

Bitterroot National Forest Travel Management Planning Project

Summary Final Environmental Impact Statement



In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov. USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Bitterroot National Forest's Travel Management Planning (Travel Planning) Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was completed to analyze the physical, biological, social, and economic effects of the proposed changes to the designated system of roads, trails, and areas open to summer (includes spring and fall months) and over-snow motorized and mechanical transport (including bicycles) use on the Forest.

The project area for the Travel Management Planning Project is the portion of the Bitterroot National Forest outside of Designated Wilderness (use of motorized equipment or mechanical transport in Designated Wilderness is prohibited by the Wilderness Act of 1964, and is beyond the scope of the project). The project area totals approximately 850,626 acres. Please refer to Figure 1-1 on page 34 for the Vicinity Map.

PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would designate on a motor vehicle use map (MVUM) the roads, trails, and areas where motorized vehicles and mechanical transport, including full-size vehicles, ATVs, motorcycles, and bicycles, can be operated during the summer months. A separate over-snow vehicle use map (OSVUM) would identify the areas where over-snow vehicles can be operated.

The Proposed Action would result in a 308 mile decrease in the roads and trails open to motorized/mechanical transport use outside of Designated Wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and some inventoried roadless areas and wilderness study areas. Approximately 2,293 miles of roads and trails open to wheeled motorized use are proposed to be designated on the MVUM. This includes about 30 miles of "unauthorized" routes which are not currently designated on the Forest's Travel Map. The total also includes approximately 0.4 miles of "new" roads open to highway legal vehicles-yearlong, and about 10 miles of "new" trails open to vehicles 50 inches or less in width-seasonally are proposed. These will be shown on the maps of the alternative but not the MVUM, as they would require separate NEPA analyses and decisions.

The Proposed Action would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping within a 300 foot corridor off both sides of the center line of designated roads and trails where resource conditions would permit such use without causing unacceptable levels of damage. Corridors would be extended to those sites identified on the maps of the alternative.

For information on roads and trails, please refer to Tables 1 and 2, below.

The Proposed Action would also result in an 184,533 acre decrease in the areas open to over-snow vehicle use on National Forest System land outside of Designated Wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, portions of wilderness study areas, and inventoried roadless areas which are not located within recommended wilderness areas. It would designate about 564,448 acres open to over-snow vehicle use.

For information on over-snow vehicle use, please refer to Tables 3 and 4, below.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The Purpose and Need of the Travel Management Planning Project is to:

- Address conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized uses

Concerns were expressed by nonmotorized users, including bow hunters, that their recreation experiences are negatively affected by motorized use in areas or on trails closed to motorized use or where the designation is unclear. Nonmotorized users also expressed concerns about trails and areas where both

motorized and nonmotorized uses are allowed. Many nonmotorized users feel that areas where “mixed use” is allowed displaces them to other areas because their expectations for a quiet recreation experience cannot be met.

- Improve quality of the recreational experience

Concerns were expressed by nonmotorized users recreating in inventoried roadless areas, recommended wilderness areas, and wilderness study areas, where motorized and mechanical transport uses are permitted, that such uses affect their experience. Motorized users expressed concern about the “inadequate quality of the experience,” in that they want more “time in the saddle” or longer loop rides.

Quality recreation experience, as it relates to this analysis, refers to how well a road, trail, or area meets the needs, desires, and expectations of the user. The types of uses occurring on a road or trail or in an area affect user’s expectations (motorized or nonmotorized, bicycles, pack and saddle stock, etc.). The resource conditions of the road, trail or area also influence the quality of one’s recreation experience. How well a trail is maintained and constructed to meet user-needs is a consideration of quality. Another consideration is how a road or trail or area links with other trails or areas. For example, does a particular trail or area provide a variety of experiences (sights and sounds, vistas, wildlife viewing, etc.) and loops for the user?

- Integrate resource considerations into the route system

Concerns were expressed regarding the effects of motorized/mechanical transport use on wildlife; water resources; fish and aquatic habitat; soils; invasive plants; rare plants; recreation and trails; socio-economic, wilderness character; and cultural resources.

The significant issues identified for resources are described in Section 2.2.2 of Chapter 2, and the analysis of effects are described in Chapter 3.

- Address confusion where and when motorized use can occur and what types of vehicles are allowed

As noted in Chapter 1 the FEIS, “...the designation of where motorized recreation is permitted on the Forest is confusing. The current travel management map, the Forest Visitor Map published in 2005, identifies road, trail, and area restrictions for motorized vehicles; there are seven different seasonal restriction dates. Furthermore, the map shows both open and closed roads and trails. Adding to the confusion, some user-created/unauthorized routes (a road or trail that is not a forest road or trail or a temporary road or trail and that is not included in a forest transportation atlas) are available for motorized use and some are not, based on when the route was created...Which routes fall into which category is difficult for users and Forest Service personnel to know because it is often hard to determine when a route was created.”

- Ensure consistency with the 2005 Travel Management Rule

Comply with the 2005 Travel Management Rule, which requires the designation of roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor vehicles.

Additional information regarding the Purpose and Need is available in Chapter 1 of the FEIS.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The Travel Management Planning process began during the fall of 2006 with a series of meetings between Forest personnel and members of various motorized and nonmotorized user groups to gather input on recreation use on the Bitterroot National Forest, and to discuss the process for travel management. The proposed action (*A Starting Point*) was released for public review and comment in September 2007; the Notice of Intent to prepare a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was published in the *Federal Register* on October 1, 2007. The DEIS was released for public review and comment in August 2009; the Notice of Availability of the DEIS was published in the *Federal Register* on August 7, 2009. Newspaper

articles were published in local papers, and public meetings, open houses, and weekly “walk-in” sessions were held during the summer and fall of 2009.

The significant issues are described below; responses to comments on the DEIS are available in Appendix F to the FEIS. Some comments resulted in re-evaluation of analysis, and those changes were incorporated into the FEIS.

ISSUES

The following significant issues were identified following review of the public comments received in response to scoping of the proposed action, and internal Forest Service input. No new issues were identified during the DEIS comment period. Significant issues were used to develop/formulate alternatives to the proposed action, to analyze environmental effects, and to develop project design features.

- Motorized/mechanical transport use on roads and trails in inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) impacts their roadless characteristics
- Motorized/mechanical transport use on roads and trails in Montana Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) impacts their wilderness attributes
- Motorized/mechanical transport use on roads and trails in areas recommended for wilderness designation (RWAs) in the Forest Plan impacts their wilderness attributes
- The designation of motorized routes affects motorized and nonmotorized recreation opportunities by altering the amount, type, and season of motorized and nonmotorized routes
- Designation of motorized routes impacts water resources, fish and aquatic habitat, soils, wildlife, and invasive plants
- Motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping impacts soils, rare plants, and invasive plants
- Designating acres open to over-snow vehicle use impacts recreational experiences
- Designating areas open to over-snow vehicle use effects wintering wildlife

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

Chapter 2 of the FEIS describes the alternative development process, including public involvement and the identification of issues. It describes each of the four alternatives considered in detail, as well as the alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study.

Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Summer:

Alternative 1 was developed to meet the Project’s Purpose and Need. It would result in a 308 mile decrease in the roads and trails open to motorized/mechanical transport use outside of Designated Wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, and some inventoried roadless areas and wilderness study areas. It would designate motorized vehicle and mechanical transport use on approximately 2,293 miles of roads and trails.

It would permit motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping up to 300 feet off a designated route; corridors would be extended to those sites identified on the maps of the alternatives.

Table 1 shows the changes in the miles of motorized routes for **Alternative 1**, compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**):

Table 1: Alternative 1. Proposed Changes (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	-41 ¹
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ²	-9
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ³	0.4
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	-74
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	9
Proposed trails open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally ⁵	10
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	-246
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁶	43
Change in total miles open to motorized use	-308

¹ (-) indicates decrease

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is completed and decision is signed

⁴ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁵ These include connectors and a new trail, both of which will require separate NEPA analyses and decisions. These will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analyses are completed and the decisions are signed

⁶ Descriptions of season of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

The proposed changes include 30 miles of unauthorized routes that are proposed to be designated on the MVUM.

Table 2 shows the breakdown of the miles of roads and trails to be designated:

Table 2: Alternative 1 Route Status and Number of Miles (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to all vehicles ¹ - yearlong	10
Roads open to all vehicles – seasonally ²	67 ³
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	846
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ²	560 ³
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ⁴	0.4
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	36
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	559
Proposed trails open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally ⁶	10
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	84
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁷	121
Total miles open to motorized use	2,293

¹ Includes highway-legal vehicles and unlicensed ATVs and motorcycles

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ Reflects a recent law in Idaho which required a change in the MVUM for Road #468 (Nez Perce Trail) from “Open to Highway Legal Vehicles- Seasonally” (MVUM 4) to “Open to All Vehicles – Seasonally” (MVUM 2). This change was independent of the Travel Management Planning Project. For additional information, please refer to {Project File folder “transportation,” Project File document TRANS-006.pdf}

⁴ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is completed and the decision is signed

⁵ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles but open to ATV and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁶ These include connectors and a new trail, both of which will require separate NEPA analyses and decisions. These will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analyses are completed and the decisions are signed

⁷ Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

Over-Snow:

Alternative 1 was developed to meet the Project’s Purpose and Need. It would result in an 184,533 acre decrease in the areas open to over-snow vehicle use on National Forest System land outside of Designated Wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, portions of wilderness study areas, and inventoried roadless areas which are not located within recommended wilderness areas. It would designate over-snow vehicle use on approximately 564,448 acres on National Forest System land.

Table 3 shows the change in acres of areas associated with **Alternative 1** compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**):

Table 3: Alternative 1. Proposed Changes (Over-Snow)

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicles– no restrictions	-177,292 ¹
Acres open to over-snow vehicles - seasonally	-7,241
Change in acres open to motorized use	-184,533

(-) indicates decrease

Table 4 shows the breakdown of the acres to be designated:

Table 4: Alternative 1. Acres Open to Over-Snow Use

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use – no restrictions	522,592
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use - seasonally	41,856
Total acres open to motorized use	564,448

Alternative 2 (No Action)

This alternative represents the existing condition and the baseline data against which the action alternatives are compared.

Summer:

Alternative 2 prescribes no changes from the current travel management direction as shown on the 2005 Bitterroot National Forest Visitor Map. This map shows all roads and trails on the Forest, both open and closed. **Alternative 2** would defer implementation of the 2005 Travel Management Rule, and not result in the publication of a MVUM.

Alternative 2 would allow motorized use on approximately 2,601 miles of roads and trails outside of Designated Wilderness. It would permit motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping up to 300 feet off a designated route.

