

## **TRADITIONAL ACCESS & RECREATION EMPHASIS ALTERNATIVE** **CARIBOU TRAVEL PLAN REVISION**

### **PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of this alternative is to provide the public with the opportunity to use and enjoy

- 1 the solitude of non-motorized recreation across expansive areas of relatively undisturbed landscapes;
- 2 healthy populations of wildlife unstressed by motorized recreation use;
- 3 cleaner and clearer streams and associated aquatic habitats from decreased erosion and sedimentation resulting from motorized recreation use.

This alternative is needed because there is not an alternative currently being considered that meets the stated purpose and need of the Caribou Travel Plan Revision (CTPR) without increasing motorized recreational opportunities

### **CURRENT CONDITION**

Motorized recreation on the Caribou portion of the Caribou-Targhee National Forest (C-TNF) has grown significantly over the past decade. Horseback riders, hikers, skiers, mountain bikers, hunters, and those on snowshoes now are often forced to make way for machines, and then have to use heavily eroded or damaged trails. The hunting experience is also significantly and adversely affected by motorized users. This alternative will go a long way toward restoring a quality hunting experience on the forest. Idaho Fish and Game has taken steps to address this issue and so should the C-TNF. We believe that motorized vehicles belong on designated routes that do not encourage proliferation of illegal trails, harm riparian habitats, cause resource damage or severely impact wildlife.

Motorized recreation has spread to nearly every corner of the backcountry. It is becoming almost impossible to escape the noise, smell, and resource damage being caused by machinery. In most cases single track trails that originated as horseback and hiking trails are becoming two-track roads. Snowmobiles are more powerful allowing them to move into areas that are traditional backcountry ski areas. Motorized activity impacts the hunting experience and scares game. Quiet, low-impact recreation and enjoyment of the forest is becoming an endangered activity on the Caribou.

The Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative was developed with input from a broad cross-section of residents, which includes hunters, hikers and trail runners, mountain bikers, skiers, snowshoe enthusiasts, and horseback riders around southeast Idaho. Citizens from Montpelier, Soda Springs, Downey, Arimo, McCammon, Inkom, Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Dingle, Preston, Malad, Chubbuck, and Blackfoot participated in this process. In addition to individuals, a number of organizations worked on developing this alternative. All those involved with its development are interested in a more balanced approach to access and recreation on the forest. The Traditional Access &

Recreation Alternative provides this more balanced approach between motorized recreation and non-motorized recreation. It also goes a long way toward permitting the Forest Service to better comply with Executive Order 11644, which directs the Forest Service to “establish policies and provide for procedures that will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be *controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands*” (emphasis added). Section 3 (a) also requires that ORV areas and trails shall be located to: (1) minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources; (2) minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats; and (3) minimize conflicts between ORV use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors.

If the access standards as described in Caribou Revised Forest Plan (RFP) are implemented literally, as the proposed action for the CTPR scoping notice does, it will allow summertime motorized use within management prescriptions areas that cover more than 1 million acres of the 1.1 million acre forest (92%), leaving a mere 8% of the forest available to those seeking solitude or a place to recreate without motorized vehicles intruding. This 8% includes the Caribou City and Mt. Naomi Recommend Wildernesses and six scattered non-motorized (summer only) prescription areas which range in size from approximately 3,300 to approximately 13,500 acres. During the winter months the RFP allows for expanded motorized use (cross-country snowmobile use) on an even larger percentage of the forest (96%), including the two recommended wilderness areas and in the drainage that serves as the water supply for the City of Pocatello.

The expansion of motorized use on the Caribou and the tenants of adaptive management require that the traditional "laissez faire" approach to access and recreation management—i.e., you can go anywhere you want, whenever you want, by whatever means you want—be re-assessed. The end result of laissez faire is more loop trails, acquiescence to user-created routes over the past planning cycle, and the apparent acquiescence to additional user created routes if, according to Forest Service spokespersons, those routes “make sense.” The proposal implies, given the areas, trails and roads open to motorized use that the Forest Service believes it must acquiesce to the increased demand and expectations of motorized recreationists. Instead, we believe that this ever increasing demand for motorized recreation opportunities is the most compelling reason why the Forest Service must aggressively manage and control such use today. If the Forest Service fails to do so another decade of increased expectations of use will be established, resulting in continued loss or degradation of non-motorized recreation opportunities, water quality, riparian areas, soils, and wildlife habitat.

Our proposal seeks to address this issue by providing the Forest Service with an alternative that not only provides recommendations for specific trails, systems of trails, and areas of the forest that should be allocated to traditional access and recreation uses, it also provides the context and the rationale for the recommendations. This context and rationale are based on the personal knowledge and experiences of the dozens of individuals, organizations, and agencies who developed this alternative.

