICNIC TABLES							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	In	In	Out except at Kirkwood	Out except at Kirkwood	Out except at Kirkwood	Out	Out except at Kirkwood
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	In	In	Out except at Kirkwood	Out except at Kirkwood	Out except at Kirkwood	Out	Out except at Kirkwood
Scenic	In	In	In	In	In	In	In
AIRCRAFT USE							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	Big Bar open, Sluice Creek closed	Big Bar and Sluice Creek open	Big Bar and Sluice Creek open	P-Big Bar and Sluice Creek would be closed except for emergencies S-Open	P-Big Bar and Sluice Creek open on motorized weeks and closed except for emergencies on non-motorized weeks S-Open	Big Bar and Sluice Creek would be closed except for emergencies	Big Bar open to private aircraft year-round. Sluice Creek would be closed primary season only
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Scenic	Cache Creek closed; Dug Bar, Pittsburg, and Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open	Cache Creek, Dug Bar, Pittsburg, Salmon Bar open

P = Primary
S = Secondary

Summary of Alternative Management Requirements

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	Alternative G
CAMPSITE STAY LENGTH							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P-5 nights except 1 night at Saddle and Granite S-14 nights	P-2 nights S-6 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights for float parties, 4 nights for powerboat parties S-7 nights all users	P-2 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights S-7 nights
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P-5 nights S-14 nights	P-2 nights S-6 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights for float parties, 4 nights for powerboat parties S-7 nights all users	P-2 nights S-7 nights	P-2 nights S-7 nights
Scenic	P-5 nights S-14 nights	P-4 nights S-6 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-5 nights S-7 nights	P-3 nights S-14 nights
DROP CAMP USERS							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P-Campground reservations required S-Self-issued permits required	P-Campground reservations required S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-No drop camps allowed	P-Campground reservations required float only. No drops allowed on non-motorized weeks S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-No drop camps allowed	P-No drop camps allowed S-Self-issued permits required
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P-Campground reservations required S-Self-issued permits required	P-Campground reservations required S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-No drop camps allowed	P-not required S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-No drop camps allowed	P-No drop camps allowed Self-issued permits required
Scenic	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P&S-Self-issued permits required	P-No drop camps allowed S-Self-issued permits required
CAMPSITE RESERVATIONS							
Wild (Dam to Kirkwood)	P-Management option	P-Required	P-Required	P&S-Not required	P-Required for floatcraft S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required
Wild (Kirkwood to Pittsburg)	P-Management option	P-Required	P-Required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required
Scenic	P-Management option	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required	P&S-Not required

P = Primary
S = Secondary