Table 5 shows the breakdown of the miles of roads and trails to be designated:

Table 5: Alternative 2. Route Status and Number of Miles (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to all vehicles ¹ - yearlong	10
Roads open to all vehicles –seasonally ²	67 ³
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	887
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ¹	569 ³
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	110
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	550
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	330
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁵	78
Total miles open to motorized use	2,601

¹ Includes highway-legal vehicles and unlicensed ATVs and motorcycles

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ Reflects a recent law in Idaho which required a change in the MVUM for Road #468 (Nez Perce Trail) from “Open to Highway Legal Vehicles-Seasonally” (MVUM 4) to “Open to All Vehicles – Seasonally” (MVUM 2). This change was independent of the Travel Management Planning Project. For additional information, please refer to {Project File folder ‘transportation,’ Project File document TRANS-006.pdf}

⁴ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁵ Description of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

Over-Snow:

Alternative 2 prescribes no changes from the current travel management direction as shown on the 2005 Bitterroot National Forest Visitor Map.

Alternative 2 would allow over-snow vehicle use on approximately 748,981 acres on National Forest System land outside of Designated Wilderness.

Table 6 shows the breakdown of the acres to be designated:

Table 6: Alternative 2. Acres Open to Winter Use

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use – no restrictions	699,884
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use - seasonally	49,097
Total acres open to motorized use	748,981

Alternative 3 (Motorized emphasis)

Summer:

Alternative 3 was developed to respond to public comments that the designation of specified motorized routes may affect motorized opportunities by altering the amount, type, and season of use. Concern was expressed that motorized use was being restricted, and that there was a need for additional motorized opportunities. **Alternative 3** would result in an 82 mile increase in the roads and trails open to motorized/mechanical transport use outside of Designated Wilderness. It would allow motorized/mechanical transport use in recommended wilderness areas, and would increase such use in one wilderness study area and several inventoried roadless areas. **Alternative 3** would allow motorized use on approximately 2,683 miles of roads and trails.

It would permit motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping up to 300 feet off a designated route; corridors would be extended to those sites identified on the maps of the alternative.

Table 7 shows the changes in the miles of motorized routes for **Alternative 3** compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**):

Table 7: Alternative 3. Proposed Changes (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	-14 ¹
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ²	8
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ³	0.4
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	-38
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	47
Proposed trails open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally ⁵	10
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	-40
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁶	109
Change in total miles open to motorized use	82

¹ (-) indicates decrease

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis

and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is complete

⁴ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles, but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁵ These include connectors and a new trail, both of which will require separate NEPA analyses and decisions. These will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analyses are completed and the decisions are signed

⁶ Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

The proposed changes include 35 miles of unauthorized routes that are proposed to be designated on the MVUM.

Table 8 shows the breakdown of the miles of roads and trails to be designated:

Table 8: Alternative 3. Route Status and Number of Miles (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to all vehicles ¹ - yearlong	10
Roads open to all vehicles – seasonally ²	67 ³
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	873
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ²	577 ³
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ⁴	0.4
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	72
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	597
Proposed trails open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally ⁶	10
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	290
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁷	187
Total miles open to motorized use	2,683

¹ Includes highway-legal vehicles and unlicensed ATVs and motorcycles

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ Reflects a recent law in Idaho which required a change in the MVUM for Road #468 (Nez Perce Trail) from “Open to Highway Legal Vehicles- Seasonally” (MVUM 4) to “Open to All Vehicles – Seasonally” (MVUM 2) This change was independent of the Travel Management Planning Project. For additional information, please refer to {Project File “transportation,” Project File document TRANS-006.pdf}

⁴ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is complete

⁵ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles, but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁶ These include connectors and a new trail, both of which will require separate NEPA

analyses and decisions

⁷ Descriptions of seasons of use provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

Over-Snow:

Alternative 3 would result in a 4,679 acre increase in the areas open to over-snow vehicle use on National Forest System land outside of Designated Wilderness. **Alternative 3** would designate over-snow vehicle use on approximately 753,660 acres on National Forest System land.

Table 9 shows the change in acres of areas associated with **Alternative 3** compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**):

Table 9: Alternative 3. Proposed Changes (Over-Snow)

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicles – no restrictions	4,679
Acres open to over-snow vehicles - seasonally	0
Change in acres open to motorized use	4,679

Table 10 shows the breakdown of the acres to be designated:

Table 10: Alternative 3. Acres Open to Over-Snow Use

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use – no restrictions	704,563
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use - seasonally	49,097
Total acres open to motorized use	753,660

Alternative 4 (Nonmotorized emphasis)

Summer:

Alternative 4 was designed as the “nonmotorized emphasis” alternative. It was developed to respond to public comments that the designation of specified motorized routes effects nonmotorized opportunities by altering the amount, type, and season of motorized and nonmotorized opportunities. Concern was expressed regarding the need for additional nonmotorized opportunities.

Alternative 4 would result in a 1,378 mile decrease in the roads and trails open to motorized/mechanical transport use. It would allow summer motorized/mechanical transport use, including bicycles, on 1,223 miles of roads and trails outside of Designated Wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, recommended wilderness areas, and most inventoried roadless areas. It would permit motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping up to 150 feet off a designated route; corridors would be extended to those sites identified on the maps of the alternative.

Table 11 shows the changes in the miles of motorized routes for **Alternative 4** compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**):

Table 11: Alternative 4. Proposed Changes (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	-312 ¹
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally ²	-140
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ³	0.4
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	-100
Trails ⁴ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	-434
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	-324
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁵	-68
Change in total miles open to motorized use	-1,378

¹ (-) indicates decrease

² Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Transportation analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C

³ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is complete

⁴ Most of these trails, open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles, but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁵ Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

The proposed changes include 3 miles of unauthorized routes that are proposed to be designated on the MVUM.

Table 12 shows the breakdown of the miles of roads and trails to be designated:

Table 12: Alternative 4. Route Status and Number of Miles (Summer)

Route Status	Miles
Roads open to all vehicles ¹ - yearlong	10
Roads open to all vehicles – seasonally ²	67 ³
Roads open to highway legal vehicles - yearlong	575
Roads open to highway legal vehicles – seasonally	429 ³
Proposed roads open to highway legal vehicles – yearlong ⁴	0.4
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – yearlong	10
Trails ⁵ open to vehicles 50” or less in width – seasonally	116
Trails open to motorcycles - yearlong	6
Trails open to motorcycles – seasonally ⁶	10
Total miles open to motorized use	1,223

¹ Includes highway-legal vehicles and unlicensed ATVs and motorcycles

² Descriptions of seasons of use are detailed in the FEIS, Chapter 3, Section 3.1.3 C (Transportation)

³ Reflects a recent law in Idaho, which required a change in the MVUM for Road

#468 (Nez Perce Trail) from “Open to Highway Legal Vehicles- Seasonally” (MVUM 4) to “Open to All Vehicles – Seasonally” (MVUM 2). This change was independent of the Travel Management Planning Project. For additional information, please refer to {Project File folder ‘transportation,’ Project File document TRANS-006.pdf}

⁴ This is a connector between two existing roads which will require separate NEPA analysis and decision. It will be shown on the FEIS map, but will not be included on the MVUM until the analysis is complete

⁵ Most of these trails open yearlong and seasonally, are roads closed to full size vehicles, but open to ATVs and motorcycles; these are known as “coincident routes.” Please refer to the FEIS, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 (Transportation) and 3.2 (Recreation and Trails) for additional information. Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

⁶ Descriptions of seasons of use are provided in the Recreation and Trails analysis, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 H

Over-Snow:

Alternative 4 would result in a 388,543 acre decrease in the areas open to over-snow vehicle use on National Forest System land. It excludes motorized use in wilderness study areas and most inventoried roadless areas, with the exception for most of the Tolan Creek IRA and a portion of the Stony Mountain IRA, in addition to Designated Wilderness and recommended wilderness areas. It incorporated concerns regarding effects of over-snow vehicles on mountain goats and elk.

Alternative 4 would designate over-snow vehicle use on approximately 360,438 acres on National Forest System land.

Table 13 shows the change in acres of areas associated with **Alternative 4** compared to the existing condition (**Alternative 2**)

Table 13: Alternative 4. Proposed Changes (Over-Snow)

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicles – no restrictions	-381,302 ¹
Acres open to over-snow vehicles - seasonally	-7,241
Change in acres open to motorized use	-388,543

¹ (-) indicates decrease

Table 14 shows the breakdown of the acres to be designated:

Table 14: Alternative 4. Acres Open to Over-Snow Use

Area Status	Acres
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use – no restrictions	318,582
Acres open to over-snow vehicle use - seasonally	41,856
Total acres open to motorized use	360,438

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

Chapter 3 of the FEIS describes the physical, biological, social, and economic conditions of the resources in their respective analysis areas, and the anticipated effects to these resources from implementing the alternatives. Effects are analyzed in terms of their direct, indirect, and cumulative effects. The following is a summary of the potential effects by resource.

Transportation

National Forest System roads require maintenance or improvements, or both. Maintenance includes spot blading to provide good surface drainage, culvert cleaning, brushing, and debris removal. The most common improvements are application of crushed aggregate and the installation of road drainage features such as culverts and drain dips. Other types of improvements include slope stabilization, aquatic organism passage structures, bridges, gabion retaining walls, and under drain systems.

Forest Service appropriations for road maintenance and improvements are authorized by Congress, and fluctuate from year to year. The costs to maintain the National Forest System roads would be sufficiently covered in **Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4** by the historical levels of funding received by the Forest for the fiscal years 2007-2013.

Over-snow vehicle use would have no effect on the Transportation resource, as vehicles would be operating on snow-covered roads, which would not result in any adverse effects to the road surfaces. Consequently, there would be no need for maintenance or improvements.

Recreation and Trails

National Forest System roads and trails provide access for the public to the Bitterroot National Forest, and are used for a variety of motorized and nonmotorized modes of recreation. Roads are used to access areas for hunting, berry picking, fishing, camping, driving for pleasure, firewood gathering, and trails for use by all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), motorcycles, horseback, bicycle, and by foot. Roads offer easy access, year-round, to a variety of forest-based activities, and allow for year-round viewing of the Forest's abundant wildlife including big horn sheep, elk, moose, and whitetail deer.

Trails allow visitors to access the backcountry for fishing, photography, and viewing scenery, visiting lakes, exercise, and many other activities.

Reductions in the miles of roads and trails available for motorized recreation could result in the displacement of users to other areas, the concentration of uses, and conflicts of uses between motorized and nonmotorized uses.