## **TRADITIONAL ACCESS & RECREATION ALTERNATIVE VISION FOR THE C-TNF TRAVEL PLAN REVISION**

Our efforts have focused on creating a vision of how the forest can be managed to provide vibrant, diverse fish and wildlife populations as well as equitable, balanced recreation. There is ample scientific evidence which clearly shows the disproportionate impacts to these values caused by motorized access and recreation. Appendix B of this alternative contains a lengthy, but not exhaustive, bibliography of research conducted over the past 40 years that provides ample evidence of those impacts.

Map 9 from the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) for the RFP portrays in part what the Forest Service thought to be the existing motorized route densities for the forest. Based on our review of the maps used in developing the proposal for the CTPR, there are many instances in which the existing motorized route densities as indicated on Map 9 are inaccurate. Generally there appear to be many more miles of roads and trails being used by motorized vehicles than indicated when the RFP was developed. In addition to indicating motorized route densities, Map 9 also includes allowable motorized route densities. Based on Map 9 there are approximately 66 prescription areas where motorized route densities *could* increase. On the other hand there are only about 26 prescription areas where densities *might* decrease and another 25 where densities are expected to remain the same. Given the excessive amount of motorized use on the Caribou already, we believe that there is no reason to expand that use. In no case should the “allowable” motorized route densities become targets that the Forest Service feels compelled to reach. The Forest Service should ensure that there is no increase in motorized route densities in any management prescription on the forest. In fact, given the adverse impacts caused by motorized use, we suggest that motorized route densities should be decreased across the forest.

The forest cannot ecologically maintain the current network of motorized routes, nor can the Forest Service continually seek to meet increasing demands for new motorized routes as the proposed action would attempt to do. The forest’s capacity to sustain recreational (and all other) use is finite. That is why the Southeast Idaho Recreation Alliance (SIRA) and other organizations and individuals (see Appendices B) have developed this alternative for the CTPR

As previously stated, the Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative reflects the many and varied interests of non-motorized forest users/organizations. This diverse group identified those areas of the forest that should be allocated to non-motorized use, the resources (recreational activity or ecological resources such as water quality, wildlife, plant communities, etc.) that would be or already are harmed by year-round or seasonal motorized use, and provided additional information to ensure that this proposal is comprehensive in nature. In combination with the attached maps and specific comments on trails by District, we believe:

- 1 motorized roads and trails that dead end encourage proliferation of illegal trails and need to be closed;
- 2 winter boundaries between motorized and non-motorized areas need to be redefined

so they can be easily identified and enforced;

- 3 areas of separation use need to be provided to allow large areas of quality non-motorized and hunting experiences;
- 4 trails that are severely damage by use should be closed;
- 5 wilderness quality areas need to be managed as wilderness areas.

The premise upon which this alternative was developed is that recreation, including motorized recreation, and access, should be managed within the *ecological capabilities* of the land. Managing within the capability of the land may mean restricting use on roads and trails (travel ways) if the travel-ways themselves, and/or the use on the travel-ways, are impairing the long-term sustainability of plant or wildlife species. Restrictions can take the form of seasonal closures, complete closures, or changes in use types or intensities. Clearly, high quality recreational experiences depend on quiet, solitude, and healthy forests, habitats, and ecosystems.

Our vision has five themes. When implemented, the Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative will

- 1 provide for high quality, traditional recreation opportunities across the forest;
- 2 protect wildlife and wildlife habitat;
- 3 protect roadless areas, aquatic habitats, soils, and plant communities;
- 4 institute balance between traditional and motorized access on the forest year-round;
- 5 prohibit summer and winter motorized vehicle use in recommended wilderness areas and other wilderness quality lands; and
- 6 request the Forest Service to seek appropriate levels of funding, monitoring, and enforcement to ensure all potential benefits of this alternative can be realized.

To achieve a balanced allocation of the finite resources of the Caribou portion of the forest we recommend that the C-TNF adopt the following provisions:

- 1 restrict all off-highway vehicle (OHV) use to designated routes under a closed unless posted open policy (this would mean eliminating ALL cross-country motorized travel on the Forest);
  - 2 allow the designation of OHV routes only where the Forest Service demonstrates through full public disclosure on a site-specific basis, that existing or proposed OHV use does not and will not result in adverse environmental impacts;
  - 3 permit OHV use only to the extent that monitoring and enforcement are funded and implemented;
  - 4 prohibit motorized vehicle use in recommended wilderness areas and other wilderness quality lands including roadless areas.
- 1 Provide an education element as part of the Forest Service's implementation of the plan. The public needs to know what the rules are and the penalties for non-compliance.