Alternative 1 proposes a 308 mile reduction in the miles of roads and trails, **Alternative 4** proposes a 1,378 mile reduction; **Alternative 2** proposes no change, and **Alternative 3** proposes an 82 mile increase.

National Forest System trails require maintenance or improvements, or both. Trail maintenance involves the clearing, brushing, and opening up of trails and the cleaning of drainage structures such as water bars or rolling dips; a 5-year rotation is now recommended. However, some trails are prioritized for annual maintenance based on user demand and other access needs, with other trails scheduled every 2 to 5 years.

Common improvements such as tread reconstruction, water bars, and drain dips are used to reduce erosion. Culverts, hardened ford approaches, and bridges are used to protect water quality.

Forest Service appropriations for trail operation, maintenance, and improvements are authorized by Congress, and fluctuate from year to year. The costs to maintain the National Forest System trails would be sufficiently covered in **Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4** by the historical levels of funding received by the Forest for the fiscal years 2007-2013, with the exception for **Alternatives 2 and 3** for 2007.

There would be changes to over-snow vehicle use: **Alternative 1** proposes an 184,553 acre decrease in the acres available for over-snow vehicle use, while **Alternative 2** proposes no change; **Alternative 3** proposes a 4,679 acre increase, and **Alternative 4** proposes a 388,543 decrease in acres.

Wilderness

There are portions of three Designated Wilderness areas on the Bitterroot National Forest: the Anaconda-Pintler, the Frank Church-River of No Return, and the Selway-Bitterroot, totaling approximately 743,000 acres. These were Congressionally-designated under the Wilderness Act of 1964, which prohibits the use of motorized/mechanical transport. **None of the alternatives** would allow motorized/mechanical transport use in these areas. There would be no effect to wilderness attributes.

Additionally, on the Bitterroot National Forest, there are three types of areas which are managed for their “wilderness character:” wilderness study areas (WSAs), inventoried roadless areas (IRAs), and recommended wilderness (RWAs). These have been identified for possible inclusion into the National Wilderness Preservation System. Only Congress can make the designation for wilderness protection; the Travel Management Planning Project does not have the authority to make the designation. No new areas were identified for possible designation.

With respect to RWAs, **none of the alternatives** would designate any miles of roads open to motorized/mechanical transport. **Alternatives 1** and **4** would not designate any miles of trails for motorized/mechanical transport, while **Alternatives 2** and **3** would designate varying numbers of miles. Similarly, with respect to over-snow vehicle use, **Alternatives 1** and **4** would not allow over-snow vehicle use on any acres, while **Alternatives 2** and **3** would allow use on varying numbers of acres. **Alternatives 1** and **4** would have the most beneficial impact on wilderness attributes, followed by **Alternatives 2** and **3**.

With respect to WSAs, **Alternative 4** would show the largest reduction in miles of routes designated for motorized use, followed by **Alternative 1**. There would be no change with **Alternative 2**, and **Alternative 3** would show an increase of 17 miles. Regarding over-snow vehicle use, there would be a similar result, as **Alternative 4** would show the largest reduction in acres open for such use, followed by **Alternative 1**. There would be no change for **Alternatives 2** and **3**. **Alternatives 1** and **4** would have the most beneficial impact on wilderness attributes, followed by **Alternatives 2** and **3**.

With respect to IRAs, **Alternative 4** would show the largest reduction in miles of routes designated for motorized use, followed by **Alternatives 1, 2, and 3**. There would be a similar result with respect to over-snow vehicle use. **Alternative 4** would have the most beneficial impact on roadless characteristics, followed by **Alternatives 1, 2, and 3**.

Socio-Economic

Economic contributions associated with motorized and nonmotorized uses includes money spent by both local and non-local users on guide services, gasoline/oil, lodging, and food (groceries and restaurants).

In general, the estimated economic effects are a function of the number of visits and the dollars spent by the visitors. For example, non-local users typically spend more money per visit than local users. Also, activities that draw more users will be responsible for more economic activity in comparison to activities that draw fewer users, holding constant spending per visit.

Alternative 1 would likely cause a collective shift in affected areas to more nonmotorized recreation, visitor expenditures, and economic contributions compared to motorized recreation. **Alternative 2** would result in no change. Under **Alternative 3**, the proposed changes could slightly shift the economic contribution in many areas from the current motorized/nonmotorized split to more motorized recreation visits, visitor expenditures, and economic contributions

Alternative 4 would likely cause the greatest shift from the current economic contributions in several communities to more nonmotorized recreation visits, visitor expenditures, and economic contributions, and less motorized use, expenditures and contributions.

Wildlife

On July 2, 2013, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued an updated list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species that may be present on the Bitterroot National Forest. The list added Canada Lynx as a transient species that may be present in secondary/peripheral habitat on the Forest. During August 2013, the Forest initiated informal consultation with USFWS regarding project effects to the Canada lynx by sending a biological assessment (BA) for their review. The BA concluded that the effects determination for implementing **Alternative 1** is May Effect, Not Likely to Adversely Effect. The USFWS responded with a Letter of Concurrence dated September 6, 2013 in which they acknowledged the BA's determination that **Alternative 1** is not like to adversely affect lynx, and confirmed that formal consultation on lynx is not required. No critical habitat for lynx has been designated within or in the proximity of the Bitterroot National Forest, so the Travel Management Planning Project would have no effect on lynx critical habitat.

On October 3, 2014, the USFWS listed the western population of the yellow-billed cuckoo as a threatened species. USFWS subsequently added yellow-billed cuckoo to the list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species that may be present on the Bitterroot National Forest in riparian habitats with cottonwoods and willows. The effects determination for this species in the Travel Management Planning Project FEIS is No Effect for **all alternatives**. A No Effect determination does not require consultation with USFWS.

The following species and their habitats were dropped from further analysis because the analysis area is outside the range of the species' known distribution or because none of the proposed activities would affect suitable habitat or populations for the species, and thus there will not be any impacts to those species from the project: Sensitive: northern bog lemming, Townsend's big-eared bat, American peregrine falcon, black-backed woodpecker, flammulated owl, Coeur d'Alene salamander, northern leopard frog, long-eared Myotis, long-legged Myotis; Management Indicator Species: pileated woodpecker.

The following species were analyzed for effects due to their occurrence within the analysis area: Canada lynx, gray wolf, bald eagle, wolverine, fisher, western (boreal) toad, bighorn sheep, elk, American marten, and mountain goats. The findings from the Wildlife section, 3.5, of Chapter 3 of the FEIS are summarized below.

Canada Lynx:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of summer motorized and over-snow vehicle impacts to lynx a considerable amount compared to **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but not as much as **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of summer motorized and over-snow vehicle impacts to lynx slightly compared to **Alternative 2**. The risk of potential impacts to lynx would be much higher under **Alternative 3** than either **Alternatives 1 or 4**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of summer motorized and over-snow vehicle impacts to lynx a considerable amount compared to **Alternatives 2 and 3**, and somewhat more than **Alternative 1**.

Gray Wolf:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of motorized human-caused disturbance or mortality to wolves, and enhance availability of prey more than **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of motorized disturbance or mortality to wolves, and decrease the availability of prey somewhat compared to **Alternative 2**, and substantially compared to **Alternatives 1 and 4**.

Alternative 4 would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance or mortality to wolves, and enhance availability of prey substantially more than **Alternatives 2 and 3**, and somewhat more than **Alternative 1**.

Bald Eagle:

Alternatives 1 and 4 would reduce the risk of motorized disturbance impacts to bald eagles at the Lake Como nest to the same extent. **Alternatives 2 and 3** would maintain the existing risk of motorized disturbance impacts to nesting bald eagles at the Lake Como nest.

Wolverine:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of motorized impacts to wolverines during the denning season and during the summer more than **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** is the only alternative that would increase the risk of motorized impacts to wolverines during the denning season and during the summer, albeit slightly.

Fisher:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality to fishers somewhat more than **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality to fishers slightly from **Alternative 2**, but more than **Alternative 1**, and much more than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality to fishers somewhat more than **Alternative 1**, but substantially more than either **Alternatives 2 or 3**.

Western Toad:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of motorized impacts to riparian habitats and the risk of direct mortality to toads caused by vehicles somewhat more than **Alternatives 2 or 3**, but substantially less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of motorized impacts to riparian habitats and the risk of direct mortality to toads caused by vehicles slightly compared to **Alternative 2**, somewhat more than **Alternative 1**, and substantially more than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of motorized impacts to riparian habitats and the risk of direct mortality to toads caused by vehicles substantially more than **Alternatives 2 or 3**, and somewhat more than **Alternative 1**.

Bighorn Sheep:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of motorized disturbance to bighorn sheep during both summer and winter more than **Alternatives 2 or 3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of motorized disturbance to bighorn sheep during both summer and winter slightly compared to **Alternative 2**, substantially more than **Alternative 1**, and very substantially compared to **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of motorized disturbance to bighorn sheep during both summer and winter substantially compared to **Alternatives 2 or 3**, and somewhat more than **Alternative 1**.

Elk:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and hunting mortality to elk somewhat compared to **Alternative 2**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of human-caused disturbance and hunting mortality to elk slightly from **Alternative 2**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and hunting mortality to elk somewhat more than **Alternative 1**, but substantially more than either **Alternatives 2 or 3**.

American Marten:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality to martens somewhat more than **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would increase the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality slightly from **Alternative 2**, but more than **Alternative 1**, and much more than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 4** would reduce the risk of human-caused disturbance and trapping mortality to martens somewhat more than **Alternative 1**, but substantially more than either **Alternatives 2 or 3**.

Mountain Goats:

Alternative 1 would reduce the risk of motorized impacts to mountain goats during the winter and summer more than **Alternatives 2** and **3**, but less than **Alternative 4**. **Alternative 3** would be the only alternative that would increase the risk of motorized impacts to goats during the winter and summer.

Water Resources

Motorized and nonmotorized use on some roads and trails on the Bitterroot National Forest contributes to erosion and sedimentation, which is the production, deposition, or accumulation of sediment, resulting in water quality concerns, especially for 303(d)-listed streams. These are streams which are identified as water quality impaired according to the Clean Water Act.