The final CTRP should also include the following:

- 1 appropriate densities for motorized and non-motorized routes based on ecological parameters, not simply based on what is on-the-ground or what is demanded by motorized users
- 2 clearly articulated recreation capacities for each management area (for each major type of recreational use—e.g., motorized), designed to ensure, fundamentally, that the land and its inhabitant species and ecosystems are not harmed by the recreational use. These capacities should account for ecological considerations such as existing knowledge gaps in the environmental impacts of recreation (e.g., they should err on the side of caution).
- 3 clearly articulated recreation capacities that secondarily (after ensuring that recreational impacts fall within acceptable ecological constraints) address social desires (e.g., the effects of OHV recreation on hunting opportunities, solitude, etc.).

## **PREMISES AND IMPERATIVES FO THE TRADITIONAL ACCESS & RECREATION ALTERNATIVE**

### **Traditional Recreation**

#### ***Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)***

A result of recent increases in motorized and mechanized use across the west is the erosion of the non-motorized, traditional, and historic backcountry part of the spectrum—outside of wilderness. We believe there is the very real possibility that a situation could be created where the public has only two choices in backcountry experiences, either motorized or wilderness, with almost nothing in-between the two. Given that there is no designated wilderness on the Caribou portion of the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, this choice will be even starker. Increasingly, it seems the slippage towards the motorized end of the spectrum results from motorized users pioneering new routes into formerly non-motorized areas and then the Forest Service conceding that use, such as they have done on the Caribou over the past decade and are now legitimizing in the CTRP without consideration of ROS allocation. Given the topography of the Caribou, simply restricting most, or even all, cross-country motorized travel does not, as the Forest Plan would lead the public to believe, increase the ROS. For example, while as far away as one could get in the middle of the Stump Peak IRA this past year, one could still easily and clearly hear four-wheelers using trails still open to motorized use. How can the claim be made that this meets the semi-primitive non-motorized ROS category?

#### **Recreation—Impacts**

The Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative emphasizes traditional forms of recreation such as hiking and horse packing and will lead to a real increase to the non-motorized end of the ROS. Motorized recreation has a place on the forest but only if it doesn't overshadow or harm other interests. Roadless areas should remain roadless and should be protected from OHV use and abuse. For those areas that are roaded, the Forest Service should reduce total motorized route densities to no more than 1mi./sq.mi. Each form of recreation should be concentrated in those areas that are most appropriate for that recreational use.

Recreational use of the C-TNF, and any landscape, has environmental impacts, and these impacts can be severe depending on the use and on the habitat type. Numerous studies, reports, and other publications have documented, in significant detail, these impacts.

Recreation and access should be planned so that motorized users are not tempted to travel off-trail and possibly cause ecological impacts. The Forest Service should carefully examine the routes that are designated for motorized and mechanized use and minimize or eliminate situations that will entice users to pioneer new routes through sensitive sites, such as wet meadows.

Additionally, the Forest Service should ensure that it is designating uses on roads and trails that are compatible with designated uses on adjacent public land units. Often, conflicts arise when a public land management agency, such as the Forest Service, allows motorized use to its boundary and the adjacent public land management agency, such as another Forest Service district or other public land management agency, disallows motorized use on the continuation of the route within their jurisdiction. Conflicts also arise when trails dead-end at private property boundaries.

Roaded areas already provide most motorized recreation, including all use of passenger vehicles, which represents by far and away the most popular motorized activity on the forest. The C-TNF has already taken the first step towards managing for equitable sustainable recreation by limiting all motorized use to designated routes on the majority of the forest. Now the C-TNF Forest Service should take the next logical step and limit snowmobiles to designated routes and play areas, because the effects of snowmobiles and summer motorized use are essentially the same. Snowmobiles disrupt wildlife and other users in the same manner as OHVs but over a potentially greater area during a more critical season. Even the long-term effects of concentrated, repeated snow compaction are not dissimilar from the damage caused by cross-country use by wheeled vehicles. Other Forest Service districts in the west, such as the Lewis and Clark and Helena National Forests have recognized this fact and taken this step, and it is time for the C-TNF to do the same.

### **Motorized Recreation Impacts**

Clearly, OHV use is a significant management challenge. OHV use negatively affects most other resources, including off-trail vegetation and soil damage, erosion, damage to riparian areas, spread of noxious weeds, and disturbance to wildlife. The technological capability of these machines allows them to travel to virtually all of the remote backcountry on the forest.

Redundant routes, parallel routes, illegal “ghost” or “wildcat” routes, routes in ecologically or culturally (i.e., archaeologically, historically) sensitive locations, and routes that are incompatible with other uses of the land (e.g., hiking, hunting, fishing, bird watching, wilderness, clean water) should be immediately closed upon completion of the plan (i.e., no implementation level planning or decision-making is required to initiate the closures—the closure decisions are immediately effective). The plan itself should establish specific and enforceable timetables and procedures to restore and reclaim all closed routes. The plan should also allocate a specified portion of management funds to

such restoration and reclamation activities.

**Motorized Use Issues**

Clarification is needed in defining motorized users. Motor vehicles are a legitimate form of transport to, from, and within the road system of the C-TNF, as well as a means of recreation. However, using a vehicle to access the forest’s many trailheads or drive the designated road system is not comparable to using OHVs, motorcycles and snowmobiles off trail. The Forest Service should make it clear through the CTPR that “motorized user” does not imply the use of OHVs, motorcycles, and snowmobiles off the C-TNF’s designated road and trail system, or off-road anywhere including the Trail Creek area east of Soda Springs. In addition the CTPR should emphatically state that seasonal closures apply to all big game winter range. To avoid continued or increasing conflicts between users during hunting season, the Forest Service should aggressively institute a more widespread use of seasonal closures on both open trails and roads.

Much has been made of the growth in OHV sales and use nationwide. In fact this growth is used by public lands managers to continually increase the number and locations for motorized trails. However, it must also be recognized that the growth in traditional, non-motorized recreational use exceeds that of motorized growth. For example, Outside Magazine recently reported the Outdoor Industry Association, Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association International’s numbers for national winter trend in sales. These are included in Table 1.

- 1 Given this fact, the Forest Service should focus on ways to manage the growth in non-motorized recreation, with a recognition that motorized trail use significantly degrades these opportunities. The C-TNF is a finite resource and long-term management cannot continually accommodate increasing levels and forms of motorized recreation and still protect the forest’s

**Table 1. National winter recreational trends through sales in 1998 and 2002.**

<b>Recreational Use</b>	<b>Increase (+) or Decrease (-) in Sales</b>	<b>1998 (\$ million)</b>	<b>2002 (\$ million)</b>
Cross-Country Skiing	+	8.8	13.5
Telemark Skiing	+	1.3	3.3
Snowshoeing	+	2.9	5.9
Snowmobiles	-	6.5	4.5

Data from *Outside Magazine*. December 2003, p. 143.

unique wildlife and recreational resources. However, it can accommodate increasing levels of non-motorized recreation much more effectively, and without degradation of the forest’s resources.

OHVs have created perhaps hundreds of miles of non-system trails on the Caribou. The resource destruction resulting from this increase should not be legitimized by the Forest Service, by now recognizing most if not all of these non-system roads and trails. Unfortunately, in many cases the proposed action does exactly that. In a related issue,

the elimination of “user-created” trails should not be considered a reduction (and thereby result in the agency designating a disproportionate amount of other system trails being open to motorized use to compensate) in OHV opportunities, as these trails were all created without the scientific analysis required by the National Environmental Protection Act, and without subsequent monitoring of their impacts, or without any public or agency participation. Traditional, non-motorized users should not suffer the loss of recreational opportunities simply because their forms of recreation do not cause visible and lasting damage to the landscape. Wildlife and wildlife habitat should not suffer either.

As previously stated, user-created routes are established without appropriate public process or environmental review and most certainly were not “built” to standard. Because of this and because illegally created routes as a matter of policy should not be officially incorporated into the travel system, these illegal routes should be closed using combinations of proven and effective closure methods such as road ripping for several hundred yards, placement of large boulders, and so forth. The closed routes should then be rehabilitated. Additionally, these routes should only be officially designated when compelling circumstances exist. Compelling circumstances should be clearly defined in the draft EIS (DEIS). We recommend that compelling circumstances be limited to the following:

- 1 the travel route provides recreational opportunities clearly desired by a wide range of public interests and not met through existing designated routes and is shown not to be ecologically damaging, and
- 2 the travel route will significantly facilitate travel thereby providing significant benefit to the government and the public and is shown not to be ecologically damaging.

As previously stated, the Forest Service should ensure that it is designating uses on roads and trails that are compatible with designated uses on adjacent public land units. Additionally the Forest Service should also consider consistency of recreational management within its own boundaries.

We also believe the EIS for the CTPR should cite the number and types of violations occurring. This review should also disclose the environmental and social impacts of the increasing illegal travel on the forest.