Alternatives 1 and **4** avoid increases in sediment risk for all watersheds with 303(d)-listed streams; motorized access-related sediment risk is decreased in 11 6th-level watersheds with listed streams in **Alternative 1**, while **Alternative 4** decreases sediment risk in 22 6th-level watersheds. The remaining watersheds with 303(d)-listed streams would have no increase in the sediment measurement indicator in either **Alternatives 1** or **4**. **Alternative 3** would increase sediment risk in only one watershed with a 303(d)-listed stream, but would not decrease risk either. **Alternative 2** would neither increase or decrease sediment risk; it would maintain the status quo for water resources.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 propose to close approximately 15 miles of unauthorized trails within 300 feet of streams to motorized uses; **Alternative 2** does not propose to close any unauthorized trails. Due to a lack of consideration for resource effects during their creation, most unauthorized routes are more prone to erosion and sediment production than system routes. For this reason, closing unauthorized routes that would not be converted to system routes is an important step in reducing sediment risk to water quality and beneficial uses.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route varies by alternative.

With the predicted reduction in sediment associated with **Alternative 1**, motorized access for dispersed camping within 300 feet of water resources would not negatively impact beneficial uses of cold water fishery, aquatic life, and full-contact recreation and in general channel condition (percent of fine sediment I the stream bottom).

With **Alternative 2**, there would be no changes to motorized access; sediment and channel impacts associated with motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping would continue at their current levels, and likely increase with the trend toward increased recreational use. Streams would most likely maintain their current levels of beneficial use support (or non-support) over the next 10 years. With **Alternative 3**, stream channel conditions would remain similar to those under **Alternative 2**, with no change to the channel conditions, impaired status, or beneficial use support. Under **Alternative 4**, observable motorized access-related sediment source areas would decrease within dispersed camping motorized access corridors.

Most sites that have desirable campsite characteristics have already been established, limiting future increases in the number of motorized routes to access them. Expansion of new and existing sites is expected, but would likely be limited by terrain features including narrow stream canyons, steep inner gorge slopes, standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, abrupt topographic changes, and water features in most locations, and by citable regulations against resource damage in others. Existing dispersed sites typically have a developed motorized access route that is the most suitable and most commonly used route to the camp site. The Forest will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as changes at existing sites. The Forest will alter or close sites where motorized access routes result in excessive disturbance to water resources.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would reduce vehicle-related disturbance to soil and vegetation in sensitive areas adjacent to water features by establishing a 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30

feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). This does not apply to designated routes. This would decrease sedimentation and help maintain stable streambanks. The buffer would likely benefit all waterbodies with adjacent existing or potential new sites. **Alternative 2** would not contain this zone.

Over-snow vehicle use seldom disturbs soils, decreases ground cover, or creates erosion, due to the layer of snow separating the machine from the ground. Occasionally, over-snow vehicle travel will disturb soils on ridges blown free of snow, where no other path is feasible. These areas tend to be extremely minor and far from streams. There would be no difference between alternatives for this activity.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat

Fish and aquatic habitat are affected by motorized and nonmotorized uses of roads and trails, which contribute to erosion and sedimentation affecting water quality. However, as trails are generally narrower in width than roads, and are constructed using less cut and fill material, the effects associated with their use is less consequential than roads, from a fisheries perspective.

There would be little change in effects to the fish and aquatic habitat resource with **Alternatives 1, 2, and 3**. **Alternative 1** would result in a small (5 percent) reduction in the miles of roads within 100 and 300 feet of perennial streams, and an approximate 50 percent reduction in the miles of motorized trails within 100 and 300 feet of perennial streams. There would be no change with **Alternative 2**. **Alternative 3** would show a slight increase in the miles of trails within 100 and 300 feet of perennial streams.

Alternative 4 would result in substantially-improved conditions for fisheries, as a result of an approximately 50 percent reduction in the miles of roads within 100 feet of perennial streams, and the essential elimination of motorized travel on trails within 100 and 300 feet of perennial streams.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route vary by alternative.

Driving to and parking in dispersed campsites affects streams by creating areas of compacted soils that grow native vegetation poorly, and promote noxious weeds. They are also prone to erosion, which results in sedimentation to streams.

Areas around dispersed campsites are used as firewood collection sites by campers and illegal firewood gathers. One of the biggest factors that influences fish habitat is the amount of large wood in streams. Fish tend to congregate in the large pools created by large wood. The fewer streams the Forest exposes to vehicle access, the more large dead trees will remain in the streams and floodplains for the betterment of fish and other riparian dependent species.

Several factors suggest a range of minor-to-moderate future increases in motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping and associated effects to fish and aquatic habitat. Most sites that have desirable campsite characteristics have already been established by repeated use, limiting future increases in the number of motorized routes to access them. Expansion of new and existing sites is expected, but would likely be limited by terrain features including standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, water features, narrow stream canyons, and abrupt topographic changes. Existing dispersed sites typically have a suitable motorized access route commonly used to get to the site. The Forest has a continuing program of installing barriers to limit vehicle access or gravelling defined access routes where needed to reduce streamside impacts. The Forest will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed camping sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as changes at existing sites. Sites where motorized access routes result in excessive effects to fish and aquatic habitat will be altered or closed.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would reduce disturbance to soils and vegetation in sensitive areas adjacent to water features by establishing a 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30 feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). This does not apply to designated routes. This would slightly improve conditions along stream sections used for dispersed camping because it would clarify that

fords on non-system roads are illegal, and that vehicles should not be on the shorelines. This action would decrease sedimentation and help maintain stable streambanks. **Alternative 2** would not contain this zone.

Over-snow vehicle use seldom disturbs soils or causes loss of ground cover or erosion, due to the layer of snow separating the machine from the ground. Snow plowing near-stream roads to get vehicles and snow machine trailers to trailheads has been an issue on other forests, but snow plowing near-stream roads was not proposed in this Travel Management Planning Project. For these reasons, no effects to fisheries are attributed to over-snow vehicle use. There would be no difference between alternatives for this activity.

Soils

Soils are subject to a variety of effects from motorized and nonmotorized use of roads and trails, including loss of productivity, compaction, displacement, erosion, and sedimentation. Use of motorized vehicles to access dispersed camping sites can impact sensitive soils including ash cap soils, high erosion potential soils, hydric (wetland) soils, and landslide/slump prone soils.

Alternative 4 proposes 0.4 miles of road construction, which equates to about a one acre loss in soil productivity.

Alternatives 1 and 3 propose approximately 0.4 miles of road construction and about 10 miles of trail construction, which would result in a 25 acre loss in soil productivity.

Alternative 2, proposes no new road or trail construction, so there would be no resulting loss in soil productivity.

Alternative 3 would have 113 miles of existing motorized routes on soils with high erosion potential, followed by **Alternative 2**, 107 miles, **Alternative 1**, 101 miles, and **Alternative 4**, 56 miles). High erosion potential soils can result in sediment, which negatively impact water quality and aquatic resources.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route vary by alternative. There would be a decrease in the acres of sensitive soils which could be impacted by wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping with **Alternatives 1** (1,633 acres) and **4** (12,057 acres). This would have a positive impact on soil productivity, and reduce effects to the subsurface flow of water, affecting the ponding of water and areas of excessive saturation. **Alternative 3** would have an approximate 1,057 acre increase in acres of sensitive soils which could be impacted by wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping. There would be no change in the acres of sensitive soils which could be impacted by wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping with **Alternative 2**.

Several factors suggest a range of minor-to-moderate future increases in motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping and associated effects to soils. Most sites that have desirable campsite characteristics have already been established by repeated use, limiting future increases in the number of motorized routes to access them. Expansion of new and existing sites is expected, but would likely be limited by terrain features including standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, water features, narrow stream canyons, and abrupt topographic changes. Existing dispersed sites typically have a suitable motorized access route commonly used to get to the site.

The Forest has a continuing program of installing barriers to limit vehicle access or gravelling defined access routes where needed to reduce streamside impacts. Forest personnel will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed camping sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as changes at existing sites. The Forest will alter or close sites if the access routes result in excessive effects to soils.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would reduce impacts to hydric soils, decreasing disturbance to wetland vegetation and the subsurface flow of water, by establishing a 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30 feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). This action would

decrease disturbance to wetland vegetation and the subsurface flow of water. **Alternative 2** would not contain this zone.

Over-snow vehicle use seldom disturbs soils or causes loss of ground cover due to the layer of snow separating the machine from the ground. Occasionally, over-snow vehicle use will occur on ridges blown free of snow, where no other path is feasible. These areas tend to be extremely minor, and frozen conditions provide protection from compaction and displacement of soils. For these reasons, no effects to soils are attributed to over-snow vehicle use, and they will not be discussed further as a soil resource effect. There would be no difference between alternatives for over-snow vehicle use and soil effects.

Invasive Plants

Invasive plants impact native plant diversity on the Bitterroot National Forest, particularly in the grassland ecosystems where weeds are most prolific. The loss of native plant diversity impacts wildlife forage, causes soil erosion, increases sediment in watersheds, and reduces pollinator populations. Motorized vehicles contribute to the introduction and spread of invasive plants by picking up large quantities of weed seeds and transporting them along roads and trails, as well as off of roads when accessing dispersed campsites.

Invasive plants are more common along routes open to motorized vehicles than in other parts of the Bitterroot National Forest.

Alternative 1 would have 18 trails where motorcycles and ATVs may be travelling with invasive plant occurrences along them. It would reopen approximately 25 miles of routes to motorized use. **Alternative 1** would have approximately 22,095 acres of invasive plant infestations within the corridors for wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping.

Alternative 2 would have 31 trails where motorcycles and ATVs may be travelling with invasive plant occurrences along them. No routes currently closed are proposed to be reopened. **Alternative 2** would have approximately 23,366 acres of invasive plant infestations within the corridors for wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping.

Alternative 3 would have 58 trails where motorcycles and ATVs may be travelling with invasive plant occurrences along them. It would reopen approximately 36 miles of routes to motorized use. **Alternative 3** would have 23,701 acres of invasive plant infestations within the corridors for motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping.

Alternative 4 would have only one trail where motorcycles and ATVs may be travelling with invasive plant occurrences along it. It would reopen approximately 1.5 miles of routes to motorized use.

Alternative 4 would have approximately 12,488 acres of invasive plant infestations within the corridors for wheeled motorized access for dispersed camping.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route vary by alternative.

Several factors suggest a range of minor-to-moderate future increases in motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping and associated effects to invasive plants. Most sites that have desirable campsite characteristics have already been established by repeated use, limiting future increases in the number of motorized routes to access them. Existing dispersed sites typically have a suitable motorized access route commonly used to get to the site.

Expansion of new and existing sites is expected, but would likely be limited by terrain features including standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, water features, narrow stream canyons, and abrupt topographic changes. The Forest has a continuing program of installing barriers to limit vehicle access or gravelling defined access routes where needed to reduce streamside impacts. The Forest will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed camping sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as

changes at existing sites. Sites where motorized access routes result in the introduction and spread of invasive plants will be altered or closed.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would reduce impacts to invasive plants by establishing a 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30 feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). Preventing motorized vehicles from having close access to moving water decrease the potential for contributing to the spread of invasive plants downstream. **Alternative 2** would not contain this zone.