### **Cross-Boundary Issues**

The Forest Service should develop the CTRP by coordinating with adjacent land management units’ recreation and travel management. The Forest Service should also ensure that the C-TNF fully complies with 36 *Code of Federal Regulations* §§ 261 and 295, Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, and the National Forest Management Act (16 *United States Code* 36 §§ 1600 et seq.) planning regulations that pertain to OHV use (including OHV planning regulations and general resource protection regulations). These regulations require that

- 1 the Forest Service effectively monitor OHV use;
- 2 the Forest Service close OHV routes that are causing or potentially will cause user

- conflicts or considerable adverse impacts to natural resources;
- 3 the Forest Service must practice adaptive management by periodically reviewing the monitoring results and adapting the management of OHVs to ensure that serious user conflicts and natural resource impacts are not occurring;
  - 4 the Forest Service must plan OHV routes so as to minimize impacts and conflicts, and;
  - 5 the Forest Service must ensure OHV use on the forest does not result in significant adverse impacts to natural resources or loss of viability to native and desired non-native species.

**Road and Trail Recommendations—by District**

The Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative is based on the assumption that all roads and trails recommended to be closed to motorized use in the Proposed Action will remain closed. Tables 2 through 6 indicate the additional roads and trails that will be closed for the Traditional Access & Recreation Alternative. These tables are by District and forest section. For example, Table 2 is for the Montpelier Ranger District, Bear River Range while Table 5 is for the Westside Ranger District, Malad Area.

**TABLE 2**

**Montpelier District—Bear River Range**

<b>Map #B-1 District—Montpelier</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
349	Bailey Creek Pack Trail	Close to protect water quality and non-motorized recreation	Marv Hoyt
No Number	This trail is east of Cheatbeck basin and beginning at Road 20402 and heading north from there.	This is a redundant pioneered motorized route which parallels Road 20402, dead ending above Setter Creek.	Marv Hoyt
<b>Map #B-2 District—Montpelier</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
311	Mill Fork Eight Mile	The first mile of this trail from Road 20437 up Mill Fork is causing significant resource	Tom Lucia

358	Squirrel Hollow	This is a redundant trail north south motorized trail, one of three that connect State Highway 36 to the trail/road system in North and Main Canyons. These three trails are no more than a mile apart and essentially create a motorized “strangle point” severing the north end of the Bear River Range from the middle and south end. Any motorized trails should be at least 2 miles apart to allow for some security/sanctuary for wildlife. If the Forest is determined to provide motorized use of virtually all of the historic Highline Pack Trail, it should not also provide redundant motorized trails in the same area. These trails have significant impacts on wildlife.	Tom Lucia
20951	No name	This is a redundant trail north south motorized trail, one of three that connect State Highway 36 to the trail/road system in North and Main Canyons. These three trails are no more than a mile apart and essentially create a motorized “strangle point” severing the north end of the Bear River Range from the middle and south end. Any motorized trails should be at least 2 miles apart to allow for some security/sanctuary for wildlife. If the Forest is determined to provide motorized use of virtually all of the historic Highline Pack Trail, it should not also provide redundant motorized trails in the same area. These trails have significant impacts on wildlife.	Tom Lucia

**Map #B-3 District—Montpelier**

<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
No Number	No Name	This trail travel south of the Pole Canyon Road, #20938, and dead ends at a non-motorized section of trail that then connects to Road #20442. This route is simply a pioneered two-track road which traverses an open area to the top of a hill. When I visited the area in 2002 this track was causing significant erosion and sediment into Pole Canyon Creek. It will also be impossible to prevent the illegal motorized use of the non-motorized section of the trail.	Marv Hoyt
309	Historic Pack Trail	This trail is causing significant resource damage due to its steepness and the fact that it diverges from the historic alignment of the pack trail crossing at Wills Canyon. By closing this route to motorized use the Forest can create a block of land where traditional access use can occur and provide a sanctuary for wildlife.	Marv Hoyt
No Name	Trail and Road in Bear Hollow which begin at Road # 20441	Neither the road nor the trail are shown on any prior map. A trail of sorts can be seen from satellite imagery but it clearly is located completely in the bottom of the Bear Hollow drainage. These routes combined are only 1.17 miles in length and serve no purpose other than to allow unnecessary motorized access.	Marv Hoyt
20499	Snow Hollow to Highline Pack Trail	This is a redundant motorized trail that is should be closed to provide sanctuary for big game and reduce sever erosion.	Tom Lucia

**TABLE 3**

**Montpelier Ranger District—East Side**

<b>Map # PR-1 District—Montpelier</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
093	Deer Creek	Deer Creek is an important spawning stream for Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The Deer Creek trail is inappropriate for motorized use, even by motorcycles. The trail is very narrow because of the steep canyon, crossing numerous talus slide areas that already add sediment to Deer Creek. Allowing motorized use will lead to significant increases in the sediment load to the stream. In many areas the trail also occurs in the riparian area, immediately adjacent to Deer Creek. Motorized use will significantly impact the stream and riparian areas. I and several others hiked from the divide between Sage Creek and Deer Creek this past summer down to trail 102 on the North Fork Deer Creek and proceeded down to the confluence with Deer Creek, then down trail 093 to the Forest boundary. It was clear that no motorized use had occurred last summer and evidently the trail currently receives little or no motorized use due to its very narrow tread (in most cases no more than 15 – 18 inches wide), the steepness of many of the trail sections, and the difficulty of navigating the talus slope sections of the trail. Finally, the trail dead ends at the gate between the forest boundary and private lands that are closed to motorized use. This trail should not be opened to motorized use.	Marv Hoyt
93, 102, 403	Deer Creek, North Fork Deer Creek,	Our main concern about the Travel Plan is the inclusion of motorcycle trails in the Deer Creek watershed. This includes Trails 093, 403 and 102. These trails are currently used only by foot traffic and some horse back riding. We have never seen any evidence of motorized vehicle usage. These trails should remain in that condition. There are obviously numerous other areas which have already seen motorcycle and motor vehicle usage so that it is unnecessary to open still more Forest terrain to motorized vehicles. The Deer Creek water shed is habitat for abundant wildlife. The area should be preserved for them with out the presence of motor vehicles which will affect them adversely. Deer Creek is steep sided through much of its distance. This will	Pete Riede

<b>Map #S-1 District—Soda Springs</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
20083	Horse Basin	This unnecessary road has caused excessive erosion. It also conflicts with traditional, non-motorized use of this area.	Royce Brown
20083	Horse Basin Caribou MT	Access off of this ATV trail/road is <u>very steep</u> and rocky & if the end of the trail is closed, probably entire trails should be.	Mark Steele
20165	Caribou City Winchell Dugway	This should be non-motorized for historic purposes. It has not been used that I know of in 44 yrs. By vehicles. Soils are a big concern, per District FS geologist, for stability & sediment. YCT in McCoy, Tincup, Jackknife Creeks, etc. Also opens a RARE II area to motorized use and loses those values & adds to more enforcement and management issues in times of shrinking budgets. (This trail is also located on <b>Map #S-3</b> and has the number 600 noted for part of it.)	Mark Steele
20165	Caribou City	This trail will open country to motorized use that has always been traditional horse & foot use, and will encourage travel on other non-motorized trails that intersect 20165.	Mike McCollum
20165	Caribou City trail	This is one of the last non-motorized refuges for wildlife on the Caribou NF. Soils and water will be damaged if it is opened to motorized use.	Mike McCollum
20118	Willow Creek	Seasonal closure to protect soils or build the road to specs.	Mark Steele
20012	Trail to Caribou Mt. Repeater	Trail to Repeater used to be closed per District Ranger Tony Varilone and had to be accessed by helicopter, he said. Needs to be closed or brought up to specs.	Mark Steele
20012	West Side Caribou Mt	Soil erosion will occur and wildlife will lose this refuge area where animals can get away from motorized areas.	Mike McCollum
20012 (also 20165 & 20189)	West Side Caribou MT	These trails give too much opportunity to go off motorized routes and harm fragile soil and it cuts off any escape to elk and deer.	Royce Brown
<b>Map #S-3 District—Soda Springs</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
20189	Morgan Meadows trail	This will allow motorized access to previously closed area cause impacts to wildlife habitat, soil erosion, a last refuge for wildlife.	Mike McCollum
46 & 21284	Pole Creek	This trail should be non-motorized. The creek is an historical YCT spawning stream.	Jack Sturm
20162	Near Clear Creek	Should be closed for erosion and for wildlife security.	Jack Sturm
20257 & 20184	No names	These two trails offer too much pressure on a small area.	Royce Brown
20257 & 20184	No names	These trails are redundant, parallel to, and less than .25 miles from road 20190.	Marv Hoyt
20169	O'Brien Pond extension	This trail is causing soil erosion and allows uncontrolled access to non-motorized routes and non-classified, un-marked trails that were created and are used by motorized vehicles.	Carter Swain
<b>Map #S-4 District—Soda Springs</b>			
<b>Trail or</b>			

103	Webster Ridge	This trail should be closed at the head of Bear Creek to junction with 20107 and trail 50 to preserve wildlife security.	Jack Sturm
103	Webster Ridge	If it goes clear up to Diamond Peak it will be impossible to enforce off-road riding. It should be closed at Bear Canyon to 20107 & trail 50.	Mike McCollum
103	Webster Ridge Trail	Close from Bear Canyon to 20107 and 50 to protect big game. It will also protect historic horseback use in the Diamond Peak area. ATV users will try to continue pushing north to the Diamond Flat area.	Mark Steele
No number	Road/trail between Stewart Flat on north almost to District boundary on south parallel to Road 21102	This is a redundant and un-needed motorized route.	Mark Steele