Over-snow vehicle use has the potential for introducing or spreading invasive plants if weed seeds are present on the undercarriages of such vehicles. Project design features, including public education efforts regarding the threats posed by invasive plants, and the need to clean vehicle undercarriages prior to accessing National Forest System lands, will be carried out during implementation of the Travel Management Planning Project.

Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (Rare) Plants

A number of rare plant species are known to occur along routes open to use by motorized vehicles in the Travel Management Planning Project analysis area. As long as vehicles stay on designated routes, rare plants and their habitat would not be adversely affected.

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have similar potential for effects, as there would be 126, 139, and 148 routes with rare plant occurrences open for motorized vehicle use, respectively. **Alternative 4** would have 45 routes with rare plant occurrences.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route vary by alternative. Motorized wheeled access to dispersed campsites has the potential to directly and indirectly impact rare plants; direct adverse impacts could occur if motorized vehicles drive over rare plant populations or suitable habitat; indirect adverse impacts could occur through the introduction or spread of invasive plants to suitable rare plant habitat

Several factors suggest a range of minor-to-moderate future increases in motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping and associated effects to rare plants. Most sites that have desirable campsite characteristics have already been established by repeated use, limiting future increases in the number of motorized routes to access them. Existing dispersed sites typically have a suitable motorized access route commonly used to get to the site.

Expansion of new and existing sites is expected, but would likely be limited by terrain features including standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, water features, narrow stream canyons, and abrupt topographic changes. The Forest has a continuing program of installing barriers to limit vehicle access or gravelling defined access routes where needed to reduce streamside impacts. The Forest will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed camping sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as changes at existing sites. Sites where motorized access routes result in excessive effects to rare plants will be altered or closed.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would reduce impacts to riparian and wetland-associated rare plants by establishing a 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30 feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). **Alternative 2** would not contain this zone.

Over-snow vehicle use should not have any direct effects on rare plants since they will be covered in snow and be dormant. There is some potential, however, for indirect effects through introducing or spreading invasive plants if weed seeds are present on the undercarriage of the over-snow vehicles. Project design features, including public education efforts regarding the threats posed by invasive plants, and the need to clean vehicle undercarriages prior to accessing National Forest System lands, would be carried out during implementation of the Travel Management Planning Project.

Cultural Resources

There are a variety of cultural resource property types located on the Bitterroot National Forest. They include prehistoric lithic scatters; cairns; rock shelters; pictographs; cambium-peeled trees; irrigation dams and ditches; cabins or cabin ruins; mines; fire lookouts; Forest Service administrative sites; logging camps, flumes and skidpaths; historic homesteads; orchard sites; and Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping would have the potential to adversely affect cultural resources through ground disturbance, artifact damage or looting, and auditory/visual disturbance or physical destruction of setting. Many of the locations where motorized access to desirable dispersed camping areas could be created by the public have been established by repeated use.

By limiting most motorized travel to designated routes, the risk of damage to cultural resources by authorized motorized use will be reduced.

Under all action alternatives, no motorized travel would be allowed off designated routes, with the exception of motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping as described in the various alternatives. By limiting most motorized travel to designated routes, the risk of damage to cultural resources by authorized motorized use will be reduced.

Alternative 1 is generally comprised of designated routes which are existing motorized system routes. Use of these routes will not directly affect known cultural resources. However, **Alternative 1** proposes a motorized connector and at least one trail reroute in close proximity to known archaeological sites eligible for the National Register.

Under **Alternative 2**, current management plans would continue to guide project area management, allowing motorized access to at least two culturally sensitive areas.

While authorized use of most motorized routes proposed under **Alternative 3** will not directly affect known cultural resources, this alternative includes a proposed motorized connector and a proposed trail reroute which have the potential to affect National Register of Historic Places-eligible sites.

Alternative 4 would substantially reduce the miles of roads and trails designated for motorized use, resulting in a corresponding reduction of area potentially affected by authorized motorized use and motorized dispersed camping access.

All alternatives would allow motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping off designated routes, though the distance a vehicle is allowed from the designated route vary by alternative. With respect to the effects associated with motorized access for dispersed camping, **Alternatives 1, 3, and 4** would reduce impacts to cultural resources with the designation of the 30 foot no-vehicle zone (no motorized wheeled access with 30 feet of any flowing stream, pond, lake, marsh, or wetland). Preventing motorized vehicles from having close access to water sources decreases the potential for impacting cultural resource sites, which tend to be located in proximity to water sources.

Despite these actions, motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping would have the potential to adversely affect cultural resources through ground disturbance, artifact damage or looting, and auditory/visual disturbance or physical destruction of setting. Most of the dispersed campsites that can be accessed by motorized wheeled vehicles on the Bitterroot National Forest are already being utilized. Existing dispersed sites typically have a suitable motorized access route commonly used to get to the site.

Motorized access to new dispersed campsites would likely be limited by natural barriers include standing and down trees, large rocks, thick vegetation, water features, narrow stream canyons, and abrupt topographic changes. The Forest will continue to monitor the emergence of new dispersed camping sites that are accessed by motorized vehicles, as well as the changes at existing sites. The Forest will alter or close sites where motorized access routes result in detrimental disturbance to cultural resources.

Over-snow vehicle activity generally will not affect archaeological resources, although there have been instances of damage to historic buildings (Lost Horse and Horse Heaven Guard Stations) resulting from snowmobile/roof collisions and unauthorized winter access/vandalism. However, these events are not common.

Mineral Materials

Mineral materials include common varieties of sand, gravel, stone, pumice, pumicite, cinders, clay and other similar materials that are of widespread occurrence and do not have special value. Motorized access is typically necessary for the transportation of mineral material products.

Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would have similar effects on mineral materials, as they would each close roads which access rock collecting areas on the Forest. **Alternative 2** would not affect access to mineral material sites, because no change in current access is proposed.

Over-snow vehicle use would have no effect on the availability of, and access to, mineral material sites. Permits are only issued when roads are passable; most would be inaccessible during winter months when they are snow covered. No mineral materials effects are attributed to over-snow vehicle use, and they will not be discussed further. There would be no difference between alternatives for this activity.

CHANGES BETWEEN DRAFT EIS AND FINAL EIS – CHAPTER 1

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability.
- Ø Sections 1.1 (Introduction) and 1.1.1 (Background) were rewritten to improve clarity
- Ø Section 1.2 (Proposed Action) was expanded to include Tables 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4
- Ø Section 1.3 (Purpose and Need and Project Objectives): Changed Table 1-1 to Table 1-5
- Ø Table 1-5: Changed one of the Purpose and Need statements from “Address conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized users” to “Address conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized uses” in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Table 1-5: Removed the underline from the words “non-motorized recreation opportunities” and added “outside of Designated Wilderness” to the following Project Objective, “Change the existing motorized recreation designations to provide quality motorized recreation experiences while protecting natural resources and providing non-motorized recreation opportunities” in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 1.4 (Forest Plan Management Areas): Changed Table 1-2 to Table 1-6
- Ø Table 1-6: The heading for Management Area 5 was changed from “Inventoried Roadless Areas” to “Semi primitive Recreation Areas and Inventoried Roadless Areas” in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 1.6.1 (Geographic and Administrative Scope). The second sentence was edited to read “The geographic scope of the Travel Management Planning Project is described as the Bitterroot National Forest outside of Designated Wilderness” to be consistent with wording in Section 1.1
- Ø Section 1.6.2 (Decisions to be Made) was deleted

CHANGES BETWEEN DRAFT EIS AND FINAL EIS – CHAPTER 2

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability.
- Ø Section 2.2.1 (Public Participation): Updated to reflect activities which have occurred since Fall 2008, associated with the release of the FEIS.
- Ø Section 2.2.2 (Issues): Table 2.1: Deleted the word “may” from all issue indicators. Added the following issue: Motorized/mechanical transport use on roads and trails in the area recommended for wilderness designation (RWA) impacts its wilderness character, along with its associated measurement indicators
- Ø Table 2.1: Added the following measurement indicators: Acres of Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), by setting and Miles of motorized routes within each ROS by Management Area

to the following issue: The designation of motorized routes affects motorized and nonmotorized recreation opportunities by altering the amount, type, and season of motorized and nonmotorized routes

- Ø Table 2.1: Changed some of the measurement indicators for the following issues: Designation of motorized routes impacts water resources, fish and aquatic habitat, soils, and invasive plants.
- Ø Table 2.1: For the issue re: motorized access for dispersed camping, added the following indicators: Acres of sensitive soils located within motorized wheeled access corridors for dispersed camping (Soils); Number of motorized routes with rare plant species occurrences (Rare Plants); and Acres of invasive plants infestations within motorized wheeled access corridors for dispersed camping (Invasive Plants)
- Ø Table 2.2: Added noise as an issue not pertaining to summer motorized/mechanical transport use
- Ø Table 2.3: Added Acres of RWA open to over-snow vehicle use as an measurement indicator to the following issue: Designating areas open to winter travel impacts recreational experiences, in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Table 2.4: Added noise as an issue not pertaining to over-snow vehicle use
- Ø Section 2.2.4 (Common to All Action Alternatives): Added a number of features and edited the section for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.4 (Common to All Action Alternatives): Changed to apply to summer use
- Ø Section 2.2.4 (Common to All Action Alternatives): Changed the wording from “No motorized equipment or mechanical transport allowed in Designated Wilderness and Recommended Wilderness” to “Motorized equipment and mechanical transport would not be allowed in Designated Wilderness”
- Ø Section 2.2.4 (Common to All Action Alternatives): Changed the wording from “There would be no opportunities for high-challenge motorized opportunities (hill climbs, mud bogs, and play areas)” to “There would be no opportunities for high-challenge motorized opportunities (hill climbs, mud bogs, play areas, and motor parks)”
- Ø Section 2.2.4 (Common to All Action Alternatives): Added the following:
 - Ø “ ‘Unauthorized’ routes which were created prior to the 2001 Tri-State Decision would no longer be open to motorized use unless designated on the motor vehicle use map (MVUM)”
 - Ø “Utility vehicles greater than 50 inches in width would be allowed on National Forest System roads open to full size vehicles”
 - Ø “Utility vehicles less than 50 inches in width would be allowed on National Forest System double-track trails”
 - Ø “Corridors for motorized wheeled access for dispersed camping would be extended to those sites identified on the maps of the alternatives”
 - Ø “Motorized wheeled access between dispersed campsites would be prohibited”
 - Ø “Access to dispersed campsites outside the designated corridors would be accessible only by nonmotorized means”
 - Ø “Parking of motorized vehicles off of designated routes would be limited to 30 feet from the edge of the route surface”
 - Ø Off-road travel for purposes other than dispersed camping would be limited to parking immediate adjacent to the designated route”
 - Ø “Roads and trails closed to public motorized use would remain available to Forest Service personnel for administrative purposes including wildfire suppression, search and rescue, medical emergencies, permit administration, data collection, invasive plants treatments, general management , and other activities”
- Ø Section 2.2.5 (Common to All Action Alternatives – Over-Snow): deleted the following: “No snowmobile use until December 1, except on open roads to support current hunting season road closures and provide for a good hunting experience.” Deleted the following: “No snowmobile use in Designated and Recommended Wilderness” and replaced with the following “Snowmobile use in Designated Wilderness would not be allowed.”