**TABLE 5**

**Westside Ranger District - Malad**

<b>Map #M-1 District—Westside</b>			
<b>Trail or Road#</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
		<b>One need only review the maps of this area of the Forest to realize that there are virtually NO non-motorized recreation opportunities. Sharing trails between horseback riders and motorized vehicles is dangerous, aesthetically unacceptable, and not an option.</b>	
174	Rowley Canyon	From forest boundary at Rowley Canyon to intersection of Rd. # 20848—lack of public land access, conflicts with private land owners. This was an historically non-motorized trail.	Dick Baker, Tony Dudley, Bill Jons, Paul Alexander
131	No-name trail	This trail does not show on USFS maps prior to 1994; it is non-existent on the ground. Over the past 3.5 years the District has changed the location of the alleged trail on	Dick Baker, Tony Dudley, Bill Jons, Paul Alexander

**TABLE 6****Westside Ranger District—Pocatello**

<b>Map #P-1 District—Westside</b>			
<b>Trail or Road #</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
20276 20282 20281 20280 20280A	Trail Creek Junction with road to Kinport and WildHorse Mt.	This area is highly impacted by motorized use. Seasonal closures as well as gated areas are ignored. Areas on Forest Service and BLM lands have turned into ATV and motorcycle parks. Switchbacks are being cut and new trails are being pioneered between existing trails. There are three trails that parallel each other in this area with several interconnecting branches. This area needs to be heavily managed. Some of these routes need to be closed to minimize pioneering of trails. Seasonal access is not easily enforced and access should be limited to stop the go anywhere attitude that prevails in this area.	Brian Gard  Greg Mladenka
20276 after junction with 20277.		Close to motorized from the intersection of 20276 and 20277 south. This trail dead-ends on a ridge top and access is provided on 20288. This would prevent pioneering along the ridge top.	SIRA
20280A	Outlaw Creek in Trail Creek area	This trail is marked as non-motorized and should stay that way because of erosion issues. Erosional rutting is severe enough in places to result in the skill level needed to ride this trail (for a mountain biker) to be elevated from an intermediate to an advanced intermediate/advanced level. Motorized vehicles use this trail and better signage or barriers to prevent travel on this trail may be needed.	Margo Lasky  Bob Marcinko
20277	West Forest Boundary to 20276	Keep closed. Not on previous maps as open. Unable to enforce seasonal closure. This road allows access to forest in the early season because of its southern exposure.	Brain Gard
20010	Cusick Creek	Close to motorized. The road/trail up City Creek provides the same starting and end point. Cusick Creek would provide a non-motorized experience and connects with the non-motorized City Creek Trail System.	Angier Wills  Margo Lasky  Bob Marcinko
20287	Horse Lake toward Rock Knoll	Close trail 20287. This road dead-ends into a non-motorized trail. This encourages motorized use on the non-	Dana Olson  John Jefimoff

**TABLE 7**

**Westside Ranger District—Pocatello**

<b>Map #P-2 District—Westside</b>			
<b>Trail or Road #</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
20292	Kinney Creek	Close to motorized use summer and winter. Once the gate is opened and motorized vehicles come in, people start dumping trash such as tables, lawn cuttings etc. We have seen fire rings in the middle of the road and in the evening this is used as a party area. This is a dead-end road that is highly used by horseback riders, hikers, bicycle riders, cross-country skiers and snowshoers. Support year-round closure. This closure will prevent illegal pioneering.	Greg Mladenka Dori Glennon Brian Holmes Bill Hogan
20014 20505 20312 20305 to junction with 71	Indian Creek Area	The Indian Creek area should be non-motorized to junction of 20014 with trail 71, including the 71 spur to 20014. There is no public access without permission at Indian Creek. If this area became non-motorized, the Forest Service could possibly negotiate an access route through private land. There is motorized access at Walker Creek. This would also prevent resource damage from Indian Creek to Walker Canyon.	Brian Holmes Greg Mladenka Angier Wills
71	Lead Draw to	Keep as single track. Open to	SIRA