- Ø Section 2.2.6 (Alternative 1 - Summer): added Table 2-5 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.7 (Alternative 1 – Over-Snow): moved over-snow effects under each alternative instead of showing it as a separate section; added Table 2-7 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.10 (Alternative 3 – Summer): added the following: “Motorized/mechanical transport use in recommended wilderness areas;”, added Table 2-13 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.11 (Alternative 3 – Over-Snow): added the following ”Motorized/mechanical transport use allowed in recommended wilderness areas,” added Table 2-13 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.12 (Alternative 4- Summer): added Table 2-15 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.2.13 (Alternative 4 – Over-Snow): added Table 2-17 for clarity
- Ø Section 2.3 (Project Design Features): Table 2-19: edited table to include additional objectives and design features in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 2.4 (Monitoring): edited to provided more detail in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 2.5 (Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Study): added Alternatives 2.5.13 – 2.5.26 in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 2.6.1 (Comparison of Alternatives by Activity): added Tables 2.20 and 2.22 to provide more detail

CHANGES BETWEEN DRAFT EIS AND FINAL EIS – CHAPTER 3

Transportation (Roads)

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability.
- Ø Section 3.1.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods). The first paragraph was changed from “The analysis area for the transportation resource consists of the 758,177 acres of the Bitterroot National Forest, not including Designated and Recommended Wilderness” to “The analysis area for the transportation resource consists of the Bitterroot National Forest, not including Designated Wilderness.”; it was moved to the third paragraph. This was done as motorized/mechanical transport use in recommended wilderness was analyzed in Alternative 3.
- Ø Section 3.1.3 (Affected Environment) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Pg. 3.1-2, first paragraph. The number of miles road decommissioned and removed from the Forest’s Transportation System was changed from 600 to approximately 134 miles. Additionally, about 195 miles of roads have been hydrologically stabilized and placed into long term storage. Table 3.1-2 was modified to show the number of miles of roads under each road restriction category. This was done in response to a comment on the DEIS. Table 3.1-3 was replaced with a new table, and Table 3.1-4 was modified. The discussion on coincident routes and Level 1 road maintenance was added.
- Ø Tables 3.1-5 to 3.1-10 were added. The section titled Funding for Road Maintenance and Improvements, including Tables 3.1-11 to 3.1-16, was added in response to public comments on the DEIS. Table 3.1-7 was renamed Table 3.1-17.
- Ø Section 3.1.4 (Environmental Consequences) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Tables 3.1-18 and 3.1-19 were added. Discussion of effects associated with over-snow vehicle use was added.
- Ø Section 3.1.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.1.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Recreation and Trails

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability
- Ø Section 3.2 Recreation and Trails was modified to describe the benefits of recreation, including the use of motorized vehicles
- Ø Section 3.2.1 (Scope of the Analysis and Analysis Methods). The first paragraph was changed from “The Analysis Area for Recreation and Trails resource is the entire Bitterroot National Forest” to

“The project area for the Travel Management Planning Project is the portion of the Forest outside of Designated Wilderness”

- Ø Section 3.2.2 D (Travel Management Direction) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization, and to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 B (Bitterroot National Forest Recreation Use Information) was rewritten to provide additional information. Table 3.2-1 was added
- Ø Section 3.2.3 F (Motorized Vehicle Use for Dispersed Camping) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization, and to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 H (National Forest Trail System) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization, and to provide information on trail operations, maintenance, and improvements. Tables 3.2-2, 3.2-3, and 3.2-4 were added.
- Ø Section 3.2.3 I (Funding for Operations, Maintenance, and Improvements) was added to provide additional information. Tables 3.2-6 and 3.2-7 were added. This was done in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.2.3 J (Motorized Use) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Table 3.2-8 was added.
- Ø Section 3.2.3 K (Coincident Routes) was added to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 L (Utility Vehicle Motorized Use) was added to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 M (Current Regulations for Motorized Trails) was added to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 O (Mechanical Transport) was added to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 P (Nonmotorized Summer Use on System Trails). The title for Figure 2.1-1 was changed, and additional data for the years 2009 -2011 was added
- Ø Section 3.2.3 Q (Special Emphasis Trails) was rewritten to provide clarity and organization. Table 3.2-9 was added.
- Ø Section 3.2.3 R (Over-Snow Use) was rewritten to provide clarity and organization, and to provide additional information
- Ø Section 3.2.3 S (Noise) was rewritten to provide clarity and organization
- Ø Section 3.2.3 T (Conflicts of Uses on National Forest System Roads, Trails, and Lands) was moved from C (Recreation Setting) to T, and rewritten to improve clarity and organization
- Ø Section 3.2.3 U (Law Enforcement and Education) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. The table was deleted; a table showing the number of violations associated with travel management is located in the Project File {Project File document REC-057.pdf}. This was done in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 3.2.4 A (Environmental Consequences-Summer) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Table 3.2-10 was expanded to include information on Acres of ROS by Setting, and edited to reflect changes; Table 3.2-11 was added. Information pertaining to Budget and Affordability, including Table 3.2-12, was added to provide additional information. This was done in response to comments on the DEIS
- Ø Section 3.2.4 B (Environmental Consequences – Over Snow) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Table 3.2-13 was added
- Ø Section 3.2.3 E (Direct and Indirect Effects – Summer and Over-Snow) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Tables 3.2-14, 3.2-15, 3.2-16, 3.2-17, 3.2-18, 3.2-19, 3.2-20, and 3.2-21 were added.
- Ø Section 3.2.3 F (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.2.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations) was rewritten to provide clarity and organization, as well as additional information

Wilderness

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability
- Ø Section 3.3.3 (Affected Environment) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Table 3.3-1 was added.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (Environmental Consequences) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (A) Wilderness. Description and effects analysis was added.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (B) Recommended Wilderness. Description and effects analysis was added. Tables 3.3-3 and 3.3-4 were added.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (C) Wilderness Study Areas was rewritten to improve clarity and organization; separate assessments were prepared for the Blue Joint and Sapphire areas. Figures 3.3-1 and 3.3-2 and Tables 3.3-5 to 3.3-12 were added.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (D) Inventoried Roadless Areas was rewritten and reorganized to improve clarity by analyzing each of the roadless areas separately. Figure 3.3-3 and Tables 3.3-13 to 3.3-39 were added.
- Ø Section 3.3.4 (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to include both summer and over-snow effects
- Ø Section 3.3.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations. Rewritten to provide clarity and organization, and to provide additional information.

Economic and Social

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability.
- Ø Section 3.4.1 D (Weaknesses, Limitations, and Assumptions of Analysis Methods). Discussion regarding the money spent on goods and services associated with the power sports industry was added in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.4.3 G (Recreational National Forest Use, Social Issues, and Conflict). Discussion regarding the aging of the population was added in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.4.3 G (Recreational National Forest Use, Social Issues, and Conflict). Figure 3.4-3 was added in response to comments on the DEIS. In addition, information regarding the analysis of OHV use and the economic impacts was added in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.4.3 H (Bitterroot National Forest Budget Trend). Table 3.4-7 was edited to include funding through 2013. The discussion titled Funding for Trail Operations, Maintenance, and Improvements, including Table 3.4-8, was added in response to comments on the DEIS. The discussion titled Funding for Road Maintenance and Improvements, including Table 3.4-9, was also added in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.4.4 B (Economic Impacts). The example in the third paragraph was edited to make it specific to bicycle use. And, a second example was added to provide clarification.
- Ø Section 3.4.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.4.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Wildlife

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability.
- Ø Section 3.5.3 (Affected Environment and Effects to Wildlife); Table 3.5.1. Changed status of Yellow-billed Cuckoo from Candidate to Threatened to reflect USFWS final rule to list the species as threatened, dated 10/3/2014. Added Bighorn Sheep, Long-eared *Myotis* and Long-legged *Myotis* to the list as Sensitive species to reflect updates to the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species list in 2011. Added Mountain Goat to the list as a Species of Interest. Changed the summary

- determination column for Fisher and Pine Marten to reflect the addition of analyses for these species in Section 3.5.6 F and 3.5.6 J, respectively.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.5 A (Summer Travel Routes and Wildlife). Added additional discussion and references.
 - Ø Section 3.5.6 (Analysis of Project Effects to Selected Wildlife Species). Renumbered most sub-sections due to the addition of the Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Fisher, Bighorn Sheep, and American Marten sub-sections. The Gray Wolf sub-section changed from 3.5.6 B in the DEIS to 3.5.6 C in the FEIS. The Bald Eagle sub-section changed from 3.5.6 C in the DEIS to 3.5.6 D in the FEIS. The Wolverine sub-section changed from 3.5.6 D in the DEIS to 3.5.6 E in the FEIS. The Western Toad sub-section changed from 3.5.6 E in the DEIS to 3.5.6 G in the FEIS. The Elk sub-section changed from 3.5.6 F in the DEIS to 3.5.6 I in the FEIS. The Mountain Goat sub-section changed from 3.5.6 G in the DEIS to 3.5.6 K in the FEIS. The Migratory Birds sub-section changed from 3.5.6 H in the DEIS to 3.5.6 L in the FEIS. The Animal Movements, Migration, and Dispersal sub-section changed from 3.5.6 I in the DEIS to 3.5.6 M in the FEIS.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 A (Canada Lynx). Updated legal status section to reflect July 2, 2013 addition of lynx to the USFWS list of threatened, endangered and candidate species that may be present on the BNF as transients in secondary/peripheral lynx habitat. Updated narrative within other lynx sections to reflect this new status. Added lynx habitat acres based on the Forest's lynx habitat map, and added an analysis of lynx habitat acres open to over-snow vehicles. Added an analysis of road miles in lynx habitat, and the results of lynx monitoring efforts on the Forest. Added Tables 3.5-2, 3.5-3, 3.5-4, and 3.5-5. Added lynx trapping data in Ravalli County from FWP. Also added additional discussion and references pertaining to potential effects of over-snow vehicles and roads to lynx. Updated the lynx analysis based on changes to the alternatives since the DEIS. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to describe past activities that have affected lynx in the Bitterroot drainage. Added an Effects Determination section that summarizes the findings in the lynx Biological Assessment
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 B (Yellow-billed Cuckoo). Added a brief sub-section, including a short habitat description, effects analysis and effects determination after this species was listed as Threatened by USFWS in October 2014.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 C (Gray Wolf). Added language tracking several changes in the legal status of gray wolves since the DEIS was published. Updated the direct and indirect analysis to reflect changes in road and trail miles, and acres open to over-snow vehicles resulting from changes to the alternatives since the DEIS. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to add the latest wolf monitoring data from USFWS, and to include further discussion of the impacts of past and ongoing projects. Changed the effects determination to better reflect potential impacts to wolves.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 D (Bald Eagle). Updated the cumulative effects analysis to include 2010 state-wide bald eagle monitoring data from FWP. Changed the description of Alternative 3 to show that it would not change the existing condition on Road #550 west of its junction with Road #13200. Changed effects determination for Alternative 3 to No Impact. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to describe past activities that have affected eagles in the Bitterroot drainage.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 E (Wolverine). Reorganized this section. Added additional narrative and citations to incorporate recent research findings and monitoring results. Added additional analysis based on modeled wolverine habitat map from Inman et al. (2013). Used that map as a base to determine the number of acres of predicted wolverine habitat open to over-snow vehicle use for each alternative, and the length of roads and trails open to motorized use within predicted wolverine habitat for each alternative. Updated the direct and indirect effects analysis to reflect changes in road and trail miles and the wildlife disturbance index since the DEIS in each alternative. Added Tables 3.5-6, 3.5-7, 3.5-8, 3.5-9, 3.5-10, and 3.5-11. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to describe past and ongoing activities that have affected wolverines in the Bitterroot drainage, and added wolverine trapping data from FWP.

- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 F (Fisher). Added an analysis sub-section for Fisher in response to public comments on the DEIS. Added Tables 3.5-12, 3.5-13, 3.5-14, and 3.5-15.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 G (Western Toad). Added additional discussion and references to better document toad use of terrestrial habitats following the spring breeding season, and toad movements between breeding ponds and upland summer habitats. Added an analysis that evaluated the miles of roads and trails open to motorized use within 100 feet of streams, lakes, and ponds for each alternative, including several tables (3.5-16, 3.5-17, 3.5-18, 3.5-19, 3.5-20, and 3.5-21). Updated the existing analysis that evaluated miles of roads and trails open to motorized use across the Forest based on changes to the alternatives between DEIS and FEIS. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to describe previous activities that have affected toads in the Bitterroot drainage. Expanded and updated the effects calls to acknowledge that all of the action alternatives will result in some continued impacts to toads, even though some of them would implement changes that would be positive for toads.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 H (Bighorn Sheep). Added an analysis sub-section for Bighorn Sheep to reflect the May 2011 addition of bighorn sheep to the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List. Added Tables 3.5-22, 3.5-23, 3.5-24, and 3.5-25.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). Added additional discussion and citations to the Synopsis of the Effects of Motorized Access to Elk to help describe potential impacts of motorized use to elk, and updated elk monitoring numbers to reflect data collected in 2008 through 2014 by FWP. Under the Affected Environment – Populations sub-heading, updated the three elk population charts with 2009 through 2014 elk data collected by FWP (Tables 3.5-26, 3.5-27, and 3.5-28), and added additional discussion and citations to document FWP's research studies on elk in the Bitterroot drainage.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). Under the Elk Habitat Effectiveness (EHE) sub-heading, the total number of third-order drainages shown for the existing condition increased by 12 between the DEIS and the FEIS. This is because it was not known whether these 12 drainages were classified as "roaded" or "unroaded" at the time the Forest Plan was written, and thus it was not known which EHE standard should be applied to them for the DEIS. The correct "roaded/unroaded" status for these drainages has been determined (most fell into the "unroaded" category), and they were added to the EHE calculations in the FEIS. In addition, the third-order drainage layer in the Forest's GIS library includes large amounts of private land within some drainage boundaries. These private lands were inadvertently included in the open road density calculations in these drainages in the DEIS, which may have reduced the open road density, and in turn may have increased the EHE percentages in those drainages. These drainage boundaries were "clipped" to the Forest boundary for EHE calculations in the FEIS, which may have increased open road densities and reduced EHE percentages in some drainages for the existing condition. As a result, the FEIS shows 12 more third-order drainages than the DEIS did, and also shows that fewer drainages meet the EHE standard and more drainages do not meet the EHE standard than shown in the DEIS. Updated Tables for Number of Third-Order Drainages That Meet and Do Not Meet the EHE Standard to reflect these changes (Tables 3.5-29 and 3.5-37).
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). EHE numbers changed in some third-order drainages in some alternatives between the DEIS and the FEIS based on changes in whether some road segments would be designated as open or closed in those alternatives. These changes influenced the total number of third-order drainages that meet the EHE standard under each alternative, as well as the EHE percentages when combined on a Hunting District scale. Updated Tables for Elk Habitat Effectiveness Percentages by Hunting District to reflect these changes (Tables 3.5-40, 3.5-41, and 3.5-42), and also updated the discussions under each table to match the new EHE figures displayed in the tables.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk), under the Elk Habitat Effectiveness Index headings for both the Affected Environment and Effect of the Alternatives sections, added Tables 3.5-31 and 3.5-39 and discussion to quantify and evaluate the number of third-order drainages that would meet and not

- meet a Hypothetical EHE Index Guideline when including both open roads and trails to determine open route density.
- Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). Updated Tables for EHE Index (Table 3.5-32), Elk Security (Table 3.5-33), Elk Security During the Archery Season (Table 3.5-34), and Wildlife Core Security Area Percentages (Tables 3.5-35 and 3.5-44) to reflect changes in the applicable numbers for each table between the DEIS and the FEIS resulting from changes in whether some road and trail segments would be designated as open or closed in the various alternatives. Updated the discussion under each table to match the new figures displayed in the tables.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk), under the Elk Security Area Index heading in the Direct and Indirect Effects section, added Table 3.5-43 and discussion to quantify the miles of roads and trails closed during the archery season by alternative.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). Updated Table for Acres and Percentage of Elk Winter Range on the Bitterroot National Forest Open and Closed to Over-snow Vehicle Use (Table 3.5-45) for the Alternatives to reflect changes in the area open to over-snow vehicles between the DEIS and FEIS for each alternative. Also updated the discussion under the table to match the new figures displayed in the tables.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk) under the Direct and Indirect Effects Summarized by Alternative subheading, updated the discussion under each alternative to reflect changes made to each analysis parameter.
 - Ø Section 3.5.6 I (Elk) under the Cumulative Effects section, updated elk population figures based on data collected by FWP in 2009 through 2014. Updated the cumulative effects analysis to describe past activities that have affected elk in the Bitterroot drainage.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 I (Elk). Moved the Analysis of the Elk Habitat Effectiveness Forest Plan Amendment from Section 3.5.6 I to Section 3.5.7.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 J (American Marten). Added an analysis sub-section for American Marten in response to comments on the DEIS. Added Tables 3.5-46, 3.5-47, 3.5-48, and 3.5-49.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 K (Mountain Goat). Added tables displaying the acres and percentage of goat spring, summer, and fall range outside the zone of motorized influence for the existing condition (Table 3.5-50) and for the alternatives (Table 3.5-52), and used numbers contained in these tables to update the analysis for the effects of the alternatives during the summer. Also added tables displaying the acres and percentage of goat winter range open to over-snow vehicle use for the existing condition (Table 3.5-51) and for the alternatives (Table 3.5-53), and used numbers contained in those tables to update the analysis for the effects of the alternatives during the winter. Updated the cumulative effects determination section to reflect these new figures, and added a heading and discussion to describe past activities that have affected goats in the Bitterroot drainage.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 L (Migratory Birds). Updated Table 3.5-55 and the discussion under the table to match the new figures displayed in the table.
 - Ø Sub-section 3.5.6 M (Animal Movement, Migration and Dispersal). Updated the discussion under Direct and Indirect Effects to reflect changes in roads and trails open to motorized use in each of the alternatives.
 - Ø Section 3.5.7 (Analysis of the Elk Habitat Effectiveness Forest Plan Amendment). Added a statement to clarify that the project-specific Forest Plan amendment would only apply to the Travel Management Planning EIS, and updated the number of third-order drainages that meet the Forest Plan standard for EHE in the discussion, (and in Section 3.5.6 H Table 3.5-31). Also added Table 3.5-56, which lists previous EHE site-specific amendments).
 - Ø Section 3.5.8 (Determination of Effects for Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Wildlife Species). Added the BA and BE Summary of Conclusion of Effects.