Unnumbered	Valve House Pass to East Mink	Close to motorized use, they have alternate route 20515 with Value House Draw all the way. This will give mountain bikers and hikers a non-motorized opportunity in Value House Draw.	Dana Olson Greg Mladenka Margo Lasky Bob Marcinko
344	Box Canyon Trail	Keep as single track. Open to motorcycle use only.	SIRA
20891	Box Canyon to Scout Mt Rd	Close to motorized use, have alternate access to the north and south. This trail connects two non-motorized trails; Bull Canyon and Box Canyon 20344. Resource damage.	Greg Mladenka
20009	Scout Mt Rd	A barrier needs to be put up between Crestline Trail and 20009 to stop pioneering across Scout Mt. This is still used illegally.	Greg Mladenka
20656	Birch Creek	Close at boundary. It was closed on the 2001 map. Protect riparian areas, dead-end road.	Greg Mladenka
West of 21265 Trail not #	Trail on Ridge Valve House to South Fork	The motorized trail just west of the non-motorized trail # 21265 should be closed. This trail is not engineered and impacts area for Sharptail and ruffed grouse	Greg Mladenka

**Winter Issues**

<b>Trail #</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant (if known)</b>
20292	Kinney Creek	Close to snowmobiles. Most years this area does not have enough snow for snowmachines. This area is getting an increase in use by snowshoers.	Dori Glennon Dana Olson Brain Holmes
Park and Ski area	Valve House Ski Complex	Close trail # 501 to over-the-snow vehicles at the gate right before the narrow entrance into the canyon. The canyon past the fence is narrow with steep side hills. Cross-country skiers and snowshoers use this trail as a loop from the South Fork trailhead to Valve House Draw. This still allows snowmachines to use the open flat area just off the South Fork road. Redefine the Cross-Country Park and Ski area boundary by starting at the South Fork Trailhead and follow the east side of the road up the draw and run the boundary along the base of the South Fork / Valve House Draw ridge to the Box Canyon Road # 20344. The boundary then will extend along the north side of Box Canyon road # 20344 to the junction of trail 344 and the East Fork of Mink Trail # 64. The eastern boundary would proceed north along the East Fork Mink Creek Trail #64 back to the campground and then along roads 20002, 20890, and 20001 to the state boundary all the way down to the Mink Creek Highway (21231). This would include the City of Pocatello Nordic Center. This boundary will protect all the trails currently used by the nordic skiers. This change in the boundary will provide	Dana Olson Michael Kugler Brian Holmes Dori Glennon Bill Hogan Margo Lasky Bob Marcinko John Jefimoff Cara Sonnemann

<b>Map #P-3 District—Westside</b>			
<b>Trail or Road #</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant</b>
Some Unnumbered 80, 83, 81,321 20303 20011 20193	Upper Toponce Region, North of Inman Canyon, South Fork of Toponce Creek	We support this as a non-motorized area. This area is used primarily for hunting and provides a quality non-motorized hunting experience.  The following trails and roads should also be closed to motorized vehicles to help protect this area from road and trail pioneering: trails 20336, 20208, 20320 and 77. See comments for individual trails 20336, 20208, 20320 and 77 below.	Greg Mladenda  Stu Reynolds  Rick Cheatum
20336	Middle Fork of Toponce Creek	Close road to motorized travel at the junction with 20366. Road 20366 provides 1 mile of motorized access and encourages encroachment on non-motorized roads that will be closed.	Greg Mladenda  Stu Reynolds
20208 20320	Toponce Region	Close road to motorized access to prevent trail pioneering.	Greg Mladenda  Stu Reynolds
77	South Fork Toponce	Close trail through creek bed. A road that stays out of the creek bed parallels trail 77. Close for wildlife and habitat protection.	Greg Mladenda  Stu Reynolds
21305	Dead End	This road is only ½-mile long and should be closed to prevent trail pioneering.	Greg Mladenka
NO #	Bear Camp Gulch South of junction of trail 20870 and north of trail junction of 20013	Close, dead-end road. One of the roads is proposed motorized and the other is non-motorized. Close to prevent trail pioneering.	Greg Mladenka
98	Boundary Trail, Inkom Pass to Pebble Creek Guard Station	This trail has been recently widened. This should have remained a single-track trail and it is now open to ATV use. Trail heads to the north and south from the Inkom Pass. These areas need to be barricaded. Was there a NEPA assessment of this trail before it was widened?  Close 98 from Inkom Pass to the junction with 20013. There is already access that parallels this area on trail 20013.	Angier Wills  Greg Mladenka  Dwight Worthington
20359	Long Gulch	There are many side trails from this road. If they cannot be blocked then this should be closed.	Dwight Worthington  Brian Gard
<b>Winter Issues</b>			
<b>Trail #</b>	<b>Trail Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Informant (if known)</b>
Backside of Pebble Creek	Boundary Trail # 98  Big Canyon # 20024	An area on the backside of the Pebble Creek Ski area has already been designated as a non-motorized winter recreation area in the Forest Plan. We think it is important to expand this area to the north to include the Enchanted Forest	Dana Olson  Dori Glennon  Bill Hogan

## **APPENDICES**