Water Resources

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability
- Ø Section 3.6.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. This was done in response to comments on the DEIS. The two water resource effects measurement indicators used in the DEIS were changed to a single indicator (Total Potential Motorized Sediment- Percent of Background) in the FEIS which integrates the effects from all forms of motorized access, including motorized access for dispersed camping, open roads, and trails. Additional discussion of separate 6th-level watersheds is provided to improve the resolution of the analysis, and to address motorized access effects at the 6th-level watershed scale. New text was added including effects of motorized access for dispersed camping, differences in motorized use impacts due to trail, rider, and machine characteristics, trail maintenance, and wetlands.
- Ø Section 3.6.1 A (Effects Estimation and Comparison). Text was added to explain the background and use of the water resource measurement indicator.
- Ø Section 3.6.3 (Affected Environment). Much of this section was moved to Section 3.6.4 C (Cumulative Effects) to clarify the cumulative effects discussion for the existing condition. This was done in response to public comments on the DEIS. New information received on the current condition of water resources within the analysis area was incorporated into the discussion.
- Ø Section 3.6.3 (Affected Environment), Table 3.6-2. The column titled Water Quality Classification was added to the table, which was also updated to reflect the most current MDEQ water quality information (2012 305(b)/303(d) list). This was done in response to public comment on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.6.4 (Environmental Consequences) was rewritten to include the effects of motorized access for dispersed camping, differences in motorized use impacts due to trail, rider and machine characteristics, trail maintenance and wetlands. This was done in response to comments on the DEIS. Table 3.6-3 replaces Tables 3.6-3 to 3.6-5 in the DEIS. Measurement indicator tables were built for each alternative to display the results for individual 6th-level watersheds. These tables were incorporated into the FEIS as {Project File document WAT-006.pdf}. The tables are too large (approximately 31 pages) to include in the FEIS. Discussion on the analysis results represented by these tables was added to Section 3.6.4.
- Ø Section 3.6.4 A (Effects Common to All Action Alternatives). Effects associated with over-snow vehicle use were added.
- Ø Section 3.6.4 C (Cumulative Effects). The effects discussion for the entire Forest and Bitterroot River watershed were expanded and also moved to the section. Effects associated with over-snow vehicle use were added.
- Ø In response to public comments on the DEIS, new literature was reviewed, cited if applicable, and added to Appendix B (Literature Cited). The new literature for Water Resources is also listed and commented on in {Project File folder 'water_resources,' Project File document WAT-002.pdf}.
- Ø Section 3.6.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Fish and Aquatic Habitat

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability.
- Ø Sections 3.7.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods), 3.7.2 (Regulatory Framework), 3.7.3 (Affected Environment), 3.7.5 A (Bitterroot National Forest Plan), and 3.7.5 D (Biological Evaluation for Aquatic Species). Edited to include the Western pearshell mussel, which was added to the Forest Service's sensitive species list by the Regional Forester.
- Ø Section 3.7.4 (Environmental Consequences) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Added Figures 3.7-2 and 3.7-3, and Tables 3.7-3, 3.7-4, and 3.7-5.
- Ø Section 3.7.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-2 reflect changes to the miles of motorized routes in each alternative. The number of miles of near-stream roads in Alternative 2 (No Action) in the FEIS are less than those shown in the DEIS because the National Forest System

roads that run through private lands were excluded from analysis in the FEIS. This more accurately represents the political boundaries of reasonable changes for travel management planning. It is very unlikely that changes to travel management would occur on roads that are the primary access to extensive parcels of private lands. Eightmile Creek, and the road along it (#601), is the best example. There are several miles of near-stream National Forest System road along Eightmile Creek, but the entire near-stream road is going through private lands, and the Travel Management Planning Project would not affect this route because of the need for private landowners to access their lands. The effect on the outcome of the analysis is minor because the discussion simply shifts from direct and indirect effect to the cumulative effects discussion, specifically with respect to Activities on State and Private Lands.

- Ø Section 3.7.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). In the discussion of effects of **Alternative 1**, the effect of the changes in management to roads in eight subwatersheds are highlighted. The National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) is the surface water dataset used by geographic information systems (GIS). It contains features such as lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, and canals. These data are designed to be used in general mapping and in the analysis of surface-water. There are a few differences between NHD map and field observations. These differences are consistent among alternatives so they have minimal effect on the comparison of alternatives in the analysis. Where differences are found that may be important at a more local scale, such as a sixth level subwatershed, there are verbal descriptions to explain those discoveries. An example is that the Road #311 closely parallels a perennial tributary of Rye Creek, but it did not show on the maps and data as a road within 300 feet of a stream. This is explained in the text of the report.
- Ø Section 3.7.4 C (Cumulative Effects). The introductory section was rewritten for clarification. The effects of recreational fishing, non-native, nuisance, and invasive species, were added to the cumulative effects discussion. A note was added that a “Worksheet for Consideration of Cumulative Effects to the Fisheries Resource is available in the Project File. Effects associated with over-snow vehicle use was added.
- Ø Section 3.7.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.
- Ø Section 3.7.5 B (INFISH Standards Guidelines, and Objectives). Under Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs), Part 4 of the biological assessment for bull trout {Project File document FISH-004.pdf} was referenced to provide details on the factors of the Travel Management Planning Project that may affect attainment of the RMOs.
- Ø Section 3.7.5 C (Endangered Species Act). The citation of the section of the Endangered Species Act was corrected from “section 2” to “Section 7(a) (2),” and wording for Alternatives 2 and 3 was changed from “would not meet...” to “would be unlikely to meet...” to reflect the recognition that consultation with USFWS would be needed to conclusively determine whether an alternative would meet the intent of ESA.

Soils

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability
- Ø Section 3.8 (Soils) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization
- Ø Section 3.8.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods) was rewritten to describe the change in the measurement indicators. The indicators were changed in response to comments on the DEIS.
- Ø Section 3.8.2 (Regulatory Framework) was rewritten to improve clarity
- Ø Section 3.8.3 (Affected Environment) was rewritten to improve clarity and organization. Revisions to Tables 3.8-1 and 3.8-2; Table 3.8-1 now shows the miles of high erosion potential soils traversed by open motorized system routes, and Table 3.8-2 now shows the acres of sensitive soils, rather than the miles of open motorized routes on sensitive soils. Loss of soil productivity is the primary concern for the soil resource regardless of soil sensitivity. Soil productivity was initially lost when the motorized routes were constructed. Analysis was only completed for existing motorized routes

located on high erosion potential soils since prolonged erosion on these soil types can lead to watershed degradation.

- Ø Section 3.8.4 A (Effects Common to All Action Alternatives). Discussion of effects associated with over-snow vehicle use was added.
- Ø Section 3.8.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). Rewritten to improve clarity and organization, and to reflect the change in the measurement indicators. The analysis for existing motorized routes located on sensitive soils was modified. Analysis was conducted to determine the soil productivity loss associated with new construction, and the impacts to acres of sensitive soils from motorized access to dispersed camping sites. Table 3.8-3 is now Table 3.8-4; replaced Table 3.8-3 with a new table, and added Tables 3.8-5 and 3.8-6.
- Ø Section 3.8.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.8.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Rare Plants

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors improve readability.
- Ø Changed the name of the resource from Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Plants to Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Plants, Species of Concern, and Forest Species of Interest (Rare Plants) to more accurately reflect the scope of the analysis.
- Ø Section 3.9.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods). Deleted the measurement indicator, the acres of potentially-suitable habitat within dispersed camping areas that could be impacted, as it did not contribute much to the analysis; the analysis only considered impacts to five dispersed camping areas.
- Ø Section 3.9.3 A (Affected Environment), Table 3.9-1. Changed the name of the table from “Sensitive Plants in or Near the Analysis Area” in the DEIS to “Rare Plants Species in the Analysis Area) in the FEIS. Added Diamond clarkia (*Clarkia rhomboidea*), Dwarf onion (*Allium simillimum*), Candystick (*Allotropa virgate*), Greenleaf manzanita (*Arctostaphylos patula*), Small camas (*Camassia quamash*), Columbia lewisia (*Lewisia columbiana*), Bitterroot (*Lewisia rediviva* var. *rediviva*), Stalk-leaved monkeyflower (*Mimulus ampliatus*), and Yerba buena (*Satureja douglasii*) to the species list based on regional and state direction. Deleted Great Basin Indian-potato (*Orogenia linearifolia*), Yellow lady’s-slipper (*Cypripedium parviflorum*), English sundew (*Drosera anglica*), Giant helleborine (*Epipactis gigantea*), California false hellebore (*Veratrum californicum*), Pod grass (*Scheuchzeria palustris*), Western pearl-flower (*Heterocodon rariflorum*), Scaepod (*Idahoia scapigera*), Three-angled threadmoss (*Meesia triquetra*), Dwarf purple monkeyflower (*Mimulus primuloides*), and Payette penstemon (*Penstemon payettensis*) to the species list based on regional and state direction.
- Ø Section 3.9.3 B. Changed the heading from Species of Interest to Species of Concern
- Ø Section 3.9.3 C. Added Forest Species of Interest
- Ø Section 3.9.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). Edits to Tables 3.9-3, 3.9-4, 3.9-5, and 3.9-6 to reflect changes in the alternatives. Deleted Tables 3.9-4 and 3.9-8 as they did not contribute to the analysis; they only showed the impacts to five dispersed camping areas.
- Ø Added clarification about the dispersed campsite analyses: acres noted include the routes used to access dispersed campsites, as well as a 150/300 foot corridor on either side of access route.
- Ø Section 3.9.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.9.4 D (Determination of Effects for Rare Species). Renamed Table 3.9-9 as Table 3.9-7. Added Diamond clarkia (*Clarkia rhomboidea*) to Table 3.9-7 (Sensitive Plant Species biological evaluation), and deleted Great Basin Indian-potato (*Orogenia linearifolia*) based on changes to the Bitterroot National Forest’s Sensitive Plant List.

- Ø Section 3.9.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Invasive Plants

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and to improve readability.
- Ø Changed the name of the resource from Noxious Weeds to Invasive Plants. Noxious weeds is a state designation, and the Forest Service analyzes all invasive plants regardless of designation. Additionally, the trend is switching to using that terminology.
- Ø Section 3.10.1 (Scope of Analysis and Analysis Methods). Added descriptions of the measurement indicators. Additionally, one of the indicators was changed. In the DEIS it read: “Potential impact of dispersed camping within 150 and 300 foot corridors on noxious weed spread.” It was changed in the FEIS to read: “The acres of invasive plants infestations within motorized wheeled access corridors for dispersed camping.”
- Ø Section 3.10.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). Edits to Tables 3.10-3, 3.10-4, 3.10-6, 3.10-7, and 3.10-9 to reflect changes in the alternatives. Deleted Tables 3.10-5 and 3.10-6 as they did not contribute to the analysis; they only showed the impacts to six dispersed camping areas.
- Ø Section 3.10.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.10.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Cultural Resources

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability.
- Ø Section 3.11.3 (Affected Environment). Added information regarding Trail #313.5.
- Ø Section 3.11.4 A (Effects Common to All Action Alternatives). Discussion of effects associated with over-snow vehicle use was added.
- Ø Section 3.11.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicles use were added.
- Ø Section 3.11.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Mineral Materials

- Ø Minor grammatical edits were made to correct typographical errors and improve readability.
- Ø Section 3.12.3 (Affected Environment) was edited to include the Ambrose Rock Community Collecting Area.
- Ø Section 3.12.4 (Effects Common to All Action Alternatives). Discussion of effects associated with over-snow vehicle use was added.
- Ø Section 3.12.4 B (Direct and Indirect Effects). Road #5685, from MP 7.5-21.50, would be closed to use by OHVs in Alternative 4. Road #428, from MP 7.3-9.1, would be closed to all motorized use in Alternative 4.
- Ø Section 3.12.4 C (Cumulative Effects) was rewritten to add effects associated with over-snow vehicle use.
- Ø Section 3.12.5 (Consistency with Forest Plan, Laws, and Regulations). Rewritten to provide clarity and organization.

Figure 1- 1: Vicinity Map

